

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
April 24, 2025

Case Number 92-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of P1316 LLC (owner) seeking approval of a five-lot PD Development Plan to be known as "Discovery Apartments" and an associated "site-specific" Statement of Intent (SOI). The PD Plan will also serve as a revised preliminary plat for the development's acreage which contains Lot 6 of Discovery Park Subdivision, Plat 6A, Lots 7 and 8 of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 7, and an approximate 16.28-acre survey tract at the northwestern terminus of Endeavor Avenue. The southern portion of the site (proposed Lots 1 & 2) will each contain a three-story residential building, a four-story mixed-use/residential building, required surface parking, and private garage structures. The northern portion of the site (Lots 3-5) are reserved for future development; however, are shown on the PD plan as having dimensional and impervious surface limitations. The approximately 22.14-acre subject site is located around the perimeter of the roundabout at the end of Endeavor Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES. May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed PD Plan entitled "Discovery Apartments" and its associated Statement of Intent subject to:

1. Amending the allowable "total building space" within Tracts 4, 5, and 9 as shown in Exhibit 21, Table A of Ord. 018043 as follows:
 - a. Tract 4-16 - 205,283 sq. ft
 - b. Tract 5 - 1,064,129 sq. ft
 - c. Tract 9 - 429,930 sq. ft
2. No new development plan submissions shall be considered on Tracts 4, 5, or 9 prior to approval of a comprehensive revision to Ord. 018043 permitting additional footprint and total building space allocations on said Tracts.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, would any of my fellow Commissioners like to recuse from this case?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I'm going to recuse myself from this case at this time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You are excused, Commissioner Stanton. Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff?

Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Zenner, I fully understand the increasing total building space to align with the request, especially since they exceeded that already. On the submitted PD Plan, it also identifies impervious area. Is there enough impervious area included in that current SOI to accommodate all that's being requested in the submitted PD Plan?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. So as we track -- as we track development proposals that come in, one of the things that we specifically asked for with this was a full detailed reporting. And the engineer and the project engineer for this project provided us that. Based on those calculations, there is the .72 acres of impervious surface left. That's after taking everything out, the five lots of this development proposal.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: That is all that's left.

MS. LOE: That accounts for what's being proposed?

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: It accounts for everything that is proposed.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: The -- it seems like we're using some of the impervious surface and building square footage from Tract 3 that is now a park, and we're kind of shifting that.

MR. ZENNER: No.

MR. BRODSKY: No?

MR. ZENNER: No, we are not. The allocations, Tract 3 -- Tract 3's allocation is to tract -- was to Tract 3 only. It has not been calculated into any of the shared square footages or allotments to the tracts that are controlled by the applicant, which would be Tract 4, 5, 9, and 8. Eight does not -- it's not counted because eight actually is the open zone parcel, so the only three tracts that they have shared between -- well, they have -- I take that back. Tract 8, they did pull some out of, but when you only use 4, 5, and 9, those have aligned. There is a portion, there's about six and a half acres of Tract 8 that has been developed, but the 85 percent impervious cover hasn't really been tapped. The data tables that were provided to us did a transfer of impervious cover from, if I am not incorrect, Tract 9 to Tract 4, which is permitted, because that's all draining to the lake. So as there's -- as you noticed in the staff report, there's two different basins, a Group A and a Group B. They only used three of their four available tracts, really, that are north of Gans Road for the transferring. That is what we have been able to document, and so we are comfortable that they have not taken anything from Tract 3. And Tract 3, actually now that it is not part of this -- not part of the plan anymore because it was rezoned, any of the allocations associated with that really are void.

MR. BRODSKY: That -- that was going to be my question, that has Tract 3, the park, there is no

ability in the future for that to build those 519 units?

MR. ZENNER: So we are -- we are basing everything on what is left.

MR. BRODSKY: Perfect. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? I have one, and you may not have done the calculation. But if -- I understand why it can't be open zone. I do.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: As far as the building envelope and open space calculations, how close are we running up to what that would be under M-C?

MR. ZENNER: I do not have that calculation. We can get that calculation with the actual -- the next iteration of what we're going to get. I think that is exceptionally important. Mr. Crockett may have that number as it relates to the amount of open space that is existing. There is, of course, and this is well documented through the agreement, through the 2004 agreement, there is an overall requirement of open space amongst all of the tracts. And I think, collectively, we have to -- we have to look at -- I have to look more detailed at how that would be considered, given the park now is ours, it is considered an open space permanent. And that's, again, part of what we have to maybe explore if we're going to look at more major modifications. But for the specific Discovery Park, Tracts 4, 5, 6 -- or, I'm sorry -- 4, 5, 8 and 9, which make up Discovery Park -- what's commonly known as Discovery Park, northwest of the interchange, I do not have that number specifically. And the only thing I can tell you is we've had amenities built into almost each one of the projects that have come through. Collectively and holistically, though, that number may be low, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh. What's -- do you know just off the top of your head what the percentage is for M-C?

MR. ZENNER: Well, the percentage of M-C was -- it was allowed to be 85 percent impervious with a 15 percent green space standard associated with it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: So that is the -- that was the standard in 2004. That's still the standard today for any general commercial -- commercial office parcel. So with that being said, I mean, until we know what specifically is going on the property, and where -- so the opportunity that exists at this point is we have explored with the owner and the applicant is the portion of Tract 5 that is to the -- to the southeast of Nocona, and Tract 8 share a common boundary. And potentially, in order to address long term concerns about not having an excessive overage, or needing to compensate for a footprint increase, the one method may be to take the M-C tract today, the open C-3, or what was the open C-3 and combine that potentially as part of the PD tract in the leftover Tract 5. Because in the opposite direction of what we typically would like to do and typically what the applicant would like to do, they would prefer to extend the M-C across all the way to Nocona. However, as we have discussed up to this point, that creates a problem potentially because we have no way outside of a planned district to be able to compensate and offset impacts that have been created elsewhere within the project and the development. And so, again,

those will be part of the -- those will be part of the talking points as we move forward. The initial issue at hand, of course, is the desire to develop Lots 1 and 2 of this PD Plan. And again, resolving to get everybody back onto firm ground with an increase in the total building space is the beginning of being able to get there, and that's -- that's the objective of the applicant. That would be the objective of us as staff. Obviously, this project has evolved over time. It was very slow in developing, and now it has accelerated. And unfortunately, particular aspects of the overall agreement and its requirements were not as well maintained as they could have been. The impervious calculations, though, have been, and that has been being monitored separately by our stormwater staff that was actually unbeknownst to me, so they, with every project, have been monitoring this, so we would have been alerted probably at a project submission that we did not have enough left. But the building space, which is something that's totally foreign generally to us unless you have GFA limitation is something that just does not -- it had not been adequately tracked. And that's part of why we're where we're at.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. I'm -- I'm a little bit irritated that the folks that have been developing this for the last 20 years have not done so in accordance with the agreement they made with the City, but that's neither here nor there, because this has had relatively stable ownership. Right?

MR. ZENNER: Well, the -- and I'll let Mr. Crockett respond to this for the length of time that -- that the applicant, P13, and others have owned the property. This was lost at one point. Jose Linder had proposed development of this property as really a retail office environment. There was very little contemplation of residential development here, so this was -- this would have been a very low-slung, California style single, maybe two-story development, if Mr. Linder had proposed it -- been successful in developing it. The development composition has changed greatly since the current owners have purchased the property. And the dynamic -- the dynamic nature of this, other than the fact that we -- we occasionally complain about color choice and some other things, the dynamic nature of the land-use pattern that has been built in this particular environment is a result of demands that the applicant has been trying to meet, and is driven, again, based on some of the locational characteristics and the other elements. And so I agree with your point, Ms. Geuea Jones, that the applicant knew what they went into, and unfortunately, you know, it takes checks and balances across the board and, you know, certain things fall through the cracks. What I will tell you is that the major component associated with this from our perspective, from a planning perspective, mine, personally, is that the environmental controls that are associated with this have not been violated at this point. Pattern of development, the quality of development, the demand for development, that has all changed over 20 years, and therefore, the density that's out here, the vertical density that is out here has resulted, as I said, in probably less impervious surfaces being created because you're going vertical, not horizontally, and we have made advancements in our Code.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Last question. It's probably in the staff report and I'm just missing it. Is the definition of total building area, total usable floor space, or what?

MR. ZENNER: I have the agreement here and I do not have that right off the top of my head

either. But if I am not incorrect, let me go back to the table where we talk about that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Because the -- the case that we are tabling is an interior modification, so -

-

MR. ZENNER: It's an interior -- so the footprint has already been accounted for

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: That's why I had indicated that if you are inclined to make a recommendation of approval of this project with these conditions, that 5000 Artemis be actually excluded because the footprint and all the impervious surface coverage that is on that lot at this point, that was part of that PD Plan --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: -- has all been incorporated into the calculations that we're bringing to you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Okay. Yeah. If -- we don't have to wait while you look for it, but if you could tell me if there's a difference between total building area and, like, usable floor space or something, that would be helpful. Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I have to admit, I'm really confused by a lot of this. This is very complex stuff, and tracts and lots and -- and building space and impervious, it's confusing. And what -- but one thing you could help me, maybe, Mr. Zenner, and maybe Mr. Crockett will too is what is the crux of the disagreement? Is there -- are they -- is the proposed allowances for Tract 4, 5 and 9, the square footage, is that not deemed acceptable at this point? Is it a question of zoning changes? I just don't understand why -- why we're at this point of disagreement. It seems like what the City has proposed, based on my limited knowledge, it seems reasonable. Can you summarize -- I can ask Mr. Crockett the same thing, but I'd like to hear from the City's point of view, in a nutshell, why are we stuck?

MR. ZENNER: There -- actually, we are not stuck. Mr. Crockett informed me before this evening that the applicant is more than willing to accept the conditions that are laid out here on the slide in front of you. We are -- we are stuck at a -- we are stuck because of our own issue. Our ordinance does not allow -- would not allow without an amendment --

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- for you to approve this project. And so what we have to unpack for you, there's two -- there's two tracks that we're going down. One is the development tract of their proposal, and the other is the underlying zoning entitlement, which is the 2004 agreement. We need to amend the 2004 agreement as a part of this zoning proposal, so those can be done concurrently, and we can amend the statement of intent that governs these tracts, concurrently with approving a site-specific development plan and its statement of intent that goes with this project site. There is no disagreement. The staff and the applicant are both in alignment. It is more of an issue is is the Commission comfortable in acknowledging that we are going to increase what was originally agreed on in 2004 by roughly 232,000 square feet. That is the question that is really before the Commission. If you are willing to do that through the way that I have displayed it here, we're all good.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. And if we are willing to do that, it's -- that's -- I'm -- if I was -- right now, it sounds like I'm favorable to this, but it's based on the fact that that increase will not result in any adverse impervious surface arterial.

MR. ZENNER: Correct. That is correct.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Okay. That's -- that helps me out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anybody else? Thank you. In that case, we will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any member of the public who wishes to speak may come forward. We allow for six minutes for groups and the applicant, and three minutes for individuals. And I will probably be enforcing it more than I usually do tonight to make sure we can get through.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. Madam Chair, and members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Before my time starts, I would like to address some of the questions that the Commission has asked, just to get some clarification on that. So Commissioner Loe, you asked about the impervious area for this PD Plan. So not only are Lots 1 and 2, the proposed buildings on this PD Plan included in the existing -- or the impervious calculations, but so has impervious coverages for Lots 3, 4 and 5. So while we wouldn't have building square footages to go with those buildings, with those lots, impervious areas have been accounted for for those lots, and we're still under the impervious limit even with the non-development of those three. Commissioner Geuea Jones, the overages on the square footage, you know, how do we -- how do we get to here. You are correct and we're -- this is the third developer, the third owner of this property. I believe there was three, if not four, City managers. City staff has had a lot of turnover in 20 years. We're the fourth engineer on this project, so I think, you know, over that time, how did that happen? We don't know. But what has happened is when we started this, we were inherited some -- some spreadsheets that staff has provided to us that didn't make a lot of sense. We had to go back through, and we just -- we, basically, started over. We said, hey, hold on. Let's just start over. Let's start from scratch. We worked with staff and we generated what we have today, and that's when we really found the big issues that we have. And so that's where we're at. How we got there, I really don't know. You know, Mr. Zenner did talk about lively conversations that we have been having with City staff, and I'm not sure -- lively, I'm not really sure, but I don't want to make -- no misunderstandings. We are discussing this with -- with City staff, and we're making great headway. I mean, Pat and his department are very willing to meet with us and discuss this and try to come up with solutions, and it's been very helpful, so we're very appreciative of that. And, Commissioner Walters, you know, why the changes. I think if you look back at the original intent of what Mr. Linder's development out here was, it was mainly strictly a -- as Mr. Zenner said, a one-story or maybe some two-story commercial development. It was large strip centers, QSRs, you know, that type of development and not so much as the residential component. Twenty years have passed. We've changed how we look at development. We look at, you know, 20 years ago, we didn't go vertical. Twenty years ago, we didn't put lower-level commercial and residential units on top, and I think the development community kind of

kicking and screaming and went that route, and I think that we see that, wow, that's the much better route for development, and that's a better way. And so I think that we've learned over 20 years a better path forward for development. So with that, I will start my presentation, and I will be brief, running through my information, I believe that Pat has -- if I can get this switched over.

MR. ZENNER: Let me go find out if they fell asleep.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. Please --

MR. CROCKETT: All right. There we go. There we go. So again, Tim Crockett. With me is Jack Cardetti, he's the owner's representative here tonight with us. Again, 22.14 acres, annexed and zoned in 2014. Five lots, only two are being developed at this time. And the units that we're proposing would be a mix studio apartments, one-bedroom, two-bedroom, and then commercial uses on the lower floors. You've seen -- this is the overall PD Plan, the two lots to the south, and then, of course, the three that would be left undeveloped to the north. Part of the reason that we included those without any additional proposed uses, first of all, as these things build out, it takes time to make changes. Units change, development patterns change, we want to propose something, but every single time that we make a change, we come back to this Commission, and we don't like that. What we want to do is, hey, is there a way that we can show you what our intention is, but not with the exact buildings with the understanding we will come back before you. And then this was all done and this was all decided before we came up with the idea that we had or realized that we had a total building square foot issue. And so it's not because we're out of area, it's because we don't know what we're doing on those. We have a good idea, but without exact, you know, specifics, we -- we don't want to present that. Here's the zoomed-in version of Discovery Apartments. Where it sits on the site, you can see here with the blue X, the blue is the commercial, the orange is more the residential mixed use with lower-level commercial on a lot of that. The green is obviously City parks, and then the yellow to -- to the left is the varying single-family development. The impervious limitations exist on all the tracts in Discovery Park, and Pat has talked about that. Sharing of impervious limits across tracts is allowed, and all the tracts under the control of the applicant are under the impervious limitations. And so I think that's important, and I think Pat has talked about that quite a bit. Here's our spreadsheet that we generated that goes through each and every development that's taken place out there, and talks about what the impervious calculations are, how much area do we have, how much do we have left. You know, if we're over on one, we found of the -- one of the previous development tracts, it was already completely developed, was over. Okay. So we to have swap and do some sharing, and so we did that, so that accounts for all of that. The total building square -- the total building space, and that's the term used in the -- in the ordinance, total building space, that's where we're having the issue and that's where we're over at this point. So the existing development is over that space. The staff is recommending a revision to that Statement of Intent to address that. And again, as Pat has indicated, the building space doesn't necessarily correlate with stormwater environmental concerns. That's where your impervious surface and your stormwater come into play, and we're not over on that. The spreadsheet for that is a little bit more -- you know, a little more complex and

a lot more information provided on that. And the way we went back and did that is we went back and simply looked at every single building built out there, whether it was a commercial development, whether it was a hotel, whether it was an apartment building, or even a garage, we took every single square foot of every building out there. And to answer your question -- six minutes already?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, I know.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's because I usually let you go.

MR. CROCKETT: I know. Well, I'll be very, very brief. So to answer your question, the area, we didn't use usable square footage. We believe that it is the footprint of the building --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: -- is the square footage, and so that's what we did. So we're not trying to -- to cut corners or skimp on that. We're using the entire square footage. Uses we've talked about. Traffic, I can talk, if you want. Utilities are all City utilities. Stormwater, this is just real briefly on this. Staff has determined that the current stormwater standards are, in their words, superior to the water quality protection plan. So the current stormwater ordinance that we have today that we use on all development in Columbia is superior to what was approved out here back in 2004, and we -- we continue with that. We check a lot of items on Columbia Imagined. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Mr. Crockett. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Next to speak on this case? Hi.

MR. CARDETTI: Good evening, Chair and members of the Commission. My name is Jack Cardetti. I am with Discovery Apartments with offices at 4220 Phillips Farm Road. You know one of the best single indicators of a community's economic health is population growth. In the state of Missouri over the last census, 78 of our 114 counties in the city of Louis lost population. There's cascading effects when that happened. We actually had 11 counties in the State of Missouri that grew at or above the national average, with Boone being one of those, driven mostly by population growth here in Columbia. That's a great sign, but, as we know, it also comes with challenges. It also comes -- how do we provide City services to this new population. Right? What happens when a recycling center gets hit by a tornado, you know. These are the type of things that everybody in this city -- there's also how do you build infrastructure for a population growth, and how do you do housing. And think it was one of the great things we saw is the report that the City and the County did last October that looked at what are going to be our housing needs now and into the future, and what that showed is that in the next 25 years, we need to build at least 37,000 more dwelling units just to keep up with expected population growth. We want population growth. Bad things happen when we don't have that, and so really important. Now I'm not going to sit here and say all -- that means that every building request that comes in front of you, you guys should support. It needs to be the right thing. It needs to be the right place. It needs to have the right

infrastructure. The apartments out here at Discovery, on average, are -- have an occupancy rate of 99 percent. More often than not, there is a waiting list, so this is clearly something that the community supports. This is clearly something where people want to live and it's something that people can afford to live out there. A lot of this is what we now call workforce housing. In fact, the number one profession of residents of Discovery Park Apartments is health-care workers all across Columbia. And so, you know, we believe that this -- there's a lot of technical details, obviously, about this, but we think the benefit that has come to Columbia by adding these 239 dwelling units is really, really substantial. We think it's going to help in the short term and it's going to help in the long term. Now, in the City and County report, it also talks about how and where we want to -- we want to build those units. And so there's a couple of things that they talk about in there I think that are pretty important. We don't want to take any land out of production. We want to develop where the infrastructure can support it. You know, we want to fill in land in the City limits before we expand outside the City limits. This is a project that really checks all of those boxes. You know, as we've said before, we realize that after this project, we're going to have to come back in and have a much more comprehensive discussion with the City, with the Planning Commission, with the City Council about how we move forward from here. But we believe that this is a project that's really going to help the community at a time when we absolutely need more housing here, and it's housing that the community currently supports. So we really appreciate your guys' time, appreciate all the staff's effort on this 12, 14-month project just to get where we are today here, and be happy to answer any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Mr. Cardetti. Any questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here. Anyone else to speak on this case? Going once, going twice. Okay. Then we will close public hearing on this case.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'll start us off. I believe this tract was approved right before my first tenure on the Planning and Zoning Commission, and, man, there's been -- a lot has changed over that time. So I am sympathetic to this applicant. You know, it -- to be able to predict what's going to happen and go into a tract or development of this size that far into the future, you know, I think it's relatively obvious that there were, you know, going to be adjustments down the road. And if there ever was a poster child development for why we don't do PUDs anymore, this -- this is it. So I agree with you, Chairwoman, that, you know, it would have been nice for them to come in and ask permission to go over some of these limits, but it does -- I'm very sympathetic to Mr. Crockett's explanation of that. And I think what we've ended up with out here, as Mr. Crockett explained, I think it's superior that we've gone vertical, and we've increased that density within City limits. When we did the -- and Pat, help me. When we did that eastern plan, what did we call that?

MR. ZENNER: East Area Plan.

MR. BRODSKY: East Area Plan. We identified this intersection as kind of the southern edge of the City for the foreseeable future. That overpass had recently been built at that time. This would have been 2007, 2008. So, you know, increasing the density within that City limit and keeping that housing where we're not sprawling out with roads and sewer and having to do all that upkeep. So -- so I'm in favor of this, you know, given that the stormwater and the impervious surface is being paid attention to by staff, and it sounds like it is.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Well, it looks like we're, once again, trying to make the best of a bad hand. And I would point out that despite the fact this providing housing and characterizes workforce housing, it does not have public transportation. There are not amenities like stores and those kinds of things accessible, so it's autocentric. And I'm not as sanguine about it being the ideal future that I would envision.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'll attempt to make a motion. I recommend approval of Case 92-2025, as described by staff, to increase the total building space on tracts 4, 5 and 9 to the numbers that are on the slide there, and that no new development plan submissions on Tract 4, 5 or 9 would be without a comprehensive revision to the ordinance to increase the footprint and total building space allocations.

MS. GEUEA JONES: May I make a small friendly amendment?

MR. BRODSKY: Of course.

MS. GEUEA JONES: To exclude Case Number 158-2025 from the point two, no new development plan submissions.

MR. BRODSKY: I will accept that.

MR. CRAIG: I'll just -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. I'm sorry. Because of the internet, you have to speak into a mic.

MR. CRAIG: Okay. I'll hop up here. If we can get the -- the specifics of that subject number one on Tract 4, Tract 5, and Tract 9, I know it's a little verbose, but if we can get that into the record, I think that would be ideal.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Mr. Brodsky, could you start over?

MR. BRODSKY: Start over?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Remake your motion, please.

MR. BRODSKY: Oh, you're killing me. So make a motion to recommend approval -- I'll just read it. Recommend approval of the submitted PD Plan and the associated site specific statement of intent, subject to increasing total building space within Tracts 4, 5, and 9, Exhibit 21, Table A of ordinance 018043, as follows: Tract 4, 205,283 square feet, Tract 5, 1,064,129 square feet, Tract 9, 429,930 square feet, and that no new development plan submissions on Tracts 4, 5, or 9 are without a comprehensive revision to ordinance number 018043 to increase footprint and total building space allocations.

MS. GEUEA JONES: After Case 158-2025.

MR. BRODSKY: Well, see, that's not on here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know it's not.

MR. BRODSKY: I will accept that amendment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Legal, does that satisfy? Thumbs up. Excellent. Is there a second on said motion?

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second with amendments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excellent. Thank you, Commissioner Ortiz. Motion made by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Loe, may we have a roll call?

MS. LOE: Yes.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters. Motion carries 7-0.

MS. LOE: That is eight -- I'm sorry -- seven votes for, one recusal. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Commissioner Stanton, if you can hear my voice, we are ready for you to return.