

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**MARCH 19, 2026**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Mr. David Brodsky**  
**Ms. Sharon Wilson**  
**Mr. Robert Walters**  
**Mr. Anthony Stanton**  
**Ms. Kate Stockton**  
**Dr. Les Gray**  
**Ms. Mckenzie Ortiz**  
**Mr. Cody Darr**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones**

**STAFF**

**Mr. Pat Zenner**  
**Mr. Ross Halligan**  
**Mr. Jesse Craig**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MR. STANTON: I'd like to call to order the Planning and Zoning Commission, Thursday, March 19th, 2026 regular meeting to order.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

MR. STANTON: Mr. Secretary, can I have roll call, please?

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Stockton?

MS. STOCKTON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: I am here. Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Here.

MR. BRODSKY: And Commissioner Geuea Jones is absent. We have a quorum of eight.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. STANTON: Mr. Zenner, do we have any modifications to the agenda this evening?

MR. ZENNER: No, we do not, sir.

MR. STANTON: And no modifications, I would entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

DR. GRAY: I move to approve the agenda.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MR. STANTON: Moved and properly seconded. All those in favor, thumbs up. All those opposed, thumbs down.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. STANTON: We have had time to look at the March 5th meeting minutes. Are there any modifications to these minutes? If not, I'll entertain a motion to accept the minutes.

DR. GRAY: Move to approve the minutes.

MS. ORTIZ: I'll second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor of approving the minutes, thumbs up. All those opposed, thumbs down.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

**V. TABLING REQUEST**

**Case 91-2026**

**A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants, LLC (agent), on behalf of PD and CJ Properties, seeking approval to rezone the subject property from Planned Development (PD) to PD and approval of a site-specific Statement of Intent allowing development of 34 multi-family units to be known as "Bay Hills PD". The approximately 3.5-acre subject site is located at the property addressed 3 and 21 Grace Lane. (A request to table this matter to the April 23, 2026 Planning Zoning Commission meeting has been received.)**

MR. STANTON: Can I get a staff report, please?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, sir. So as we have indicated here, Case Number 91-2026 is sought to be tabled until the April 23, 2026 meeting. The purpose for the tabling request is to allow for technical revisions to be addressed for our first round of comments. The applicant is continuing to work with their design professional to address those staff-related comments. This particular project, not unlike the one that is immediately to the south and southeast will have a corresponding development agreement in order to offset transportation improvement costs on East Richland Road. Therefore, we are in favor of the tabling to allow for the technical corrections to be made, and to allow for the preparation of that corresponding development agreement. And just to ensure for the public, for the purposes of the public record, and as clarified by me earlier this week with another related project, we are actually not rezoning. This is a major amendment. This is planned development in 2017, or prior to 2017 this property was zoned CP, if I recall correctly, and had some PUD associated with it in the very northeast reaches of the highlighted area. That was all converted to PD in 2017, and so we are, in essence, modifying as what we

consider a major revision to the PD plan. There was no PD plan submitted on this project site, but is not formally a rezoning since we are not rezoning out of the district that it is presently in. It is a major amendment to the PD. It will have a site specific statement of intent to cover the acreage that's here, and would have actually a formal development plan. And we will correct that as we move forward. This is a technical issue at least as it relates to how legislation needs to be prepared, since we have made a conversation. If we were rezoning from CP to PD, that would be a little bit different. Because we have converted everything to PD now, it was a little bit confusing as we were preparing legislation for a similar item that we were referring to it as a rezoning when, in fact, we are not changing the underlying zoning. We are changing the statement of intent and adopting a plan. And so as a result of that, this is -- this follows a slightly different procedure. We will, because there is no plan on it, there is brand new land uses that are being proposed. It does have to follow our current PD district standards unlike other projects that we may be just modifying or we may be adopting a PD plan on, which then would be if they are changing anything, they are subject to the former standards to which they were approved under. This, however, is, in essence, required to be compliant with our 2017 PD standards and will be when it gets presented to you formally. With that, that is all we have to offer. And, again, we are supportive of the tabling to allow the technical issues to be addressed.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any questions of staff? Mr. Zenner, if I'm correct, it is our tradition to open it up for a public discussion on the tabling matter only?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. This was an advertised public hearing item, and this tabling request came in -- if I'm not incorrect, it came in after we had done -- it did come in after we did advertising, but it was advertised as a request for tabling, but the public does have an opportunity to speak on the tabling only.

MR. STANTON: Okay. In our tradition, I'm opening it up for public discussion on the tabling matter. We won't be discussing the case itself, but on the tabling, a go or no go. If anybody would like to speak on that matter, please come up to the podium. Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Going once, going twice, three times. Closing the door.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Okay. Any discussions with my fellow Commissioners on this matter? I would entertain a motion.

MR. WALTERS: I would move to table Case Number 91-2026 regarding the northwest corner of Rolling Hills and Richland Road.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. CRAIG: I'm sorry. Can we get the date on there, as well, since it's going to be tabled to a date certain, can we restate that -- that motion with April 23rd in it, please.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Okay. I move to table Case Number 91-2026 regarding the northwest corner of Rolling Hills and Richland Road to the April 23rd, 2026 meeting of the Planning and Zoning

Commission.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary, can you give us a vote?

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Stockton, Mr. Walters, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr. The motion carries 8-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: That request will be forwarded to City Council. Okay.

**VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS  
Case Number 93-2026**

**A request by Russell Boyt (agent) on behalf of Jon and Laurie Gehrke (owners), seeking approval to allow 2002 Valley View Road to be used as a 210-night, maximum six guest short-term rental pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The 1.2-acre subject site is located at the terminus of Valley View Road, approximately 360 feet west of its intersection with North Valley View Road.**

MR. STANTON: Can I have a staff report, please?

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow the dwelling at 2002 Valley View Road to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy of four transient guests;
2. A maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage;
3. A maximum of six transient guests subject to the installation of one additional on-site/off-street UDC compliant parking space is added to the property.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? I would like to ask if any of my colleagues have any ex parte information relating to this case, if you would like to share that information with your fellow colleagues at this time, or would like to exempt themselves from this case, you can do so at this time. I see no takers. No questions for staff? I will open it up for public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Others who want to speak on this case, come up. If you're an individual, you've got three minutes. If you're acting as an organization, you have six. Don't be shy. When you get up here, state your name and your address for the record, please.

MR. MARSHALL: My name is Alan Marshall; I live at 810 North Valley View Drive. I'd like to know if you all have received my letter and read it. I think a lot of my opposition is entailed in that letter. This is a quaint neighborhood. I grew up in this neighborhood. It's a family neighborhood. I have a child in my house. There are children living right next door to this property, young children living next door to this property. I think it would be a travesty, a real travesty. This is a small neighborhood, two cul-de-sacs, not designed for in and out traffic. I noticed on the next case number that you're talking about limiting the number of unrelated folks in a house to four. Isn't that the next case? And we're talking about

six, if they add a parking spot, six people that we don't know would be unrelated or not. And so your next case down takes into account that this particular place might have six unrelated folks if they just add a parking spot. And so I just speak in opposition. I think it would be a real travesty to allow people in and out that we don't know in our neighborhood, young children in the neighborhood. Thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: If you could hold just one second sir, and we'll see if there's any questions from the Commission. Anybody have any questions? I have one question.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Are you universally opposed to short-term rental or this particular short-term?

MR. MARSHALL: This particular location. I think there's -- there's places -- if this was rented out long-term rental, I would be fine with that. But we're going to have -- we could have six people we don't know in and out of that place all the time -- parties, young kids right next door. They play in the cul-de-sac. We don't -- we don't want people we don't know in and out of that cul-de-sac and our neighborhood. I mean, I just think it would be a travesty. Thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Appreciate your time.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else want to speak on this case, step up. Again, state your name and your address for the record, please.

MS. MOORE: My name is Miranda Moore; I live at 2012 Valley View Road. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: Can you repeat that? Our recorder couldn't hear you.

MS. MOORE: Oh, sorry. Miranda Moore, 2012 Valley View road. Thank you. I'm the quietest person in my family, so bear with me. So I have -- was the one that collected the signatures and sent them in to Mr. Ross Halligan and also Ms. Betsy Peters, and I just have a quick statement that I would like to read on behalf of my neighbors that are not here, and my neighborhood that is here. So I'd like to start today with a quick reference on your vision statement. The statement of the comment, commitment to your community and, by extension, your neighbors throughout our city. And I quote: "Our Vision. Columbia is the best place for everyone to live, work, learn, and play." From this statement, I would like to ask you to uphold your vision of a place where this is truly the best place to live, where our neighborhoods are preserved along with our public areas to allow those who live here to thrive, to grow, and to seek peace and solace when needed. Today a neighborhood is asking you to maintain just that, a place we have created that tries to seek the same thing you pledge in your vision statement. We, as a neighborhood, strive to care for the safety of not only our homes and our environment surrounding us, but all that dwell within it. We have families of all types and ages within our neighborhood, and each deserves the peace of mind that they have a say in what happens not only to their homes, but around their loved ones. We have aging neighbors that enjoy walking our streets for their health, with their grandchildren, with their pets. We have young families that have the comfort that they and their children can be in their personal space or that of the neighborhood and still feel safe. We have many in between that that simply enjoy the comfort that someone around them is always keeping an eye on things in our

small part of the world, and there is a relief in that, especially needed in a time with so much uncertainty. This is a comfort that has been lost in many neighborhoods these days because we don't care to know who we live around. This neighborhood does not live that way. I myself am fairly new to the neighborhood, still having only lived there a few years, but I can attest to the peace of mind it gave me as my first few days just clearing up my yard at my new house, several of my neighbors came by to talk with me. They welcomed me, asked me about myself, about my family that would soon be joining their little community. You just -- you don't have that nowadays. For me, I know, and for many that live in my neighborhood, my home is the place where I can decompress, feel safe, and recharge. I have a job that can sometimes weigh very heavily on me as I care for others. But knowing I can come home, sit outside, watch the peace and quiet of the nature around me truly helps in that. So I ask you today, along with my neighbors, who have signed a written statement of opposition and those present with me today, to please reject this application for this house in our neighborhood to be turned into a short-term rental facility. The instability of such a business in a quiet neighborhood will only hurt those who have worked for, in some cases, generations to keep it as it currently stands. If you truly stand with integrity and want to uphold your vision for this community, I ask that you do not approve this application for conditional use permit, Case Number 93-206 -- or 2026. Sorry. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Thank you. Commissioners, any questions for this speaker? Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Hi. Thank you so much. I just wanted to follow up. You mentioned safety and peace of mind quite a bit. And can you tell me just a little bit more about how approving this is a threat to your safety?

MS. MOORE: So as Alan suggested, just having inconsistent persons in the house. I live two houses down. I also have a child in my home. It concerns me because I do know people that have these type of rentals, and I, too, am not opposed to a longer term rental. But knowing that every other weekend or so, there could be new faces, new people. I know a neighbor has tried to contact the owners to just reach out to them, you know, as a neighbor, to say, hey, you know, we are concerned about this for our kids and our well-being of our neighborhood, and have been denied any access to them through their agent, and that's also concerning. You know, if there is a problem, who do we contact, you know? What do we even do about it? And as much as I know Airbnb and different facilities try to have rules and things in place, we all know in real time that that's not going to do much for us as far as something happening situationally in the moment. Knowing that I have neighbors that have very young children that live right next door, being a mom myself, I would be very concerned of who is in and out. I mean, nowadays, you have no idea, and just because somebody signs a contract for that house doesn't mean that that's the person that's, you know, is going to be responsible for other things happening around that house. We have beautiful wildlife preserves behind us. You know, we have trails behind us and things. I would hate to see that be a detriment to someone that's coming in. They're not going to care for that home, they're not going to care for us. They're not going to care for the space around them that we have cultivated, you know, as a close-knit area. Again, like I said, neighborhoods like this don't exist, and we would like to

keep it this way. I know that my neighbors look out for me. I look out for them, you know. If there's somebody that's in our neighborhood that is not -- notify we're all kind of on the lookout. So, yeah, the -- just the constant turnover of people and having no way to really manage that or what's, you know, going on, or even having contact with owners of this business would be.

DR. GRAY: Thank you. And I have a follow-up question.

MS. MOORE: Okay.

DR. GRAY: Other than having the contact information of the designated agent, if this were to be approved, are there any other actionable steps that the owner or the agent could take to make sure that you feel safe. And if you don't mind, could you mind speaking into the microphone?

MS. MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. MOORE: I don't know. I mean, you can't stop that many people from coming in. You have, you know, the ability for 210 nights of the year to have a different person in that space. And I know a lot of people have good intentions, but people don't. So there's no guarantee that they can say they're going to know who is personally renting that, that they're going to take care of that space, that they're going to be a safe person. I don't know anyone that would want different neighbors every other week of the year. I know we already have a lot of rentals in our town. We already have a lot of influx of students in and out. You know, we have somehow managed to keep this little space our own and a safety net for our kids. For our elderly population, you know, we have some people that, you know, come in and out, that walk around our neighborhood that are not in the best of health, to be quite honest, and that concerns me that people would not be mindful of them, which we very much are. We -- I've already seen a couple of instances of someone new to the neighborhood driving very quickly down our road and not being mindful of those around them. So that, in and of itself, is just very concerning to me, that there is really no way for you to say that this is going to be a safe situation at all times, which I know you can't guarantee in any situation, but knowing that you're going to make it this type of turnover rental is all the more concerning.

DR. GRAY: Got it. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: I have -- anybody else have a question? I have one, ma'am. So in your testimony, you had discussed reaching out to the owner. Has -- has the owner made any contact with you being that you're -- how close are you to this property?

MS. MOORE: Two houses away.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Has the owner or their agent reached out to try to get by and let you know what they intend, any of that? No?

MS. MOORE: I have only seen the owners of the property one time at that -- I'm assuming the sale of the property.

MS. ORTIZ: It is so hard to hear you.

MS. MOORE: I'm sorry. I've only seen that the owners of the property one time, so -- and I'm assuming that's when they purchased, so -- but I do know there is a neighbor also just next door to the

property that has tried to reach out, and to my knowledge, has not heard anything, so --

MR. STANTON: Thank you, ma'am. Any other questions?

MR. BRODSKY: Just counting the number of houses in these two cul-de-sacs, there's -- I counted 18, I think. And I added up the addresses on the petition that you circulated that folks signed, and then the individual letters that we had, and it looked like it was unanimous.

MS. MOORE: Every property except for the one in question and the neighbor, who is the agent.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions? Thank you, ma'am.

MS. MOORE: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other speakers on this case? Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations. State your name and address clearly into the microphone.

MR. KALINKOS: Hello. I'm Bill Kalinkos; I live 2004 Valley View Road, which is immediately next door to the property that we're talking about today. I share many of the concerns that have been raised already by my neighbors. And I also have a statement here from Noel Feldman, who is my neighbor across the street. He is within the 185 feet of this property, and he is sick today, and he asked me to read this. Is that okay if I read the statement on his behalf? My concerns about rezoning this property extend beyond the decreased safety, property values, and quality of life it would surely bring to our neighborhood. I also believe it would expose a loophole that the City of Columbia likely doesn't want exposed, one that allows local real estate investors to sidestep the City's short-term rental regulations and thin the supply of affordable housing. As the regulations are currently written, there is a limit to the number of short-term rental properties one can own, but there is no limit to the number of rentals that one can manage. In this case, local real estate broker Russell Boyt has partnered with an Iowa-based investor to purchase 2002 Valley View Road. Russell is not the owner of the property, but he is managing every aspect of it. As far as we know, the owners plan to spend little to no time residing in the home. Since Russell refuses to provide us with their contact information, we can safely assume their primary reason for owning this home is passive income. What is stopping Russell, along with other local investors, from following this blueprint again and again, taking affordable homes away from local families and turn them into investment opportunities for people who don't even live here? Our neighborhood is overwhelmingly opposed to the rezoning of this property. In addition to considering our quality of life concerns, please also consider the precedent you will set if you allow this loophole to be exploited. Thank you for your time. Noel Feldman. That's all I have.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker?

MR. WALTERS: Do you have any further comments on your own that you would like --

MR. KALINKOS: I do not, no.

MR. STANTON: Questions? I have one.

MR. KALINKOS: Yes.

MR. STANTON: Do you concur with the previous speaker about contacting? Have you tried to

contact the owner, have they tried to contact you in relation to this case?

MR. KALINKOS: Yes. I don't have the owner's contact information. I did have a talk with Russell, and he did not pass on their contact information to me when I asked for it, so --

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. KALINKOS: Thanks.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else speaking on this case? Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations. State your name and address clearly into the microphone so our recorder can hear it.

MS. ASHBY: Maris Ashby, 2003 Valley View Road. We are directly across from the residence in question. I'm actually here to just follow up on a few questions that have been asked, just as part of this community, so Commissioner Stanton, and I'm so sorry if I address you incorrectly -- first time here. But, Commissioner Stanton, you asked a question very appropriately. Do we have an issue with short-term rentals as a whole, or this residence in question. We have a covenant. Right? This is important to our community, and as we know, it is not -- it is not meant to be taken lightly. The first covenant of our residency of our community is that there would be no commercial business. So to reiterate what our neighbor Noel just has stated, we do fear that these new owners would not -- only not reside, but it is meant to be a cash property. We don't inherently have an issue with rentals. Rentals have happened in our community before. That part is welcomed. But the issue actually lies with part of the answer to a question that Commissioner Gray had asked, which is that what could help us feel a little bit more safe if this were to move forward. The problem with short-term rentals is that there is no security measure in play on who would actually be renting that property. Example: If this were to be managed or registered or rented out via something like Airbnb or VRBO, there are protections for Bill's children, who are right next door playing outside to prevent someone with ill intent to rent the property, even if it is a beautiful property. There is no protection in place to prevent that. If measures were taken that we could very well and truly feel confident and comfortable were being upheld, I think that that could help some of the concerns. Parking seems to be somewhat addressed, but it's also important to understand that our cul-de-sacs are of a smaller size, which means if there is ample parking if there are visitors, which I'm sure you've noticed, we are close proximity to downtown and the stadium, meaning we are attractive. We will lure a lot of visitors. It's probably why this is a really, really, really enticing business venture. But the more traffic in that cul-de-sac, the less likely an ambulance turns around to help our elderly in the community effectively, the less able we are able to have our own visitors here that we sought so hard to protect. I think that if we can put strong measures in place to ensure that the values of -- of our neighborhood are upheld, some of these could be quarreled, but without the ability to communicate with the owners without putting aside the conflict of interest that does exist, I'm sorry, and, respectfully, Russell, the conflict the interest being agent right next door, it doesn't provide us a safe place to be able to share our concerns day of. Right? If a conflict comes up, where are we turning? Russell is sitting next to the owners. That doesn't put us in a position that allows us to state that we're having issues with visitors, that we're having issues with parking, that we have concerns about security. If we can address

those matters, I think that that would also be very helpful. Oh, I can see questions.

MR. STANTON: There -- Ms. Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I have heard a couple of times that you have a person to connect with, the designated agent. You know who they are. You know that their role is to address your concerns. That is their role. So I don't think that they are trying to thwart your efforts to get to the owner. Their job is to address your concerns, and they're just wanting to address those concerns with you and with the neighbors. Is that something that you were understanding? I guess I'm trying to understand why do you want to go past them trying to do their job to get to the homeowner?

MS. ASHBY: Thank you. That's a good clarification. That is not the ask. It would not be to circumvent. It is that the comfort and what we've already been met with has not helped us to resolve or even address the concerns that we have. For that reason, we can only sit here wondering what our continued experience might be. Right? Will we not be able to raise our concerns in a way in which we have a solution? Will they simply be taken, and not actioned upon? We've not had the ability to effectively present these to the owners. I am not one of those individuals, so I want to make sure that that's clear. I did not specifically seek time with the owners, and I was not rejected, but as we saw or as we heard, residents here have felt that. That is the big concern. I also -- and I -- please excuse me if I misrepresent this. I recall in some of the research that there are expectations for an agent's response time. If we can ensure and we understand what happens if we are feeling unsafe or if we are feeling like our concerns aren't being felt, if we can address the ways in which we can move forward with propelling those concerns. I don't want to speak on behalf of my entire neighborhood, but I know that that would help with some of the concerns that I have, that wonder of if our voice is not heard due to that conflict of interest.

MS. WILSON: Could I ask a follow-up. So my follow-up is, is the designated agent a neighbor?

MS. ASHBY: He is.

MS. WILSON: So when we were drafting this, our concern in terms of time that it takes for someone to respond was if they did not live near, and they needed to come from some place that was a certain amount of time away. With this person being a neighbor, unless they are simply not home, response time should be instantaneous because they're right there.

MS. ASHBY: I very much hope you're correct, and I'm not suggesting otherwise. I want to be very respectful to my neighbor and, of course, to the business that's in the room, there's still a concern that that would be true.

MR. STANTON: Just to add -- oh. Mr. Walters? I'm sorry.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. I just wanted to expand on this a bit between a concern versus a violation.

MS. ASHBY: Okay.

MR. WALTERS: Like -- and we'll have an opportunity to talk to -- I assume, Mr. Vogt will speak here shortly, and we can ask him about his history of communication with the neighbors up to this point.

But the fact that he's present there, as Ms. Wilson pointed out, is instantaneous response, but if he's not home, that's not instantaneous. I get that. But if there are issues that come up that you feel that he's not responding to, or the agent is not responding to, you can still contact the City of Columbia and register a complaint. And if there's a violation, particularly like a noise violation or a parking violation or whatever, then -- or trash collection, anything that would -- that would adversely affect your lives there, you can file a complaint. And if the City then -- and I'm paraphrasing, and my fellow Commissioners can correct me, that if the City will then study the complaint, review it and determine whether or not it's a valid complaint, and, if it is, they can register a -- they can note on the applicant's rental STR agreement, and if they have two -- two such complaints, then there is a method for which the license can be revoked. So you have those -- just to clarify, a concern is one thing, and I'm not dismissing your concerns.

MS. ASHBY: That's helpful.

MR. WALTERS: But if you feel like you're not -- and if you feel like you're not -- your concern is not being taken seriously, that's one thing. But there are absolute violations, that's really different and very serious. And so you do have -- you do have options to pursue those, for what it's worth, a little bit of prospective.

MS. ASHBY: Thank you. No. That is very helpful and, again, I -- I certainly don't want to assume that I am speaking for the masses here. I am speaking to my own heart the concerns that we have. We are just very worried. I'm sure that that's very evident, number one, by the population here, and by the petition, as well. It's easy for us to think worst case scenario. Of course, if best case scenario happens, wonderful. That absolutely wonderful. But as I'm sure that you can recognize, there a lot of ways in which this could really impact us as residents, as families, as the community that we've built, and every even little notch, not necessarily a violation, hampers our ability to be our best selves, our truest selves, our most present selves in the neighborhood that we've built. It is a little fear based, but it's also statistically based, and I'm sure you're all very well aware, but there are -- those statistics exist for a reason. Right? And more times than not, unfortunately, people are exposed to dangerous and scary things when it comes to these short-term rentals, and that is because the agencies -- not agent, but agencies, that are finding these guests don't do in-depth research as to who we are inviting into those -- into these residences. It's just -- it's a very large concern, especially with, you know, the children that play on Bill and Megan's lawn every single day. It's -- it is fear based, but please also read and understand that it's not misguided. It's very true.

MR. WALTERS: No. And I don't mean to imply that at all.

MS. ASHBY: Thank you.

MR. WALTERS: I'm just saying -- just pointing out, in case you weren't aware, that there are options to -- to pursue in case you feel that the agent handling the property is not doing an adequate job or is ignoring obvious violations.

MS ASHBY: Deeply appreciated. And I think that that does help add some reassurance just to know that we don't have to have our hands thrown up if we do get truly concerned. So we will absolutely

use the appropriate avenues. I do mean it. We're here with respect, but thank you. I think that's all I have.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions from the Commission? I have a couple. So one -- or more of a statement. This body nor the City gets involved in the local property covenants that you have in your neighborhood.

MS. ASHBY: Right. Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: It doesn't mean they don't have teeth. What that means is that your neighborhood needs to seek legal counsel and discuss that covenant with said owner. We don't get in that fight. That's your neighbors -- neighborhood fight. That's number one. Number two, to follow up with my colleague, yes, there are mechanisms in place. I happen to have been here from the beginning of this process, a hot flash now talking about it. But -- so there are things in place to have your voices heard, and to ensure that this business model is appropriate, run properly, and all of that. Your neighborhood already has the mechanisms; you already look out for each other. That's good. Continue to do so. You just have a new neighbor.

MS. ASHBY: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: And just to follow up, because I'm asking everybody, you have reached out or you haven't reached out to the agent or the owner and have got response or no response, or haven't tried?

MS. ASHBY: I have not tried.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. ASHBY: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anybody else want to speak on this case? State your name and address clearly in the microphone so our recorder can hear you.

MR. RAE: I am Frank Rae. I live on the other circle, at 806 North Valley View. I've been there almost 50 years now. And what I'm concerned -- what I don't understand is, you can go into a single-family zoned area and change it? It's -- the Planning and Zoning does that? Is that what we're doing, taking this single-family residential area and rezoning one house? I don't understand exactly what's happening here this way.

MR. STANTON: Staff, do you want to direct that question?

MR. ZENNER: So, Mr. Rae, what is being asked by Mr. Boyt and the owners is to be -- to have a conditional use approved. That does not change the underlying zoning of the land. So it is still -- it is still R-1 zoned land. It is still a single-family home. That was how it was permitted. But the conditional use, just by the nature of conditional, requires special permission. And so we're adding a use on top of the single family. We're not changing the zoning, so if this does not get approved, the owners of the property can continue to use it as a single-family home. They could register it as a long-term rental, and use it as an investment property, in that means, but with a permanent -- more permanent resident. But the conditional use process has additional regulatory standards that get applied to it. So if this were just a

typical long-term rental, some of the same standards about you being able to report violations as the commercial activity of the short-term rental, don't apply. It doesn't have, if it's a long-term rental, a two-strike rule. It -- there are a lot of -- so what the Planning and Zoning Commission and our City Council are doing are they are evaluating is this particular use and our staff evaluates, is it -- does it technically comply? Does it have the parking? Does it have the bedroom area? And so we're reviewing it from that. Our Planning Commission and the reason for the questions that they are asking our audience is to gain an understanding of what is your concerns. How does that relate to a set of criteria that they are using as not necessarily determinative criteria of approval or denial. They are more informative. And so the Commission has to weigh the impact that the use has, and that is why we go through the conditional-use process. If the conditional uses is not approved, the home still exists. It's still a home. The applicants could choose to seek this process and then after a year decide it's just too much of a hassle. What ends up happening? The conditional use still stays, but it's not being used that way. Single family home could be sold. If it's sold, the condition use doesn't go with it. So a future owner of this property does not get any rights that may be conveyed by an approval of a CUP for a short-term rental. They would have to go back through this exact same process all over again. And at that point, it is possible that the impacts into the neighborhood that there is concern may exist may be established. There may be more evidence to support that. At this point, what the applicants are doing is actually what we hoped would end up happening by our citizens and our operators, they would come and ask for permission first. And by asking for permission first, this Commission and our City Council has the ability to engage with the residents that have concerns and the operator to understand how are they mitigating those express differences. And that is why this is an important process. But it doesn't change any of the underlying zoning, so it's not a rezoning at all.

MR. RAE: Okay. Well, yeah. That just was not clear to me how that worked, not at all. And being a long-resident --

MR. ZENNER: Could you talk into the microphone?

MR. RAE: Oh, I'm sorry. Being a long-term resident, I just -- you know. It just seems counter to our neighborhood. It's been that way. I watched Alan grow up as my neighbor, you know. Good friends with his dad. And it just seems -- and it's at the back of the cul-de-sac. If it were, like, on the corner, on Old 63, it might be a little different. That house is already busy -- everything is busy there. There's a sidewalk there. Here, there are no sidewalks. There's no -- you know, there's some trails, things like that. So it just seems quite -- it just seems kind of oddly placed to me.

MR. ZENNER: And I think the Commission --

MR. RAE: Not -- you know, not along with our community.

MR. ZENNER: I think that that's relevant information that you've just shared with us for the Commissioner to take into consideration.

MR. RAE: Okay. Okay. Well, thank you much.

MR. STANTON: One second, please.

MR. RAE: Question, yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: I was -- well, Mr. Zenner took my thunder, but I was going to say what you just said is very relevant data for us to consider, and that's exactly what I'm looking for, when community members are coming to speak to this Commission. What about this unique property makes it not suitable for a short-term rental. And what you just gave us, I think, is information that will help inform our decision, the earlier information from you personally wasn't very moving, but the information you just gave for me moves me in a direction. So, thank you.

MR. RAE: Okay. Well, that's good -- good. I'm glad.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? So I'm going to ask the generic question. Have you tried to reach out to the agent or their owners, and had you had any success or not?

MR. RAE: I -- I have seen the neighbor. I wave to him every once in a while, and that's -- and he's not just -- not to be snotty or anything, doesn't seem very friendly to me.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir.

MR. RAE: Kind of -- kind of -- sometimes I get a wave and that's it.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RAE: Okay.

MR. STANTON: State your name and address clearly into the microphone, three minutes for individuals, six for organizations.

MR. ASHBY: Good evening, everyone. I am Steven Ashby; I live at 2003 Valley View Road, across the cul-de-sac from the -- the residence in question. So to provide some more information, no, we do not have any sidewalks on this street. There is also only one street lamp for this cul-de-sac. It's kind of dark. I don't know how that plays into it. I think there's only three street lamps total for this entire street, so personally I like that it's dark, but that might not be very conducive to short-term rentals, lots of people in and out. So hope that helps. Also my -- my opinions, I think, at least for me, what's -- what we're all trying to do is we're trying to stop that worst-case scenario from even happening. A long-term rental might be a better option if that would be -- if that were to happen, something where, you know, vetting of who is going to be residing there would happen. If it's like Airbnb or VRBO, there's no vetting. There's no background checks. Anything could happen, and it takes only once. And, you know, if it were the case -- if it were the worst case scenario, a -- I don't even know what exactly that would be, bodily human harm, something very bad, lodging a complaint with the City Council isn't going to do much good in the moment. So hopefully -- hopefully we can just stop this from getting to that point, or even having the opportunity and we can, you know, implore them to look at other options, especially if they're not even Columbia residents, somebody out of state trying to, you know, make money off of property. I'm not sure if that's the case or not, but here we are.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I am going to steal your question.

MR. STANTON: What?

MS. WILSON: Had you had the opportunity to reach out to the homeowner and, by the way, I know it's old school, but letters are effective still. The mail with a stamp. And it -- you know, we may not be able to actually speak to them, but I'm just asking if some of these suggestions were even made through the agent that, you know, maybe we would rather see a long-term rental, any kind of contact with the agent to share what you're sharing on the record this evening.

MR. ASHBY: No. I have not personally reached out, but I have also not been reached out to by the agent. And I think that's -- that's something that's getting left unsaid.

MS. WILSON: It's not. We have to wait for them to come up for us to say it.

MR. ASHBY: I mean -- I mean on this side. Like, we haven't -- they haven't reached out to talk to us to see how we feel about it. Granted, a lot of us haven't reached out to them, either. So understood. But, yeah, it hasn't gone the other way, either, so -- thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Wilson just stole my whole thunder, rain, and everything. Are there any other speakers on this case? Six minutes for organizations, three for individuals. I'm assuming you're representing the --

MR. BOYT: The owners, yes. I'm Russell Boyt, the agent, neighbor, and not to be confused, real estate agent that did help them buy that, but also the agent and property -- so I've got a statement to read, but I --

MR. STANTON: Address?

MR. BOYT: 2000 Valley View Road. Real quick, to adjust the -- the big elephant in the room, on March 3rd, Bill and I communicated by via text. He reached out and said, hey, I had some questions for the owners, could I get their number. And I -- and I said, Jon has had a medical emergency, and he is -- been in the hospital for a few days recovering. I am going to be taking care of the day-to-day management. I'm next door. If you have any questions or concerns, I'd love to help out. So the next day, Bill and I met, I don't know, about 20 minutes at his house. We spoke, and I understood his concerns, and, quite frankly, I personally would have some of those, as well. So I tried to alleviate those as best as possible. On March 8th, Megan, I think she spoke here earlier, too. She reached out via text, and asked if she could get the neighbors -- or Jon and Laurie's number, said the same response, that he's recovering, but I am the local contact. I'm next door. I'll be managing this, doing the day to day, and overseeing all aspects. Please feel free to ask how can I alleviate your questions and concerns, and I got no response from that. I was quite surprised, a little bit perturbed, but it's okay. I completely understand the neighborhood's concerns. When the petition was filed, and I saw everyone's signature on there, I did not know that there was the questions or concerns. I would have loved to have been at this meeting to have addressed and answered questions. Also had the ability to sign it, or presented it to my wife. So that being said, I am available. I would love to answer those questions, and answer all of these issues that have come up. So I'm going to read the statement really quick, try to make this very brief. So this home was purchased by Jon and Laurie in September of 2025, after more than 120 days on the market. The home was purchased for \$450,000, and has been continuously remodeled and improved for both

personal and future rental potential. I think some of the neighbors have met Jon and Laurie while they've been there, they've introduced themselves. So, relatively speaking, this home does not fall within the boundaries of what we considered affordable housing, as all the homes in the neighborhood, are of equal or higher value, and we understand -- I understand this is a consideration of the P & Z, kind of unwritten rule for consideration. Jon and Laurie are deeply rooted in the community. Jon stayed at the home and recently enjoyed his 50th Rock Bridge High School reunion. That was the weekend after my 30th Rock Bridge reunion this last fall. Both Jon and Laurie are also Mizzou alumni, and they are season ticket holders to sporting events. So I don't know if it matters whether that's volleyball, wrestling, football, I don't know if there's any sway. They are very, very imbedded in the community and have been for their entire lives. They purchased this home for personal enjoyment for their frequent visits back. Secondly, behind that, it was an investment. So while they're not enjoying the home, they tasked me with finding a property in a very specific price range and neighborhood, and a location with the desirability for only higher-end Airbnb. Now this will be starting out with an average nightly rate of \$400 to \$500 a night during the week, higher for weekends, with two-night minimums. The rates will have a strong impact on the type of guests of those who will be staying in the home. The driveway currently has two recognized parking spaces. We're going to be adding a third in the very near future, and the home does have a carport, and a driveway that's over 68 feet long. It will have the potential for the real parking of four spaces, even though we can only count three for the use of this application. We're trying to ensure there will be on-street parking, it will be all off-street. So I'm the -- I'm the property manager next door. I'm going to handle all the day-to-day scheduling, maintenance, as well as being the contact for guests and/or the neighbors. I live right next door. I've got 20 years' experience as a real estate broker, worst job in the world sometimes, a property manager, a contractor, and my response time will be swift and immediate with an iron fist. Personally speaking, I live next door and do not want any of the same things that the neighbors have concerns with, and it will be my job to ensure that -- sorry guys -- for me first for property values, and second, because I represent them as their investment. It's a win-win for us both in that scenario. No leniency will be tolerated for off-street parking, excessive noise of any type, or anything that would impede the quiet enjoyability of the neighbors or the neighborhood. All guests are going to be required to have a verified government ID prior to booking. That is through the system that they will be booking with - - Airbnb, VRBO, or if we are doing longer term not long-term rentals, but 30 days to nurses. So they will have updated or uploaded an ID so that they have half-way been vetted. I'm not necessarily doing a background check, but they will not have had prior complaints on those booking platforms, and it makes it much easier to ensure insurability. The home has multiple exterior cameras that will allow for 24/7 oversight and proactive enforcement. If I'm not and there's a guest there, I'll be able to check and ensure that they're complying. Again, I will rule with an iron fist. The anticipated and preferred guests will be families, professionals, and with the higher than average rates, we're expected to have only respectful and conscious [sic] guests. Specifically, we're going after longer nurses that will be coming on two and four-week contracts to the University, and there's also a high demand that I've already found and

experienced with families coming to see guests at the hospital. So we are -- it's a very close proximity that is absolutely a great location close to downtown, that's why I purchased a home there and have been remodeling it for three years. So the quiet enjoyment is the golden rule for all guests, and I am entirely confident that I'll be able to enforce that. So no large gatherings of any type, no -- yeah. No aborigine bonfires in the front yard. No loud parties, because all of these things can be reported for violations, overcrowding. We do not want six individual guests there, so I'll be quite selective on the people that can stay there -- families, gatherings of families, not six individuals. If there's a sorority reunion, unless they're celebrating their 50th reunion, they're not going to be allowed to stay there. So that's all I've got.

MR. STANTON: Questions for the speaker? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Oh, yes. This is the moment. So I have a few questions and some notes. I want to make a note on the record of -- really, it's just for the people in the room, that short-term rentals are less than one percent of the housing stock in Columbia, so the concern that we are going crazy with short-term rentals, they're less than one percent of the housing stock. Number two, I hope that it's not lost on you that the reason that they failed to contact you back, as you have heard this evening, is because they felt that there was a conflict of interest, so they didn't think that they would be able to get what they needed through you, specifically. That's what I'm hearing. I hope that's what you heard. Number three, and this is the one, so with this, because it's not meant to really feel like a hotel operating in a neighborhood, it's really meant to feel like another neighbor. Right? So like a good neighbor, even though you're not Jake, the expectation is that you would have been preemptive and taken the initiative to share all of the great things that you've shared with us on the record this evening with your neighbors, and given them the opportunity to give you some feedback prior to a moment like this. That would have given us all some comfortability, and it would have given them some comfortability. Now they may have still came out with the pitchforks, but it would have given them some comfortability. Do you understand that?

MR. BOYT: Oh, I absolutely do. Hindsight is 20-20, but --

MS. WILSON: I didn't have a question, I just had a whole diatribe.

MR. BOYT: Yeah. And I honestly tried to communicate that in my text with -- with both Bill and I'm saying, please, any questions, concerns, I would love to meet, discuss, and alleviate those, and I communicated that on both of those instances. I -- I honestly didn't know there was that much feedback or -- or that much push-back from it. So, sure.

MS. WILSON: I mean -- I mean, I think for you, because you live there. Right? So if someone else were to come in and want the same thing, you would probably have similar questions. And you knew your plan.

MR. BOYT: Surely. Absolute.

MS. WILSON: Which is a great plan. I think your plan is amazing. They didn't know your plan. And so, now they know your plan, and now they know you, and they -- you guys can, like, get together and talk and all kinds of stuff, you know. It will be great.

MR. STANTON: Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Thank you. You said that you're -- you're a neighbor, you live next door to the property?

MR. BOYT: Directly next to it, yes.

DR. GRAY: How long have you lived there?

MR. BOYT: I think that May will be three years.

DR. GRAY: Okay. And do you own this property?

MR. BOYT: Uh-huh. My wife and I do. We plan on being there a long time. It's a very special -- we love that neighborhood. I grew up in Columbia, so I was -- we had a bidding war on day one.

DR. GRAY: Okay. And just curious, what is your wife's name?

MR. BOYT: Amber.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Cool. Thank you so much. I just want to make sure that there is a differentiation between mid-term rental and, like, long-term, mid-term, short-term.

MR. BOYT: Uh-huh. Yes. So it just -- it goes less than 30 -- 30 days is short-term, and then we would consider as a verbal just to say mid-term would be 30 to 45 days, and then long-term would be at 12 months at a time, so yes. So when they're not staying there enjoying the home, I mean, Jon did have a medical emergency, he couldn't enjoy watching Mizzou lose. He would have been there. But the goal will be in between when they're not there using the home, and they're both in the medical field, and have connections that we anticipate we might have those traveling nurses stay there a lot. And so, again, they've invested a great deal of money. It's my job to, one, help protect it, and then be a good steward of it when they're not staying there. So it's already dressed up and the inside is quite personal. It's covered with Mizzou. There is one picture with a Jayhawk on it, but we'll see how long that lasts.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for this speaker? I have a couple, sir.

MR. BOYT: Sure.

MR. STANTON: Your presentation was fabulous. You are technically eligible for this business. But this is why we're here. It is a conditional use, so, technically, you're sound, but it's the soft stuff that matters in the conditional use thing. It's the interaction with the community. So a successful -- the most successful applicants for short-term rental have a symbiotic relationship with the neighborhood. Like they -- the neighbors and you exist as one. Like, you are like there. Like all this information that you just dropped on us right now was beautiful. Somewhere, that didn't get to your neighbors to the point, and if you're from Columbia, you know that Columbia is full of very smart people with a lot of time and are very activist. If you're from Columbia, you knew that. So even though you're technically sound, you have my -- to win my vote, tell me how you're going to address these things. And you're already -- you're already at strike two, because the communication with the neighbors wasn't there. I mean, I'm not talking e-mail. I'm not talking --

MR. BOYT: Well, I mean, I -- it should -- I should --

MR. STANTON: Successful candidates -- successful, our most darling candidates -- Commission, pull me back from lying -- have reached out and touched the neighbors, at least the immediate ones have had a discussion up or down. If they agree with it or not, they know. They know before they get in here how the neighborhood feels about the situation. And I think you addressed all their fears in your presentation. They should have had that same presentation. I think we would have been in a different ballpark, and our mindset up here would have been different if we knew that you did your due diligence to get with the neighbors and get their thoughts, buy in, or a blessing or a curse, before you got in here.

MR. BOYT: If I could turn the clock back, I would absolutely do that. And I communicated the majority of that, I think 90 or 95 percent of that with Bill when we first met --

MR. STANTON: But, you know, this is Columbia. This is the midwest. We do handshakes, we look people in the eye. This -- this the success. We're still -- we're still early in our short-term rental life in Columbia. We are trying to learn from the good things that other cities have done, and the bad things that other cities have done.

MR. BOYT: Sure.

MR. STANTON: And for this to be successful here and for you to have future successes as an agent of other STRs, if that's what you do, or other people want STRs, is the communication in the -- it has to have communication in a residential neighborhood. It -- that communication is paramount. It just is. And you are really a pioneer still. We've only got, what, 400, Mr. Zenner, registered maybe not even that. Okay. We're young in the register; you see what I'm saying.

MR. BOYT: We need --

MR. STANTON: So the success of the ones that we approve is detrimental -- is important for the success of this program long term.

MR. BOYT: I mean, hindsight is absolutely 20-20, and I wish that some of the messaging that I passed along would have been -- I think maybe there was just miscommunication, that I was not withholding, I was trying to -- I would love to answer these questions.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So let me get to another question, so my fellow colleagues won't have to beat me with a stick. Okay. It seems like there is a gap in communication. If you are going to be the face of this property, you're the corporate veil of the owners. Right? Which we love to talk to the owners. As you see, people are trying to get to the owner to hear their -- their thoughts. If you're going to be that person, how are you going to be different from what you have proven already? At this point, from our perspective, put yourself where I'm sitting, you have not communicated clearly or openly or even presented yourself as an open book as it relates to this property. How are you going to convince me that you're going to be any different than that if I give you this license or you get my vote. Maybe you're not going to make me look like a Jayhawk.

MR. BOYT: I think at this point, having kind of let the cat out of the bag and expressed all of those things, and I hope I don't come across as a -- a-hole, that I'm approachable, otherwise, I'm in the

wrong business. But my -- my number is available, and I -- I would love to address any issues and concerns before they even come up. Again, I will be ruling with an iron fist, watching that place like a hawk, so there is not a concern which will have to be addressed by a neighbor because I will have seen it and taken care of it before it even happened. So I hope that I come across as, one, to be a great neighbor. I would love to have the neighbors unanimous support, not unanimous rejection of it, absolutely. So --

MR. STANTON: How are you going -- how are you going to fix that? If you get --

MR. BOYT: Make sure there is never a complaint that can ever be filed.

MR. STANTON: I -- I don't want a regret -- I don't want to make a bad decision, and I say go, and you --

MR. BOYT: How to be a good neighbor.

MR. STANTON: You're keeping the same bad communication. How are you going -- what's --

MR. BOYT: What would you prefer? What would be --

MR. STANTON: Well, you tell me what you're going to do.

MR. BOYT: What would be the perfect answer for you?

MR. STANTON: You're winning my vote. Win my vote based on my concerns with communication. And I'm convinced you run a good business, but how are you going to convey that to the neighbors?

MR. BOYT: I -- I would like to communicate. I promise to be the best steward of the neighborhood to ensure the protection. I have a step-son that lives in the house. I have a daughter that graduated Hickman. I love this community, and I don't want anything negative to ever happen there. I'm also on the CID of downtown. I apologize. I've been quite busy here with all the committees that I serve on, I'm on two a week. And so I have not had the chance to go door to door, because, quite frankly, I hate the cold. It warmed up today, but it was a cold spell. So short of going door to door when people are on different schedules, I wish I had the time to do that. I would love to be able to communicate and talk. I waive to all my neighbors. I see Frank half the time. Sorry, Frank, if you think I'm mean, but I sit back -- he walks the loop and he goes away, so usually because my -- when we remodeled our house, I put a large eight-foot glass wall, so Frank can see me every morning in my kitchen having tea, and I wave most of the times that I see him. So I don't cross paths, but I try to be personable and waive and be interactive, and it's --

MR. STANTON: But you're -- you're conducting business, he's not. It's your -- if I want to sell my wares to you, it's my job to present my wares and to make that -- I do concrete, so I understand the cold and all that. I'm up at 4:00, 5:00 in the morning. So, you know, business is business, and we do what we've got to do to have a successful business. So --

MR. BOYT: I want to be as available 24/7, 365 days a year to answer questions, and actually address them before they were even an issue or a question that came up, and just be available all the time. So I -- I'm not sure how to phrase that differently.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. BOYT: I want to -- I would love to have everybody's support. So what I would do is be nice and hopefully, gain their trust, and we don't have any issues, and this is a non -- a non-issue if -- if we get approved. So --

MR. STANTON: Any other questions for the speaker?

MR. DARR: You said short of going door to door I don't know what to do, but I think going door to door would be a good start.

MR. BOYT: I would love for you to make that requirement on the application process. I would love to see any and every scenario. Sure, I -- but I don't know in what -- what way that -- is it required? I don't know. I've had -- haven't gotten to this part before. Is it required to have the unanimous support of the neighborhood?

MR. STANTON: No.

MR. DARR: No.

MR. BOYT: I mean, so if I had spoken to a few neighbors of the immediate neighbors around there, and kind of assumed -- it was my fault for assuming it wouldn't be a big issue, or it was my fault for assuming maybe somebody would stop or reach out or -- I mean, I love the -- if you had waived and said, hey, I've got some questions about that, I would have been glad to meet your ask. So I met with Bill in person. I would have loved to have met everyone at that petition had I known it existed and that meeting was taking place, I would have been there in a heartbeat, but hindsight is 20-20, so -- but if there is a requirement that -- that that would help for future people applying, I would say absolutely put that on there, that you have to have a petition signed of -- of you've met the neighbors.

MR. STANTON: It's not a requirement, but like I said, successful -- successful applications do their due diligence to be good neighbors. That's -- it's not a requirement. I'm telling you what's successful, what gets an A and what gets --

MR. BOYT: I mean, it was my fault for assuming because I had lived there for three years -- almost three years, and had been part of the neighborhood and improving the house and always out doing different projects, and I just kind of assumed -- it was my fault for assuming that maybe I was more approachable than I apparently am.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. First of all, let's all take a deep breath. I feel like we're just -- we're going on at it -- not really, but I'm also, like, a little bit anxious right now. But taking a deep breath, did you fill out the paperwork or did the owners?

MR. BOYT: I did.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. So there is a question on the supplemental conditional accessory -- what is it called?

MR. BOYT: The application, yes. Have you told the neighbors, and that I checked after a conversation with Jon and Laurie, they had met -- Bill, the neighbors next door, so yeah.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Cool. And I'm not coming at you. I'm just saying so this is part of the criteria

of things that we can look at for a short-term rental application. But it's not like do or die. Like, oh, you don't have neighbor support, so anyone of us could say neighbor support doesn't matter or it does matter. You know, it's subjective, and that's the point of having this point of having this Commission. Right? And then our decision is not the final decision. Right? This will go to City Council. So even if we -- in a hypothetical situation where we all say no, that doesn't mean it's a no. It'll go to City Council. So there's still that time for repair and trust-building with your neighbors, even if we're all a no. Like, there's still that time, and I think that what Anthony -- what Commissioner Stanton is trying to get across is that part of being a good neighbor is building trust. And as you know, I'm sure, if you're doing like CID stuff, you know the importance of being a politician sometimes, and shaking hands and kissing babies. And I think in a respectful way, like maybe I'm thinking that's what Commissioner Stanton is trying to suggest, just repairing those relationships. However, that is just one criteria. For me, it's not the major, like -- well, for me, it's not like the major thing that's going to decide this case. I think you presented really well. I am a Jayhawk, so I don't know why we're getting so much Jayhawk hate tonight.

MR. BOYT: I'm sorry.

MS. ORTIZ: But Jayhawks can be very committed to this community and serve on boards and commissions, so I just want to put that out there.

MR. BOYT: I didn't talk you out of it?

MS. ORTIZ: But I think, ultimately -- well, now, I'm getting into my own comments. But I just wanted to clear that up with you because I feel like there was, like -- I don't know.

MR. BOYT: Oh, certainly.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MR. BOYT: I understand this process will evolve, and after every hearing, there's notes and tidbits that make an improvement. So I would just imagine that 99 percent of the application process is going to have neighbors that stand in oppositions, so it's -- I just kind of assumed just that would have been a small thing out there, but I also assumed wrongly that I might have been approached or that I was more available than -- than apparently I was.

MS. STOCKTON: Just to clarify, do you or the owner have any other short-term rental properties in town?

MR. BOYT: I don't own any other short-term, no.

MS. STOCKTON: Okay.

MR. BOYT: They don't have any other short-term rentals. They do own other family property, but, no, it's not -- they're not short-term rentals, and they have no intention of -- not even -- it wouldn't be a possibility to be a short-term.

MS. STOCKTON: Okay. Okay. Just checking. Okay.

MR. BOYT: So -- so -- I mean, going back to, I think, one of the letters in opposition was that it's in an LLC. We -- Pat put that on me, and I think I had about one day literally, we had it in their individual names, but as a short-term rental, as getting a business license, for liability and tax purposes, we filed

and put that into the LLC. I think he was on vacation on Friday, so he let me sneak it in to make this meeting's quota. So that's why it's in an LLC. It wasn't to hide, and it wasn't some evil corporation trying to make money. They're just trying to protect their investment and have some rental income while they're not there.

MR. STANTON: And to clarify the weight of the community input, as you hear Commissioner Wilson's questioning, we are -- we are seasoned enough to differentiate between a fear and a legitimate quantified problem. We're seasoned enough to do that. So I'm trying -- I'm trying to give you some help to --

MR. BOYT: Was there a legitimate fear that you saw -- was there, like, a concern of, like --

MR. STANTON: I don't know. I will reflect it in my vote.

MR. BOYT: Okay. I mean, I hope we addressed -- and with the policies and procedures that we'll put in place on who is allowed to stay there. I mean, there's -- can't do a full background check, but it's going to come pretty close.

MR. STANTON: Technically, you were sound, and I think your presentation was great.

MR. BOYT: But?

MR. STANTON: It takes more than that.

MR. BOYT: Really. Okay. I would love to see the process if there's an issue. If there is a way of having an extended checklist of these are the things that you must achieve, because I would have worked on those diligently to have that done in advance.

MR. STANTON: I think our application does it. Any other questions? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Can we move on?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. If you all don't have any other questions.

MR. WALTERS: I don't have any other questions.

MR. STANTON: And I'm -- and if I'm done. Yeah.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Any other questions? Thank you.

MS. GEHRKE: Good evening. I'm Laurie Gehrke. one of the illustrious unknown owners. I'd like to introduce my husband, Dr. Jon Gehrke. I will take responsibility --

MR. STANTON: Address, ma'am. Sorry.

MS. GEHRKE: I'm sorry. I would like to take responsibility --

MR. STANTON: Address for the --

MS. GEHRKE: Oh. Oh. Oh. Well, 2002 Valley View. We own that. We live at 1604 South Park in Oskaloosa, Iowa. We are from Columbia. There is a really good chance that this will not be a short-term rental in a few years when we live there full time. But I will take full responsibility for the fact that we were off the grid for the last couple of weeks because two weeks ago, we were still in the hospital at the University of Iowa. And, no, well, we weren't -- (inaudible). And I had asked Russell -- I said we've kind of got to get off the grid. We can't have a whole bunch of calls, and we didn't really realize everything that

was going on with the neighbors. I can solve this problem. We will give the neighbors our phone number and our contact information. But when they call, the first question we will say is have you talked to Russell? If they say, hey, you rented, somebody is parking in the street and it's a problem. Have you talked to Russell? If the answer is no, I'll direct them back to Russell because he is the on-site manager. That's the only reason that we're involved in a short-term rental. There is no way we would try to manage it from Oskaloosa, Iowa. It's a place that when we want to come into Columbia, where he was born, where three of our kids were born, and we want to go to a basketball game, we want to go to a swim meet, our daughter was on the swim team at the University of Missouri, we want to come down, we've got a place to stay. We can bring our dog and it's not a problem. So I would say as far as alleviating this problem, it's not an issue. We will give our information to the neighbors. We're not -- we're not hard to get ahold of. And I would also say I'm the mother of six children. I raised my kids on a cul-de-sac. I understand neighbors and neighborhoods. I get it. We didn't buy a place with the thought that we would bring in a bunch of frat boys to party. One of the reasons that we purchased the house that we bought, because it's special. But I also can't assure that there's not going to be somebody on that walking path behind that might be dangerous. I don't know. You never know what's safe. You can't control what's outside of what you have. I can live in Oskaloosa, Iowa, which is a small town. I don't know who is going to move in next door. I don't know. I can't control it. But I can tell you, as the owners of Valley View, we have no intention of that property being torn up. We have put a great amount of money into it. We have no intention of any tolerance of any of that. So I will take your questions.

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Yes, ma'am? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I think you are sensing a theme here. So, thank you.

MS. GEHRKE: Appreciate it.

MS. WILSON: And I appreciate your willingness to share your information with the neighbors, talk with the neighbors. They want to be heard. That is -- that's what they want.

MS. GEHRKE: And we want to listen. We want to be heard, too, you know.

MS. WILSON: Yeah.

MS. GEHRKE: We want to know if something is going on, we want to know.

MS. WILSON: And everything that you shared, we appreciate it, because it brings a full picture. Right?

MS. GEHRKE: Yes.

MS. WILSON: You've made an investment. It is a home that you care for. It is a city and a town in a neighborhood that you care for. You don't want somebody there tearing up your property. You don't want somebody -- right? So all of that brings a full picture. It brings a full picture for us as a Commission. It brings a full picture for your neighbors, as well. So thank you. I appreciate you sharing that with us.

MS. GEHRKE: Thank you. I appreciate that. Any other questions for me? I think the gray-haired man is coming up.

MR. STANTON: Thank you. Thank you. State your name and address.

MR. GEHRKE: My name is Jon Gehrke, 1604 South Park in Oskaloosa, Iowa. I'd like to thank the Commission for letting us talk to you and -- and our story. I grew up in Columbia. I was born at Boone Hospital Center. Went to high school, went to college here, like Laurie. My wife was the trauma coordinator at the University of Missouri between 1990 and 1996. She has seen plenty of things, plenty of traumas. I was a resident at the University of Missouri Orthopedics, and subsequently, was an attending there. Now I'm in a small critical access hospital in southeast Iowa. I enjoy my work there, but I'm 70 or close to 70 now, and always wanted to come back to Columbia. This was an opportunity to do that. And so this gives us the opportunity to come down and participate in sports, visit friends, and so forth. It's a big investment for us. This is not a small thing at this point. And when I see -- I have to say, though, when I see patients, and I'm going to operate on somebody, I give them my phone number. And I will give every neighbor my phone number tomorrow or tonight. Write it down for every one of them. I am always available to my patients and I'm always available to my neighbors. This cul-de-sac hopefully will become wonderful neighbors, and we can be wonderful neighbors for them. So I -- I don't know what else to tell you. Is there any questions I can answer for you guys?

MR. STANTON: Any questions for this speaker? Thank you, sir.

MR. GEHRKE: Truly appreciate the opportunity. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Anybody else want to speak on this case? Going once, going twice, three times.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Comments from Commission?

MR. WALTERS: Oh, I do. I think it's worth -- on the letter Mr. Kalinkos read on behalf of Noel Feldman and a couple other people talked about, it being unusual for out-of-town people to own rental property. That's -- I don't think that's an accurate way of looking at it, nor do I think this is a loophole. I think that this Commission, prior to me being on it, put a lot of time into getting this ordinance in effect, and these ordinances are in effect across the United States, and so, they've worked very hard to try to get there and accountable. So I just wanted -- I think it's -- also, it's not unusual for someone like Mr. Boyt to manage more than one property. It's -- it's his line of work, so it's not unusual for someone. And he could manage five or six different STRs, as long as they're not owned by the same party. So anyway, that may be redundant and unnecessary, but a couple of people mentioned that, and his letter brought it up, so I think it's worth mentioning that these things are not loopholes, and they're not -- they're not really that unusual.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Walters, thank you for that information. I think it's very important that we kind of clear the air. Any other comments? Sir?

MR. BRODSKY: So this case has some similarities to the case that we had on the north side of Stephens Lake Park. It's a dead-end, street cul-de-sac, no sidewalks, lot of neighborhood opposition. So my initial inclination coming in here tonight was leaning towards -- towards a no vote. But I think the difference maker for me is the fact that the registered agent is right next door, and is a homeowner in the

same neighborhood. I -- I hear the neighbors' concerns, and I did want to make one clarification about the neighborhood opposition. It's not so much -- or at least the way the Code is written, it's not so much the validity or veracity of those fears or concerns, but just neighborhood opposition, or -- you know. So for me, like I said, I was kind of leaning towards a no vote. I try to be consistent with my votes. It bared a lot of resemblance to that case at Stephens Lake. But the difference maker for me is going to be the registered agent is right next door.

MR. STANTON: Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Commissioner Brodsky, could you clarify? You said it is not the --

MR. BRODSKY: I'm sorry?

DR. GRAY: -- it's not the validity or, like, the quality of the neighborhood opposition? Did I mishear you?

MR. BRODSKY: The way it's written, I was just trying to look it up again. It's whether or not there is neighborhood support or neighborhood opposition. It's not so much if you think that that opposition is -- I mean, I get -- we -- it's all subjective, so we all have to make our determination on that. But it's -- it's -- the way it's written in the Code, it's just support or lack of support.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Anyone else? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. I -- I feel very -- sorry. I went to the rest room. I feel -- so I might be repeating things. I feel very torn on this. I do. I feel like the neighbor -- I love a petition, and the fact that it was unanimous, I think really speak volumes. And I'm also thinking what is the Council going to do, because when they see a petition, they like to vote no. Just speaking plainly. But then these homeowners are so responsible and so kind. It's -- it's hard. It's kind of one of those things where I think if they would have gone first, a lot of the problems that the neighbors had would have been alleviated. So regardless of how we vote, this will go to City Council, and I would just recommend speaking first, because I think you all did a great job of alleviating some of the questions and the problems that your neighbors had. Yeah. I feel torn on this. I think there is problems with the infrastructure. However, the applicant did say he lives right there. He can look. I don't know. I'm torn.

MR. STANTON: Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Sorry. I'm just asking follow-up questions of people's comments now. You said you are torn because of the infrastructure. Can you say what you mean by that?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. Well, no sidewalks. And then if people do use street parking and there's kids -- first of all, I'm pro sidewalk. Right? And there's children in the neighborhood that are using the cul-de-sac as, like, a play space. And I think streets should have children and people in them. And I think that with no adequate sidewalks for kids to hang out on or travel on and older people -- I also live very close to this. And so I'm very familiar. I think -- oh, my God, let me go back. Okay. I think that because there's not sidewalks, people are being forced into the street regardless, if they're playing or whatever they're doing just to get around. And I think that with increased traffic and more vehicles, more people in the

neighborhood, even if they're not parking on the street, I think that, for me, it would be an infrastructure issue.

MR. STANTON: Any other Commissioners? Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: I will actually say my comments. I'm -- I'm not really torn on this. I had some questions and some curiosities, but, for the most part, those have been answered. In terms of I love looking at the criteria, because it's the thing that we apply evenly across all the cases, does it align with the Comprehensive Plan, is there adequate access? Yes. Is there sufficient infrastructure, minus the sidewalks? Yes. And significant adverse impact, I understand, and also along with the neighborhood support or opposition. I understand that when we talk about the opposition or the support, the fear of the unknown and the uncertainty. And when you invest in a property, you want to believe that you are investing in a particular matter of certainty. Again, as a person that lives next to two Airbnb's, and again, the origin story for being on this Commission, I have a really difficult time subscribing to the anticipated fears versus the most probable reality. I think that, you know, when we look at why we are passing or hoping to pass an amendment, it is to get as many people under this regulation as possible. It seems like we are anticipating doing that regulating by denying them, if we have any kind of concern. So by my logic and my discernment, based on the criteria before me, I plan on supporting this.

MR. STANTON: Any other comments? I agree with everything said. I think my position is I want everyone that we approve to be successful so the program will continue to be successful. I don't want -- I don't want bad apples because one bad apple will hurt four years of work on this thing. I want this thing to be successful. So my -- my filter is I want whatever I approve to be successful. I want it to be a win. I want it to be a beacon of success. So everything was sound. The presentations were sound. I'm just going to say this and I'm going to hold what I'm going to do, but how do you have a Commission if you lived in the neighborhood and the whole Commission -- a whole neighborhood has a petition signed and you don't know? How do you not know how the neighbors feel if you live next door to the property and 18 neighbors around you, you don't know how they feel? That's all I'm just going to say. Any other questions? I would entertain a motion.

MR. WALTERS: I make the motion and, just to inform the audience, all motions are made in the affirmative. I -- regarding Case Number 93-2026, 2002 Valley View Road STR conditional use permit, I move to approve this recommendation based on the following bullet points, I guess: Approve the requested STR CUP subject to maximum occupancy of four transient guests, maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage, maximum of six transient guests subject to the installation of one additional UDC compliant on-site parking space.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary, roll call, sir.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Dr. Gray, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Walters, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr. Voting No: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Stockton. The motion carries 6-2.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries 7-2 -- or 6-2. Sorry.

MR. STANTON: It will be forwarded to City Council.

**Case Number 102-2026**

**The City of Columbia is proposing revisions to Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) that would revise the definition of “family” as shown in Sec. 29-1.11 [Definitions]. The proposed amendment would eliminate the difference in the number of unrelated adults permitted within dwellings in the R-1, R-2, and R-MF zoning districts in favor of a single maximum limitation of 4 unrelated adults, revise how a “family” is defined to allow non-traditional and multi-generational family formations to occupy a dwelling with no numerical limitation, and provides clarity that dwelling unit occupancy would be determined by using the adopted International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) standards such that "overcrowding" is appropriately addressed. The amendments are proposed as a means of addressing recommendations presented within the 2024 Boone County/City of Columbia Housing Study.**

MR. STANTON: May I have a staff report, Mr. Zenner?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed revision to the definition of "family" as shown in attached Public Hearing Draft Definition of "Family."

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? Mr. Zenner, let's use Uncle Harry next time.

MR. ZENNER: My apologies, sir.

MR. STANTON: Yeah, you know. Just for --

MR. ZENNER: I should have taken the -- I should have taken the cue from you when we were doing Black History Month, but that was -- and that wasn't even Black History Month you referred to it as. You confused us all.

MR. STANTON: American History.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you. Because it is all history.

MR. STANTON: It's all history. All right. Any other questions of staff? Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Not in line with that conversation at all. So you mentioned a potential change would be adult versus person?

MR. ZENNER: Back to that. So we're talking about here. I can't do that in this because I'm in the PowerPoint, but you are correct. So that would be up to four unrelated adults, because that's what we were driving at, is adults. Children can't rent homes, so, I mean, I -- you know, it's persons, adults. I would ask Mr. Craig to chime in if he feels that there's any concern if we were -- if they were to amend to adults instead. I think it means, you know --

MR. CRAIG: Well, yeah. Inability to contract. Or yeah. Yeah. So I don't know if those fears are -- are, you know, reasonable, so, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: Would it make it any clearer, do you think --

MR. CRAIG: A person must be able to purchase property or to contract with a landlord, so by its

nature, it's someone 18 or older, you know.

DR. GRAY: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Is that the question? Does that answer the question?

MR. ZENNER: I mean, an adult is considered 18. Correct?

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. Yeah. It's the age of capacity contract in most circumstances.

DR. GRAY: Great. My second question, you said there is some differentiation between what Boone County is recently doing, but the particularities of it are with, like, their college town for Columbia. But the spirit of it, the move toward -- well, like the spirit of the direction is the same, yes.

MR. ZENNER: It is to expand housing opportunity by -- and it's taking a different approach. So instead of the City's approach, which would include a cap based on our -- a cap across all of our residential districts, the County is not applying a cap on unrelated individuals or related, for that matter. They are going to go solely to a definition that is only drawing upon IPMC.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Have questions of staff? I would open up the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anybody wish to speak on this issue, come up. Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations. Going once, going twice, three times. Close the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Commission discussion. You guys are a lively bunch this evening. I would entertain a motion then, if we're not going to talk about it.

MR. WALTERS: I would be happy to make a motion.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Regarding Case Number 102-2026, the family definition revisions and UDC text change, I recommend approval of the text change to Section 29-1.1(A) as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. ZENNER: It should be 1.11(a). I apologize. Missed a one.

MR. WALTERS: Approve the text change to Section 29-1.1(a) as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. CRAIG: 1.11(a).

MR. WALTERS: All right. I'll try that again. Third time is the charm. All right. Approve the text change to Section 29-1.1(a) as presented.

DR. GRAY: One-one.

MR. ZENNER: One-one.

MR. WALTERS: Didn't I just say that?

MR. WALTERS: Don't look at that. Don't look at the screen, look at the paper.

MS. STOCKTON: Look at the paper.

MR. STANTON: Don't give up on it, Mr. Walters. Hang in there.

MR. WALTERS: It's getting late. I amend my prior mistake, and recommend approval of the text change to Section 29-1.11 as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary, let's take a vote, sir.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Stockton, Mr. Walters, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr. The motion carries 8-0.**

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

**VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MR. STANTON: Any comments from the public?

**VIII. STAFF COMMENTS**

MR. STANTON: Any comments from staff? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: So, Uncle Pat will talk now. Your next meeting will be April 9, and it will begin with a work session which will not be nearly as humorous as this last end of the meeting. We are going to talk about some text changes that are going to be more statutorily driven, so we're going to give you an overview of some of that, and just going to feel our way through that. On the April 23rd meeting, I can inform you that you will have a presentation -- another presentation that will come from our consultants from CMT as it relates to the complete streets project. After they've done some public outreach -- some additional public outreach before the 23rd, they're going to come to you with some recommendations and some findings that they have been working on for the last year or so. And we will follow our April 9 work session, however, by a regular meeting. That regular meeting will have just two items on it again. Those are both short-term rental requests, so we continue to beat that drum with compliance. You have one at 2208 Concordia Drive. I kept reading 2202 tonight, and I'm thinking, wait a minute, did I get the wrong address? 2208 Concordia, it's an R-1 request for a 210-night short-term rental. And then 802 North Sixth Street, again, another 120 -- or 210 night RMF request for a short-term rental approval, as well. And these are the locations. Out of the west side of town, of course, west of Bourn Drive is our Concordia property, and then up on north Sixth Street, just a block south of Wilkes Boulevard, not even a half block south of Wilkes Boulevard and the high school. That is all that we have for right now, and I, in the way of business, what I will inform the Commission is is the meetings -- adjustments that we have, I talked about previously, due to the renovations of this space and conference rooms 1A and 1B, those changes are now reflected on the City calendar. We will be meeting on June 4th, which is the first Thursday of the month following the Council meeting. We will then -- because the June 18th meeting would need to be cancelled, we have moved and scheduled our regular work session and our regular Planning and Zoning Commission for June 11th. So we will put two meetings in the month of June. They will be a week apart. We have secured space for both of those. I will not be here, so I will let my very competent staff run both our work session and this meeting so we can continue to move forward. The July 9th meeting, both meetings have been cancelled in their entirety, as we had discussed previously. Enjoy your 4th of July

holiday, if you would, and we will see you on the 23rd then of July at our regular times in our regular space, both back in 1A, 1B, and in the Council chamber. And that will then consolidate applications from the July 9 meeting and the July 23rd meeting into a single meeting, so it may be double what we are currently seeing, so anywhere between four to maybe six projects may be before us that night. With that, again, that is all I have to offer this evening. Thank you for your time and your attention. Please respond to Leland if you have comments about the cap and its updates. They would greatly appreciate that.

**IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MR. STANTON: Any comments from fellow Commissioners?

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. STANTON: Would you guys like to adjourn? I would entertain a motion as such.

DR. GRAY: Move to adjourn.

MS. STOCKTON: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. All those in favor of adjournment, thumbs up? All those opposed, thumbs down.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. STANTON: We're out of here.

(The meeting adjourned at 9:12 p.m.)

(Off the record.)