

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
June 11, 2026

Case # 162-2026

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of James & Leah Beth Johnson, LTS-1 LLC, East Meets West LLC, Momentum Builders, LLC, and BVSHSSF Columbia, LLC, (owners) and Theory Sterling Mizzou (Developer), for approval to rezone approximately 2.91-acres from the R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) district to the PD (Planned Development) district, approval of a PD Development Plan to be known as "Theory Sterling University" that will also serve as a preliminary, and approval of an associated statement of intent. The development plan would permit development of the site with up to 320 dwelling units. The approximately 2.91-acre subject site is located directly northwest of the intersection of University and College Avenues and includes the address 1205 University Avenue.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning of the site from R-MF to PD, the proposed PD Plan, inclusive of design exceptions, serving as a preliminary plat, and associated statement of intent, subject to the following conditions:

1. Technical corrections
2. Adherence to the attached architectural renderings

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

DR. GRAY: Hi. Thank you. Okay. I have a little bit of a list. So to clarify, the sewer improvements --

MR. KUNZ: Uh-huh.

DR. GRAY: -- you said that the plat -- the final plat would be on hold until that was approved not improved.

MR. KUNZ: Correct. Approved. So they would submit their plans to improve the infrastructure, and we would know that those are ready to be made should a final plat be approved. And then the improvements themselves would be made before issuance of a building permit. If I'm not mistaken, it may also be a certificate of occupancy.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: Thank you. And kind of a follow-up to that, are these sewer improvements that would need to be made already, like, regardless of whether this was rezoned or developed?

MR. KUNZ: I do not know if I have the capacity to answer that particularly. I apologize. I think, if I'm not mistaken, the improvements have something to do with the pitch of the -- the main. So there needs to be adjustment to increase flow for sanitary sewer to lead to a wider main that is, if I'm not mistaken, on Elm Street.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: You're welcome.

DR. GRAY: You said that the -- much of the surrounding area is R-MF.

MR. KUNZ: Uh-huh.

DR. GRAY: And are those largely legal nonconformities with the setbacks being less than -- what was it -- 25 feet?

MR. KUNZ: It's kind of hard. I haven't done an exact inventory of it. I would imagine some of them are legal nonconforming uses. With the University of Missouri situation, it's a little bit different insofar they need not necessarily meet the dimensional standards of our Code for development.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you. I'm -- I'm trying to categorize how it is congruent with the surrounding.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: And then, again, maybe a question that you don't have an answer to. The current landscaping, do we know, like, roughly what that percentage is? Is it comparable to what is being suggested?

MR. KUNZ: I do not know what the existing landscaping is. It's -- the structure I do believe is more than 10 feet setback when I measured it. I do not know what the exact landscaping percentage of this site comprehensively is though.

DR. GRAY: Thank you. And I -- this is my first time seeing a shadow study, and I would appreciate a little bit more context about how I'm taking that into consideration, whether it's like the impact on neighbors. Like I'm trying to figure out how to sort this data.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. The -- the way we looked at it was mostly to see the periods of time in which it would be most impactful, as well as the extent of the shadows that are created to -- and also using that perhaps in comparison with Paquin Towers, which is also structure that's well over what our height requirements would be to -- to see -- yeah, what adjacent property it would be impacting.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Got it. Everything the light touches. My last question, I am a little bit unclear about how to understand the comparisons, and maybe this is a question for the applicant regarding parking, because it seems like there is a 100 percent not in the in-town comparisons. Thank you. A 100 percent utilization without - with one exception. So I'm curious about how -- yeah, how that is -- this comparison is being offered.

MR. KUNZ: Like just interpretation of it or kind of --

DR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. So there's a few factors that certainly I considered when I was looking at what the parking ratios are and how it relates to utilization rate. One of the initial thoughts is potentially as you center decoupling parking spaces from rent, so you don't inherently have to have a parking space if you're also renting a bed. However, with still only being at 63 percent utilization rate, at a -- at a .76 ratio, it didn't seem -- I mean, if there are 200 spaces undersold and they have 546, that's 346 parking spaces for 714 beds. That's closer to a point five ratio. And if you think of actual occupied spaces per bed, if that makes sense, which would still be under parked for a lower parking ratio than what's being provided here. But, yeah, mostly just looking at what the ratio is, what the utilization rate is, and kind of seeing where this is proposed to fall and what expectations for utilization of parking may be because of that.

DR. GRAY: That is super helpful. Thank you so much.

MR. KUNZ: All right. It was a meandering response.

DR. GRAY: No. It's perfect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is that it, Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. I didn't mean that to come off snotty, just making sure before I moved on. Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Real quick follow-up question to Commissioner Gray's question. On -- do you -- you said the youth center on Turner, they decouple.

MR. KUNZ: I don't know. I -- that my theories for why it may be that they have such a lower utilization rate for their parking.

MR. BRODSKY: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MR. BRODSKY: That answers my question. Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? I have a question for legal. I'm not saying we do want to do this, I just want to ask now before we get too far into the hearing because it may inform my decision-making. The 1,300 square feet for the barbershop and spa, that's optional on the current PD plan, do we have the authority to amend the PD plan to make it mandatory?

MR. CRAIG: I don't believe so.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: No. I don't know. I'm trying to reach and see what -- how we could -- I mean, we could ask the applicant --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know we can place other --

MR. CRAIG: -- if they might agree to it but I don't think that we can --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. I know we can place conditions on the PD plan approval, I just --

MR. CRAIG: Conditions are usually to bring the up -- the application up to compliance with the Code or with UDC in general --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: So usually it's conditioned with health, safety, or welfare, or if there's something deficient that the condition --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: -- is to bring it into compliance with -- with the Code.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: That might be a little too far afield.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So we could theoretically say since you're basically copying MDT, the entire first floor has to be retail, but couldn't say 1,300 square feet or would that also be too far?

MR. CRAIG: I mean, like I said, you can try and negotiate with the applicant --

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. No. No. Sorry.

MR. CRAIG: -- to see if they'll agree to it. I don't know -- I don't know how that we would enforce --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: Make that -- that condition enforceable.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm hearing a no.

MR. CRAIG: Pretty much. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment. Please come forward. Name and address for the record; six minutes for the applicant and a group, three minutes for individuals.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1,000 West Nifong. The first slide -- there we go. With me tonight is the architect, Jonathan Delcambre, Todd Gaines is one of the one of the applicants, as well as Jeff Githens. And they will be speaking behind me tonight. And also with us tonight is Caleb Colbert, and, of course, the traffic engineer, Brian Rensing, who's with CBB, does not have a presentation, but can answer any traffic questions that you may have. I believe that Mr. Kunz did a very good job in his overview and the staff report, so pretty much my overview covers everything that he kind of talked about. Again, let's talk about the -- the location of this site. This is in a unique location in town, in my opinion. You see it here; you can see what's around us. You take the MDT district, the boundaries of the MDT encroach in the northwest of us coming in, then you take the University of Missouri and Stephens College to the south and to the north of us, and then add into that College Avenue. And we have this little pocket of ground that kind of sits in there between University and Stephens mound on the west side of College and the MDT. Much of it is zoned multi-family residential -- multi-family residential, and really, I don't think that the standard zoning classification for multi-family residential is suited for this particular location, this little pocket of area between all of these entities. Coming in here with the 35-foot maximum building height and large parking lots just doesn't seem that that's the right area, the right spot for -- for that type of development. Again, you've seen the PD plan, you've seen this before with what's there versus what we're proposing. You've seen the -- the rendering that they're coming up with, and this is what it looks like today. Again it's only about 20 foot taller, and I think Jonathan will go into that a little bit more in detail. Traffic study was done on that for the site, so if you have any questions, Brian's here to answer any questions. Again, this traffic study was approved by the City of Columbia and MoDOT. It was done with their complete input on the site. Utilities, we do have utilities on the site to serve this, and to answer one of your questions, Ms. Gray, the sewer in question, there's a -- there's a run of sewer that the City has, and it's simply -- it's below State minimum. So as it sits there today, it flows, it functions, it's fine for what's there today, but for there to be additional capacity, we have to reconstruct it and steepen that grade to increase the capacity. So we're working with the sewer department on that. They brought that to our attention, told us what section it was, and they're looking to us to -- to make a proposal back to -- to fix that issue. So that's -- that's the sewer in question. The waterline is there as well. We're going to do some -- some significant waterline upgrades as well. They've got eight-inch water lines on two sides, a 16-inch water line kind of caddy corner from us, and some four-inch lines that we're going to upgrade through our development. Again, the stormwater, electric is there, there's a lot of electric out there. We're talking with Water and Lights trying to underground that electric. So if you've driven down College -- or excuse me. If you've driven down Paquin or you've driven down University, there's substantial electric lines over overhead and it's rather untidy, and we're working with them to see if we can't underground those. And, Ms. Gray, you also asked a question about the existing landscape in question. I don't have that exact calculation, but I think it's pretty comparable, and -- and we may -- there may be a little bit more green space out there right now than what we'll have in the future possibly. But we're going to have more green space along College Avenue, and the reason for that is if we have to grant additional right-of-way along College Avenue, and that -- and that green space, unless something is done with it by MoDOT or the City of Columbia, is it going to be basically green space or a sidewalk. What's out there now is parking lot in that green space, and so there's large, paved areas, there's -- buildings are closer, that kind of thing. So we believe that we're going to have green space where it really matters. Columbia Imagined talks about -- we talked about what Columbia Imagined says about this site, again, neighborhood district located inside the urban -- urban service area, obviously, and a tier one growth priority

area. Again, what does that mean? It means that utilities are available, it's infill development, encourages higher density housing, which is exactly what we're proposing, and it's a preferred area for the City to focus development in. And, of course, it's aligned with policy three of the Comp Plan. And with that I'm happy to turn it over to -- to the architect to talk about the building a little bit.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Good evening, members of the Commission. Sorry. My name is Jonathan Delcambre. I'm an architect with Gensler. Gensler is a global architecture firm with about 60 offices across the globe. My role is a specialty in high-density housing, in particular, projects like this at major universities across -- across the globe, or actually across the nation. When we began looking at this site, our goal wasn't to simply introduce a new building, it was to design a thoughtful contextual addition to the existing campus in -- in Columbia's urban fabric. And so we -- in doing so we focused on, you know, four key pillars to ensure that the project respects its neighbors and delivered a meaningful public benefit. Those were context scale architecture and pedestrian activation, all which we feel are appropriate for a purpose-built student housing project such as this. Our design framework was really deeply rooted in respecting Columbia's architectural heritage. We spent a great time -- deal of time understanding that unique college collegiate atmosphere here. You know, our -- our study around the quad and the greater campus gave us a really good understanding of what this campus is like, and our goal was to preserve and enhance that sense of place. And because the site sits predominantly at a major transitional intersection, it naturally serves as a gateway to the campus, so our proposed design steps -- steps up to that responsibility by anchoring this primary corner with a distinct welcoming identity that defines this gateway without overwhelming the neighborhood. We know density and height are always at the top of mind for Commissioners like yourself, and the public, so we designed the massing of Theory Sterling with the understanding of the dramatic scale and the gap in the existing neighborhood. As mentioned before, the current -- the site currently sits adjacent to the high rise, Paquin Tower. That one's about 162 --170 feet tall, and a neighboring parking structure that sits about 40 feet tall -- 45 feet tall. Theory Sterling would step carefully from 75 to 85 feet, and we believe this is a highly effective mid-rise urban bridge between those two extremes. To put that in perspective, at its highest point, this building would only sit 20 feet taller than the existing University Place building. We feel that this design provides a pretty balanced common-sense transition for these building types. You know, we -- when looking at this, we were really disciplined in trying to avoid a massive monolithic building, and creating this wall effect along the streetscape, so instead, we intentionally broke down the scale of the façade using different types of material and varied material palette. The façade, as you can see, has a characteristic -- characteristics of several distinct buildings instead of one, and by breaking this into smaller components, we feel it creates a highly pedestrian friendly human scale street edge that softens the buildings overall presence. Finally, I want to emphasize how this project, you know, interacts with the public realm and complies with standard -- city standards that we see across the nation. The design will ensure a smooth transition into the surrounding context. We've utilized setback strategies to give the right-of-way to pedestrians along South College Avenue. This is something that we heard from the neighborhood as a concern, but this does create a significant wider, safer and more generous walkable environment for everyone. At the ground level, the main entrance and primary student and many spaces feature a highly transparent glass façade. This allows the internal energy of the building and the activity to visually interfere with the sidewalk breathing life into the streetscape. And finally, this transparency at night would serve as a vital purpose for activating the interior zones and providing a safe, secure walking environment for students. We believe this represents a balanced approach to urban infill, and it respects Columbia's history, bridges a difficult scale gap, enhances the pedestrian experience on the University and South College Avenues, and contributes to a safer, more vibrant neighborhood.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you want us to stop for questions or are you going to pass it off to the next person?

MR. DELCAMBRE: I'll pass it off for the next.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Three minutes, sir.

MR. GAINES: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Todd Gaines, I live at 1705 Lakecliff Hills Lane in Austin, Texas. Appreciate you all having us here this evening. I want to introduce our company super quickly. So we're one of the applicants. We're partnering with PeakMade co-developing this --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Could you get -- I'm sorry -- a lot closer up to that mic?

MR. GAINES: Oh sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Maybe bend it up a little towards you?

MR. GAINES: Is this a little better? Okay. We are the applicants and the co-developers for this project. Our company, the Dinerstein Company, is based in Houston, and has been developing property since 1955.

We are a family-owned business. We've been doing student housing for about 25 years now, all purpose-built off-campus student housing, as well as luxury multi-family housing. We do about 50 50 both of those. I want to speak tonight about a question that we had received sort of prior to this, which is does the market really need more student housing right now? And I wanted to just give a brief overview on where the University of Missouri housing market is for students. Obviously, I'm going to tell you the answer is, yes, more housing is necessary. Mizzou's freshman class size has expanded 20 percent in the last three years. Record growth every year for the last three years, which obviously starts with living at the university and then flows into off-campus student housing. So you might imagine that total enrollment is also growing as well. It's grown over 8 percent in the last three years. There had been no new purpose-built off-campus student housing projects in the last eight years here, and by the time that this project were to deliver in 2029, that would be ten and a half or eleven years. So purpose-built student housing is not keeping up with the growth that Missouri is experiencing right now. How do we see that? Well you see that in rent growth. Rents are going up across the board, and, in fact, they went up - I've got my number here -- 12 percent just in the last year for students. That is a ton of growth for rents, and it's -- it's not necessarily something that indicates a healthy market, that's something that indicates that the market needs more student housing. We've seen a couple of the competitor properties that exist sell out in 72 hours when they start leasing. So again, it's extremely competitive right now. So we would argue that, yes, they're -- more purpose-built student housing does need to be developed as a result of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You've got about 30 seconds.

MR. GAINES: Okay. I'll hurry up. What I wanted -- and I'm sure you all cannot really read this, so I'll summarize this, but we provided a rent study of our competitors, and what I'd like to emphasize is that we're including a fairly high number of four-bedroom units within our project because that provides the best value to students out of these. So as you look, the more bedrooms you add, the lower the per-bed price is. I don't know how much more time I have, but I'll finish there and see if there any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions for this speaker? Go ahead and -- Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Two quick questions. And overall, I'm in favor of this project. The parking has me a little bit concerned, so I want to ask you a couple questions about that. Would -- would adding more parking make this project financially unfeasible for you?

MR. GAINES: It could. Also we've provided as much parking as we can without going even higher on this project. If you recall the design that we've included, we're screening our parking on all sides. Right? So we're trying to create sort of an attractive project. We recognize that this is on the footsteps of campus, and so we would have to go even taller to include more parking.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any -- Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Will the -- will the parking be included or is it an option?

MR. GAINES: It's an option.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Thank you. You said that you have been in student, like, purpose-built housing for about 25 years?

MR. GAINES: Our company has.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. GAINES: That's right.

DR. GRAY: But you, personally?

MR. GAINES: No. No. No. I'd still be in high school at that point.

DR. GRAY: Oh, okay. I'm curious about what are the lessons that you've learned in these experiences or their takeaways?

MR. GAINES: Oh my gosh, how much time do you have?

DR. GRAY: About 30 seconds.

MR. GAINES: We -- well we start -- if you look at what student housing looked like even here 20 years ago, that's what we were building. So very low density. It looked very much like regular residential. There was not a bed-bath parity, and over time, we found that students could get more value out of leasing per bed. We found that they appreciated amenities that were student focused, for instance, study rooms versus, you know, perhaps a multi-family community wouldn't have. So we've learned a lot of different things, but I think one thing we always come back to is that putting students as close as we can to campus benefits those students, and it benefits the university as well. Having access to the campus is paramount. It also actually -- and I know, again, parking is a question here, I just want to say, and you'll probably hear it from the rest of us too, it provides us an opportunity to actually offer living that is so close to campus that students have the option to not bring a car. Many of them will. We can argue about how many will, but I guarantee you that if this project is less dense, you

encourage other projects which are further away from campus, all of those students are going to be driving to campus.

DR. GRAY: Thank you. I have follow-up questions for the architect, if that's okay.

MR. GAINES: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We don't usually allow people to come back up, but we will since they did this whole trio act.

MR. DARR: I have questions too.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Architect.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hey -- yes. You know the rules. No. Okay.

MR. DELCAMBRE: I may be able to --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will allow each person to speak for three minutes, even though that means that the -- that you are all for the developer. Yes. If we have a Commissioner that has a question for the architect, we will allow the architect to come back. Mr. Architect, please come back, state your name and address again for the record.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Mr. Architect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hi. I'm sorry --

MR. DELCAMBRE: No. Jonathan Delcambre.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Delcambre. Please go ahead. Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I'm so sorry. Thank you for coming back up.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Sure.

DR. GRAY: I just had a kind of point of curiosity, I think. You know, it was mentioned that the last student group that has built housing in this area was about eight years ago, and I'm not sure which unit that was. But I know, generally, concerns about architectural design renderings -- and I respect that you wanted to honor and really signal an appreciation for Columbia's architectural specificities. I am curious about how that those specific architectural features are not just like -- sorry -- they're like not having a mass brick wall, but like what specifically are you drawing from that is particularly Columbia Missouri? And additionally, that sometimes when we combine different architectural features from different standards or signals, you get kind of a postmodern Cheesecake factory nightmare. And so I want to see what you have to say in terms of what you drew inspiration for and perhaps assuage some citizens that may fear what is being presented.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Yeah. I mean we don't want to replicate the campus architecture. There's some great Beaux-Arts architecture here. The use of the limestone and the red brick, you know, it's very historical, but we don't want to recreate that. So we want to take that and apply it in a contemporary language, which is what you've -- which we have shown. We have had hints of the lighter color material, hints of the reddish material expressing the verticality, the punched openings, kind of be reminiscent of some of the buildings on campus and the scale. So I -- you know, it's not hey, we want to replicate these types of details that were done in this very expensive limestone, because this this won't be a limestone building, you know, and so trying to replicate that can be very difficult in a contemporary manner, if that makes sense.

DR. GRAY: Yes. Thank you. And a quick follow-up. In -- in your expertise, these materials that you've chosen as a part of these designs are sustainable over time?

MR. DELCAMBRE: Yes. Correct.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Since we've got you here, any other -- Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I believe -- I know we've been talking about MDT, and, you know, we're really close to that. Did you compare the form standards from MDT to what you're proposing? How does that compare?

MR. DELCAMBRE: Yeah. So the MDT standards are quite a bit more dense in terms of height and setbacks. The parking ratios are less, so --

MR. DARR: I was more talking about the facade articulations and dissimilar materials. They have standards for those in the MDT.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Yeah. And they do, and it's activating the streetscape. I think there's requirements for retail activation and whatnot, so we've applied some of those principles here. Obviously, we're not proposing mixed-use building, although we will have some small component of retail, we hope with the barbershop. We do believe it's a good blend between the MDT and a pocket that was pointed out that really is kind of sitting in no-man's land and has -- really doesn't have a zoning for it that is applicable.

MR. DARR: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you.

MR. DELCAMBRE: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case.

MR. GITHENS: Good evening, Commission. I'm Jeff Givens, PeakMade Real Estate, 2970 Clairmont Road, Atlanta, Georgia. We're partnered with the Dinerstein Company on this development. I'm going to address two things, and I don't need slides to do so. I want to talk about parking, and then University Place. Parking -- and I want to answer some questions that I heard. One, all of the comps that we showed existing here in the University of Missouri market decouple parking from the residential rent. So parking is an additional fee, and thus, you know, there's no property in the market right now that would do it any differently. You pay your rent, and you pay for a parking space. The real relevance is University Center, which had a built parking ratio that was higher than what we're proposing; however, is 100 percent occupied in its residences, but only occupied 48 percent of -- well, it's parking ratio or occupied parking ratio is 48 percent, and that's pretty telling. And I'll give you other market context which you may say, well, this is Columbia, this is not Gainesville, Florida. In the last 10 years, the highest parking ratio -- and we develop a lot -- I've been doing this over 20 years in multi and student. The highest parking ratio that we have built in the last 10 years has been a .65 ratio, and that was in Gainesville, Florida. With our utilization -- the actual utilization was less than 0.6 ratio. Parking demand, and this is true across the globe, is reducing every year. With alternative modes of transportation, ride share, and in a pedestrian location, the need for parking is not what it is in a suburban location. So we are -- we have a responsibility to ourselves, to our investors, to our partners, to our residents, to make sure we get the parking ratio right, and we feel -- and we've done a lot of study of what we built before and what we have seen in this market, feel very confident that what we're building as a parking ratio is more than adequate. I would almost argue -- we probably could have gotten by with less. I would have thought a .5 ratio would have been more than adequate here, but we went up to be respectful of, you know, the difference in the zoning class and that we're kind of in a hybrid. But I feel very good about our parking. As for University Place, a related entity of ours is the owner of University Place. When we bought this in 2018, we bought it because it's a tremendous location, tremendous market in University. We always had the vision of this being redeveloped into a higher and better use, and it was just a matter of time. The time is now given the growth of the University, the growth in rates in this market, the sheer imbalance in supply and demand, and so we are really representing the owner of the property and wanting to improve upon that property. I'm not coming in as a third party to develop or wanting to develop something that I'm buying, we're improving what we thought we would do from its infancy in 2018, and this is a 60-year old property, served its purpose great, but you would argue -- I would argue that it's functionally --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. GITHENS: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I'm going take privilege and ask my question first. So what are you doing with the residents who live there now?

MR. GITHENS: The residents that live there now that will start their lease term this coming August, so the residents that are living there now, their leases will terminate at the end of July. The residents that will move in who have already signed leases to move in in August, we will continue their residency through the spring semester of 2027. And so the goal is to let that semester conclude, to let graduation conclude, which I think is May 17th of 2027, and give them a week until May 24th of 2027 before they need to vacate. We have the right to do that in our lease, but we want to be -- we could, you know, we could vacate them more quickly than that. We want to be fair to the student residents that we have in this building, let them get through the semester, let them plan for that and get through graduation and give them time to move. And to save us --

MS. GEUEA JONES: And are all of your current resident students?

MR. GITHENS: No. They're not all students.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So what about the ones that aren't students and aren't on that schedule?

MR. GITHENS: Everybody has a lease renewal. It's a 12-month lease. So, you know, they will be renewing with knowledge of this condition, and we will be communicating with them early in '27 of, you know, our plans to demolish the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you're allowing the people who -- whose current leases expire in July, you're allowing them to renew for --

MR. GITHENS: Allowing renewals, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But not for 12 months? '

MR. GITHENS: We're allowing renewals for 12 months given that this is still speculative. We don't know how this is going to be approved. We hope that it will. Once it's known for certain, and this is a closed transaction, then we will notify our residents and work with them appropriately. And we've done this on many other projects.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you just said, then we will notify our residents. The ones whose --whose leases expire next month, have you already been talking to them about the fact that their next lease won't be --

MR. GITHENS: We -- we have not in the residential residents. Commercial residents is a different story

-- or commercial tenants.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. GITHENS: So the one that we likely will keep and we want to come back is the barbershop and spa. They've been in Columbia for 90 years, in this location for 40 years. They're an iconic provider of -- you know, of haircuts and now nail manicures and pedicures and other services, and we think it would be a great, you know, addition to the merchandising of the new project to have them as a tenant. And I think they're open to that, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: But you haven't told your residential tenants that you're doing this yet?

MR. GITHENS: We haven't because this is not definitive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other questions? I'm going to go to Commissioner Brodsky and then Commissioner Gray.

MR. BRODSKY: Just a quick question on parking, going back to that. You know, we have residents, of course, that we're primarily discussing. What about visitor parking?

MR. GITHENS: What we find in many markets is that the visitors to our residents or to our apartments are coming by other modes of transportation, certainly in a pedestrian setting. Here I would expect most visitors to come by foot, they might come by Uber, they might come by bicycle or scooter, and so it's always a balance of trying to be mindful of a visitor coming into a building. At the same time you want to secure the parking for your own residents and access control into our residences, into our parking, you know, facilities are always something that we want to protect for the residents' use predominantly. There are instances where we provide visitor parking within a parking garage, but it has to be studied, and we want to make sure that it's safe for both the visitor and the residents. We haven't decided here if there would be a visitor portion to the parking garage. There may be. Now there is parking on Matthews Street, and that's metered parking. And so that's -- it's actually a luxury that, you know, a lot of our projects don't have is to have on-street parking that's available to the public and then you have adjacent parking facilities. So I think in our view in the scheme of things that we've done, there's more opportunity for visitors to park if they choose to drive to visit you know our residents than there are in most cases.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Gray. Sorry. You had already raised your hand. Go ahead.

DR. GRAY: Thank you. Thank you. I am appreciative of the different comparisons to parking in the context of Gainesville. I don't live there, so I don't know. But I am -- I'm curious about these points of comparison given we see 100 percent utilization in the city in our permitted parking structures, and 100 percent in all of the other comparisons, minus one. And so, yeah, can you help me understand that?

MR. GITHENS: Well utilization is meaningless without quantity or ratio. So if you have a point two parking ratio, and you're 100 percent utilized, and that -- okay, that -- that doesn't tell you a whole lot. If you have a .78 parking ratio and your utilization is only 65 percent that tells you that the demand for your parking is less than what you have built physically, and that's -- that's my strongest point, you know, is that the parking demand is relative to -- again take the residential occupancy. If residences are full and you have parking that's not fully utilized, then that tells you your real utilization. You don't have enough parking, it's always going to be 100 percent, but if you have more parking than actual demand, then you're going to have a difference in utilization.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. GITHENS: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Thank you.

MR. GITHENS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. NORGARD: Good evening. Peter Norgard, Hinkson Avenue Third Ward. I think we've identified the problem here tonight, cars -- parking in this case. As a resident of Benton Stephens neighborhood, this whole discussion sounds very familiar to me. You might recall if you've been here long enough that in 2012-ish, a large development was built at East Walnut and College with significantly too few parking spaces, and we had free parking in our neighborhood right next door. Guess what happened? They parked up our neighborhood so much that we had more than 120 percent of our -- we had parking in excess of 120 percent of available parking, and that persisted for about a year and a half until the developer was forced to build a garage. And then at that point in time, they still didn't use it because the developer charged too much for the parking, so just because the parking exists doesn't mean it's going to be used. So those utilization factors should be considered carefully. I also want to point out that this is a plan development. My understanding is that a plan development is a special concession that you all make to the developer. They're asking for something, and in return, the City gets something. Now in that -- in this case, I think the argument is the City gets activated walking spaces, additional housing, but that would happen with almost any development. So what are we getting in return? They're asking

for additional height, they're asking for reduced green space, they're asking for reduced parking. So what do we get? Where's the win-win for this City? And with that I have nothing else.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Norgard. Any questions? Seeing none. Next speaker on this case.

MR. SHANKER: Hello again. I'm Rick Shanker of Sixth Ward; I'm an electrical contractor. I'm also a member of the Buildings and Codes Commission, and I'm also a landlord. In regards to utilities, 99 percent of new buildings are underground, and although we appreciate there won't be overhead wiring here, and therefore, no more tennis shoes hanging from the lines, most of the new housing is underground electrical services. As far as parking goes, in Buildings and Codes Commission, we always see requests for variances. I think this parking request on their part is not at all acceptable. If you ever go to East Campus where a lot of us live, the parking does overflow. So the parking request that they're making is not acceptable to me, and also the landscaping requests. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Mr. Shanker? No? Thank you. Next speaker please come forward.

MS. NEAGLE: Hi. Cindy Neagel, live on Cliff Drive in the Sixth Ward. And I've lived in East Campus for 25 years, initially on Wilson and now on Cliff. I think among all of the residents here tonight you've probably got well over 100 years of experience in dealing with the parking and traffic issues, and so I wanted to -- we wanted to bring some context. Oh, and I want to say I'm speaking as the vice president of the East Campus Neighborhood Association, so could I have six minutes, please?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Did they take a vote?

MS. NEAGLE: We didn't, but our president.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm the Chair, and -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Fine. Yeah. Fine. Just keep going.

MS. NEAGLE: Thanks. Thank you. Okay. So I want to talk specifically about traffic and traffic safety. There are only three signalized access points in and out of the East Campus neighborhood, the intersection at Broadway and William, the intersection at College and University, and the one at College and Rollins. Both of the intersections on College see heavy use by pedestrians, many of whom are neighborhood residents, but many also are people who park in our neighborhood because it's free and there's unrestricted access to that. So I appreciate the traffic study, but I do want to point out that's a traffic study about utilization and not safety, and this -- the same firm that prepared this traffic study also prepared and presented last November of 2025 the street and intersection pedestrian safety study, and this study was prepared in support of the Como to Zero initiative, and that study found that 32 percent of fatal crashes in Columbia are pedestrian related which are -- is well above the state and federal averages -- national averages. So additionally this study found that the groups of -- in the age range 20 to 21 and 15 to 20 account for more than 60 percent of all crashes involving pedestrians. So the safety study also found that the number one and two most dangerous intersections in the city of Columbia are, number one, College and University, with 12 pedestrian accidents in 10 years, and, number two, College and Rollins within -- which had six in 10 years, and, number five, which was tied with several others, was University and Matthews, which had three pedestrian accidents in 10 years. So this project involves directly two of the most dangerous intersections for pedestrians in the city with a combined one point five pedestrian accidents per year on average. So there are a number of reasons for this. Primarily, there are too many competing interests trying to navigate that intersection. There are pedestrians traveling both east and west across college on both the north and south side intersection points. There are vehicles navigating from University to turn right, to turn left, and to go straight without protected turn signals and on the same signal cycles as the pedestrians, and there are vehicles making U-turns to get around the traffic barrier that's on the south end of the street of College. So I want to note that this traffic study doesn't include the intersection of Anthony and College. It wouldn't because it's not really into the study, but that also creates some impact on this development. Many people, many students who live in the neighborhood use Anthony to make a quick left turn across two lanes of traffic, and then go right on to Paquin, crossing two more lanes of traffic on College. So it creates a pretty dangerous situation. So I suspect if we have an access point on College that's not too far away with people trying to turn to go north, we're going to have people both competing for that middle median on a kind of a head-on collision. So related, but secondary to safety, is the amount of time spent waiting at the intersection at College and University. The traffic times are average times, but I think we can all tell you from years of experience navigating this intersection that you can wait a lot longer. Very often only one car is able to make a left turn, and that's the car that pulls out into the middle of the intersection, and very often turns right or left on red. So the times are much longer when classes are about to begin, which is about from 15 till until the top of the hour, and then when classes have just let out, which is the top of the hour to 15 after the hour. So a half hour of about every hour, you have some pretty severe traffic impacts. So delays in making these left turns occur due to pedestrian traffic. The left-turn vehicles have to wait for all of this traffic to clear, pedestrian, then

right turners, then go straighters. So it creates a backlog, both on University going both ways. So I think this happens because there's no protected left turn lane go on University either way because the right and straight lanes, go straight lanes are shared on University, and that the shared lane particularly on the west side of University is very short because there is parking on the south side of the street. So the question I think is what - what improvements do we need to make this in this intersection safer for everyone including the people who are going to be living in this development? So ideally, I'd love a pedestrian bridge, but I don't think that's probably going happen. I've wanted that for years. But I do think increased setbacks would be helpful to improve the sight lines. I think we need to make sure that we prohibit moving and delivery vehicles from unloading on College and University Streets, and have a dedicated unloading zone either somewhere within or on Matthews. We need to add a dedicated left-turn lane to the College and University intersections. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for the speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Next speaker please come forward.

MS. CONCANNON: Hello. My name is Marie Concannon. I live at 704 Hilltop Drive in the East Campus neighborhood. I've lived there for 26 years. I'm a bicycle commuter, and I know this section -- I know this section of road very well because for 26 years, I've gone through this intersection every weekday. I got my calculator out. I think it's nearly eight or nine thousand times I've been through this intersection. So everything that Cindy said before me, I can corroborate with my actual experience. I think that this is a great spot for a high-density student complex. I think they'll love living there. I think it's a beautiful building. I'm here to comment on some of the details about this that do concern me. The biggest thing I can tell you about is the safety of that intersection. It is the number one most dangerous intersection in our town, and I just -- to get through it, I have to carry a strobe light with me, otherwise the cars will not yield to me. Okay? It's that bad. The reason why they won't yield is they have to go through so many red light/green light cycles before they get their turn, and when they're finally up at the front spot they do not want to wait for a pedestrian. So I'm very concerned about the -- the setback thing. If they build their building right up to the edge, 10 feet of that intersection, it's going to really restrict your opportunities to make that intersection safer, if you need to add a lane or make a right-hand turn channel. Now here's a bigger more close-up version of that intersection. I don't know if you can see my cursor. Can you see my cursor? Okay. So if I'm here wanting to cross into East Campus, as soon as I get my walk signal, I've got three groups of cars barreling toward me who also have a green -- well, two groups have a green, and one person's trying to do something illegal. So as soon as I step into that street, all the people who have been lined up on University Avenue want to turn south on College Avenue, so they're jockeying with me. At the same time, the people from East Campus are trying to turn south on to College, and they're trying to -- to get around me too. And then this is the people who are in the left-hand turn lane of College acting like they're going to turn left, but they're about ready to make a U-turn right into my body and kill me. So I have to look all directions just to get through this intersection. If we have a new student development there with 900-something beds and 600-something cars, I think it stands to reason that we are going to have to look at the safety of that intersection for pedestrians. Okay. That's just a bigger version. There you see it again. That's the intersection. Notice that there's no right-hand turn channels. That's an image of what it looks like.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ms. Concannon?

MS. CONCANNON: Is that -- am I at three minutes?

MS. GEUEA JONES: You are.

MS. CONCANNON: Please ask me questions. I actually have a couple more pictures. If you have more questions, I might be able to illustrate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do -- these pictures are very helpful. Do you have anything additional besides the -- the lack of curb cuts and right-hand channels?

MS. CONCANNON: Yes. Loading and unloading. It has -- it looks like this. This is the intersection that Peter Norgard talked about in his presentation. This is looking on Walnut towards the east or towards the west, I'm sorry, and this -- these are all the cars that are just sitting there with a loading and unloading, even though there is a sign that says no stopping standing or parking, everybody does it and you can't stop them it seems. These are all Google Maps views, by the way, and this is what happens all the time. You see -- somebody lives in the apartment, they want their friend to come to the nearest door -- and by the way, this student complex that they're proposing has these student -- has these doorways all -- all throughout what would be the University Avenue stretch of street, and now they're going say come to that door where I can meet you there. So you see how the cars, they just --

MS. GEUEA JONES: It sounds like you're worried about the stopping and things in the lanes too.

MS. CONCANNON: They -- what they do is --yes. They'll stop there, and then -- I've experienced this by the way at that -- at that Walnut intersection. You have to get in the lane that's going the opposite direction in order to go around them. So you guys might have to consider, do you want to make University Avenue wider?

Do you want to make it littler so that nobody stops? Do you want to add right-hand channels?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I guess my question is, are you --

MS. CONCANNON: That's Broadway.

MS. GEUEA JONES: These are -- these are existing problems that you think will be exacerbated?

MS. CONCANNON: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. CONCANNON: Yes. And by the way --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for Ms. Concannon?

MS. CONCANNON: That's Broadway, by the way. That's a right-hand channel. It was what I was talking about --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. CONCANNON: -- that we might want to do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. CONCANNON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I guess -- I'll couch this is a question. I -- I live right down the street from the pictures that you showed on Walnut, so I see this often, particularly when students are moving in and out at the beginning and end of semesters. Is that something you have observed as well?

MS. CONCANNON: Yes.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you, Ms. Concannon. Next speaker on this case please come forward.

MR. KRUSE: Good evening. I'm Mark Kruse. I represent Campus Lutheran Church at 304 South College Avenue. It's diagonally across College from the development. I don't really have any opposition to the development, but I echo the concerns about the traffic flow in that area that, you know, if you're going to allow left turns into the developments and left turns out of the developments, that'll be a nightmare on College. And just one other concern is, you know, to refute the parking being adequate, if you look at Anthony Street, that's a mess. That's all on-street parking because there's not adequate parking in the area. So it's definitely a concern to keep in mind. And, you know, once again, the church has no particular objection to this. You know, 1,000 students across the street, what an opportunity for our ministry. So thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MS. ODOR: Can you hear me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MS. ODOR: My name is Debbie Odor I live at 1820 Cliff Drive. I've lived there for 12 years, but my husband's family broke ground on this house in 1939. The house has been occupied by family members ever since. My husband grew up in East Campus neighborhood, and he held a very deep love for his neighbors and the community. That's why he chose to retire here, and I understand why now after I have moved here. East Campus is a diverse mix of people and houses, old and new. The neighbors care for one another and care for their larger community, and that's why I'm here tonight. This proposed project is situated at the most dangerous intersection in the city for pedestrians. Anything that can be done to make this intersection safer should be done. The proposed setback of 10 feet from the street is unacceptable, and I don't understand because College Avenue is a State road, and it's under my understanding that the State requires a setback of 20 feet. I don't know what's going on there. During peak pedestrian traffic times, there's little space for pedestrians to stand. With a 10-foot step -- setback, they're really crowded. And don't -- another thing that just came to me tonight is that downtown you have 10-foot setbacks. You also have a 20-mile-an-hour speed limit. You have a 35-mile-an-hour speed limit on College Avenue. Now we'll talk about the height of the structure. I don't have any problem with the height of the structure if you have a 20-foot setback. The sight lines for a tall structure are diminished. And as dangerous as that intersection is and with so much traffic, we can't have the 10-foot setback. Now as you've already been told, there are cars, pedestrians, bicycles trying to cross or enter these streets, and as you already know, it's very, very dangerous. The only other comment I have to make is that I live in East Campus, and I can tell you from experience, parking -- East Campus is over parked, and if these students are paying rent, they are going to opt to not pay for parking so that they can park somewhere like East Campus.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much, ma'am. Next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. JANET HAMMEN: Hello. I'm Janet Hammond. I live on Cliff Drive in the Sixth Ward, and I've actually -- I lived on Wilson Avenue for 33 years and well know what it's like to be surrounded by students, which

was fine, and up where I am now for 16 years. Per the developer, this plan provides for luxury student apartments that include 957 beds, 570 parking spaces. If this were subject to R-MF zoning, it would -- they would be required to have 718 parking spaces. The applicants note that they are providing more than is -- than is required by the MDT, but while this is close in proximity to downtown, it is not downtown. Car trips will be needed to go to the grocery store and other shopping since none of these amenities are within walking distance. The applicant and staff seem to believe that the 570 spaces will not be fully utilized by the 957 tenants living in the -- in the apartments, but experience shows that this is wishful thinking. The parking analysis provided with the materials indicated that parking is fully occupied for three of the four downtown apartment complexes listed. However, the U Centre on Turner is close enough to walk to a grocery store. It is also possible that some tenants do not want to pay the price of parking charged by the landlord, so find other parking on the street and nearby parking lots and neighborhoods. A parking study conducted in 2015 by the City concluded that among other neighborhoods, the East Campus neighborhood was already over utilized with weekdays showing 40 percent more parking over capacity and 113 percent utilized on a normal weekend. This study further noted that there was negative excess parking capacity in East Campus at all times during the parking audit. Given the proximity of this proposed development to East Campus, it is likely that some of the tenants will -- will choose the East Campus streets for parking rather than pay for on-site parking. The study also noted that nearly all of the street parked cars audited for turnover were parked for more than 12 hours. In order not to further exacerbate over-parking in East Campus, please require at least the minimum number of parking required for R-MF, which would be 718 spaces according to the staff report. And so deny this particular PD proposal. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Ms. Hammen? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. LOWE: Hello. My name is Shane Lowe, 1660 High Ridge Circle. I serve on the Parking Commission but I'm not necessarily representing them tonight. One of the things that I think is important to note with this is that there is wisdom in knowing the right tool for a job and knowing when you do not possess that tool. We've heard a lot about parking tonight. Simply requiring more or less parking spaces, yes is one tool to address that. I don't think it's the right tool in this situation. If you're not familiar with the work of a group called the Parking Reform Network, I would suggest you check it out. One of the things they highlight that I think is really important is that there's a lot of ways we can address parking problems that don't involve just requiring more on-site parking, or less, or however we want to go about that. Those are tools that exist outside this room at the moment. I would like to see the concerns about East Campus being over-parked, about Benton Stevens being over-parked, addressed more by metered parking and resident permits. I think that's a far wiser solution of this. Simply adding more parking spaces -- like there's a cost to every parking space we require. That's, you know, essentially a bedroom, and every extra parking space we require is an extra student who will not be downtown, who will not be patronizing the businesses downtown, who will not be providing sales tax that we desperately need to fund our firefighting, our police services, and all the essential things that make this town a pleasant place to live in. So I just want to address that, and yes, I agree like College and University is a significant issue. As a bike commuter, I feel that. With that being said, I don't want this developer to have to pay for the sins of MoDOT. I think that's another conversation there. I think walkable dense development downtown is something that is a very good deal for us as a city as far as a great boost to property tax, sales tax. That doesn't cost us too terrible much in terms of extra utility development and so forth. Appreciate the time. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Next?

MS. FLEISCHMANN: Testing. Hello. My name is Rita Fleischman. I live at 1602 Hinkson. I've lived in the Benton Stephens neighborhood for 40 years. I love the neighborhood. I love our -- I love our neighbors. I've chosen to live there. I'm not on a lease. I live my life, and I challenge everyone else to stop each day and think about what we do. It doesn't just affect me, it affects you. It's not about money. Money plays a part of life, but it's what we do with our money. How we treat people. Our actions, our decisions every day affects everybody, who you say hi to, who you're kind to, who you give your money to. Let's pause every day, every minute, and think about how we live our life and how we affect people. Your decision, our decision every day is our responsibility, money, and our life, our kindness. Give pause and be happy and live your life. That's all I ask. Any questions for me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker?

MS. FLEISCHMANN: I don't have answers for them. I'd have no answers for the meaning of life.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Forty-two. Thank you very much.

MS. FLEISCHMANN: Have a good life.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. MEHR: I'm David Mehr, 714 -- 714 Ingleside Drive. And I'm -- as I pointed out from the back, I'm

the chair of the East Campus Neighborhood Association. And obviously, there's considerable concern about this development in terms of traffic and parking in the East Campus area represented by the number of speakers. I would suggest that -- I love the fact that they have a beautiful design. I totally agree with the idea that having housing that's available to students in walking distance with campus is great. I am very concerned with their plans for entrance and exit on Matthews Street and College in terms of traffic safety and congestion. I'm concerned about whether the parking spaces are adequate. I think these are issues that need to be addressed in terms of their plan. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for the speaker? I guess I have one kind of question, and I'm not trying to start a huge debate, just with this being on the other side of College, do you really realistically believe that people will park in East Campus and have to cross College, especially with the pedestrian barriers and all of that?

MR. MEHR: Well if parking is charged, and parking is free in the East Campus area, I suspect there will be at least some.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. MEHR: There will be -- but I -- you know, I think that the -- the big issue is has been mentioned that I'm particularly concerned about is there's already at various times of the day terrific traffic and pedestrian congestion at that intersection, and adding a huge number of people and vehicles entering and exiting is only going to make that worse.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, and that gets to the other thought that's in my head which is this puts a lot more student housing close to campus, but outside of East Campus. But that relieves some of the pressure that we've been hearing about with students trying to move into houses on East Campus.

MR. MEHR: It's possible. It's possible. And actually I had that thought, although I suspect that the main effect might be on some of the more remote student housing rather than on the close East Campus housing. However, I have -- I have no crystal ball.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Neither do I. If I did, my life would be easier. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. MEHR: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. You -- it is 10:25 and you've had five speakers, Mr. Colbert.

MR. COLBERT: Again, Caleb Colbert, attorney at 1203 West Broadway. Just wanted to respond to a of things really quickly. Number one, on the setback, so that will be 10 feet from the new property line after we dedicate right-of-way. The back of curb is going -- that separation is going be closer to 40 feet. The new building will actually be further away from College Avenue than the existing building. So we are -- after we dedicate the right-of-way, it'll be moved in substantially. Additionally, there will be a loading and unloading zone on Matthews to provide an -- obviously a convenient location for folks --

MS. GEUEA JONES: You've got to stay next to the microphone, Caleb.

MR. COLBERT: So there will be a loading and unloading area. And then, finally, I also wanted to -- as soon as the presentation switches over --

MS. GEUEA JONES: You might want to just keep going.

MR. COLBERT: Okay. So I think it's important to walk through the history of parking in the MDT district. So a lot of the -- the parking concerns that have been discussed, a lot of the developments that have been discussed were pre-Unified Development Code. So if we go back to the old C2 zoning, we appointed a parking and traffic management task force back in 2017. They did a count, figured out that the parking ratio was roughly .26 spaces per bed downtown. So as a result of that management task force, we hired a consultant, and part of that consultant's job was to rewrite the zoning code. It's tiny there, but the zoning consultant's recommendation for downtown parking was .25 spaces per bed. That recommendation was adopted by the parking task force that was part of the Unified Development Code in quarter space per bed. That recommendation came to this body as part of the Unified Development Code, and this body adopted a recommendation that was sent to City Council of a quarter space per bed in downtown. Again, the idea being that we want a walkable pedestrian experience downtown. We don't want to require people to have vehicles, and we don't want to build excess parking. So ultimately, we went to City Council with the Unified Development Code, and we heard a lot of the same concerns here in this very room that they were discussed tonight about parking downtown. And City Council's compromise was point five spaces per bed. So that is ultimately what was included in the Unified Development Code, and it was adopted. And so here we're proposing .6 spaces per bed, which exceeds what we basically struck as a compromise back in 2017. So we think we have addressed essentially the parking situation, and again, based on the utilization of other properties, we do think that we'll have adequate parking. I hear my timer, and it's getting late, so I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Colbert? Seeing none. Thank you for being

here. Anyone else to speak on this case? Last call. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: I think the applicant did a good job of supporting their proposed parking, what they're going to provide for parking. so I don't really have any concerns with the parking. I do -- I am inclined to agree with some of the speakers that the intersection of University and College is dangerous and could be improved, and most of that -- a lot -- some of that stems from not having a wide enough road and not having dedicated turn lanes on University Avenue. So I would ask staff had -- I don't see that the -- that they're proposing to dedicate additional right-of-way on University. Does the staff feel confident that they have enough right-of-way to make improvements in the future?

MR. KUNZ: If there were to be a dedicated turn lane, I don't know exactly if there would be enough right-of-way. But for a local residential street, which if I'm not mistaken that is classified as, it would meet our minimum widths for both paving and right-of-way dedications, so I guess consideration for particular improvements around that intersection were not considered, and especially if it's on the south side of University, if you were to add a right turn lane there potentially, that wouldn't be part of the half width they're dedicating. But, yes, I do believe it has the right-of-way that meets our local residential standards. But, yeah, sorry it's not a complete answer.

MR. DARR: Yeah. It seems like something that should have been evaluated, and specifically since we're reducing the setback, we have less -- you know, for additional right-of-way, we have less room to go to the building if it gets built because it's pretty much a hard line. So that being said, overall, I like it. I think it'll be an asset to Columbia, so I plan to support it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I'll say something. I think it's similar to the previous one. This is kind of an instance where the City is not keeping up to step, not doing things, which have been long -- obviously had -- need some to be addressed a long time ago. I mean, the things are pointing out about the intersection are pretty obvious, and on the one hand, the City, it wants to accommodate development, wants to encourage development, yet it is not keeping up with addressing weak points -- weak points within the within the development -- within the City. So I plan to support this, but I would certainly encourage the City Council to give strong consideration to prioritizing the intersection improvements that these people are -- have made very clear is a major problem tonight.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I echo mine my -- my colleague's sentiments. Project is sound. There's infrastructure issues that aren't necessarily the developer's problem. I think there could have been a little more wiggle room on the developer side, but I'm going say the same thing we said about Rock Quarry. I like this project. It gets built, traffic is a problem, people get hurt, you could get ran over. The developer is gone. He don't care; they're in Atlanta. Oh well. And that will be the catalyst to maybe something getting done.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Well, this -- the last case and this case sounds like automobiles are a major problem, but I -- I want to echo Commissioner Walters' comments. It just -- and I've noticed this on my first stint on the Commission, and this stint on the Commission, that for whatever reason, it just seems that we have trouble keeping up with our infrastructure in Columbia, and maybe that's a universal problem, and we're not unique as a community. I'm -- I'm still a little concerned about the parking. I know we have the one example of the development on Turner, but, you know, similar to the last case, one example -- one anecdotal example where we have several that are 100 percent occupied is a little concerning to me. I do appreciate the developer's comment that you have to take that into context with the ratio with the bedrooms. The height with this doesn't concern me at all. I'm -- I'd be okay with it honestly being even a little bit taller if that means getting more parking. And then I do live downtown just a few blocks away from here, very close to the Brookstone on Walnut, and I see it all the time. They -- students in particular, they -- you know, there's a yellow curb, they stop right in the travel lane to pick people up, drop people off, particularly when they're moving in. And I know the developers mentioned that there is a unloading and offloading area on Matthews. I just, I don't see that on the plan, and -- and what I've noticed is if your apartment is on one side of the building, and the drop-off areas on another, where are you going to do your offloading? You're going do it in the door closest to your apartment. So I'm generally supportive of the concept. I think it's the right spot. I like the density. I would be supportive of something taller if it got us a better parking ratio, and I do think there needs to be some -- more consideration about offloading. So, yeah, those are my comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thanks. Anyone else? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I'm getting considerably less eloquent as we move along. I concur with many of my fellow

Commissioners, and echo some of their sentiments, and also some of the ones that we had in the previous case. I agree that this is an appropriate area. It is in service and comports with the Comprehensive Plan and goals toward housing. I am a little bit -- and -- and that is the -- you know, the criteria that I'm abiding by, I'm not compelled by this argument. I understand that infrastructure is an issue and I'm taking that in consideration, especially as it pertains to the sewer upgrades that are necessary. However, I feel like placing the blame solely on the City and its inability to keep up with these developments in their needs offsets the responsibility that the University has outsourced its housing. So just a point. I think this is a movement in the right direction in terms of density. I wish that it was maybe a different kind of housing that appealed to a wider variety of people, but that does not seem consistent with how this area has been used and will likely continue to be used in the future. So I plan on supporting this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I think that it's a good concept in the right location. I think there's a lot of fine-tuning around the edges that could and should be done. I am concerned that the setbacks mean that College and University will never have dedicated right-hand turn lanes, but I think overall, although I could end up eating my words, and in ten years, every time I drive past this place gritting my teeth, the pros outweigh the cons. But there are considerable cons. So that that's kind of where I'm at. Yes, Mr. Stanton -- Commissioner Stanton. please go ahead.

MR. STANTON: I just want to add one more statement. It is something that we're running into often, and we encourage this kind of design, and when an architect or developer does it, the infrastructure doesn't fit our forward-thinking sometimes. So extrinsically, right here, right now, I would say shrink this, because, yes, it's a good idea, but the infrastructure isn't right. I would shrink the whole thing just to accommodate some of the other issues that would happen. Not saying that's who -- I'm just saying we're going keep bumping into this and somebody is going catch one. I'm just saying there's going be a case where they're going have to -- we're going have to pick -- you know, encourage or discourage what we ask them to do. I plan to support this, but this is what we're running into where our forward-thinking is catching up with our backward thinking on the infrastructure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would you care to make a motion?

MR. STANTON: I would. My colleagues are done?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Brodsky.

MR. BRODSKY: Sorry. One more quick comment. The parking ratio as it relates to MDT, as a resident of downtown, I do want to say in the core downtown there are a lot more parking options -- City-owned lots, parking structures. I, myself, park at the bus station with the City permit directly behind my building. Whereas, here we don't have quite as much of that. So I did just want to make that comment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to case 162-2026 Theory Sterling Mizzou rezoning PD plan and preliminary plat, I move to approve the proposed rezoning from R-MF to PD, as well the approval of the proposed PD plan inconclusive of design exceptions, associated statement of intent and serving as a preliminary plat known as the Theory Sterling Mizzou. Subject for technical corrections and subject to adherence to attached architectural renderings.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any further discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. The motion carries 6-0.

MR. BRODSKY: Motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. By show of hands, how many folks are here to speak about the short-term rental on Worley? Okay. Let's see if we can get it done before we need a bio break. Is everyone okay with that? All right Moving on.