



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, May 8, 2025

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Columbia City Hall

Council Chambers

701 E Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now call the Thursday, May 8, 2025 meeting of the Columbia Planning and Zoning Commission to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Yes -- or here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: I am here, Commissioner Williams. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson, absent. Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have eight; we have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

Present: 8 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier, Thomas Williams, Robert Walters, McKenzie Ortiz and David Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Shannon Wilson

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any changes to the agenda tonight, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, there is one change this evening, ma'am. Case Number 121-2025, your first public hearing, has been withdrawn, so that will not be discussed and is

not part of the presentation this evening. There is no further action needed to be taken. It was withdrawn by the applicant.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for that. With that change to the agenda, is there a motion to approve?

MR. STANTON: Move to approve the agenda.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Thumbs up approval of the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous, thank you.

Move to approve the agenda

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

April 24, 2025 Regular Meeting

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the April 24th, 2025 regular meeting minutes. Are there any changes or adjustments to the minutes? Seeing none. Is there a motion to approve?

MR. STANTON: Move to approve the agenda.

MS. LOE: Second. Or --

MS. GEUEA JONES: A motion to approve the minutes?

MR. STANTON: Oh, minutes. I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct. Thank you.

MS. LOE: Second on the minutes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Stanton moves to approve the minutes; Commissioner Loe seconds that motion. Is there any discussion? Seeing none. Thumbs up approval on the minutes?

(Seven votes for approval; one abstention.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous with Commissioner Williams abstaining. Okay. Very good.

Move to approve the minutes

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISIONS

Case # 154-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Donna Jean Armstrong 2016 Unitrust (owner), for approval to rezone the southern 2.56-acres of 6.80-acres from M-N (Mixed Use - Neighborhood) to M-C (Mixed Use - Corridor) to allow more intense commercial use on the

portion of the property closest to I-70. A concurrent request (Case # 155-2025) seeks approval of a 7-lot preliminary plat on the overall 6.80-acre site. The subject site is located west of St Charles Road and Clark Lane and includes the address 5320 Clark Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed rezoning from M-N to M-C along the southern 2.56 acres of the subject site. Approval of the recommendation above would require technical corrections to correct the legal description of the subject site.

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 the public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I have a couple of questions about the relocation of the hotel site. While I understand being close to I-70 would be, I suppose, an advantage for a hotel, but it also looks like this places the hotel closer to residential than to Schnucks, which is a commercial use. And also it looks like maybe these graphics are a little bit rough, but it also looks like more damage to the forest that is mentioned in the staff report. Can you talk about balancing those things?

MR ORENDORFF: Sure. And the climax forest that exists there on the site, we'll get two more in the -- in the actual subdivision because that was accounted for by the City Arborist. Those were taken into consideration, the location relative to the residential site to the west there, given the gap between the structures that exist and their property line, in addition to the screening and the setbacks requirements in M-C, it was determined that we have the capacity to mitigate the adverse outcomes, and, like I said, the 45 feet is the maximum there, and I tried to illustrate that, and, you know, as I said, that's a little bit rough. But we did do our analysis. We -- we looked at the Code, and it seems to be supportive. We are supportive of that.

MR. ZENNER: One other issue to add to that, Ms. Placier, is that if you'll notice on the graphic that's on the screen in front of you, along the on-ramp onto I-70, that is M-C zoned property, as well. That is currently an undeveloped, but available tract for redevelopment purposes. And so a use there that may not be nearly as intense as the Schnuck's Grocery store, but still retail in nature, is a likely outcome on that property. That is not a parcel that we are aware of that would be impacted by the I-70 project. And so it is likely that over time, that commercial piece will fill in. It does have access off of St. Charles Road to be able to get to that parcel at this point. And so the interaction of -- of this particular pocket along the interstate all being zoned M-C just is, from a land-use

perspective, seen as a more appropriate buffering between what goes further back into the residential portions as you head north on the property. So while there is an immediate impact at that southeast corner with the M-C, from a land-use planning perspective, all of the M-C along the corridor that is to the east of this site is what is also a justification for why we believe that it would be appropriate here, coupled with all of the other points that Mr. Orendorff has brought up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If you are a member of the public who came here tonight to speak on this case, please come forward. State your name and address for the record. We allow six minutes for the applicant and groups, three minutes for members of the public who are individuals, and with that, please come up. And I will say, I'm running a timer tonight, so if you hear it go de, de, de, that means your time is up, and we'll use the little red button.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, offices at 1000 West Nifong. I will not take my six minutes tonight. I believe that the staff has done a pretty good job on the staff report. We originally came in with our concept review or not -- or informal meeting with the staff, and really inquired about the whole tract being M-C. And then staff kind of came back and said hold on, we don't need to do that. Let's start paring this back and maybe we can give you a piece of it or recommend for a piece of it, but not the whole tract. And so that's when we started looking at the best location for the hotel. We obviously had it located at a different location, Ms. Placier, but I believe that staff, as well as my clients, came to a conclusion that we believe the property along I-70 is probably the better location for that -- for that hotel, and so that's the reason for the location that's -- that's before you tonight on the rezoning. So, again, we can talk about the rezoning and the preliminary plat will be the next item. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Mr. Crockett? I have one, and I assume that the other M-C portion or the other M-C parcel is not owned by the same --

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: We do not own the other M-C portion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you know if there is going to be, as you build out, any contemplating of doing a connector to that property?

MR. CROCKETT: With that M-C tract?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: The owner of that piece actually reached out to us and asked if we had any finite plans for our -- for our tract that's being rezoned, and we don't at this time. We have some conceptual, but they talked about potentially wanting to have inter-connectivity as well as utilities kind of pass through there, as well. So we're very open in, you know, having communication with them to -- if it works and it's beneficial to everybody, we absolutely want to do that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Wonderful. That's all. Final call for questions. Seeing none. Thank you very much, Mr. Crockett.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other member of the public here to speak on this case tonight, please come forward.

MR. BOUGASH: Good evening, Commission. My name is Don Bougash [ph.]; I'm a resident of The Links apartments that are right there, and actually one of my -- I live in 5030, which is the corner apartment on there, so -- and my back would be along the -- the barrier that you put up -- that you're talking about putting up there. Even though I'm not speaking officially for the management there, I've talked with them about this and I said I was coming to the meeting and I'd -- I'd express my opinion on this. One of the things that I am concerned with is that even though you're talking about a setback and fences and that, right now it's an open field and there's a fence there and there's a hill and it's got nice greenery there. Now you're looking at taking that away and you're also looking at putting potential cars and traffic and there's going to be other people in that area. That area that I know that I live in, there's a family below me and next to me that have children. Two buildings around me, they have a lot of children. The building in front of us, they have children, also. And with that extra traffic that is going to be brought in because of the car traffic and such like that, not that, you know, I don't know what is going to be brought in there, but it still brings another element of people and, you know, objects in there that could be, you know -- adversely affect the lifestyle of the people in that area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Thank you for coming here tonight. Appreciate it.

MR. BOUGASH: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

NS, GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. Any Commissioner comments on the rezoning case? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Make a motion to approve Case 154-2025, a proposed rezoning from M-N to M-C along the southern 2.56 acres of the subject site.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. I don't like to see something approved without discussion. I think -- now, one, we're supposed to be looking at this solely just for the rezoning piece, and not the secondary matter, which is coming up. And so given what's outlined here, and what City staff presented, I think it makes sense that this would continue on the track that's to the east of it of M-C and just continue that -- that direction. So I intend to vote to approve for that reason.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would add that the zoning is already commercial in nature. It's not set up as an open zone, nor is it set up as a residential zone. So I don't find the move from M-N to M-C to be particularly much of an increase in intensity. I think that we're likely to see this be a commercial corridor, which is why I asked about the pass-through between the M-C districts or M-C plats. I think that this is a growing area of commercial activity. Anyone else? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Voting No: Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is six yeses and two nos. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Our next case of the evening, Case Number 155-2025 is on the same property.

Approve Case 154-2025, a proposed rezoning from M-N to M-C along the southern 2.56 acres of the subject site.

Yes: 6 - Stanton, Geuea Jones, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

No: 2 - Loe and Placier

Excused: 1 - Wilson

Case # 155-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Donna Jean

Armstrong 2016 Unitrust (owner), for approval of a 7-lot Preliminary Plat of M-N (Mixed Use - Neighborhood) zoned property, to be known as “*Armstrong Subdivision, Plat No. 1*”. This request is being reviewed concurrently with Case # 154-2025 which seeks to rezone the southern 2.56-acres of the overall acreage to M-C (Mixed-Use Corridor). The approximately 9.18-acre subject site is located west of St Charles Road and Clark Lane and includes the address 5320 Clark Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed seven-lot preliminary plat subject to technical corrections regarding requested corner truncations, utility easement illustrations, and other clarifications on the plat.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any member of the Commission has had contact with the party to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Seeing -- Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Not really a question, but I just want to commend staff on these new graphics. It does help visualize things a little better.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anything else? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward, state your name and address for the record, six minutes for the applicant and groups, and three minutes for an individual.

MR. CROCKETT: Again, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 100 West Nifong. Again, I believe the staff did a pretty thorough staff report on this. Again, it is currently zoned M-N, with a pending M-C zoning, so it's been zoned commercial for quite some time. To piggyback on the previous comment, Ms. Geuea Jones, with regards to the access to the other M-C portion, the reason why we didn't take a street all the way through there is you can see that's relatively narrow. If you put a public street through there, it really prohibits what the future development can be. And, more importantly, there is no real place for the street to go at that point. When it goes back out to the public roadway out toward the interchange, MoDOT does not another access, another public street at that location. So they may allow for a private access to have access to that piece of property, but it's certainly not a public street, so that's the reason why it didn't punch all the way through. As staff indicated, we did a traffic study for this. Given the other intersections in that location, they don't want another full access. The left out was problematic, which we understand, and we're agreeing to limit this to a three-quarter access, and part of that is in conjunction is that we have an access easement with our

neighboring property, which is the Schnuck's development that would allow us to have access into their property to get to their full access. So we don't believe a lot of left-turn movements will go out, and if they are needed, then they can certainly go through the other access point further to the east to make that movement. So with that, we're happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. BOUGASH: Don Bougash, 5030 Clark Avenue. Everything I said before. You know, we're -- people are concerned about, you know, the developing area and what kind of -- what kind of traffic, what kind of industry is going to be brought into there with children in place, you know. And a lot of the people that came there came there because it was kind of isolated. It didn't have a lot of kids and a lot of -- and kids, when you didn't have a lot of traffic over there and you didn't have a lot of distractions with -- with industry in there. So it's kind of taking away the -- the appeal that The Links and that area at least had for it, so I'm -- you know, I'm not opposed to, you know, growth and that, but I am opposed to putting children at risk. Thank you. Do you have any questions for me?

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

MR. BOUGASH: You're welcome.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else from the public to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on the platting action? Seeing none. Would anyone like to make a motion on the platting action? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'll make a motion, but I do want to acknowledge the public comments that we've had and certainly appreciate that this will represent a change for you, but we do have to take into consideration other folks' property rights and their ability to -- to use their property. So with that, I'll recommend approval of the proposed -- excuse me. Making a motion to recommend approval on Case 155-2025, approve the proposed 9.18-acre seven-lot preliminary plat subject to technical corrections regarding clarifications on labeling the plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by

Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none.

Commissioner Williams, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: I did have a comment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, I'm sorry. Please continue.

MR. WILLIAMS: I was swallowing at the moment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think, you know, these two, the last one and this one are tied together, and I guess it's just a -- you know, there's very few differences between what's permissible and a M-N and M-C, and although we have voted to recommend to City Council for the zoning change, I do hope that what was proposed is what manifests itself because that's roughly in line with -- that is the difference between M-N and M-C, but it's fairly consistent with the uses that are allowed in M-C. There are a few things that are allowed -- or sorry -- in M-N. There's a few things that are allowed in M-C aren't allowed in M-N, that may not be as conducive next to a neighborhood, and so I'm just hopeful that the developers recognize that and that that's how it turns out. Obviously, that's outside of the purview of the Commission once it's in the City Council, once it's approved, but with that, the plot looks fine to me and I understand it would be the same whether we have that as M-N or M-C, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone prepared to make a motion? Oh, sorry.

MR. BRODSKY: -- I --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Did -- that was in discussion. Thank you. I'm sorry. In that case, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: Anyone else wants to discuss? All right.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms.

Ortiz, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr. Walters, Mr.

Brodsky. Voting No: Ms. Placier. Motion carries 7-1.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is seven yeses, one no, the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case.

Approval on Case 155-2025, approve the proposed 9.18-acre seven-lot preliminary plat subject to technical corrections regarding clarifications on labeling the plat.

Yes: 7 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

No: 1 - Placier

Excused: 1 - Wilson

Case # 167-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Mendez Properties LLC (owner), for approval to rezone 5.09 acres from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to R-2 (Two-family Dwelling). The subject site is located at 3310 Oakland Gravel Road and is being considered with a concurrent request (Case # 166-2025) seeking approval of a preliminary plat inclusive of 23 single-family cottage-style lots pursuant to approval of the R-2 "optional development standards" by the Board of Adjustment.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested rezoning to the R-2 district.

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. Any questions for staff? I had one quick one, Rusty. The cottage standard 23 lots, how would that compare to a density if they built this as R-2 duplexes, do you know?

MR. PALMER: I don't know the exact numbers, but it's very comparable. It would be the difference of one or two units, probably at the -- the end of the day. The one kind of factor, it's all being developed, so the storm water component and everything still apply. If it were developed piecemeal and single family, like traditional R-1 lots, they could potentially not have to do storm water, but it would -- it would probably all have to be platted together anyway, so the R-1, I think you would lose maybe three lots, and with the R-2, you're -- you're somewhere between there. It's really not much of a different.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. So even if this stayed R-1, we're looking at 20 lots probably?

MR. PALMER: Eighteen to twenty, yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Eighteen to twenty lots. Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Thank you very much. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any members of the public who would like to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. This is Jay Gebhardt; I'm a civil engineer with the A Civil Group on site representing Jesus Mendez, the owner of the property. I think staff has done a pretty good job of explaining this. If you guys have questions, I would be glad to answer them, but I know you have a long meeting, so I don't want to just sit up here and talk.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for that. Any questions for Mr. Gebhardt tonight?

Seeing -- oh. Commissioner Placier, go ahead.

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Just one question about the wooded nature of this area. Is there any plan for tree preservation? Is it even possible with this density?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes. So there's -- on the preliminary plat, you'll see a common area lot that's being set aside for this storm water detention and the required 25 percent of the climax forest to be saved. And don't confuse that. I don't want to misrepresent anything, and the arborist has determined that there -- probably about a third of these trees are cedars and things that don't qualify for a climax forest, so the area we've saved is the minimum requirement for the climax forest.

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

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other member of the public to speak on this case tonight, please come forward. And again, name and address for the record -- for our record.

MS. MACY: Thanks. My name is Jessica Macy; I live at 2401 East Oakland Ridge. We're directly south of the plat on the corner of Oakland Gravel and Oakland Ridge. Thanks to A Civil Group for having a community meeting. We probably had -- I don't know, 15 or so community folks show up and talk about and hear what was going to happen going from the 15 currently platted to the 23. Some concerns were brought up about 46 cars coming into the neighborhood, in and out of an already incredibly busy intersection. There is lots of storm water, which I am grateful that that maybe this will help take care of. The whole neighborhood slopes towards Oakland Park in that direction. And I think a big concern of mine was seeing the duplex situation. When the map was presented and we all talked about it at the community meeting, that was never brought up that there could potentially be duplexes, otherwise, I think we might have some more neighbors here talking about that situation. And I think that's it. So I just -- oh. And the trees, there are some amazingly beautiful big trees on that lot, and one of them came down during the tornado, but there are many in the designated area that will be wiped out. We're lucky enough to be behind the retention pond and hopefully have some value increase to our house from that, but there are lot of, I think, concerns in the neighborhood about how the traffic specifically is going to be impacted.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. And to be clear, no one else is talking about duplexes. I was just comparing density in different plat.

MS. MACY: Well, if the replat is not approved, it said that it could be open for duplexes, and that was a concern that was brought up, and it was very clearly presented that this would all be single-family housing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. And that's most likely the case. I just didn't want you to take what I said as money.

MS. MACY: No. I was going off the sign.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. But I'm going to reinforce that. Right, if we don't approve his plan, he could just do duplexes.

MS. MACY: Right. And that is definitely a concern of the neighbors.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: But he would have to come back for -- it's not like we switch from this to this as a result of this meeting.

MS. MACY: Okay. There would be another opportunity to speak on that?

MR. WALTERS: Yes.

MS. MACY: Thank you. I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: They would have to replat it. I'm looking at staff. They'd have to replat it?

MR. PALMER: It's more dependent on the zoning decision, so the decision on this, if we go R-2 and deny the plat --

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MR. PALMER: -- then they would come back with a different plat that would potentially be for duplexes or single-family homes, whatever. If we approve the zoning and the plat, we're moving in the right direction, basically, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: And then if Board of Adjustment denies cottage standard --

MR. PALMER: Right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- they're stuck with that plat or they have to come back for a new plat.

MR. PALMER: It would not be consistent. It would not be approvable because it would be a cottage-style lots, so they'd have to come back with a new prelim potentially. Again, as I stated, if it's a reduction of lots but generally the same layout with the -- you know, the infrastructure still in the same location, they would not have to come back. It would be a substantially conformant prelim plat, because, basically, what they would do is they would take the individual lots, take out middle lot lines every other one, and combine instead of 22 lots, they'll probably end up with, like, 11 or 12 duplex lots, so they'll just consolidate where they can to -- to get this similar number of units on half the lots. Does that make sense? I don't know what it -- the math would work out to be, but the difference would just be the street would be in the same location, the infrastructure is all the same, and that's what would trigger a new prelim plat is if they move those items.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Or if the number of units --

MR. PALMER: If it goes up for --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- goes up.

MR. PALMER: -- which it wouldn't be able to, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. MACY: Which I just think that concern of the neighbors of single-family owned homes versus rental duplexes was very loud and clear.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. Understood.

MS. MACY: Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Commissioner Ortiz, go ahead.

MS. ORTIZ: What was the problem with the duplexes?

MS. MACY: There was just -- when we discussed it, they were single-family owned homes. I don't have a problem with that, it's just wasn't anything that was ever presented to us as an option, but that could be something that would happen. And so when people are asked are these owner-occupied, home owned, or will there be apartments or what does that look like, they were single family owner occupied, and I think that's a difference in what the neighbors heard.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify. You mentioned a homeowners' meeting. Is there an HOA that your neighborhood has and I was just curious if you're here in some sort of representative capacity?

MS. MACY: No, I'm not representing -- other than what I heard at the neighborhood meeting that A Civil Group hosted, we do not have an HOA. When we talked about -- I asked a question about the retaining pond and how that might be maintained, that there would be an HOA with this group, which would be great. But, no, we are just individual homeowners that they invited to a community meeting to describe the process and make it clear as to what was going on.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MACY: Thanks.

MR. PALMER: I can offer a little bit of info on that. I don't think we have a registered HOA or neighborhood association within 1,000 feet. They didn't -- it was not on our mailing list, so --

MS. MACY: Okay. That's good to know because I didn't think there were --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any final questions for this speaker?

MR. ZENNER: One more point.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: One more point of clarification. As it relates to the request, should the zoning be approved, and should the plat be recommended for approval, if the neighborhood is desirous of single-family cottage-sized lots, you will have an opportunity to express that desire as a part of the Board of Adjustment action, and I would strongly suggest that if you are concerned that you will end up with duplex lots here, you come to the Board of Adjustment meeting and support the cottage standard approval, and that will assure then that -- or it would be greater assurance that you will have single-family home sites next to you. That is how this process all plays out. The reason we ask applicants to come forward with platting actions when we have R-2, and we ask them to hold neighborhood meetings is so you can be given some assurance of here is what is happening, because, historically, R-2 property is automatically assumed to be used for duplex development. And what we are trying to arrest in this session is that that is actually the intent. But to fully facilitate that, you have to come and you have to do the next side of the public process and that makes sure our Board of Adjustment sees it from your perspective as neighbors, as well.

MS. MACY: Great. Thank you so much. I will make sure we let the neighbors know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much for being here, Ms. Macy. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. MACY: Hi. Chris Macy of the same address. With regard to Commissioner Placier's question about the trees, I don't feel like we got the cool graphic like the other two got with the trees in the background and the three-dimensional view. But the comment that there was an offset or whatever the wording was, for the retention pond, that's not where the trees are. The trees are basically in the other portion of that property, so it looks like they would all probably -- or a good portion of it would come down. The other thing I think that was noted was that one of the bullets was that in the vicinity there is R-2 zone, but it's not on the screen, so I'm not sure what vicinity means, unless it's way to the north or many blocks away, because if you look at the neighborhood that surrounds that property, it's all single-family homes. So where is this vicinity that the R-2 is located?

MS. ORTIZ: It's on the screen.

MR. MACY: Where -- where is the R-2? Up there past --

MS. LOE: Actually, north of the middle school.

MR. MACY: Okay. And is that, like, the recent development that just happened?

MS. LOE: The orange in the graphic would be the R-2.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. So the -- the orange at the intersection is R-MF and then the middle yellow kind of hue is R-2.

MR. MACY: Okay. Okay. It's still kind of out of the way. And I think there was a comment about if the church goes away. I don't see the church going away anytime soon. So those are my comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next, to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment? Any commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm trying to keep myself from being confused --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: -- so I need everybody to help me out. The way I'm reading this is, he needs R-2 to do cottage standards single-family homes; is this correct? That's the reason R-2 is required so that he can make smaller homes closer. If we do not -- if we do not support the R-2 change, those that are supporters of single-family homes are shooting themselves in the foot. Right? Because then he could come back and do duplexes; am I correct? Okay. I was starting to get confused, so I wanted to clarify that for me so everybody in the audience understands that. That if we -- he's doing this so that he can do cottage standards. That's why he needs R-2.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. Commissioner Williams, then Walters, then Placier. Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: So if we do not approve the change in the zoning to R-2, then he has R-1, and he would not be able to do duplexes, he would just be able to build whatever would fit within that property subject to the current lot size standards for an R-1. And so it would reduce the number of houses there presumably to some number that is less than what is proposed, but I couldn't tell you what that would be.

MS. GEUEA JONES: At 20, it sounds like. Between 18 and 20.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I mean, if you use the lot standard for 7,000 square feet, I think it comes to, like, 25, but then you have to subtract out the street and the -- you know, any type of storm water like we have here. So it -- I should have done the math on that. I was pulling 25 as the number based on the lot size, and I was, like, it's not really indicative of what would actually be built there, so instead of confusing you guys even further, I decided not to put that in the report. But you're looking at 17, 18 houses is what will end up there in the R-1 because it will virtually be the same layout probably, just with

the lot -- larger lot sizes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is it fair to say that it would probably be two rows of houses that would mirror the lots there on Oakland Ridge Drive on the north side?

MR. PALMER: I don't really follow, but it would be the double-loaded Glorietta Drive with a lot on either side like it is now. They would -- they would just be generally wider lots. And I don't think it's a two for one exchange because the lots there are already -- a lot of them are already over that 7,000-square-foot threshold. So I think they will -- they will end up with more than half of what they have now. That's why I'm guessing 17 to 18 lots probably.

MR. WILLIAMS: I was just saying that the -- there's -- on the -- bordering this parcel, there is eight houses on Oakland Ridge Drive. And so using that as an approximate --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And those lots are more along the lines of 10,000 square feet each, so those are a little larger than the minimum lot size, so they're -- they're a decent comparison, though.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I just wanted to follow up. I think I misinformed the speaker earlier in terms of the process. And tagging onto what Mr. Stanton just said and what Mr. Zenner just said, it's important that the homeowners show up for the Board of Adjustment meeting. And so, I had a question. So was he saying, is this process of notification the same for Board of Adjustments as it was for this? Will these people, say, receive notification for their Board of Adjustment?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, they will.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. So just to reinforce, the Board of Adjustment is critical if you want to see single-family detached homes here.

MR. ZENNER: The tentative Board of Adjustment date will be our July 8th Board of Adjustment meeting. It's at 7:00 p.m. on a Tuesday, this same room.

MR. WALTERS: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Oh, I just wanted to agree that if we do not approve the R-2, it just remains R-1, and so it would be fewer -- fewer homes. And the R-2 purpose is for a cottage, but I also would point out that there is a demand for the smaller homes, although somebody in one of their letters cited a price point that wasn't all that low, but there is a demand.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Palmer, can you go to the preliminary plat?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. We'll get to that on the next one.

MS. LOE: Oh.

MR. PALMER: Do you need a visual of some kind?

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. PALMER: I don't know. What exactly are you trying to illustrate?

MS. LOE: The -- the lot layout, there is -- they've labeled the 20-foot building line, which is a setback from the front right-of-way, and they've labeled the utility easement line eight foot around the perimeter. And there's another dashed line between the two of those, which appears to be a rear building setback.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh. Yeah. In the cottage, those are both ten, and they've electively made the -- I know the front one is 20. I think the rear is 15 on there. We can look at it when we get to the prelim plat, but --

MS. LOE: Right. My comment was going to be, it's been pulled in further on the south side of the site --

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: -- so against the adjacent R-1 properties --

MR. PALMER: And you'll find also there's --

MS. LOE: -- we have a bigger setback --

MR. PALMER: -- there's an easement there that creates an even deeper easement --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: -- a deeper setback, so --

MS. LOE: So it's going to be more comparable to the R-1 setback than --

MR. PALMER: Yeah. And you'll see, too, that those lots that are mostly impacted by the easement end up being the ones that are 10,000-plus square feet in size, so they're -- they're really just standard lots with some narrower front yard setback and, you know, required rear yard. But the effect is that they have much deeper setbacks back there.

MS. LOE: Okay. So, yes. I'm a little premature --

MR. PALMER: No. You're correct.

MS. LOE: -- but I did just want to observe that there seems to be some sensitivities --

MR. PALMER: They do go hand in hand, so yeah.

MS. LOE: -- with how plat is being laid out with respect to the existing context.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I had a question, I think more for staff, too, but I think you mentioned, Pat, that you encouraged A Civil Group to hold a community meeting. I was curious what

triggers that. Like, when does staff encourage folks to hold those types of meetings?

MR. ZENNER: Well, you know, generally when we hold concept reviews, we know where properties potentially are going to generate controversy and we advise, to the best of our ability, that applicants take care of possible controversies before they become a controversy at this body. And so, that's all discerned as it relates to the type of project that's being proposed. Increased densities have historically always generated that and, therefore, there is always the advice. Most of our seasoned consultancies already understand that, but we -- we reinforce that whenever necessary.

MS. ORTIZ: Understood. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And I would just point out what I think Commissioner Stanton was getting at is that if this rezoning and platting go through and the Board of Adjustment does not hear community support, then we're looking at duplexes. And where it is now, I don't see that there's a huge increase given the platting action combined with the R-2 between where you would end up with R-1 density-wise, and the 23 that they're asking for, especially when I look at the surrounding neighborhoods and the spacing of those homes that are already pretty densely packed together even if they are larger homes, and so the lots are larger. So I -- I -- we used to do these as packages almost -- well, and -- and, yeah. We used to have to do all the cottages as PUDs. And then we started doing the platting and the rezoned as packages. And I think that that is a better representation of at least how I think about it when I'm look at rezone in order to do cottage, and I cannot wait for us to get done with our small-lot standards so we can be very clear about what people getting when they do their zoning actions. But that's my comment.

Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I just want to clarify that even if the Board of Adjustment -- we do R-2, and the Board of Adjustment doesn't approve it, it doesn't necessarily guarantee that there's going to be duplexes because they could still build the same single-family neighborhood in R-2 that they couldn't in R-1.

MS. GEUEA JONES: True.

MR. WILLIAMS: And that's really just going to be driven by market--

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- considerations by the owner of the property. So I don't know that there's -- there's a direct path, but I do encourage attendance at the Board of Adjustments with the other Commissioners. And I just want to say publicly, I know a few meetings ago, we had one of these cottage neighborhoods proposed, and I was vocal in my desire to see a setback that would be equivalent to a single-family -- a standard single-family lot. And so I'm pleased to see that that was built into this plot to help

provide a more natural flow between the properties.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any final Commissioner comments, and if not, would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I make a motion to approve Case 167-2025 to approve the requested rezoning from R-1 to R-2.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Brodsky, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's eight to zero, the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case, which is on the same property.

Motion to approve Case 167-2025 to approve the requested rezoning from R-1 to R-2.

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Wilson

Case # 166-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Mendez Properties LLC (owner), for approval of a 23-lot preliminary plat to be known as Totolmajac Villages. The preliminary plat shows division of the property into 22 cottage-style lot and a common lot and will require Board of Adjustment authorization to use "optional" development standards permitting reduced lot width, setbacks, and lot area. A concurrent request (Case # 167-2025) seeking rezoning of the property from R-1 (One-family Dwelling to R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) has been submitted. The 5.09-acre subject site is located at 3310 Oakland Gravel Road and is presently improved with a single-family dwelling and two out-buildings.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed 23-lot preliminary plat known as "Totolmajac Villages", pursuant to approval of the cottage "optional dimensional standards" by the Board of Adjustment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public

hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Any questions for staff? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I have a compound question. I see on the -- before we talked about trees, and I see on the plot there's notations for significant deciduous and significant coniferous trees. What are the requirements related to these significant trees, and, secondly, what are we empowered and/or instructed to consider with respect to those trees and this plot?

MR. PALMER: For this body, I would say we have -- as a staff, we have confirmed that it is compliant with the Code requirements, and those Code requirements are 25 percent, I believe, of all climax forest, plus 25 percent of the significant trees, which are 20 inches in diameter or greater. So if those are denoted on there to be preserved, then those are meeting that requirement. And this has been reviewed and approved by our arborist, so it is in compliance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: When this -- if this is recommended to go to the Board of Adjustment, do they receive, like, an excerpt of our minutes with that, or is it, like, an independent, like --

MR. ZENNER: No, they'll receive an excerpt because based upon the conversations that we have here, the Board is wanting to understand what the back story was with --

MS. ORTIZ: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- the Planning Commission's deliberation on the platting action. It's not necessarily as focused on the zoning component of it. And given that we have two separate cases here, what will end up happening is we'll excerpt out the case minutes for 166. They will be provided that. I have been asked as a part of cottage standard presentation, and there's a slight disconnect between the Board of Adjustment's understanding that they can't approve optional development standards until the plat is approved, whereas, in actuality, the way that the procedural section of the Code reads, you cannot approve a plat, should not be approving a plat, but we do it in this instance because they're tied together without the Board first granting authorization. Where there is relief or a variance required, it should be that that relief is provided by the Board first in order to process these actions effectively. That particular provision, we have not attached it directly to cottage because cottage requires the zoning and they can't even consider cottage standards without zoning being done first. And so the public is -- is given greater levels of assurance, as we talked about with the rezoning action, we have requested that the applicant pursue both the rezoning and the preliminary plat together, so there is a package, and it is understood this is the intent. On larger cottage standard

developments which we have taken a number through the Board, they understand this process. When we take an individual lot, however, it becomes very confusing to them, and there is no differentiation within our development code that you could seek cottage development standards on a single lot. You don't have to do it by a subdivision. And so we will provide them the minutes. I am the one that gives the presentations to the Board, so that's -- I'm -- I'm the point of contact, and I'll be able to convey the ideas, compliance, and then the issues that the Commission had. And the case that Mr. Williams refers to with Wyatt, that has come in. That is scheduled for the Board of Adjustment's action in May. We will make very clear and we made clear with the applicant when they made that submission for BOA approval that the issue with the rear yard setback needed to be addressed. And just you are aware, the rear yard setback has been addressed on the submitted plans that will go to the Board. So they would have been made aware of the concern that the Commission expressed as part of that approval of the subdivision plat and the zoning. You can rest assured that as long as I'm here, the Board is informed of what you do when they have to be informed of actions that are interrelated.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: On the last cottage style development that Mr. Gebhardt brought to us, I believe the roads on that one were 24 feet, and we couldn't have any parking because it would kick it below 20 feet. In this instance, it seems like we could, if we wanted to, have the option to allow parking on both sides that would bring that corridor below 20 feet. Is that an option for us -- or it just seems like a little bit of a disconnect.

MR. ZENNER: I think the way that Mr. Palmer stated it is if you all do not want to reduce below 28 -- so 28 feet will you allow you to put parallel parking on one side. Presently, the way that the Code reads on a 28-foot-wide street, parking is permissible on both. If you want to condition the approval of the plat that parking shall only be permitted on one side such that there is 20 feet of travel -- fire lane travel with left, that is an option that you have available to you. It is not something that we have requested that the applicant do. We haven't requested that of the Public Works staff either. So it is a discretionary call at this point. This is a topic that I am sure we will address as a part of wrapping up the small lot standards because of not only A, the issue with the setbacks, but also ensuring that we have adequate fire access.

MR. BRODSKY: And what would be standard in a typical R-1 development?
Twenty-eight feet?

MR. ZENNER: Twenty-eight feet is the standard, and so that's where this is -- that's where this is -- this is somewhat of a new development over time. So our subdivision

streets used to be 32-foot-wide subdivision streets, and even if you provided parking on both sides of a 32, you would still be less than 20. However, as our fire apparatus has grown over the years in size, the fire service has become a little bit more concerned. That is one reason why we went from a -- a much smaller radii or a diameter cul-de-sac prior to 2017 to the 96-foot-wide cul-de-sac that we presently have. And so as fire apparatus sizes have increased, they so too have become more cognizant of the concerns with limiting access for their vehicles. And so I think it did catch Mr. Gebhardt off guard that we all of a sudden were indicating a concern with parking, even though it has historically always been allowed, and I think we will be seeing this more and more frequently. Depending on the nature of the street segment, I would imagine our traffic engineer may take a more forward approach in suggesting that parking restrictions be incorporated in developer-imposed restrictions on certain platting actions, and this one he did not, so that's why Mr. Palmer made the comment that he made.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. Jay Gebhardt, a civil engineer and land surveyor with A Civil Group. I just want to kind of go through a couple of things here. First, it's my policy in my company that when we do a rezoning or a preliminary plat or anything, that we -- we contact the neighbors first. And I always want to do that as early as possible in this, so we did hold a meeting on the site and we did have a good attendance to that. As far as the parking situation, in 2012, the City of Columbia adopted new street standards, and then this went from 32 foot, as Pat said, to a 28-foot street. So since 2012, we've been building 28-foot streets in every single-family res-- and now we have this issue of that it doesn't comply with the 20-foot fire code situation. So I would ask that with this, especially with the cottage development, that allowing parking on both sides is -- is a good thing. We do have plans for two-car garages on these with a driveway, but allowing parking on both sides, I think, would alleviate concerns of the neighbors of the number of cars that are -- will be with this development. Other than that, I just wanted to ask if you guys have any questions or concerns about the trees, about the setbacks in the back, the drainage easements, and -- and, Rusty, can you bring up your slide that showed your kind of layout of the easements and everything? Yes. I wanted to point out that you can see the proposed drainage pipes on that, but there's a lot of area there in that easement that is not needed for the drainage. It's being proposed mainly to preserve those trees.

And what's weird about the tree preservation ordinances, you can only save trees in a certain clump, and it's got to be a certain ratio. And so that linear strip of trees along that south line, we're saving those, but we don't get to count them toward our tree preservation. So that's just a -- an illustration here that we are saving trees along that south line, but we can't really show them as tree preservation. They don't count toward the 25 percent minimum. And as far as significant trees, we do have to save 25 percent of those, also.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Probably we're discussing the road width. Currently it's 28.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: You're proposing bigger so you can park on both sides --

MR. GEBHARDT: No.

MR. STANTON: -- or we leave it here and just allow parking on both sides?

MR. GEBHARDT: I'm asking to do what the City's street standards allow, which is 28 foot.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Gebhardt, when we see the cottage proposals, we often end up talking about introducing a mix of housing types. But the proposals themselves often are still a more or less uniform set of lots. They're just being introduced into a community that might have a different size of lot sizes. I appreciated seeing some mix in lot sizes because I understand it may have been introduced by the curve in Glorietta, but I would love to see more development, or more mix happen at the street scale, that we don't just have a street of uniform lots. I really do think having a variety of lot sizes along the street will make the neighborhoods more interesting, so thank you for that. And I appreciate the setbacks, and I also check the roads when it came through, and aside from it being wider, I appreciate having the open common areas adjacent so that we have some curve without driveways, so there really is an area where people could park. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for this speaker? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Gebhardt, what's the depth of the -- the easement -- easements in red just at -- on the north side, it seems even, and then on the south side, it's -- you know, it's a wedge. So at that -- that narrowest part between the southern border and on Lot 122, there's -- what's the -- what's the --

MR. GEBHARDT: It's 118 feet is the -- and that's the shallowest lot on there. The ones on the north look like they're -- they range, that are approximately about 135 feet,

138 feet.

MR. WILLIAMS: I was actually looking at just on the easement, what's the width of the --

MR. GEBHARDT: Oh. Width?

MR. WILLIAMS: -- easement on the north and the -- the road seems pretty even on the south, on the smallest point.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. It starts -- yeah. The north one is a 16-foot easement. Okay? And the -- the south one starts at 20 feet and then just gets wider as you go east.

MR. WILLIAMS: So would you say that in your experience, I think 20 feet is roughly the distance between you and me right now. Maybe it's a little more, a little less. But given the current vegetation there, that would be a fairly -- it would provide pretty full coverage in terms of just screening a view from one side of that to the other?

MR. GEBHARDT: Well, the homes to the south, Thomas, are lower than this, so they'll be looking up at this. As we get to Lot 122, the construction of the storm drainage will take out a significant amount of those trees right there. But as we go to the east, that construction won't touch those trees, and there's no reason to remove them. This project, when we first started it several years ago, there was comments from the neighbors about, you know, I wouldn't say severe, but very concerning storm drainage coming down that slope and into their backyards and causing concern. So part of what we're doing here is trying to capture all that water before it comes down into their backyards. And so it's necessary to remove those trees in order to address that drainage for that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, I just want to appreciate -- I appreciate that the buffer, not just from the property lines, but just preserving the Woodland buffer, whether it's, you know, trees of -- of value or they're just -- you know, it's -- it's brush and -- and such. I think it just helps preserve the character of the neighborhood, so I just appreciate that.

MR. GEBHARDT: And then the intent here is with the preliminary plat through this multi-step process that we go through, is to show the intent that it will be single family, and that is -- that is the intent of Jesus when he wants -- this is what he wants to do, so I -- I don't know what would happen if the Board of Adjustment were to deny it, but I would - I would guess that he would still do single-family homes on this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: On -- Mr. Gebhardt, on the last cottage development you brought to us, I remember you discussing a little bit the narrow nature of the lots, and when you put in sidewalks, that it really limits the on-street parking. Is that as much concern with this

one because it has slightly wider lots?

MR. GEBHARDT: These lots are about the same size, so you'll get a one-car between each driveway, and that's why I think it's important to park on both sides because if you eliminate parking, say, on the -- you wouldn't want to do it on the south side because, as Sara said, that's where a bulk of the parking could occur without any driveways. But if you eliminate on the north side, you're going to basically eliminate a parking space for each lot that we could happen on the street for visitors or teenage -- teenagers that -- that type of thing.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

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

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case this evening, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Any Commissioner comments on this case? Seeing none. Commissioner Stanton, do you have something? Sorry.

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion, but I would like the screen up so I can read it off of the staff notes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: There we go.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to -- oh, do my colleagues have any other discussion? As it relates to Case 166-2025, 3310 Oakland Gravel Road, preliminary plat, I move to approve the proposed 23-lot preliminary plat pursuant to the cottage standards by the Board of Adjustment. If R-2 zoning request is denied, the preliminary plat cannot be approved, which we already did. Right?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MR. BRODSKY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Mr. Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Brodsky. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Eight to zero, the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case for the evening.

As it relates to Case 166-2025, 3310 Oakland Gravel Road, preliminary plat, move to approve the proposed 23-lot preliminary plat pursuant to the cottage standards by the Board of Adjustment.

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Wilson

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 121-2025

A request by Michael Stevenson (agent), on behalf of 2009 Stevenson Revocable Trust (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to be constructed on property addressed as 2317 Cherry Ridge Court pursuant to the standards of Sec. 29-3.3(gg) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.75-acre subject site is addressed as 2317 Cherry Ridge Court, is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), and located at the end of Cherry Ridge Court.

MS. GEUEA JONES: What?

MR. ZENNER: It's been withdrawn.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, that one? Thank you. Trying again. Case number 165-2025. See, this is what happens when you don't give me a printout.

MR. ZENNER: You don't have one?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I don't have one.

MR. ZENNER: I apologize.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's okay.

MR. ZENNER: We'll get you one next time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I apologize to the audience. Let's try this again.

Case # 165-2025

A request by John Michael and Christina Washington (owners) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the construction of an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) on property addressed as 1120 Westwinds Drive pursuant to the standards of Sec. 29-3.3(gg) and 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 1.5-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), is located approximately 400 feet east of the intersection of St. Andrew Street and Westwinds Drive, and is addressed as 1120 Westwinds Drive.

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 CUP to allow the future construction of an ADU at 1120 Westwinds Drive, provided only one of the dwellings on the property may be

registered as a rental unit and a Significant Tree Inventory and Tree Preservation Plan is submitted before permitting.

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. Questions for staff? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I know we did the accessory dwelling unit stuff, I think, right after I left P & Z last time. Is the -- the only one-dwelling unit being a rental unit at a time, is that something in the Code or I'm just curious about where that came from.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. I think it comes from the fact that in R-1, you can -- you wouldn't be able to rent two separate dwelling units in the R-1 district. I believe that's the ethos of it, but, Pat, if you could correct me maybe?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, David. And that is -- actually it is a -- it is a condition that the Planning and Zoning Commission post-adoption 2015 is when we adopted these standards, has historically utilized for the reasons that Mr. Kunz has explained.

MR. BRODSKY: Is that some -- and you maybe aren't the right party to ask, but is that something maybe that we should consider if we -- if and when we do go through the - the development code that is a hole that we might plug so we're not doing it ad hoc?

MR. ZENNER: What I -- what I would probably tell you is we will be going in the opposite direction as it relates to possibly ADUs requiring a conditional use in the R-1 if we are to fulfill the obligations or the objectives of the housing study, but that will be a discussion at a later date. There is concern and we have relaxed the ADU standards here within the past year to allow them to be on lots as little as 3,000 square feet. We have removed restrictions as it relates to two doors facing the public street. We may not be to the point where we are generating enough production of ADUs, and part of that could be as a result of some of the additional standards. The underlying principle, though, is an R-1 zoning district which does not allow two rental family units generally, period. The condition as added just as a supplemental standard in order to ensure that the already existing restriction on multiple rentals is addressed through this particular use. With the advent of short-term rental, this becomes even more important. So this particular condition at this point in time is probably still necessary.

MR. BRODSKY: Great. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Excellent. We will open the floor to public hearing. If you are member of the public who is here to speak on this case, please come forward.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: And just as a reminder, name and address for the record.

Three minutes for an individual, six minutes for the applicant or a group. Hello.

MR. WASHINGTON: Hello. Good evening. My name is John Michael Washington. I am the owner of the lot that we are meeting on now, and I don't really have much to say, but I'm happy to answer any questions that you guys might have. Just a little back story. My family has owned this lot for over 60 years, and my wife and I, we have plans to build a forever home for ourselves and our family, and the additional dwelling unit that we also are considering is for my mother to also live on the land with us. And so, with that information, that is all I have for you all this evening. And thank you, David, for putting together this report and presenting.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for applying and doing everything the correct way. We appreciate it.

MR. WASHINGTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other member of the public to speak on this case?

MR. GEBHARDT: Jay Gebhardt, A Civil Group. I am helping Michael with this, and I just want to point out, and I don't want this to color his decision -- this decision on his, but this is a pretty big deal for a normal person to try to go through like Michael. I mean, I think trying to get a plot plan drawn, trying to do all that, it's a lot, and then have to go through this conditional use process. So if you guys are considering making ADUs allowed in R-1 with use specific standards or whatever, I strongly encourage that because it's -- it's a big deal. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for Mr. Gebhardt? Seeing none. Thank you. Oh.

MR. STANTON: I do have, Mr. Gebhardt.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Mr. Stanton.

MR. STANTON: How do we make it -- well, I'm just going to ask your opinion. How do we make it easier but protect from the bad guys taking advantage of you? You know where my position is. I'm not going to let the wild, wild west and people just build whatever they want in their backyard, but I am an opponent [sic] of allowing it to be an easier process. So how do we make this a win-win and protect my interests, and protect the interest of the homeowner?

MR. GEBHARDT: Well, I think it -- you have to answer the question if an ADU is an acceptable thing in the R-1 subdivision. If it is, then it should be allowed. And then you protect the -- from bad actors with your use-specific standards, and that's how I think you do it.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Next speaker, please come forward.
You'll have to pull that -- yeah. Thank you.

MS. GRAVES: I'm used to that. Rebecca Graves, 1108 Chantilly Court in the Miles Manor development. And we came here because we got the postcards, we got the letter, so thank you very much for the good work. All my questions were answered in the presentation and we are in favor of this, so I know you get -- you probably hear mostly complaints, so thought we would be on the other side. So thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for supporting your neighbor. Any questions? Oh, sorry, Ma'am, Commissioner Stanton go ahead.

MR. STANTON: I just wanted to verify. Did you say Miles Manor as in the development? Okay. This is good to know. It's the first black development after urban renewal.

MS. GRAVES: Yes. And we have a -- we have a plaque.

MR. STANTON: That's right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other members of the public to speak here tonight? Seeing none. We'll close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: You guys hear it all the time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: This fits exactly within the spirit and intention of the ADU textbook, hands down the best and most straightforward example of ADU usage as is intended.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other comments? Commissioner Loe and then Commissioner Brodsky?

MS. LOE: So my Commission started with the ADU or in its development, which took a little while. But we started the ordinance with the ADUs in R-1, as well as R-2. But it was eventually determined that it would -- we would keep it in R-2, and do the CUP in R-1, in part because we were targeting an area of town that was more R-2. But we also thought there may be more resistance to the ordinance from R-1. And when the CUPs have come forward, a concern has been about building a second unit and the renting of that unit, and that is, in part, where this condition has come from, and we have included it. And it may be why we're getting more support. I'm happy to see where the neighbors are supporting it. Often we have been getting more concerns, so this is good to see. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And thank you for that background. That's very helpful. Yeah. And I remember my last tenure on the Commission, we were talking about ADUs and I'm happy to see one finally. And -- but, yeah, I echo Commissioner Stanton's comments. This is textbook kind of exactly what we're looking for. I did want to address Mr. Gebhardt's comments. I -- you know, we'd have to see what that looks like, of course, but -- but I do -- I am sympathetic to -- to what he's saying. You know, this is a lot, you know, and this isn't the last stop. He's got to go to City Council after this. So, you know, if there is a way to put in standards that we think would be protective enough to allow as a permitted use in R-1, I would encourage us to look at that. And I do plan to support this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I wanted to add that I really appreciated the housing study being quoted, or, like, referenced in the staff report. I don't know if I've seen that yet. Maybe I have. I don't feel like I have. But anyway, I'm glad it's not just sitting on the shelf or it's not dying anywhere. It's actually being used and we're using it here.

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

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I would like to, if my colleagues are through with their discussion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 165-2025, 1120 Westwinds Drive, ADU conditional use permit, I move to approve the CUP request subject to the following: No more than one of the two dwelling units may be rented at any time. A Significant Tree Inventory be conducted prior to introduction to City Council.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. When you are ready, Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is eight to zero. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case for the evening.

As it relates to Case 165-2025, 1120 Westwinds Drive, ADU conditional use permit, move to approve the CUP request subject to the following: No more than one of the two dwelling units may be rented at any time. A Significant Tree Inventory

be conducted prior to introduction to City Council.

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Wilson

Case # 134-2025

A request by Ashleigh Stundebek (owner) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 1617 Highridge Circle to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 4 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.16-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), is located west of the intersection of Stadium Boulevard and Forum Boulevard, and is addressed as 1617 Highridge Circle. This case was originally heard before the Planning and Zoning Commission on April 10, 2025; however, due to an error in the public hearing notice the Commission's hearing failed to meet statutory requirements. This case is being re-presented following compliant advertising within the Columbia Tribune and distribution of property owner notification in accordance with the City's notification requirements.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP 1617 Highridge Court to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. Condition that the parking space within the one-car attached garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes, and
2. Maximum occupancy shall not exceed four transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
3. Maximum of 210 nights of annual rental usage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. This was a rehearing, so we have heard these facts before, certainly. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: The last time we heard this, was it four guests? Okay.

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

MR. BRODSKY: And I apologize if this was discussed. I think I was absent from this meeting when we heard it last time. One of the letters described this property as a nuisance property. Were you able to find any instances of police action or anything around the property?

MR. ORENDORFF: We checked the code violations and with the Columbia Police

Department. We're not able to find any violations that had been reported by either.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: As a reminder, please come forward. State your name and address for the record. Three minutes for an individual, six minutes for a group. We do ask you to come one at a time, but you can sit in the front row and go next. And since we did hear this before, just keep that in mind. Go ahead.

MS. SPENCER: Thank you. Good evening. And thank you for your time again. My name is Ashley Stundebek, this my husband, Clint. We are the owners at 1617 Highridge. Sorry. Our current address is 225 East Starla Road here in Columbia. We have owned this property for two and a half years. We have had it as an Airbnb since then. We have done many updates. We currently did a kitchen remodel. We have poured a lot of time and energy into this, and are very proud of it. We take into consideration the neighborhood. Obviously, we like the neighborhood. We don't want to cause any problems. That's not why we're here. I'm going to address some of the things that we read in some of the letters. I was not given all of those, I just wanted to state that. So Airbnb does vet people. They do ask for your Social Security Number, they ask for a driver's license, your information. If you have had past violations with Airbnb people, that is noted, and you -- you're not allowed to book on Airbnb. We get all of that information. I also message all of the guests. I ask how many are coming, what they're in town for, things like that, so I do feel like I do vet them. Our property or our neighborhood has a lot of rentals. Rentals, you don't have to vet. Some people do, and I understand, you know. Ours have said that they do. It's not a requirement. It is a requirement on Airbnb. Another issue that I would like to say is in the two and a half years that we've had this, we have had no complaints. I'm currently a super host on Airbnb, which is not easy to attain. I've had that for over a year now. So I do feel like until the postcards came out, we had no issues. So two and a half years, I've owned the property, and if you want to find me, I just have a hard time believing that nobody could get in contact with me before this. I'd like to address the parking issue. Before this, parking wasn't an issue, and I do understand the limitations that Planning and Zoning has recommended for parking. And since then, I have actively communicated that with our guests in the last month since I have been here, and I'm pretty stern and strict on that. I tell them we have a garage, we have a one parking thing. And with that being said, I cannot control public parking on a public road. And I have drove by a couple of times, and a car is parked in front of my house when no people are there. I have no control of

that. Another issue I would like to address that was said was property values. So -- sorry. It's a claim that, you know, short-term rentals will decrease the surrounding home values. However, I feel that this claim is not supported by current research. In fact, several studies have found the opposite. Well-managed STRs can increase neighborhood property values. I have a couple of things I could site. I don't want to bore you, but many cities have shown that home improvements made for STR use often have a positive impact on curb appeal and nearby neighboring values. I do feel like my husband and I have done that. I feel like our house is probably well maintained -- better maintained than some of the rentals on the road. So thank you for your time and consideration.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to get right to the nitty-gritty. You've been here before. What have you done since the last time you were here to improve your chances of getting this through like you want it?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah. You said --

MR. STANTON: If you've got a sense, you know, communication. You know, you just talked about parking. What have you done since the last time you were here to make this a better outcome?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah. So any -- I've had two people since stay at the Airbnb, and I have communicated that they are not supposed to park on the -- the roadway, to not block anybody, that there are two spots in the garage. You also said to me that night to go and make it right with your neighbors. I spent 30 minutes outside, my husband and I, after the last meeting, talking to one of them, gave them my card and phone number. Last week, I went to the neighbor across -- directly across from me, and had a nice conversation with her. I apologized for any issues that she had seen, told her, you know, what we were doing to improve that, and that we did not want any problems, handed my number to her. And I also went next door to the neighbor right beside me. I've been there twice, I just haven't had any luck reaching them.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Thank you.

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

MS. ORTIZ: Are you bringing in commercial construction equipment?

MS. STUNDEBECK: No.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm assuming that's relating to maybe people staying there that are construction workers that are bringing in their commercial trucks or something, as they

stay in town. Right?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yes. We did have one instance, and I think that's -- everything that I've read in the letters is one stay -- one stay. So one stay in two and a half years where somebody parked a trailer. We did call and ask them to move it, and I have apologized. That's all I can do. We have to move forward from here, and I do feel like I deserve that chance.

MR. STANTON: How can we address -- I'm sorry if I need to get -- (inaudible). I'm a construction guy. I've never lived in an Airbnb while I'm on the road, but, shoot, I will now. So how do you -- how do you -- how do you address that? How do you talk to someone, I mean --

MS. STUNDEBECK: We -- so we --

MR. STANTON: I can see that being a problem if I brought my dump truck and parked it in front of your yard.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: I mean, so how do you -- how do you resolve that?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Really, Clint and I had a talk after the last one of just not allowing them to stay anymore.

MR. STANTON: Construction workers?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: (Inaudible). Okay. That's terrible. So I've got to stay in a hotel because I -- okay.

MS. STUNDEBECK: But, yes, it is. I mean, we had one, they're working on the stadium at Mizzou, they're great guys. They can't go home. They stay in a Airbnb. Their family came to visit them on the weekend. They have small children. They don't want to stay in a hotel. It's small and confined. We have a yard, we have a kitchen, so they can cook. I think Airbnbs are great. I have a family of five. We travel a lot and we stay in the Airbnbs because of -- it's a home.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Thank you.

; MS. GEUEA JONES: I have a question, and maybe this was in the staff report and I just have read too many of them. Do you do any mid-term stays?

MS. STUNDEBECK: The last two summers, I have had -- the last time I had a family relocating from Korea, and they stayed for three months while they were trying to find a home to live in. So, yes, in the summers, I usually do that, even a couple of winters. Well, not this last -- this last December, I had a family who had had an insurance claim. They had a water main break, so they stayed for a month and a half through Christmas.

They were from Fulton area, but they stayed there because they just wanted a house. And then the Christmas before that, I had a lady whose husband was in a car accident, and he was at Rusk and the University, so they were down from Rolla, so she stayed there just because she didn't want to drive back and forth. She was older.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you -- so you'll have dual licensure then?

MS. STUNDEBECK: Yes. I'm currently -- yes, have that paperwork in.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here.

MS. STUNDEBECK: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next?

MR. STUNDEBECK: I don't have a -- very much to add, but I'm Clint STUNDEBECK, Ashleigh's husband. Same address, 225 East Starla Road. On the construction thing, I'm sympathetic to that, too. We did not know there was being a trailer parked in front of our house. Had we known sooner, we would have addressed it sooner. I found out when I went there to do some maintenance one day, there was something with the front door, and we went there, and I asked them to move it, but it was, like, the second to the last night of their stay. So that won't happen again. To say, you know -- so anyway, we're there weekly at least during the short-term rentals because nobody stays much longer than that, so we're doing maintenance all the time to this home, keep it -- the face value up. I don't know what else I could add. That's about it, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: We've had a few folks who run Airbnbs come through during the time I have been on the Commission, and I am not going to say that I know how to run a successful Airbnb, so don't take this as advice, I'm just asking a question. Some of those individuals have had -- have had cameras that they've installed on the outside of their property so that they can monitor better what's going on. And is that something you've considered given the complaints from the neighbors just so that you can see, like, oh, a camera pointed at the front of the house -- you know, from the house looking out to the street, for instance.

MR. STUNDEBECK: Sure. Absolutely. I would consider doing that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Does that have a detrimental effect on -- on renting the property? Do people not like that?

MR. STUNDEBECK: This is the only one I have, so I couldn't tell you.

MS. STUNDEBECK: (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we can't -- sorry. It's okay. Do you have an answer now, sir?

MR. STUNDEBECK: What's that?

MR. STANTON: Do you have an answer now since she's told you?

MR. STUNDEBECK: Yeah. Evidently you can't record, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: You have to disclose that, yeah.

MR. STUNDEBECK: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Anything further Mr. -- Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: No. That's it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Thank you very much for being here. Next member of the public to speak, please come forward?

MS. SPENCER: I'm Kitty Spencer; I live at 1713 Ridgemont. Next month, we will have lived there 30 years. I love my neighborhood. I have in my hand and maybe they were already received by you all, but from the lady right across the street. One is dated April 14th, another one May 2nd. And wherever Ashleigh went -- oh, there you are. Maybe you talked to her after this, but she did -- this is from Lorna Wyatt who lives at 1616, right across the street. She is also the lady with her daughter, Cynthia Bassett, who addressed the issue of it isn't just one trailer with the heavy equipment. It was, like, multiple, so it wasn't just one, according to her letter. She also said she has lived there 24 years, and I would -- I kind of feel like the neighborhood was spoken with some disdain, but there's all those rentals were there a long-time rentals, but there are a lot of homeowners. And I just -- I read the transcript from a month ago, and we really want to reiterate what Mr. Christensen said about the need for low-income housing, housing in this price range where people who are first-time buyers or trying to downsize. That's my opinion. So she -- one thing that Lorna, who is right across the street said, okay, a real concern is the -- the home value, but the other one goes will these things be enforced? In other words, will there not be construction, yeah, because, oh, I'm sorry. Will the construction -- you know, will there be -- rules can be broken? How can that be enforced? And then I just want to say to Ashleigh and Clink that a friend of mine on -- who runs an Airbnb, she went to every one of their neighbors and -- and introduced herself, said what she was doing, gave them her card with her phone number, and said if there's any problem I want you to call me, and she's a super host, too. But I just want to say that that would have been a really helpful thing, a really kind thing. This is a good neighborhood. There's a lot of long-term residents, long-term renters. It's not just a trashy place, so, that's all I have to say.

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

MR. SPENCER: Well, I am Clay Spencer. I live with Kitty Spencer at 1713 Ridgemont. I don't really understand how the Zoning Commission and the zoning rules operate, but, in our neighborhood, first of all, I want you to understand that Highridge Circle, the streets are narrow. There's no sidewalks. And the homes were built during the Ozzie and Harriet period, so they're -- they're single-car garages. Most of them are used for storage, so -- and there are teenagers, so there's multiple cars at every house, and they're on the street on both sides. To go in two directions on that street is sometimes very difficult. There is certainly no spare room for commercial vehicles or semis or anything like that to be parked on the street. But in addition, we have had experience in our neighborhood with group homes, and because group homes fall under Americans with Disabilities Acts, the R-1 zoning doesn't apply to them. We have two group homes on Highridge Circle. I think in the zoning requirements, when you're looking at approving Airbnbs, you need to look at also are how many group homes because the group homes have cars sometimes for the clients and multiple staff that would also be at the group homes. And there's just not enough parking in that neighborhood for four cars, five cars at every house. I think that's what I want to say. I don't understand why you can buy a home in an R-1 area, and have more than three unrelated people living in it since 2023, and it not be a violation of something. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Next member of the public to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. VICKERS: Stephanie Vickers, 1651 Highridge Circle. I am an 18-year resident of this neighborhood. I have watched the cosmology of our neighborhood go from having a lot of rentals that changed over regularly to watching young families move in, settle down, older people feeling more comfortable, getting out, gardening, coming around talking to people. The idea of having an Airbnb in there when we've already got two group homes that we are trying to make sure those people are safe and taken care of, it's adding more stress to the mix for all of us. I am also one of the people who walks the neighborhood constantly. I feel safe enough to walk my neighborhood constantly, whether it's light or dark, raining, sun, whatever. The idea of having such a high turnover in that area, in that one house, is very uncomfortable to me both for me, for the safety of my elderly neighbors, for all the children who have moved in and are growing up with us.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next member of the public to speak, please come forward.

MS. BRADFIELD: I'm just going to go on one section of this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Name and address for the record?

MS. BRADFIELD: Gail Bradfield, 1801 Ridgemont and 19 Highridge Circle. I don't know if 1619 is going to speak tonight or not. I'd love to hear her. But anyway, I'm just going to go over Section F of the conditional access three, can use supplemental questions, because that has to do with the proposed conditional use will not cause significant adverse impacts to the surrounding properties. I'm afraid -- I could go on each one of those and tell you how it has. Comparable rental use, I would say the bulk of the people have lived there 35-65 years, and so, when we're set -- we have long-term renters. We have landlords that live in the neighborhood. People who rent have lived in the neighborhood, and people know the homeowners. And I would not say that this is a rapid turnover rental neighborhood. We've gone through and we're having a hard time finding numbers to support that as far as just asking the people coming up and down the street. I'm surprised how many are homeowners. So I feel like when people have spent the bulk of their lives in this place, trusting the R-1 zoning, and they're getting near this last -- you know --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you stay a little closer so -- thank you.

MS. BRADFIELD: They don't know -- they don't have any plans to live anywhere else during their life, than -- and they're made to feel uncomfortable in their own homes, that bothers me. Also even having people who have lived there five or more years feeling like this is not the neighborhood I moved into. So this -- this property does not function similarly to a typical long-term residence. You can go your neighbor and talk to them when there's party and when there's semis, when there's construction equipment, when there's trash, but you don't know these people. And sometimes they might not even speak the same language as you do. So there's no way that these elderly people, we have people on hospice, we have people who -- that have emergency vehicles bringing them in and out of long-term care. We have people whose siblings had two heart attacks and all of that, heart attacks in the last six months who are very concerned about the blocking of the roads that's happened related to the emergency lane. People going into chemo can't get out of their driveways, and it's not that this was an isolated incidence. I mean, this is something that went on. If it was one stay, it was a stay of extended time, and it's very -- it's very difficult. I talked to a -- husband before the previous meeting, and he told me they weren't screaming, they weren't going to scream, they -- and they weren't coming by regularly, and that if we had any complaints, they would just go to a long-term rental. That's what I was told before the meeting. So as far as being professionally managed with strict policies, when you have four or five weeks of construction equipment being stored and blocking people's driveways, that's not responsible guest behavior. Guests -- house rules, I know there's been people woken up from the goings on in the

backyard during the night. There's been toxic substances dumped in our water drainage, then the street is 27 feet wide. If you add the storm drainage, it gets close -- it approaches 30 to the curb. So you can't really -- the vehicles brought in are not the small vehicles that fit in the eight feet, you know, or could get by on it in two ways with a ten-foot lane. They exceed that size. We have Ford Expositions, they are work trucks, and they're not often using the garage. So there's not a lot of noise control because they live north of Hatton, which is not necessarily inside of Columbia. It's towards Moberly a ways. And they said they're just too busy driving their kids around to sports traffic to put in more, you know, observation. This stuff happens outside of the work hours, so neighborhood services wouldn't necessarily see it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ma'am, I'm afraid that's your time. Could you wrap up or --

MS. BRADFIELD: Okay. Excuse me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Did you have a last comment?

MS. BRADFIELD: I was going to go over these other areas, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. I'm afraid you're out of time. It's okay. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: If we assumed that the parking issues are addressed going forward, other than not knowing who is residing in the property at any point in time, what specific concerns, based upon the usage up to this point, do you have because I haven't heard much other than parking, and I really want to understand if how it's being run is creating a nuisance for the neighborhood if we exclude parking. So if you could give us some specific examples of how -- again, other than parking, other than not knowing who is there, but -- but how the guests who have been there over the last two and a half years have -- have negatively impacted the neighborhood?

MS. BRADFIELD: (Inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Come closer so we --

MS. BRADFIELD: Trash, liquor bottles, and such, coming and going at all hours, not respecting the walker and the dog walkers, because we have no sidewalks, so we have more problems with that narrow street, walking in the street. And people try to walk with their children, too. So it's somewhat a danger for the children. Sometimes the children are playing, the parent might be watching from a distance, but they have no place to ride their bike except in the street, so you might see three kids riding in the street, and then someone is, like, zooming down there or it's hard to see because of the big vehicles. So a lot of it is vehicles and a lot of it is safety, and a lot of it is the inconsistencies in what we've been told and what's really happened, and I would say that covers it for me. I don't know about anybody else, but --

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. I don't mean to -- I really do want to understand. So we see respecting the walkers, is that -- is that -- again, is that the vehicles or what -- how -- just help me understand what's going on with the walking.

MS. BRADFIELD: Yeah. Oh, okay. People go very fast down a road where people are walking, and they can't see because of all the cars that are parked. And I wouldn't say during the day, because a lot of the people go to work. It's as much of a problem as it is after hours. When people come home, there's a lot of walking in the street. It's a walking neighborhood. There's no playgrounds, there's no yards that are, you know, level to play in easily. And so it's kind of -- it's dangerous. And getting emergency vehicles in and out is an issue. Getting caretakers and home-health people in and out has been a problem.

MR. WILLIAMS: So do you have specific examples of -- of the renters at the property being the individuals who are driving quickly down the street?

MS. BRADFIELD: They -- and you will say -- do we need to film that, you know? We kind of see it, but are we responsible to show the evidence? They -- they're -- like, last week, there was a huge -- a great, big extended Ford Escalade, and there was a great big work truck, you know, so we kind of see it go, but if the walkers might not be where they see it pull out of a driveway. But the increase in traffic, I would definitely say the parking is -- has been noticeably -- the school buses have had to switch which side of the circle they go up because of the increased larger vehicles parked in the road and --

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And I'm not asking to -- I'm taking you at your word. I'm just -- I want to understand. And then you mentioned liquor bottles and trash, or there's -- how many times in the last year do you -- you recall specifically seeing instances where there was trash or liquor bottles or other, you know, such things?

MS. BRADFIELD: I'd say several.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. BRADFIELD: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh. You wanted --

MR. STANTON: Yeah, I did have a question. Don't worry about it. Forget it. Forget it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Next speaker?

MR. MCDOWELL: (Inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, you're going to have wait till you get up here so we can hear you in the microphone. I'm sorry.

MR. MCDOWELL: Matt McDowell, 1701 Ridgemont.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Was that Matt McDowell?

MR. MCDOWELL: Matt.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Matt McDowell.

MR. MCDOWELL: I've lived there for 35 years. It's a safe community. Opening this up to an entrepreneur that wants to make money -- short-term big money, and a single resident that puts the entire history in jeopardy is not something that should be status -- that we should stand for at all. I don't care how much money is in there, not additional taxes or personal profit. We've lived there safely -- I've lived up there safely for 35 years, raised two kids there. I've had my grandkids move in a few times. Now, I have great grandkids. They can come any time they want, too. It's a safe place. I'm not going to let this happen to my community. We all know each other. I see those cars racing up and down there. I'm not a real busybody. I don't like sticking my nose in other people's business, and I don't want to be responsible for doing the job that the authorities should be doing, not me. But I will if it comes to that, and it's not going to be pretty. Now I just want you to realize that one man's profit that destroys a community is not worth it. It is not worth it. It's not a good idea, and it's not. And if this doesn't work, I know we'll have to get together and somehow get something on the ballot for the next election to put this to the City to see if there is any short-term rentals allowed in this town. I know several towns in this -- in this state that have done that. We don't want that there. She can rent that to anybody, just like that, and probably get \$1,250 a month. Maybe that's not enough money for her, but it seems like enough money to me. That's about all I've got to say. I'm totally against this. I would like for you to help stop it. I don't have the power here. I do have one -- one vote and one voice, but I know a lot of voters. I know a lot of voters, and I always vote -- always.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Great. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Good evening. How are you doing?

MR. MCDOWELL: All right, man.

MR. STANTON: Didn't I hear that you had group homes on your block?

MR. MCDOWELL: Had what?

MR. STANTON: Group homes, two of them?

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes. Yes, we do.

MR. STANTON: Those are cash cows. They rent every single room to individuals in recovery, and that is the same business model, I do believe. I have three group homes in my neighborhood, and they all function like that. The difference between them is, and this, I didn't even know they were going to be there. They just popped up and we just deal with it.

MR. MCDOWELL: Yeah. They never come out with it. Nobody told us they were

coming either, but they just did.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. In this case, you got the heads up that an STR is coming in your neighborhood.

MR. MCDOWELL: Right.

MR. STANTON: So the profit position is you've got two profit-generating homes that are cranking out a lot more than that STR is going to make. They're probably charging \$300 to \$400 per person in two -- in each bed, so that's probably two people per room at \$800 a room. Just estimate, don't know for sure, but that's kind of how they work.

MR. MCDOWELL: It's a small neighborhood. You jam one more place like that in here, then we had no say-so. Nobody asked if that was all right. I've got one catty-corner. They come in really early in the morning and they leave the lights on, and they go up to that thing. There's a lady across the street that came out yelling about a month or two ago. You always wake me up in the morning with your lights on that. That's just what happens when you have strangers come into -- if they lived there, if they're long-term, if they're part of the community, everything worked its way through. Sooner or later, we get it all right, and everything would go back to a safe loving place. I mean, I raised two children in this thing, a boy and a girl, and I've had grandchildren there with their -- with my -- and I've had a great-grandchild there. This is a community, it's not a profit center. It's a community.

MR. STANTON: So you have two group homes. It seems like was this level of community participation and advocacy reflective on these two group homes, because I feel like no one house -- and maybe I'm wrong -- I could be dead wrong, one house cannot generate such discourse on the whole block without contributing factors that I heard throughout the testimony tonight. We heard congestion in parking. Unless one house has got 20 cars in front, I don't see how this one property can be the cause of all the congestion.

MR. MCDOWELL: Take that times three. There's two there already, this makes a third.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So we've got two group homes, a potential STR, existing neighbors. So nobody else is contributing to the parking problem, the congestion problem, the two group homes that are transient guests, they're not long term. So the transient guests may be 30 days, may be 60 days there.

MR. MCDOWELL: I have no idea.

MR. STANTON: They're there for years?

MS. LOE: They're often there.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Okay. But you can't --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please stay --

; MR. STANTON: You can't speak. He's got to -- he's got to talk. He's got to talk. Okay. So my point is, it's hard for me to see you put all this focus on this property. Now I'm looking at this owner. He -- I hope he's soaking all of this in --

MR. MCDOWELL: I don't --

MR. STANTON: -- because all it takes, all it's going to take -- this is all I'm going to say, sir. All it's going to take is two legitimate legally sound complaints and he loses that license. But I have a hard time with everybody else using their property as they see fit, either short-term, long-term, homeowner or not, he has those same rights. And if you don't want him to exercise his rights as a short-term rental, and I'm -- and this is you're in his shoes, how do you make his rights just as important as yours and how would you resolve that?

MR. MCDOWELL: His one person trump the entire neighborhood?

MR. STANTON: No. But his -- but his property rights --

MR. MCDOWELL: One person --

MR. STANTON: -- are just as equal as yours.

MR. MCDOWELL: -- trumps the entire neighborhood. There's nothing right about the vote goes against him. If you want to vote for it, come around with ballots. We'll take them to each and every house, let them vote, and then we'll see who's got the right to --

MR. STANTON: Well, if I come to you and say you are not allowed to have your grandkids at your house, you have too many grandkids, your occupancy level at your house is -- you're violating your occupancy level at your house, you have too many people in your house.

MR. MCDOWELL: Well, that's a load of crap.

MR. STANTON: Right? I'm just throwing this out here. Right?

MR. MCDOWELL: Yes.

MR STANTON: You have a right to your family, you have a right to use your house the way you want to. How do we fix this? Because this man has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on this home. And he's got everybody else telling him how he can and can't use his property when he's asking for a -- this is a legal use, just like you have a legal use. Make this whole for both of us. How do you make this a win-win without stepping on his rights as a homeowner?

MR. MCDOWELL: He can rent that to regular people, have a long-term rental, not short-term rentals, not short-term rentals. They come and they go. They come to have a good time. They don't have anybody watching them. You don't check in at desk and have somebody at the desk all night knowing what's going on in the rooms upstairs, a

hotel.

MR. STANTON: So I can have a construction crew rent long term. I can have a -- so I can have a company rent the house long term to my crew and that would fit your requirement as a long-term rental, and I can have my proofs that -- rent it for a year, and park their trucks, and what can you do about it?

MR. MCDOWELL: Well, I can tell you one thing if you -- if you -- if you have a -- if you have that happen in a hotel, they'll know. If they say this is a four-person occupation, how do you know that it's a four-person occupation? For two years, they did this without anybody's consent. Two years, they broke the law. Nobody stopped them doing that. Then they came here and said, okay, we're going to give you a license, and then we'll make a couple of bucks off of that. No. How do you know there's four people? Four people could have -- each could invite four more people. Nobody is going to know. He didn't find out about that till a month into it. The last two days is when he found out there was people "parking" where they shouldn't be parking with big trailers. That's what you'll open yourself up to. Now, believe me, everybody would have known if it were people in the neighborhoods because we all see each other. I want to know -- how do you know if they're going up and down the street? I recognize most of the faces. I've been there 35 years. I recognize most of the faces that drive up and down that street, and I know who it is and who it is, and I'll try and see people outside, well, who the heck is this? It's not a thoroughfare, it's not a main street, it's not a traffic area, it's the group of people that live in that thing, and I think --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Any one -- no.

MR. MCDOWELL: Are we done?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think we're good. Thank you very much, sir. Anyone else?

MS. SORTMAN: Hello. My name is Emilee Sortman, and I currently live in the house owned by Gail Bradfield. It's 1619, it's the lot just to the west of this plat. I've lived here about four years. It is a very nice neighborhood. I can see why they bought a home in this neighborhood. I do realize people are getting really hung up on the parking situation. I don't know that it's specifically the parking which wasn't convenient for sure, but I think it's also that they're not really monitoring the premise. Like, it wasn't like this people are parked in the street and on the yard for two days or a week or two weeks even. So that has made me a little bit nervous about the safety aspect, like, do they know what's going on? If I lived 15 minutes away, I would probably occasionally drive through once a week or something just, you know, and check, make sure things are on the up and up. I do agree with Mr. Stanton that we are trying to, you know, compromise with them, how can we respect their right to use their property however they want to, but

also bring some comfort to the neighbors that they are, you know, maintaining it and that they're -- have a presence on the premises. That's been my big concern. Also, my neighbor did mention it would have been nice to have some sort of notice. Like, they could have knocked on the door, said, you know, hey, I'm your new neighbor. You might see people in and out, but we're doing what we, you know, can to maintain the safety of the property. Like, none of that was ever explained. Of course we noticed that it was being used as an Airbnb, for the last two years. We just assumed that they were operating under the ordinance, that they were doing what they needed to do to lawfully do it. I didn't know that this form even existed for us to voice this, so that's why probably you're hearing a lot of, like, concerns from people at this point. I guess that's pretty much all I have to say. Just -- that's why I feel people are getting hung up on the parking thing is because they didn't notice it for a very long time, so maybe they're not monitoring the property. That would make me feel a little bit safer. If they could maybe provide me with a phone number, if I see something, say something. I mean, clearly, they probably had some issues with -- cosmetically with people parking in the yard. They probably had to spend money to -- to repair that. That probably wouldn't have happened if we had a way to contact them, and say, hey, the last, you know, month, someone has been doing this. I would think both sides would want to have that open line of communication open to prevent those problems.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. And there will be a hotline starting soon.

MS. SORTMAN: Yeah. With Neighborhood Services. But I just -- you know, I really don't want to be a rat for Neighborhood Services. Like, I would like to be able to approach my neighbor.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MS. SORTMAN: You know, if they're open to that, I would like to be able to approach them with things directly, you know. I realize that's my responsibility as a citizen to refer those things to Neighborhood Services, but I also feel like they should have a responsibility to have someone we can communicate with them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That makes sense. Any -- Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: So you live in the house west of the property?

MS. SORTMAN: I do, yes. I -- I've rented that house for four years.

MS. LOE: People have mentioned some issues with noise and also litter?

MS. SORTMAN: Definitely litter, yes. There's been litter from there blown over. Mainly, a lot of it was from the construction crew, but I have seen other instances of it. We had a guy for three or four days was working on his car in the street, and just drained all his antifreeze in the street. And I feel like people who live here would know that drains

down the street and right into the creek. Like, you know, and I feel like if I had had their phone number, I probably would have called him and said, like, Hey, he's not respecting your property, they're not respecting -- and they probably wouldn't have wanted him, either. I would assume that they wouldn't want them to do that to their property. They have spent a lot of money and time, like, making this place nice, and it looks really nice, and I -- you know, we want our neighborhood to -- to be nice, and I would think that they would probably not approve of that, either. I would hope not. Sorry. I'm very nervous. I don't know if I actually answered your question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're good. Go ahead, Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: It sounds like you are proposing a compromise. I wasn't clear if you support the continued use as an STR, or if you don't.

MS. SORTMAN: I don't -- I don't love it, no. I mean, there's, you know, definitely a housing shortage. There's two million Airbnbs in America, and I understand that, like, this is your way to try to compromise this, is making these new zoning laws for these institutions to exist. I'm really kind of on the fence. My main concern is feeling safe and feeling like they are monitoring the place, and I heard them mention maybe, you know, putting outside cameras. I know that does lessen the appeal to people who want to rent because they don't want to feel like they're under surveillance or anything like that. Even just for them to say, hey, yeah, we're scheduling, you know, a ride through every, you know, week or two, to make sure, you know, things are on the up and up. I would feel a little bit more comfortable with that, because some of the things that have been going on there, I feel like if they were more attentive, they wouldn't be occurring, and also, like I said, the damage to their own property, like, they would probably want to mitigate some of that.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I was going to say something as a point of order. Thank you for coming and giving testimony. As a point of order for you and the previous speaker, that one reason -- these -- this has not been illegal for the past two years. Fact of the matter is there has been no regulation, no monitoring.

MS. SORTMAN: Got you.

MR. WALTERS: That's the -- that's the significant purpose of having this take effect is so there is a mechanism for monitoring registration and -- and also transparency and also a reason that they could revoke, they could lose their ability to have this, if these continued violations were continued. So that is a significant change, and, like you say, you don't like to be a rat or people don't like to rat out people, but if this is truly

something that becomes out of hand, that's -- that's the recourse is to have to --

MS. SORTMAN: Yeah, I understand that.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah.

MS. SORTMAN: I would just like to have, like, if they're okay with that, some sort of direct line of communication to them before it would get to that point.

MR. WALTERS: Well, I hope that --

MS. SORTMAN: You know, some things might not be worth losing your license over because someone is throwing a party next door. You can't, as I stated, always control what everyone is doing there all the time, just the same as my landlord can't, you know.

MR. WALTERS: Well, thank you. I think -- I hope as a result of tonight's comments, the -- the owners will do better in terms of perhaps notifying at least all the six or eight people closest to the property of providing contact info for them. And I know that, I believe, if this is approved, the neighbors will get postcards with how they can react or respond to problems, and that could be noted in the future.

MS. SORTMAN: Yeah. That would be greatly helpful.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Ditto. This is -- there's hundreds underground that exist amongst us.

MS. SORTMAN: Oh, yes. Yes.

MR. STANTON: Hundreds. These people that you're seeing popping up are subjecting themselves to the legal process, and that's why I'm so adamant about making a win-win, because those hundreds that you don't know, I'll bet there's hundreds of those, dozens around you right now that you just don't know about. And we're trying to make people legal and do a legal process so they can be monitored, can be regulated, all of that good stuff. So -- you know, these people are subjecting themselves to this process. And thank you for your comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner -- right. Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I just wanted to say -- sorry. There's a phone. Thank you for coming out, especially as a renter. I think it's super cool that you, like, care about your neighborhood and care about your home enough. I'm also a renter. I think it goes to show that there's a community there and I can tell that by you being here, and thank you for having the courage, especially in front of your landlord, because my -- I mean, I'm sure your landlord is great, but some landlords, you know, would direct people to go a certain direction, so I think it's really awesome that you showed up tonight.

MS. SORTMAN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I do have a question, and maybe with you being right next door, you can comment on this. It sounds like the construction crew was there for more than a month, like, five weeks, four weeks?

MS. SORTMAN: You would have to ask the owners, but it was a considerable amount of time, yes. It was several weeks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That would make them a long-term tenant under our ordinances. So even though they're not there for a full year, that would not qualify their stay as a short-term rental. And I bring that up because it is the kind of mid-term rental that a lot of folks are changing to where they're renting to traveling nurses, you know, one semester professors, construction crews that are doing massive projects in our community. And -- and that is not the same as a transient guest, and I'm -- I'm sensitive to the fact that it sounds like that was a very disruptive thing in your neighborhood.

MS. SORTMAN: Incredibly, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But there's -- I am sorry that you weren't able, as neighbors, to be able to go and speak to the people that were staying there, because if they were there for multiple weeks, and -- and problems were occurring on a daily basis, it is just a shame that no one was able to have that conversation the same way that you would for someone who was staying there for six months or a year. It's one thing if you're, like, well, they were only there for three days, and so we never got a chance to go over and talk to them, but if they're there for five weeks, then -- then it -- it seems like, one, this ordinance wouldn't apply to that stay anyway, and, two, I'm just sorry that you weren't able to find a resolution to that and it was disruptive for so long because it -- it was the same people there.

MS. SORTMAN: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. SORTMAN: Yeah. That's why I mentioned maybe, like, having a line of contact with them where we could voice --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. SORTMAN: -- those concerns, you know, to them, directly.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. And it sounds like they are willing to give out their contact information to -- to folks, and certainly make sure you get that from them.

MS. SORTMAN: Okay. Yeah.

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

MS. SORTMAN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? I'm sorry, sir. We do

one shot. You've already come up.

MR. STANTON: On this case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: No, I'm sorry. You've already come up in this case. Thank you. Next speaker?

MS. BALL: I'll try to get the right distance here. My name is Elizabeth Ball; I live at 4000 White Pine. I'm a local homeowner, a business owner, a former short-term rental host. I'm also not a great public speaker, so I'm going to read from my notes, if you guys don't mind. First, thank you for your time and for the work that you do to guide growth in our city. It is appreciated. I'm here tonight to support the STUNDEBECKs and their application for a short-term rental permit. They've already spoken for themselves. I just want to quickly note to Emilee that you should definitely talk to them afterwards. Ashleigh would happily give you her card with a direct line of contact. I also am a co-host for them when they're out of town. My property is closer than theirs. I know that that's been brought up as a concern, so I'm, like, maybe eight minutes away. I also really like Dairy Queen, so I do drive by their property quite often, and have submitted some photo evidence of not their guests parking in front of their house to kind of show that while they have a public street and a public right-of-way, it is not only used by their guests, but by their neighbors, as well. They do screen guests and try to maintain a peaceful environment. And I think they do understand what it is to be a good neighbor and a good host not only to the people staying in their property, but I know since the last meeting, you all recommended that they try to meet their neighboring owners, and -- excuse me -- I believe that they have tried to do that, some with success, some not. It's hard when you're there to do maintenance, and you just pop over to introduce yourself and maybe somebody is at work during that hour. So I think that is -- would be a continued proactive effort on their part to try to, you know, better relations. And then I think there is an important question to ask not only you all, but also everybody still in presence today is has anybody ever stayed at a short-term rental, maybe not in Columbia, but while traveling? And likely there's a reason that you chose to do that, whether it's to have a kitchen for convenience, your family is too large to stay in a single hotel room. I do it with my family very often, and I think it is a double standard to not allow them to proceed through this approval process just because a few people don't like them. I think this process has been put in place. The STUNDEBECKs have shown great effort by coming back here for a second time to go through this process. Their home is great for families coming to attend community events, so we're bringing in outside of our community to support our community. They have mentioned that there's people who come here for medical care, people who come in for local college visits. So overall, there is a need for

this, and we're going to see through this process that there's going to be a reduction in short-term rentals, which in, by way of that, is going to mean that the need is going to become higher, because there is going to be a limitation for those guests and what is available to them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That's your time. Did you have a final wrap-up or --

MS. BALL: Just that I, like, wholeheartedly support their effort and I'm here as a closer resident to -- to help them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight. Anyone else to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comments on this case? Anyone at all? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: I'll start us off. I think like the -- I guess it was at our last meeting, or the meeting before, the one over by Stephens Lake Park, like that instance and the other instances where we've had where there is some resistance in the neighborhood, I see a lot of just communication that needs to happen. And I don't know what we can do as a commission to ensure that this process is -- you know, really enhances and increases the amount of communication between the neighbors and the short-term rental operators, but I do think that that would have a significant difference or make a significant difference for the neighbors. So I -- I'm not sure where I land on supporting this one.

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

MR. WILLIAMS: I plan to support the motion as I anticipate it will be made. The reason for that is because it seems like most of the complaints that I've heard relate to parking. There are definitely some that have related to specific guests and whether it be the -- you know, doing maintenance of vehicles in the driveway and maybe not doing that in the most responsible manner, or trash, definitely some concerns. But the reason that I support this is that we have owners who have, I think, demonstrated that they've taken steps and seem to be responsive and understanding what the concerns are here. And so from my vantage point, that is a real difference maker, and that it's going to be up to -- to them to -- if the Commission and the City Council go that direction, to, you know, communicate and operate in a manner that is responsible and respectful to the neighborhood. The impression I get is that that's what they want to do and how they want to operate. So I don't want to prejudge that based upon what I've heard tonight.

More generally, as I've said before, my time on the Commissioner is running short. So I - the one thing that I regret about how this has come together is that these -- this CV process creates conflict where conflict didn't previously exist, where we've had the folks that who have been coming through are folks who have typically been operating for several years and then we have the hearing and there is -- there is concern. And what I want to say and I probably won't say it as eloquently as I wish I could, but if this is approved by this Commission and the City Council, you will have neighbors who are operating an STR according to a license granted by the City. And it is really incumbent for any community, any neighborhood to work, whether that's neighboring countries, or neighboring houses, that we afford each other lots of grace and forgiveness and really try to have an open mind about the concerns that each other have. And that's not just -- I'm not saying that to those who are opposed to it. I'm also saying that to the people who will be operating it, and that's my hope is that at least walking out of here tonight, whatever the outcome is, that there can be some resolve for everyone here because I wish you could all have been here for the one -- the hearing after yours the last time because they loved each other, and they spoke very positively about how wonderful it was because this house had been dilapidated and it had been restored, and they were very happy. And there was two on the same street, and the neighbor in the middle, actually there was one house in between them, and they were supportive of it, and the whole thing was just very warm, and they made it work. And I've got to believe that that can be done in all of our neighborhoods, so I just hope that we can work together to accomplish that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. Probably if you have read Dear Abby, you know that an awful lot of complaints that people write in about are about neighbors, dog poop, kids, cars being too loud, all kinds of things, what should I do, Dear Abby? And there's a lot of sort of powerless feeling that we can't do anything about it. We have to write to Dear Abby. Well -- and, you know, what can she do? But the other thing is that you've also experienced that powerlessness with the group homes. Now you seem to be pretty supportive of the group homes and the people that they serve, but nobody asked you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please don't speak out. Thank you.

MS. PLACER: In this case -- in this case, we sent out cards and there's a hearing and the whole thing. It all does come down to communication and getting over the feeling of -- I know, I'm a shy person. If somebody is driving too fast on my street, and I know that they are parking down the block, am I going to go down and knock on the door and say, you know, you were driving too fast, and I was trying to walk. You scared me to death. But that might be the kind of communication that we're looking for. It also

seemed like this one group of people, these construction people -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Stanton. But these -- these construction people, they came in with their vehicles, they were purportedly throwing trash around, you know, whatever -- whatever they were up to, staying there a long time, sort of having their time off be fun at the house, and the owners were not aware of that. And again, you know, would I go and say -- knock on their door and say, hey, you guys have got to tone it down. You've got to move your trucks, and you've got to get your act together and pick up the trash. You know, I would have to have a lot of nerve to do that. Now once we have these STR regulations, yeah, it does seem like a weaselly way out of it. I could call. I can call the City and say there's a bunch of people down the street, or I could call the owners. Once we have these regulations in place, it does provide other avenues, but I'm hoping that we aren't going to be so powerless that we can't work something out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: In work session, we commented that not every house is suitable for use as an STR. And I would say that, at our last meeting, there -- we had a tie vote because there were some feelings that not every neighborhood is suitable for an STR. And there has been some new information on this case including some additional comments both for and against, but one thing that strikes me more in this go-around is, well, it's not as much about the concerns with how it's been run, though it has been run as an STR for two years, unlike the case that came forward that hadn't been run yet. So the neighborhood has had a chance and they were aware that it was an STR, so they have -- they've had a chance to get used to the idea. What my sense is is that the neighborhood is saturated, and my aunt lives in a neighborhood that has a group home, and those tenants are there for years. They're there a long time, but we know when we're walking by the group home because, as has been said, it's not just family visiting, but it's the attendants, and it has a different use profile than the residential homes next door to it. It's great that they're in a residential setting, but it does have an impact on the community. So understanding that there's already two group homes in this neighborhood, I feel like this -- it may not be appropriate to add another commercial use, so I will not be supporting this request.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comment? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe, that was a compelling argument. And -- it was. Now I would tend to agree with you, and still might, because that was a very good argument. I just have a problem with the lack of a win-win. It's like everybody is hunkered down and I'm going -- and when I feel like someone is up against a wall, I'm going for the -- I'm going for the underdog because I feel like everybody is hunkered down and they're putting their

stakes in, and saying this man can't do this, and he can. I tend to go with the underdog because everybody is against them. Now the reason why I would, and I still -- I'm going to pray on it while up here. The reason why I would support it, because I want to see if this owner is going to shoot himself or herself in the foot, because you have had adequate information. And if you -- if you have done nothing that you said you did, and you're not watching your property like you said you are, and they get the -- I'm going to be the -- I'm going to be in front of them to make sure that license gets snatched. If you do not stand on your word, and I say this every time these come in front of us, that you guys are the pioneers, this is your second time coming up here, and if your stuff isn't like Taj Mahal, and you don't have those construction workers under control, and you're not there looking at your property on a satellite, every night, looking down on them from a satellite, and your property is subpar, and these people come in with complaints, yeah. Bounce you out of there and take your license and don't come back. I want to -- I want to -- I want you to show me, because I'm from Missouri. Show me that you're going to do, or show me that you're not, and your neighbors are definitely going to show me if you are or not. Now I hope, if I do support, that the neighbors are not vindictive and saying, oh, you got this license, so now we're going to be on a mission to make sure you lose it. I hope that doesn't happen, because that's kind of the environment that we've set up, you know, the pros and the cons, and see how this falls -- I hope it doesn't go that way, but as an owner, if I was you, I'd be well aware that that's -- I'm surrounded by people that don't support what I want to do. It's up to you to make it -- make a business decision from there. This might not be -- a short-term rental might not be what you need to do, but a moderate to long-term would be. And if you've got a construction company and have rented it for a month, or a year, that will -- that will fit the requirements of the neighborhood that they would, hey, I'd rather have a short term that I can get out -- up out of there faster, but that would be a business decision that you would make. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? I would -- I'll just take moment. I wasn't here when this came through the first time, and I can imagine that a lot of the comments we heard tonight are echoes of what we heard the first time. And our job as Planning and Zoning Commissioners is to make a recommendation to City Council based not on emotion or feeling or, you know, ideals, but on what does the ordinance say, what can we back up with a rational understanding of the facts on the ground, and applying the law in a way that is equal and fair to everyone. We've denied a couple of short-term rentals. Both times, it has been because we were looking at owners that were not being good neighbors. We were looking at complaints out of the neighborhood that were related to

that owner and their operation of the property as a short-term rental. There have also been times when we've had neighbors come in and we have approved it because the neighbor's complaints were not related to that owner's behavior or to the operation of that property as a short-term rental. They were based on emotion and fear of the unknown, fear of strangers. I think this is a marginal case that's somewhere between those two. The complaints that we have heard are very real complaints. They are related to these owners, and their operation of their property. They are not related to their operation of their property as a short-term rental as we define it. They are related to their property as a mid-term or long-term rental, which they can do with the long-term rental certificate. There is nothing that says you have to have an unfurnished, you know, property, with a year-long lease. Our long-term rental ordinances allow people to rent for 31 days or more, and it can be a fully furnished property. It sounds like the incident that caused such a disruption in this neighborhood falls into that category. But it also sounds like these owners were not in a position to know that their neighbors were upset, which means they didn't have good communication, which means their neighbors didn't know how to get ahold of them, which means they weren't going by every week while it was under this rental for a mid-term. And I find that a little bit concerning only because the neighbors did have such a problem with it. They talked about it clearly to each other. They all showed up twice. I have a feeling they'll show up again when this gets to City Council. To me, that says that there was a pretty significant disruption, and whether or not Neighborhood Services and the police were called, I don't know. I think we would know for sure if an official complaint had been made. But the owners were not responsive to any of that uproar. And if it did, in fact, go on for four or five weeks where the neighbors were constantly having problems with these guests, and the owners were nowhere to be found and no one knew how to contact them, that's concerning. At the same time, if I were renting a house and my landlord stopped by every week just to make sure I wasn't bothering anyone, I would find that concerning. So it -- I'm really in -- in a conundrum up here because there are real concerns, and I don't want to dismiss those as being fear of the unknown or being fear of, you know, strangers in the neighborhood. We're always going to have strangers in our neighborhood. That's just the nature of a neighborhood. You may think you know everyone, you don't. But I -- I do think that something real happened here, and these particular owners were not responsive. So I'm - I'm really torn about what to do, and I want to make sure we give clear guidance to City Council about what we think about this case. So I -- I don't know. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: It seems like this was one major group and one incident

collectively.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: If she's got the top tier of hosts, then she's had to have had successful rentals. I think that this one group just blew their average out of the water. They got an F on the report card and everything else was A, rather a C or B-; you know what I mean. I think this is -- and it's all coming to that one group. So really hope the owners are really listening and I hope that -- I pray to God that they're just taking notes, because if they're not, then it's just going to be all bad for them. I pray for them now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: The last time this came up, I did not support it. This time, I do intend on supporting it. I feel like the information that we got this evening, that linked the construction crew to the one -- the one stay, I think helps me understand this better, because last time, we didn't hear much from the property owners. We heard way more -- there was way more people here, too. We heard a lot more from others in the neighborhood in opposition, but I think now, having more information and having a more thorough staff report -- and another contributing reason why I voted against it last time is that it was mis-advertised, but now given all the information, I do plan on supporting it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other comments? I'm going to give Commissioner Loe a chance if you want to make a comment. No? Okay. In that case, would anyone like to make a motion? For the benefit of those listening, we make all motions in the affirmative. Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I'd like to make a motion. Regarding Case Number 134-2025, an STR conditional use permit at 1617 Highridge Circle, I would vote -- move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: No less than one parking space with any attached one car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes, a maximum of 210 nights rental, a maximum of four transient guests, regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Walters, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walters. Voting No: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Loe, Mr. Brodsky. Motion ties 4-4.

MR. WILLIAMS: That is four yeses and four nos. And so, Commissioner, I will let you tell us what happens.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Our rules technically say that a tied vote is no recommendation, however, it will be communicated to City Council as a denial; is that still correct?

MR. CRAIG: Yes, that's correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes. And that means that it will not go on the consent agenda, and there will be a full hearing in front of City Council.

MR. ZENNER: That is correct. And if I am correct, Mr. Craig, it has a two-thirds majority vote?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Two-thirds majority vote?

MR. CRAIG: That -- whether it requires a -- I'd have to consult with -- with the ordinance, whether it would require a simple majority or a super majority. On a plat, denial does. I don't know, off the top of my head, without consulting the UDC, if that would be a simple majority or a super majority.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. But either way, it will have a full hearing in front of City Council.

MR. CRAIG: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: So this does require -- for those in the public and those that are listening, the ordinance approval process is two reading procedure. This case will be introduced, and at that time, the bill number and title will be read only. There will be no public input. At the second reading of this particular case, there will be public -- it will be scheduled as old business, and therefore, a public hearing will occur automatically. That public hearing will be scheduled for -- the second reading will be July 7th. That meeting begins at 7:00 p.m. I do not know where the item will be placed on the Council's agenda -- 7:00 p.m. in this Council chamber on July 7th.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Is there any other comment to be made in this case from Staff? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Oh. I just wanted to ask if the neighborhood will be notified again when it's going to be heard.

MR. ZENNER: We do not do -- we do not do notifications post Planning Commission action. That is not a procedure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Seeing nothing else in this case, we move on to our final case for the evening.

Regarding Case Number 134-2025, an STR conditional use permit at 1617 Highridge Circle, I would vote -- move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following: No less than one parking space with any attached one car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes, a maximum of 210 nights rental, a maximum of four transient guests, regardless of allowance permitted by IPMC.

Yes: 4 - Placier, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

No: 4 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones and Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Wilson

Case # 168-2025

A request by Richard & Tamela Wyatt (agent), on behalf of The Wyatt Family Trust (owner), to allow 534 West Southampton Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 4 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The subject site is zoned R-2 (Two-family Dwelling), contains 0.28-acres, and is the west half of the existing duplex dwelling located on the corner of West Southampton Drive and Pear Tree Circuit address as 534 West Southampton Drive.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit to allow 534 West Southampton Drive to be operated as an STR subject to:

1. The maximum occupancy permitted within the dwelling shall not exceed four transient guests, regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Management Code (IPMC);
2. The garage be made available while in short-term rental use;
3. A minimum of 210 nights of annual usage.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with a party to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? Seeing none. Very good. We will go to public comments.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. We will go to public comment. If you are a member of the public who came to speak on this case, please come forward. State your name and address for the record.

MS. WYATT: Good evening. My name is Tamela Wyatt, and I live at 8653 South Route N. And my husband and I have owned rental property in Cedar Lake for over 35 years. We love our property. We take pride in it, and we have great tenants surrounding the area, and a lot of support from my neighbors that were very grateful to stand behind me. I have very strict rules on -- out online, no parties, no smoking, quiet hours after 10:00 p.m., and no guests exceeding four. I do have disclosed that I have camera at the front door, so I keep watch on that when people do check in to make sure there's not

more than four people checking in. I have loved having the short-term rental, having had long-term rentals for so long is a long time to keep property going, and my husband recently -- actually six years ago, had a brain tumor. And he's still with me, but his short-term memory is not well, so I've taken over the property. And when I did that, I had to flip five properties within a year and a half. Gratefully, my husband and I worked together with our kids, so I knew what to do, what needed to be done, and in doing that, needed to take some of pressure off myself from long-term tenants destroying the property even with good references and still have people that tear up property. And by having the short-term rentals, it allowed me to take a breath and take care of my husband. So with the one, I'm enjoying it -- all the other ones that were short-term are now long-term, and I have leases on those. Thank you for your time.

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

MS. PLACIER: Just a really brief comment. Whenever we see public correspondence attached to a case, we think, whoa, what is that going to be, you know. Somebody hates this thing. You had the letter with all those signatures. It just made me smile. It's a good sign.

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

MS. LOE: This was probably in the report, but I don't remember. How many nights have you been renting per year?

MS. WYATT: Not -- not over 210, so it's very small. And I'm fine -- I've been fine with that because I just like to rent to people who are really needing a place that's a home to stay --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MS. WYATT: -- so I don't mind not having all the nights filled. I think I -- last year may have been 80. I can't remember.

MR. HALLIGAN: Yeah. Eighty is what we discussed.

MS. WYATT: Yes.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you. That's good to know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here. Next member of the public to speak on this case? Anyone? Seeing none. Okay. Then we will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

MS. LOE: This application appears to have full neighboring property support.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Indeed it does, Commissioner Loe. Any other Commissioner

comments? Seeing -- Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion, if you will allow, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please do. Please do.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 168-2025, 534 West Southampton Drive, SRT conditional use permit, I move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following, Madam Chair: A maximum of 210 nights annually, garage be made available while the STR is in use, as well as a maximum of four transient guests, regardless of permitted by the IPMC.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Mr.

Walters, Mr. Brodsky. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Eight yeses, zero nos. The motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

As it relates to Case 168-2025, 534 West Southampton Drive, SRT conditional use permit, move to approve the requested STR CUP subject to the following, Madam Chair: A maximum of 210 nights annually, garage be made available while the STR is in use, as well as a maximum of four transient guests, regardless of permitted by the IPMC.

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Williams, Walters, Ortiz and Brodsky

Excused: 1 - Wilson

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone from the public who would like to make a comment of a general nature? Seeing none. We will go to -- yeah. Thank you. I know he can hear me, I just don't think he's paying attention to me.

MR. STANTON: No. I don't think so. I was out there the last time and I couldn't hear anything.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, really?

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. I don't think -- they don't have the speakers on.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh. Normally they can hear us out in the lobby. I guess not, so we have sent a staffer to go and fetch Mr. Zenner for staff comment.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Zenner, I could take over for you if you are still busy.

MR. ZENNER: No. You -- you should know better, Mr. Stanton. I just love this time of the meeting.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: I apologize for having to step out. I made a wrong statement with our case 134, as it related to when the public hearing actually would be held. It will be held on June 16th, not July -- the first Monday in July. As a result of that error, we will most likely be redistributing notification, which we are not required to do to ensure that there is an adequate amount of transparency and knowledge made to the applicants that have spoken this evening, and we will address that as our time permits. So for this evening, your next meeting is on May 22nd, two weeks from now. You will all be very happy, you'll only be here for 45 minutes. We have only one case on the agenda. Well, you all may think you're getting a reprieve, and for those that are cycling off at the end of the month of May, they get to leave, like a lamb, even though it is a single short-term rental request, but this is the only request we have on the agenda. But I will forewarn you that the first meeting in June will have ten times this number, so we will be back up to a ten-item agenda. Now I will say this much, for those of you that will still be around, they are not all short-term rentals. We are getting a pretty good collection of different types of cases, so we'll be doing some things a little bit different, but our short-term rentals are obviously taking up a tremendous amount of our time at this point. As much as this map is small, hopefully you in TV land and our Commissioners can see this. This is at 209 Alexander. This is a single-family R-2 home that is -- actually it's a two-family home that is being sought to be partially used as a short-term rental, so this project will be presented at our May 22nd meeting, and it is the only project that will be presented at that meeting. And we didn't sanitize the rest of the cases, so we're just going to zip through those. We do have a work session. It was a long week because you all probably got your agendas at about 12:30 a.m. on Saturday, and then I provided you your work session agenda about 8:30 or 9:00 on Sunday. We have a lot of work that we are working on, and, quite honestly, these amendments that we have been talking about as it relates to short-term rental, we'll hopefully be able to reduce a little bit of the workload for both bodies, for my staff, myself, and this Commission and counsel. As we talked in work session this evening, we will prepare the amendments that we discussed tonight as a viewing document, and schedule roughly half of our work session time on May 22nd for that purpose, to go over those changes. As indicated, we will prepare for advertising those amendments for June 6th. Our June 6th meeting, of course, the opportunity exists to vote as Commissioners see fit. This ordinance does need to go to City Council for its approval, and the comments of the Commission will be included in that staff report to

Council. So as I have done with all items that we have taken from the Planning Commissioner as it relates to public hearing matters, your comments are summarized, the verbatim transcript goes with those. And as it relates often with text changes, the description and the discussion of the Commission discussion is a part of the ordinance or a part of that item is normally elongated. And so, again, I respect the opinions of our Commissioners and want to make sure Council understands what they are by not having to read the minutes. And then, of course, we do summarize the public comments. I believe the other half of our agenda for the May 22nd meeting will be Mr. Teddy's follow-up as it relates to the definition of family and some of the discussion we had now two to three work sessions ago as it relates to that item. As many of you were aware, Mr. Teddy is retiring from the City of Columbia. His last day with the City will be July 7th, so we are hopefully going to be able to work with him at least through the end of June in order to be able to produce the framework associated with the definition of family. I am -- he and I have discussed the project that he will hopefully be handling from beginning to completion. But after July, we don't know what will end up happening at this point, but Mr. Teddy will be retiring that Monday. So with that in mind, that is all I have. Again, long meeting this evening. Thank you for your attention and your contributions during work session, and we will see you on the 22nd.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any final Commissioner comments for this evening? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I was going to move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: That's what I was going to do, Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: I'll take your second.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - May 22, 2025 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: Okay. Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion. I would like to move to adjourn.

MS. LOE: I'll second.

MS GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Adjournment moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Loe. With that objection --

MS. PLACIER: Aren't we going to have comments on that?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would you like to have a comment on that?

MS. PLACIER: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. For the record, Commissioner Placier objected and kept us here for 30 seconds too long. We are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

Move to adjourn.