



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 23, 2025

7:00 PM

REGULAR MEETING

Columbia City Hall

Council Chambers

701 E Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good evening. I will now call to order the January 23rd, 2025 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MR. STANTON: Yes. There's a new secretary in town this evening. Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Here.

MR. STANTON: Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. STANTON: Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MR. STANTON: I'm here. Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Williams? Ms. Loe.

MS. LOE: Here.

MR. STANTON: Wilson? Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. Here.

MR. STANTON: We have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. We have a quorum, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

Present: 7 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier, Robert Walters, McKenzie Ortiz and David Brodsky

Excused: 2 - Shannon Wilson and Thomas Williams

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. LOE: Move to approve the agenda.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Loe; seconded by Commission Stanton. Are there -- thumbs up approval on the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. Unanimous. Thank you.

Move to approve the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

January 9, 2025 Regular Meeting

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the minutes from our last regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Are there any changes or adjustments to the minutes? Seeing none. Is there a motion?

MS. LOE: Move to approve the minutes.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Loe; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Can I get a thumbs up approval on the minutes?

(Five votes for approval; two abstentions.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous with two abstentions from Commissioners Ortiz and Brodsky. Thank you. Wonderful.

Move to approve the minutes.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 68-25

A request by Courtney Pulley (Owner) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 5406 Gemstone Way to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 8 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 0.22-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (Single-family Dwelling), is located south of the intersection of Gemstone Way and Agate Way, and is addressed 5406 Gemstone Way. **(A request to table this matter to the February 6, 2025, Planning Commission meeting has been received).**

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

MR. ZENNER: Yes, Madam Chair. As you've indicated, a request has been received to table this matter to February 6th. The applicant was unavailable to be in attendance here this evening, and given our last short-term rental application request with a non-applicant here, we advised the applicant to request this tabling to be able to appear at your February 6th meeting, which he has indicated he will be here for. We have

nothing else to state as it relates to this matter, and it is just a thumbs-up vote to accept the date certain, February 6, 2025, for the hearing to be moved forward to.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Are there any questions for staff about the tabling request? Seeing none. Is there a motion to approve the tabling request?

MR. STANTON: I move that we table Case 68-25 to a date certain of February 6, 2025's Planning and Zoning meeting.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Tabling moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Can I get a thumbs-up approval on the tabling motion?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Thank you.

Move that we table Case 68-25 to a date certain of February 6, 2025's Planning and Zoning meeting.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 198-24

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of BC Investments of Columbia LLC (owner), for approval of a design adjustment from Sec. 29-5.1(g) of the UDC in regards to required dedication of utility easements. A concurrent 22-lot final plat to be known as "Tuscany Ridge, Plat No. 4" is associated with this request. Planning and Zoning Commission action is limited to the requested design adjustment as the proposed final plat is substantially compliant with the previously approved preliminary plat for Tuscany Ridge. Pursuant to Sec. 29-5.2 of the UDC, a recommendation of approval on the submitted final plat shall be withheld unless the requested design adjustment is recommended for approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and approved by City Council. The 5.78-acre subject site (Tuscany Ridge, Plat No. 4) is located along in the southwest corner of the overall Tuscany Ridge subdivision and is commonly addressed as 5217 Brown Station Road.

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 design adjustment from Section 29-5.1(g), specifically subsections (4) and (5), with regard to required dedication of the standard 16-foot utility easement on western frontage of Venetian Parkway.

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? Seeing none. Very good. We'll go to public hearing. Members of the public, please come forward. State

your name and address for the record. Three minutes for individuals, six minutes for applicants and groups.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. As Mr. Palmer indicated, this preliminary plat was approved in 2006, and at that time and still to this day, CATSO has Venetian Parkway shown on their CATSO plan, which is major collector that runs north and south. And so, typically, what you see when you go through this property, you would see that that roadway would be split between two property owners on either side. Obviously, at that time, the County owned the fairgrounds, and they weren't really interested in granting additional right-of-way for that road. So what was decided was we would put it on the property line. We put it all on my client's property, put the road, put the right-of-way, everything on that side, and then they would grant the ten-foot utility easement. Pretty simple, pretty standard. And the reason for that is if we move the road over ten feet, now -- and I think staff mentioned that in their -- in their staff report a little bit, there's a grudge strip. There's a ten-foot strip that the Boone County at the time wouldn't have access to Venetian Parkway, and given -- again, it is a major collector, which is to serve that whole area. It's not to serve my development, it's not a road that would be in there for just this specific property, but for that entire area, including all of the fairgrounds. And so talked to the Commission at that time, they were fine with granting an easement. Well, as we all know, at a much later date, the City of Columbia purchased the fairgrounds from Boone County. And the issue here is I don't think that the City is necessarily against granting an easement, it's the fact that the City can't grant an easement. They can't grant an easement to themselves. And so that's the issue that's at hand tonight is that, you know, they can't grant an easement, and I don't think anybody wants to move the road over and have that grudge strip. And so that's the reason why we're before you tonight. So if there's any questions that you have, I'm happy to try to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else from the public to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public hearing and go to Commissioner comments. .

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton, go ahead.

MR. STANTON: Even though I love seeing Crockett sweat, there's no reason to, this

is pretty technical, straightforward, so, Madam Chair, if there's no other questions from my colleagues, I would entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If you will give me just a minute, Commissioner. Legal counsel has something.

MR. CRAIG: Sure. I just wanted to clarify what's going on with this. Legal has had their hands on this plat for a moment -- for a while. And the corrective easements to correct the erroneously filed grant of utility easement on the City property I don't believe has been filed yet, but that got cleared by legal, I can't remember if it was Friday or Tuesday, and I don't know if it's been recorded yet, but that has been fixed, so I would agree with Mr. Crockett's assessment of the situation, so I just wanted to clarify that and give the Commission all the information they needed to move forward.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Can I move forward on that recommendation?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. I just wasn't sure what --

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 198-2024, I move to approve the design adjustment from Section 29-5.1, subsection (g) 4 and 5 regarding easement dedication on west side of Venetian Parkway.

MS. PLACIER: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Placier. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Stanton, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

MR. STANTON: Yes.

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

MR. STANTON: Unanimous, Madam Chair.

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

Move to approve the design adjustment from Section 29-5.1, subsection (g) 4 and 5 regarding easement dedication on west side of Venetian Parkway.

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

Excused: 2 - Wilson and Williams

Case # 62-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of TLI Real Estate Holdings (owners), for approval of revised PD Plan and Statement of Intent (SOI) to the 2024 approved Fresh Karma PD Plan. The revision proposes to subdivide and add one lot to the existing PD Plan and make corresponding revisions to the "site-specific" SOI. The revised PD Plan will be known as Fresh Karma PD Plan. The approximately 2.00-acre subject site is located northeast of the intersection of Highway 63 and Stadium Boulevard, and includes the address 1407 Cinnamon Hill.

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 requested PD Plan revisions to "Fresh Karma PD Plan" and the revised Statement of Intent, subject to technical correction of the PD Plan and Statement of Intent to address signage related matters.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. 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 had a quick question in relation to Dr. Puri's e-mail.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. BRODSKY: If -- if folks did want to subdivide any of these other lots in this planned development, one, they would have to come to us to do that, and, two, would they -- you know, this subdivision doesn't involve any increase in density or use, they're just kind of splitting that square footage up. Would that be the case -- also the case if anyone else were to come forward wanting to subdivide lots, would they be held to that same kind of floor square footage?

MR. ORENDORFF: It would depend on what they're proposing, you know. As you mentioned in this case, because it is a pretty cut and dry subdivision, the structures all staying the same, it's triggering this Planning and Zoning Commission action which would be the case in any other situation because they are all planned developments. So every single subdivision would be subject to public hearing.

MR. BRODSKY: I guess my -- maybe a better question would be, if -- if these other lots were to come in and subdivide the way that Dr. Puri seems to be concerned about, that wouldn't necessarily -- that wouldn't trigger an increase in density? It would still be the same amount of square footage allowed?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Brodsky, the approved Statement of Intent for all of Cross Creek has allocated specific square footage limitations to each of the development parcels. So

Dr. Puri's concerns as it relates to this parcel at question is not relevant because there is no square footage increase being asked for. Most of the projects that are out here already have either built to the maximum allowable square footage that they were allocated, and any additional allocation pursuant to private covenants of leftover square footage needs to be agreed to upon all of the property owners within Cross Creek. We have done one amendment to increase the total amount of square footage allowed, and it was with this particular tract when it was proposed as a hotel, because had it been allowed to have been developed using the available square footage left, it would have rendered three of the undeveloped tracts completely unavailable for development. So that is not what is happening with this request, and any project that would come forward because of its PD designation, as Mr. Orendorff has indicated, would require a public hearing and it would require a very thorough investigation of what available square footage is even left in those planned districts. So there are protections here that Dr. Puri's interests are for -- would be addressed. The mere subdivision of a piece of property does nothing to increase density in the grander scheme of this commercial development. It is an ownership-related issue as to wanting to have separate ownership of square footage that was already allocated to the lot. Residential densities, on the other hand, if it was a residential project, again, may not have even been changed. But again, this is a commercial project and the infrastructures supportive of what is being proposed. We would evaluate any additional commercial project the same way.

MR. BRODSKY: That's what I thought, just wanted to make sure I had a correct understanding of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you. Following up on Commissioner Brodsky's question, the other concern raised by Dr. Puri appears to be creating smaller lots. And per the report, the proposed lots meet UDC requirements. And my belief is that should Cross Creek limit lot size, that would be included in their Statement of Intent. Correct?

MR. ZENNER: That would be correct. And to my recollection in administering this particular planned district since I have been here, there is no such limitation. The limitations are associated with the square footages that were allocated to the project, originally, about 480,000 total square feet over roughly the ten or so lots that were originally proposed. There was no prohibition against subdividing any of those original ten lots. And to be quite honest, Lot 108A is a subdivision of what was originally proposed as Lot 108. So this is a -- this is a fairly normal practice of further subdividing down for ownership interest purposes only.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further questions for staff? Seeing none. We open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. State your name and address for the record, We allow for three minutes for individuals, six minutes for groups or the applicant.

MR. MURPHY: Madam Chair and Commissioners, my name is Kevin Murphy; I'm with A Civil Group, offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I think staff has laid this out pretty simply. It's the exact same plan that was brought forth most recently. The only difference is we're showing a lot line to be able to sell the northern lot and building and parking either to another entity of the current owner, or another entity all together. There is no change, as far as Mr. -- or Dr. Puri's comments, no change in the density or more traffic or anything like that, again, just as staff laid out. So just pretty simple, just putting a property line in between all of this. Any questions, I'll be happy to answer.

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

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, folks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to come forward about this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues don't have any further questions, I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. STANTON; As it relates to Case 62-2025, 1407 Cinnamon Hill PD Plan revision, I move to approve the proposed PD Plan and associated SOI revisions.

MS. LOE: Second.

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

MR. STANTON: All right.

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

MR. STANTON: Unanimous.

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

Move to approve the proposed PD Plan and associated SOI revisions.

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

Excused: 2 - Wilson and Williams

Case # 64-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Garry & Brenda Lewis (owners), seeking to rezone 3.73-acres of a 5.38-acre parcel, from M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) to R-MF (Multi-Family Dwelling). The subject site is located at 4804 John Garry Drive.

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 request to rezone 3.73 acres from M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) to R-MF (Multi-Family Dwelling), pursuant to minor technical corrections.

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 Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And this is probably just a little bit born from my own unfamiliarity with the new zoning code, but what's really gained by down-zoning, because they could do multi-family in M-N; am I correct about that?

MR. PALMER: It's -- I mean, the simple answer a lot of times is that it's a tax benefit. If you have a commercial lot, you're being taxed at a different rate than if it's a residential use. I don't know if that's their reason. That's pure speculation, just, you know, that's usually what it is, but --

MR. BRODSKY: It looks like Pat has some info.

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. A little bit of the back history on this. Before Mr. Palmer was assigned the case, along with the admin plat, the applicant contacted our offices based on a building permit related issue. So split zoning -- a split-zoned parcel has got to be looked at in its parts. And so the multi-family construction that is being proposed on this property is about 18 inches greater in height than is allowed in the M-N zoning district, which maxes out at 35 feet. And so the admin plat is to align the property line so the side-yard setback meets the increased side yard to get to the 45 feet allowed in the R-MF zoning district, and the only way you can get the 45 feet is is you have to rezone

the 3.73 acres to R-MF, and then comply with the required enhanced side yard. And that is how they are then being able to move forward with the current construction plans that they have for the multi-family, which is similar to the multi-family that Mr. Lewis has developed elsewhere within this area. And so that's really the underpinning issue. Tax -- tax implications or not, which is probably a correct statement, as well, you may be taxed a little bit less if you're a residential versus the commercial, but that is the skinny of why this is really the impetus behind this. They were trying to resolve the zoning -- the multiple zoning classifications. And this is why we don't recommend split-zoned parcels, because you have to look at them in the parts as they exist.

MR. BRODSKY: Perfect. Thank you for that background.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll open the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward. Mr. Murphy, you know the drill.

MR. MURPHY: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Kevin Murphy again, 3401 -- with A Civil Group -- 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I think Mr. Zenner's staff has cleared up the situation at least somewhat if not, but, yes. And this gives me a chance to say why -- or to blame it on the architect. Engineers love to do that, so this is what we get to do. Yes, we do. We had a split zoning and the buildings fell into that split-zoning area and so this is kind of why we're going that foot and a half. It seems like it was pointed out to the architect with 35 foot, but anyways, that's where we're at. And, again, it fits in with the -- the development, the neighborhood, the adjoining parcel, and that whole center block is owned by the same owners and developers, and we currently have construction plans in review which brought this up and that's where we're at. So -- so what we see is what we're going to get, and if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

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

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward. Seeing none. We will close public hearing and go to Commissioner comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

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

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues don't have any further questions, I would like to

entertain a motion, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 64-2024 [sic], I move to approve the request to rezone 3.73 acres from M-N to R-MF pursuant to minor technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Stanton, when you're ready.

MR. STANTON: Staff, can you just leave that slide up just a little bit longer so I can write it down, but just leave it there for a second. Okay.

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

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

Brodsky. Motion carries 7-0.

MR. STANTON: It's unanimous, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. That recommendation will be forwarded to City council.

Move to approve the request to rezone 3.73 acres from M-N to R-MF pursuant to minor technical corrections.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will now go to public comments. Are there any general comments from the public this evening? Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Now, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: So I will talk slowly so Mr. Stanton can write. Your next meeting will be February 6th. We have a work session and a regularly scheduled meeting. We will have a number of items on that agenda. We'll have four total items on the agenda for the February 6th meeting. Our tabled short-term rental application will be one of those items, so if I can, I will move forward. And you have potentially the subdivision action for 20 -- for 1516 Wilson Avenue. This is a preliminary plat. Technically, this would have been a replat of property. It's basically shifting of property line, however, there needs to be a public utility extension, and therefore, it does need to come back before the Planning and Zoning Commission as a result of that, and then would be processed as a final plat after the approval of the construction plans for that public utility. You have two other requests in addition to the short-term rental that was tabled tonight. You have Arcadia Plat 9. This is another design adjustment, separate design adjustment that has been identified

as a part of a replat of lots of record, and is necessary to be handled as a public hearing, but the final plat or the replat which would divide the property is not part of the Commission's discussion or consideration since it is consistent with the approved preliminary and it's replatting property that exists that has public infrastructure. The design adjustment specifically is relating to our minimum lot furnished standards for newly created lots, which specify that you need to have a minimum of a 300 lot frontage in order to have individual access, so Mr. Palmer will unpack those details at the February 6th meeting, and go over a little bit of what the preliminary or the final plat will look like if approved, if the design adjustment were approved by both the Commission and City Council. Again, your 68-25, which 5406 Gemstone, that is the STR request that was tabled for this evening. Mr. Halligan will be delivering the staff report on that. And then 70-25 is a permanent zoning request at 5961 South Highway KK. This is a parcel that is basically on the southwest corner almost of the Thornbrook Subdivision. It is along this portion of KK which is to the west of the elementary school, the only property that is presently outside of the City's corporate limits. It is an island. The property surrounding this subject parcel was actually the subject of a platting action a couple of years ago. And so the property has been acquired by heirs, and they are desiring to have the parcel brought -- this particular property connected to public sewer, and therefore, they are required to go through the annexation permit zoning process. So we know where we're talking about, our Wilson Avenue project, and Mr. Palmer would be presenting that if the applicant is ready to move that forward. I think we may still be waiting on revisions. Our Arcadia Plat 9 property, the fish hook which we had done some rezoning with a while back, the IG and the MC were the changes there. That used to be planned district zoned property, and the design adjustment focuses primarily along the Roger I. Wilson Boulevard frontage. And then, of course, we have our Gemstone property, and my apologies for the tabling map not matching the map that you see here. As Mr. Stanton was reading Case Number 48, that was the prior case that that slide went with, so this is the right map. This is the location. This is up off of Geyser Boulevard just west, of course, of Lake of the Woods. This is the portion of the city that's, in essence, surrounded by the county. And then finally the last project that will be on the agenda for the permanent zoning, that's our 5961 South Route KK. And everything to the north, as you can tell, that is -- that's the Thornbrook development, and the parcels that immediately surround this, the larger acreage tracts were the ones that were part of the subject platting action, and if I recall correctly, that was in 2020-2019. The subject parcel that is actually being sought for permanent zoning and annexation has been determined to be a legal lot, so no platting of that property would be needed. It is improved with an

existing single-family home. And with that, that is all we have to offer for this evening. We will have more discussion at the work session on our small lot integration project, and we will continue to move forward with that trying to keep in tune with the calendar and schedule that we had provided in our memo from this evening's work session. And at the request of Mr. Brodsky, you all will receive a copy of the working draft of the use specific standards that we have been discussing. Thank you very much for your time and your attention, as well as your comments.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Mr. Zenner.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments for the evening?
Commissioner Stanton?

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - February 6, 2025 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: If there are no other comments from my colleagues, I'd entertain a motion to adjourn, Madam Chair.

MS. LOE: I would second that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Adjournment moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Without objection, we stand adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

Motion to adjourn