

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MARCH 6, 2025

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones
Mr. Thomas Williams
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Ms. Peggy Placier
Ms. McKenzie Ortiz
Mr. Robert Walters
Ms. Shannon Wilson
Mr. David Brodsky

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. Kirtis Orendorff
Mr. David Kunz
Mr. Ross Halligan
Mr. Earl Kraus

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good evening. I will now call the March 6, 2025 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, you may. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: 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: Commissioner Williams? Here. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: That's all nine. We have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

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. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to approve?

MR. STANTON: Move to approve the agenda.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Mr. Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Loe.

Thumbs up approval on the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the February 20th, 2025 regular meeting minutes. Is there any changes or adjustments to the minutes? Seeing none. Is there a motion to approve?

MR. STANTON: Move to approve the minutes.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there a thumbs-up approval on the minutes?

(Seven votes for approval; two abstentions.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous with two Commissioners abstaining, Commissioner Walters and Commissioner Geuea Jones. Thank you.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Our first order of business of this evening is a tabling request on Case Number 84-2025.

Case Number 84-2025

A request by Justin Lucas, on behalf of Family First Rental & Investments, LLC (owner), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 3411 Goldenwood Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of eight transient guests, and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.21-acre subject site is located 150 feet east of the intersection of Arbor Point Parkway and

Goldenwood Drive and includes the address 3411 Goldenwood Drive. (A request to table this matter to the April 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting has been submitted.)

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

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, ma'am. This was a publicly advertised hearing, so if there are any present that would like to speak in regards to the tabling request, we would typically allow that. The applicant is requesting a tabling. They are -- they were not able to be present this evening. Given the volume that is on our March 20th agenda, we had requested that they table to the April 10th agenda before we knew what our volume for the April 10th agenda would be. So it is at its maximum tabling length with the first tabling request pursuant to internal procedure. We only will allow a tabling for two months from its initial hearing date. So this is the max before we will have to send -- before we would have to formally readvertise. We have sent out notification postcards prior to this evening's meal -- meeting, indicating that the item was being requested for tabling, and we'll send out new public notification prior to the April 10th meeting, allowing all interested parties to be aware that the hearing will be occurring on the April 10th agenda. With that, we support the request given that the applicant was not able to be present, and if you have any questions, more than happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff about the tabling request? Seeing none. This is just a tabling request. We are not making any decisions about the merits of the case tonight, but if anyone was here to speak on this case and would like to come forward, please do so now.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing none. We will close opportunity for public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner's comments on the tabling request?
Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: If there are no comments, I'll make a motion to table -- I move to table Case 84-2025 to April 10th, 2025 date certain.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to table to date certain April 10th, 2025 was made by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. May we please have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine yeses and zero nos.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That matter will be tabled to the April 10th, 2025 meeting. The next case is also a tabling motion.

Case Number 90-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Bucky C, LLC (owner), for approval of a design adjustment seeking relief from the provisions of Section 29-5.1(f)(1)(iv)(D) of the UDC relating to the required minimum lot frontage along collector and arterial streets such that individual driveway access may be permitted and approval of a one-lot final plat of M-C (Mixed Use - Corridor) zoned property to be known as "Oscar Plat 1". The approximately 0.55-acre subject site is located at the northwest corner of Vandiver Drive and Rangeline Street, and includes the address 1901 Rangeline Street. (A request to table this matter to the April 10, 2025 Planning Commission meeting has been submitted.)

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

MR. ZENNER: Yes, you may, ma'am. Similar to the prior request, this was an advertised public hearing for the design adjustment as required by the UDC, so if there are any members of the public here, they may be offered an opportunity to speak to the tabling. The purpose for the tabling request is that additional discussion with MoDOT, who is the responsible party for the -- one of the primary driveway access points to this site off of Rangeline Street is still needing to be coordinated with by the applicant. Vandiver Drive is a City maintained roadway, and any potential additional discussion with our City's traffic engineer in regards to that driveway approach could also be facilitated during this delay. Again, this is the maximum delay that would be permitted prior to having to readvertise; however, property owners were notified in advance of the requested tabling and will be renotified prior to the April 10th meeting. If you have any questions, I'm more than happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff? Seeing none. Once again, we will not be deciding on the merits of this case tonight, but if anyone would like to come forward and comment on the tabling motion, we will give you an opportunity to do so now.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing none. We will close opportunity for public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: If there are no comments, in Case 90-2025, I move to table the case to April 10th, 2025, date certain.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. 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. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's nine to zero.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That case will be tabled to April 10th, 2025. Moving right

along.

VI. SUBDIVISION REQUESTS

Case Number 91-2025

A request by McClure Engineering (agent), on behalf of COR Development, LLC (owner), for approval of a four-lot preliminary plat of M-C (Mixed Use - Corridor) zoned property to be known as "Crown Center Plaza Preliminary Plat". The approximately 14-acre subject site is located at the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and State Farm Parkway, and includes the address 1110 Nifong Boulevard.

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 preliminary plat of "Crown Center Plaza Subdivision", subject to technical corrections regarding the dedication of utility easements along the northern edge of the subject site.

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. Any questions for staff? Seeing -- oh, Commissioner Williams, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: For the traffic piece on the State Farm Parkway going south, is it going to -- is the road going to have to be expanded then to the west? I was just looking at a map of how it lays now. Is that -- I was just curious if there is enough room. As it's going south right now, it's one lane, I believe.

MR. ORENDORFF: Yeah. So the -- the plan is illustrated there is they would shift the lane to the west. Now the right-of-way that's -- that I mentioned that was way wider than it needed to be just for the pavement, they're still well within that right-of-way corridor, if you will. So, yes, it would be expanded as far as the pavement is concerned, but it would still be within their -- their right-of-way dedication.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other 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 now. Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comments.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments? Seeing none. Anyone want to make a motion? Go ahead, Commissioner Loe.

MS. LOE: Thank you. In the case of 91-2025, move to approve the Crown Center Plaza preliminary plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Do we --

MS. LOE: Do we need to include subject to -- no? All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a motion for approval made by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. 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. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine yeses and zero nos.

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

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND SUBDIVISION REQUESTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have two cases that are connected to the same property, but we will hear them separately.

Case Number 86-2025

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Adam Kopriva (owner), for approval to permanently rezone 5.05 acres of property from County R-S (Single Family Residential) to the City R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling) upon annexation into the City. Concurrent with this application is a proposed preliminary plat (Case Number 87-2025) that seeks to divide the acreage into a 32-lot "cottage" development, subject to Board of Adjustment approval allowing the use of R-2 "optional dimensional standards." Assignment of permanent zoning and annexation are required in advance of any Board of Adjustment action and approval of the concurrent preliminary plat. The subject site is located about 200 feet northeast of the intersection of Mule Deer Drive and North Wyatt Lane, and includes the address 4100 N. Wyatt Lane.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Our action here will be just on the zoning. 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 request to permanently zone the subject 5.05-acre site in the R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling) subject to annexation into the City.

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? Seeing none. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: We -- thank you -- we do allow for six minutes for the applicant and groups, three minutes for individuals. Please state your name and address for the record, and, Jay, you're going to have to -- yeah -- move that up. Speak directly into the microphone so that our folks listening at home can hear us.

MR. GEBHARDT: All right. Thank you, Sharon. My name is Jay Gebhardt; I'm an owner of A Civil Group. I'm here tonight representing Adam Kopriva, and just for full disclosure, Adam is an employee of A Civil Group. He's one of my surveyors. So -- I provided one PowerPoint presentation that

kind of combines the plat and the rezoning together, so I'm going to go through that now because I think a lot of questions are going to come up about the preliminary plat even though I know this is about the rezoning to R-2. So, you know, as David has done and typically does, he's done a really good job of detailing all the information around this, but there are sufficient resources for this zoning at this location. There is existing sewer capacity. There's water capacity. It's on a collector street. We have to comply with all City regulations for stormwater, so there's been a lot of concerns from neighbors about things like that, and we've tried to address them as best we can. This slide just kind of gives you the location of it, but I also included a slide from 2002 that showed Adam's house there before any development occurred there. This is a copy of the preliminary plat. It shows the 31 cottage lots, and that large inside that loop is the common area lot for the detention. So some questions have come up about, you know, how -- how -- what size are these houses, what kind of houses would they be. Are they going to be rentals? Are they going to be for sale? And a lot of people were not believing that you could get a 1,200 square foot house on this lot. So this -- this is an example. It's not representative of necessarily of what exactly is going to be built, but I just threw this together, and with two examples, one with a two-car garage, and one with a one-car garage with an additional space, and I think David is going to detail that out in the preliminary plat for you, but I'm just showing how -- how that all works on the lot. This is an example of one that was approved, a cottage development was approved on Northridge. It's built. Those homes are -- have been sold, and this is another one that's -- has not been built off of Old Plank Road, but it is surrounded by existing R-1. And then this one is up off Oakland and is currently not built, but I think the preliminary plat has been approved, and the cottage standards have been approved for it. These are examples from Zillow of homes that are in these existing cottage standards lots, and kind of the price point for them, so I'm trying to illustrate here that, you know, these -- these are normal looking houses, they're not, you know, anything necessarily different. There's some more. There's a two-story example with a one-car garage. And that's really all I have as far as the zoning. If you guys have questions about that, I can get back up during the -- for the preliminary plat, but I really just want to try to answer any questions you might have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Are there any questions for this speaker?
Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And this isn't necessarily germane to the zoning itself, but just curious. Is the -- the current owner, is he intending to develop all of these lots himself? Is he going to sell some of the lots off?

MR. GEBHARDT: No. We're going to get through the entitlement phase of this to get the right to do the -- that, and then his intention is to market it to builders or -- then to complete the subdivision. But to get to the point where all those approvals have been done, you know, his day job is land surveying, he's not a developer.

MR. BRODSKY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? No. Thank you very much. Next speaker, please

come forward. Next speaker on this case? If you wanted to come now, you could. You're okay. We're nice. State your name and address for the record to get started.

MR. CROW: My name is Emery Crow; I live at 4215 North White Lane in the trailers, and, you know, being just north of this area, and we knew the original owner of that property. We liked it where it was pretty quiet. And as, you know, a family living there, you know, the reason why we moved outside the city limits to get as far away as possible, but things keep getting closer and closer. Well, with -- we feel having 32 of these small homes there, and that it -- that road, even though we say it's a major thing there, it's small. People slip slide all around constantly in that, and it's not very wide, and to add that much traffic and everything in that area would be extremely dangerous. And then there's -- you know, we're worried about our kids and everybody else's children there, too. So -- and my next part will be on 87-2025.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. One moment, please. Any questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So I'm assuming you don't like this current development?

MR. CROW: No. No, I do not.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Put yourself in the owner's shoes. What would you like? What would you do if it was you, and it was your land, and you were addressing someone like you, what would be a good compromise?

MR. CROW: Yeah. I think about -- so if I'm already out there and I -- and I'm buying an area where it's supposed to be outside the city limits, it's a little quieter and everything else, and it's a nice plot of land. That's what I would have bought it for. And I'm not a developer or anything like that, so if somebody bought it just for the simple reason of making money, that's not me.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions?

MS. ORTIZ: I -- I do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry. Please, sir. Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: How many manufactured homes are there in your, like, area there?

MR. CROW: In my area? I don't know exactly.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, sir. Next speaker on this case, please come forward. Thank you. Please state your name and address for the record and then --

MS. FERGUSON: My name is Denise Ferguson; I live at 5401 Axis Court.

MS. ORTIZ: You're going to have to move your microphone down.

MS. FERGUSON: Oh, I'm so sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner.

MS. FERGUSON: Did you hear that? Okay. Can you hear me now?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good.

MS. FERGUSON: The property that we are talking about is actually directly behind my home. My husband and I bought our home eight years ago. At that time, Mr. Brown had a farm back there, and as the other gentleman said, it's a very quiet neighborhood. We love our neighbors. We all get along very well and we would like to see the zoning not as it is being requested. We would rather see something like our own and incorporate it into our own Deer Ridge if that's at all possible. My husband and I oppose having 32-unit cottages on a five-acre piece of land because of the density. As the other gentleman mentioned, it is a narrow road, but he did not mention this. There are dump trucks and flatbed trucks that haul dirt and cars to the salvage yard beyond every day, particularly in the summer, two and three times a day, and they speed through there. So I think that the safety issue may be something that the Commission might want to look at. Barbed wire fence is around the whole perimeter. Again, it was a farm. The old guy that used to own it, he was a farmer. We understood that eight years ago when we bought our home. We were fine with Yuri having his barbed wire fence up there. It's rusted out, it's old, it's dingy. Children shouldn't be near it. I should know, I'm a teacher. We should be having at least the owner of that fence take that fence out. I haven't had any answer that said that that was going to happen, but it honestly should. Again, our yard, we back up to it. It's a narrow back yard, that 16-foot easement, yeah, that would pretty well infringe into us because when we bought it, we bought it on purpose to have a small yard. We're retired. We don't need that much yard. We have a lot of native plants out there. I plant it constantly. I invite anybody to come out and take a look, it's beautiful. I'll even give you a cup of coffee. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much, ma'am. Next speaker, please come forward. Going once. There we go.

MR. AREY: Hi. I'm Bennett Arey; I live at 5655 South Cordevale Court. I'm in real estate in town, and new construction and rentals, and in the real estate world, we're always looking for more affordable houses. I mean, that's what -- that's like a buzz word right now with everyone in town in real estate. And so as far as, like, affordable houses go, I think Jay showed some examples of what they would be priced at. Those are a very similar situation of what would go up there. It's more just getting to -- we're a growing city. I mean, there's no way around that, and I think this is a perfect opportunity to create more listings of houses that are at that \$250 prime kind of price point to, you know, help the growing town just grow and give opportunities to families as a turnkey kind of possibility, so -- and I think as far as, like -- I think there is maybe some worries about low income. I mean, the houses that are \$250,000, that's at least a \$2,000 rental. So, I mean, these are small families, single families or, you know, retired people that would be moving into this place. And I'm excited for it being in real estate, as an opportunity to have more opportunities for my buyers to buy actual affordable housing in town, so that's all I've got.

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

MR. STANTON: The word "affordable house" is a trigger for me because I don't think that's really the intention. Logic, love it. Are these really -- are you involved in this, or are you just a neighborhood and you're just kind of voicing your opinion?

MR. AREY: I'm interested in helping the development, yes.

MR. STANTON: That's all I have. Just --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. STANTON: -- be careful with that affordable housing word.

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

MR. TALLMAGE: Hello. My name is Allen Tallmage; and I live on Elder Drive, which is west of that property. I am concerned about the density of the lots, the homes that are going to put there. Cottages, I don't know the dimensions of the lots. I've heard that they were only 40-foot wide. A 40-foot-wide lot is not nearly big enough to create a living space for either -- a small growing family. I have concerns about the possibility that it may become a problem for the other residents who actually live out there. I've been there for 30 years. I like it. I have eight acres there. It's very quiet. I don't have any problem with anyone, and I can only see this becoming a problem for me and for the other residents that are there in that area who want to maintain that -- the distance from their neighbors. So questions for me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Thinking in consideration in your position, if you owned that land and someone was approaching you exactly like you're approaching us, what would be a win-win situation? Due to the fact I have a right to my land, I have a right to do what I want to do on my land. What alternative would you offer that would make you make it a win-win for both your position and the right to develop my land?

MR. TALLMAGE: I -- I -- yeah. My problem -- I have six and a half acres at the -- off of Elder Drive, and then I have six lots. I don't want to develop it, and I really think that this -- this development is going a little bit too far providing such a dense area for 32 families. I don't think there's anything out there that's like that anywhere. The lots are all decent sized. To make them 40 foot by 100 foot is -- my house sits on 100 foot by 100 foot, and even that is small. So -- and cottages really concern me. To me, that's not -- that's not really a -- I think that's a substandard living area or that it would become a substandard living area because they are so small.

MR. STANTON: Just for the record --

MR. TALLMAGE: Uh-huh?

MR. STANTON: -- I live in a 918 square foot house, three bedroom, one bath, for generations.

MR. TALLMAGE: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: I don't think it was substandard.

MR. TALLMAGE: How big is your lot?

MR. STANTON: I don't know, but my house is 918 square feet.

MR. TALLMAGE: Right. Okay.

MR. STANTON: Living space.

MR. TALLMAGE: But how close are your neighbors?

MR. STANTON: Probably about as close as this development is. I live in the central city. I live two blocks away from here.

MR. TALLMAGE: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: That's smack in the middle of town, so -- I'm -- this is why I -- you know, said that --

MR. TALLMAGE: That's -- and that's -- and that's where you choose to live, and I understand that. But the people that live in this area aren't -- don't really -- I don't know of anyone who is interested in allowing this development to go on.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? I have a quick -- of course, you -- you said you live on an eight-acre lot?

MR. TALLMAGE: I have -- I have six lots. They're 100 foot by 100 foot, and then I have 6.5 acres that are on the south side of the lots.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you -- you don't live in some of the built houses around here?

MR. TALLMAGE: No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Okay.

MR. TALLMAGE: My home is the only home on Elder Drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak? Thank you, sir, very much for coming tonight. Appreciate you. Anyone else, please come forward.

MR. MELVIN: Hello. My name is Billy Melvin; and I live right across the street from Adam. I knew why Adam bought it, and I don't blame him for subdividing it. It's just I don't want to see a whole bunch of rentals where they rent it to Section 8, and then downsize the price of my land. And all the kids that will be there coming on my land. I've lived there for 40 years, and not once been broke into. But, like I say, I just don't want it to become a big hassle for me, and I don't know if there's any way that they can't make it where they make it Section 8. I mean, I don't care how many he puts in, but it's going to cause problems. I just don't want the problems to be mine.

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

MR. WILLIAMS: I probably should have asked Mr. Gebhardt this question, but since you have lived across the street for 40 years, I'll ask you, if you don't mind.

MR. MELVIN: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Gebhardt showed a slide, you may have been in here and seen it, about what the property looked like when the house was built, and I'm gathering that the current owner is rather new to the property; is that correct?

MR. MELVIN: The current owner?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes.

MR. MELVIN: Lives across the street from me.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. And he's new to the property? He just bought it recently?

MR. MELVIN: Yeah. He just bought it I don't know how long ago when Gary died.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to get clarity on how long he had lived there, and I figured you would know since you've lived there for 40 years, that --

MR. MELVIN: Yeah. Yeah. So -- but that's -- that's what -- I just don't want it to bring down having, you know, you've got 31 lots times some of them could have four kids, and I'm 71. I'm done with all the little kids.

MR. WILLIAMS: So I want to be delicate about this, and I -- I know these concerns come up. I -- I -- and I appreciate your -- your being direct with us, and I will say that I personally can't speak to Section 8 and how something becomes Section 8 or what have you. but it is difficult to predict the -- when a lot like this is -- the property is developed, is difficult to predict, you know, what the price point is going to be of the houses and what the mix of individuals living there is going to be, and I'm reluctant to go any further than that in discussing it, but I just would say that it's difficult and I don't think we can assume, as a Commission that just because a certain density is built, that it's necessarily going to result in particular problems that might be concerning as -- as possible outcomes for people living around the area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's very delicate, Commissioner Williams. Commissioner Wilson? Okay. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: A Civil Group gave a presentation, and they showed basically some of the models that are considered cottage. And like the previous speaker, and I told them to be careful with the word affordable, these are not going to be that. They're under the \$250 -- maybe \$250,000 price point.

MR. MELVIN: Right.

MR. STANTON: I didn't hear rental, I heard sold. There is a big market for cottage for people of above 50. I don't want to call them elderly, but where they don't want a lot of yard.

MR. MELVIN: Right.

MR. STANTON: They just need just a certain amount of space to live. There's a very big market for that. These are not of size to raise a big family. Just the term cottage doesn't afford that size that someone raising a family would buy a cottage home if they had a bunch of kids. So I think the price points that they're looking for will probably be comparable if not superior to some of the houses that are surrounding -- in the surrounding area. I understand your concern with density. I think you have a lot of implicit biases that we could probably hash out with the -- with the developers due to the fact that you're neighbors. I think some of those questions you could ask the owner and the developer, the engineer, and I bet he could answer a lot of those biases for you.

MR. MELVIN: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: I think you would get a better answer and a better feel of realistically how -- what's going to go on out there.

MR. MELVIN: Well, I've been in the construction field. I kind of know what's going on. I just didn't figure he'd do that much. I figured maybe one lot on the south side of his house and maybe four or five on these over here, not 31. That's what I thought.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. MELVIN: And then the houses would be -- I don't know what she give for hers, probably \$400,000, \$450,000, but, you know.

MR. STANTON: You don't have a problem with a half-million-dollar house, you just have a problem with the \$250,000 house?

MR. MELVIN: No. See, now you're making me sound like I'm having something against the rich people. I don't.

MR. STANTON: I'm just asking.

MR. MELVIN: I'm just -- we moved out there because we liked the school for my three kids, and I can do what I want. We have, me and my neighbor to the south of me, we have big 4th of July out there every year. I'm just -- I'm just stating that's what I thought this meeting was for, for me to state what, you know --

MR. STANTON: It is.

MR. MELVIN: -- instead of me being made out like I want rich people out there, I don't want rich people out there.

MR. STANTON: You just don't like the density.

MR. MELVIN: But I don't want -- if the \$250,000 is what everybody can afford, and somebody comes in and buys six lots, and then he starts renting them, I mean, you know, that's -- I'm going to be upset if it turns out the way I think it's going to turn out.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sir, I -- excuse me. Sorry. I have a question for you.

MR. MELVIN: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you -- you lived there before Cottonwood got built. Correct? There were no houses out there when you first moved out?

MR. MELVIN: Yeah. The only house out there was my neighbor to the south of me, and there was a little house across from me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So when all of the houses that you see on the screen behind me, when those all started getting annexed into the City and built, did you have concerns then?

MR. MELVIN: No. Because I had Gary there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You had a buffer?

MR. MELVIN: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I see.

MR. MELVIN: All this land here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I guess I'm just curious as to -- and maybe I'm just not getting it, but I'm curious as to why you think that these homes are going to be desirable to -- in a way that's different than the other homes. It's the same area. It's, you know --

MR. MELVIN: Well, okay. Like I say, I've been asked this question, so I have seen it --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- I don't understand where you're -- uh-huh.

MR. MELVIN: -- and I wanted to speak it, so I'm not going to set up a fight.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm not trying to fight with you. I'm just trying to understand what it is that is making you think this going to be different.

MR. MELVIN: Because I've seen it happen. Like I say, 31 houses in that little land is a lot of houses.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. So it's the density?

MR. MELVIN: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. Next person to speak? We usually only allow people to come up once, sir. I'm sorry. Anyone else to speak on this case?

MR. NEALE: My name is Kyle Neale; I live at 4301 Cottonwood Drive, which is directly to the east of this development, so it would literally be in my backyard. I don't -- I don't have -- I get why it's being developed. You know, it's his land, he can do what he wants with it. I -- I guess, like the others, I just have a problem with the number of homes. Thirty-two does seem like an awful lot for a five-acre lot, but I just question, you know, three years ago, we received a postcard that said they were only going to develop it into one-acre lots, five one-acre lots. I'd just like to know what happened to that plan, why did it suddenly turn into 32 cottage style homes or whatever they're proposing. I also would like to bring up that even if --if this is approved and everything and then all 32 are developed, I would like to point out that Wyatt Lane is, like the others have said, it's a -- it's a narrow road, it's not a -- it's a county road, so -- but, also, there are no sidewalks on that road, and the closest bus stop in that area would be at the corner of -- or at the round-about there at Ballenger and Mexico Gravel. So if there are people that, you know, if like Mr. Stanton had said, be careful with the word affordable housing. If these are considered affordable housing or whatever, these people may not also have means to a vehicle or anything, so they're going to have a long walk for public transit and things like that -- or public transportation. It's just a concern, you know, I have for them. But, yeah, again -- one other issue I have is just like others have stated, it's along my property line and it's just -- they're going to be very close. The back of the houses are essentially going to be, you know, 50 feet from my back porch or less. So again, that's just my problem and none of your all's problem, but those are -- those are the issues that I have wanted to bring up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So I don't usually jump in line, but I'm going to here. Can you explain to me why you think that this is -- these homes are likely to be inhabited by people who need public transportation and don't have vehicles?

MR. NEALE: There -- I mean, I know there are some other people in our -- in my current neighborhood that they do utilize public transportation and things, so -- but they -- they generally use Ubers or things like that, so -- but, yeah. It's just -- it's just a concern, you know. It's, like, maybe -- I don't know who is going to move in there. I don't know what a person's situation is, but if they need to -- access to public transportation, it's going to be quite a walk. And like I said, Wyatt Lane is -- there's -- there's no sidewalks along that road or anything, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you know people that live in your neighborhood now that don't have access to their own vehicle and --

MR. NEALE: Yes. They're -- they're mostly elderly people that either they don't have access to a vehicle, or they're just -- they can't drive.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And -- okay. I'm just confused as to why you think -- what it is about this piece of property that --

MR. NEALE: It's mostly -- I mean, I'm not -- like I said, it's any neighborhood. It's just a concern that I thought should be brought up.

MS. GEUEA JONES: There's no sidewalk, yeah.

MR. NEALE: Yeah. It's just a concern I thought it should be brought up. It's, like, it's -- it's going to be quite a walk for someone if they don't have a vehicle to -- to get access to public transportation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Thank you, and thank you to those who made previous comments. I only want to make this comment. Columbia is a very interesting city. When I first moved here, I was married to Sam Robinson; he worked for Ped-Net, and so walkability in this city is huge. It's one of the main things that we strive for and drive toward, so a lot of times people are walking because they want to walk, not because they can't afford a vehicle. I think there's an assumption that I want us to avoid, making that assumption with what's going on with this zoning request. And so I think we should just stick with focusing on the zoning request. Although I do, I appreciate your notes.

MR. NEALE: Yeah. And I kind of thought of that after the fact, after I started talking, that maybe my concerns may be for the next case, not particularly this one, but --

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

MS. PLACIER: Oh, just to clarify, when Commissioner Stanton was talking about affordability, he was suggesting that was mis-applied to this -- these are quarter-million-dollar homes, and probably not for old --

MR. NEALE: Yeah. I was -- I'm not -- I'm not saying that these homes are affordable or not affordable.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I -- yeah. Okay. I guess it's a point of information. Am I allowed to make a comment or should it be --

MS. GEUEA JONES: We usually save them till Commissioner comments, unless they're specifically about something that this speaker said.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Okay. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: And I wish I had asked this of all the neighbors that have spoken, but I'll ask this of you. If this rezoning proposal was for R-1, is that something that you would be in support of? Just

trying to gauge, you know, where -- where is the density that those folks are comfortable with?

MR. NEALE: Like I said, I mean, yeah. We received this three years ago where it said they were going to do that to make it R-1 with five one-acre plots, and I'm not opposed to that. I think it's just the density thing. It's just -- right now, I look out my back door and it's a pasture with a barn. And now I'm going to have to -- and possibly, if this goes through, I'll have to look out at 32 houses, so I mean, I get it. It's not -- if that's what you guys decide, that's what I have to live with, so --

MR. BRODSKY: And, you know, without going through a full-blown staff analysis, R-1, we might get 18 houses on this lot without the cottage style standards.

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

MR. DINGWELL: Hello. My name is Riley Dingwell; I live at 4250 North Wyatt Lane. I do live in a double-wide on the backside. Right now, they're saying that they've checked and evaluated the water, and I guess the sewer systems. As of now, I think a lot of us out that way all have water issues during daytime runnage, sometimes our water will drop off -- it's a six-inch water main, so it don't get a lot to everybody out there, especially during the day use. The sewer system, as far as I know, is from a pumping station that goes all the way back to -- and I could be wrong -- back to the end of Leisure Drive that pumps to a lagoon. So to add, like, I guess 32 more units pumping to that lagoon, I'm wondering kind of what they're going to do with all that because that's owned by the City, also. And our water. And these guys that are talking about the road, it is right. The road is dangerous. You've got these concrete trucks or the dump trucks running back and forth up through there. The salvage yard is back there. He runs up and through there like crazy. There is nowhere for kids to walk, so if you have a bunch of kids out there, I mean, we do have some -- a few in the trailer court there, they have to be good enough for the buses to pick them up there, but when he said something about the R-1, I guess 18 is better than 31. And I just -- a \$250,000 home, when they built the other one back there by Spike and stuff, I think it's Spike Drive there, people weren't very happy about having to build back and buy them houses. When they bought them, I don't think they really realized what they were buying next to when they bought next to a trailer court. So, I mean, a \$250,000 home, if it was me buying it, there is no way I'd buy that home, not with the stuff that's on the far side of it. I wouldn't want to live in a \$250,000 home, so what I see is somebody getting stuck with a bunch of homes and having to rent them.

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

MR. DINGWELL: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Just a quick show of hands, how many more people are there to speak on this case that haven't spoken yet? Anyone else who is planning to come up after this speaker? Okay. Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Commissioners. Kevin Murphy with A Civil Group, office is at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I want to address some of the questions that were asked possibly

first.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Could you step a little bit closer to that mic?

MR. MURPHY: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: One of the former speakers had inquired about the barbed wire around the property. This was a rural property where barbed wire is allowed in the county on rural properties for livestock and whatnot. And when it comes into the City, barbed wire is not allowed in the City, so the barbed wire will come down. As far as Ms. Ortiz' question about the mobile home park to the north or 18 lots in there, roughly two point-three to two-point-five acres, that's a density of seven-and-a-half to seven-point-eight units per acre versus what we're proposing is roughly six-point-three units per acre. I would like to go to the picture -- wait. Wait. We don't have to show it, but anyway, it's 25 years ago where a lot of these folks had lived in -- in Deer Ridge and I don't know if there's other folks in Maryland Heights or Gold Star Farms or whatnot. Twenty-five years ago, these were all two, five-acre, ten-acre plus lots out here, and now they're enjoying their environment where it's much more dense than what was out there then. The -- the cost of land, the cost of building, the cost of everything is requiring smaller lots. I know Mr. Stanton doesn't like the word affordable. I don't know who can put a number on affordable, but if anybody is thinking sub \$200,000 for a single-family home, that's unattainable. What I would like to call what we're trying to do here is attainable housing. Again, if these were R-1 lots, they -- similar to what's in Deer Ridge right now, those -- those lots are going to -- those houses are going -- similar size houses, fifteen hundred, six feet -- square feet, are \$350,000 to \$390,000. So, again, this is more attainable. What we're trying to do is what the City wants to do, what the County wants to do, what the State wants to do, that the Nation wants to do is to provide more -- more affordable housing. The City worked very hard on these standards and we're utilizing in this. And as far as just a few years ago being four or five one-acre lots, once again, just the cost of development makes that unattainable in this area to be able to sell a one-acre lot and -- and build a house on it and to get your money back just doesn't work. As far as rental properties, I checked on the City's customer service website, in Deer Ridge alone, there's 16 rental homes, rental licenses. I'm jumping around here trying to read my scribbling as I was going on here, but we have a known price point here. You had asked about that, Commissioner Williams. Again, that goes back to what -- what we can provide here versus if we did bigger lots, what they're costing now. But these aren't going to affect property values in the adjoining neighborhoods, and again, the last speaker -- one last thing. One of the last speakers had spoken about the City sewer. This is not going to the lagoon that feeds the mobile home park. This is connecting the City sewer which has been determined by City utilities as more than enough capacity to serve this. As far as the water is concerned, again, I think the low-pressure issue is the water line within the private mobile home park and not the public line that we will be tying into, as far as that, so there's a neck down that feeds that as that mobile home park is 40, 50 years old, and doesn't quite meet today's standards. But that's all I have. If anybody had any questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm not a real estate agent, but --

MR. MURPHY: Neither am I.

MR. STANTON: -- if I was determining the property value, don't I take a comp of surrounding properties?

MR. MURPHY: Similar properties.

MR. STANTON: So if this is developed and I'm building \$300,000 homes, that is part of the calculation of my property if I live around this area. So I'm not a real estate agent, but I'm thinking a property value would probably go up; right -- in theory?

MR. MURPHY: As far as I know of it, that is part of the computation in that, but the other thing is comparable properties, so they would look at comparable house sizes, comparable lot sizes, and things of that nature. But they do look at the overall picture of the area, as well, and you're right.

MR. STANTON: But once --

MR. MURPHY: Once again, this comes up many, many times, and I -- I know of no development that has ever brought property values down in this town as everybody says that's going to happen, that's going to happen. I wish somebody would really dig into that, and if I had the time, I would do it, but nobody is paying me to do that, and I've got my own bills to pay. But I guarantee that in my experience, that has never happened in this town.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Gebhardt had said that the process here was to do the -- you go through the approvals and then -- and then sell the lots to a developer. And so although I understand what the comps were that were shown on the screen, there's no way for you to provide any certainty of what's going to go on these plots. Correct?

MR. MURPHY: First of all, Adam -- Adam is taking a big risk and spending a lot of money to take the legwork out. There are a lot of developers that don't want to go through this hassle. They don't -- you know, he's taking all that risk, and if he can hand them something -- construction plans, the approval for this, it's a golden ticket. He's handing a golden ticket to somebody and these -- these are being currently being built around town, and these are the prices they're getting, and I don't see anything getting any less expensive. I'm sorry. I want to talk about tariffs and the cost of lumber and the cost of cement and everything from other countries, it's --it's -- we're lucky if it's not going to get worse.

MR. WILLIAMS: I guess my point is that --

MR. MURPHY: But housing is needed, needed, needed.

MR. WILLIAMS: I understand. My point is just that you could hand someone a plot full of lots, but you could build a \$500,000 home with all of the best accoutrements on that lot, or you could build a bare bones house on that lot, which costs something less, and I won't speculate what that would be, and

all I'm saying is that it's difficult, as it's been to me before by developers when I've asked what's going to go here if we zone it this way, and I get told I can't tell you what it's going to be because it could change. And so I just want to say the only thing we can be certain of is, if we approve the R-2 and then we approve the plot, we can be certain that there is going to be certain lot sizes on this piece of land. We can't say what is going to go there and how well it's going to sell. And so I say that both to you and to others, again, these could be \$500,000 premium small houses that people buy because they want to live outside of the city. They could be much lower cost that attract a different buyer. They could be built and not sell, and they can become a bunch of rental properties, and there is no way for any of us to know what that is. And so I just am saying that broadly to everyone is that we can't assume what that outcome is going to be, and we can't, with any certainty -- just like we can't certainly say these are all going to be houses that attract, that are, you know, \$150,000 if you can build that -- I don't know. But we can't say that they won't be this other thing either. And so I'm just -- the question was really designed to try to elicit that point, and I apologize, maybe I should have said it more directly, but there is no certainty about what this is going to be, and that applies both to the position of the person -- of the petitioner, and it applies to those who are sitting here and being concerned. And so that's my comment.

MR. MURPHY: Commissioner Williams, if I may interject on that. I can guarantee that there will be no house that can in any possible way go in on this for less than \$250,000. That is just a fact of life that it is not. And I can also guarantee there is no house that's going to be \$500,000 that's going to be built on -- on these type of lots. I can guarantee you that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Any other --

MR. MURPHY: But anyone can guarantee that. You may ask Mr. Arey, the realtor, that deals with -- yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions, Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Just to clarify a point that I must have missed earlier regarding the sidewalk question that someone brought up. Now looking at this plat, if I can read it properly, it looks like there's 585 feet of frontage on Wyatt?

MR. MURPHY: Correct.

MR. WALTERS: Now with this -- and then all this, the City requires sidewalks. But does sidewalk go -- be deferred until that Wyatt was improved, or would the sidewalks go in as the lots are built?

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll probably get to that in the next case.

MR. WALTERS: In the next part. Okay. All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Murphy. Unless there is somebody else? No? Thank you very much.

MR. MURPHY: Thanks, folks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next person. I think we have one more to come up.

MR. CHERRINGTON: Hello. Dave Cherrington; I'm also with A Civil Group. I knew the plans for all of this, but aside from the work aspect of it, just looking around in here, I'm one of, if not the

youngest person in here, and I am looking to own a home here in the foreseeable future, hopefully. But, you know, like Kevin said, with everything, it just -- everything just keeps going up, and it's harder and harder to buy. I don't want to live in the middle of the city. I don't want to -- you know, I don't want to spend \$1 million because I can't -- I can't afford that. But with some of the houses that we showed that were around the \$250,000 mark, that's kind of where my mark is, and we talked a lot about how, you know, the 50-year-old and up, you know, like this would speak to them, but it would also speak to people of my age where, you know, I'm done with school, but I'm also a functioning member of society where I'm trying to get a start on life and, you know, I don't necessarily need a huge yard yet, and I can't afford a huge yard yet, but this is a type of development that I think that we're really lacking here in town, but also speaks to a lot of people who may not necessarily come to these meetings hardly ever, so --

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

MS. ORTIZ: I don't know about --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ms. Ortiz, go ahead.

MS. ORTIZ: I don't know about youngest, but --

MR. CHERRINGTON: One of.

MS. ORTIZ: Just kidding. Sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anybody else? Thank you very much for being here tonight. Last call. Anyone else who wants to speak on this case. Seeing none, we'll close public comment on the zoning question.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Again, as a reminder for my fellow Commissioners, this is zoning. We'll talk about the actual layout and platting in the next case. Any Commissioner comments? Commission Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Oh. No.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. Sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry. I thought you had said you had a comment earlier.

MS. ORTIZ: Oh, I did. I did have a comment. I just appreciated the comment about public transit. I love to hear that come up in conversations about housing. I think that's important. But, like my fellow Commissioners have said, this might be construed as affordable, but attainable might be a better word because I think the folks that are looking at moving to this area are not the folks that are relying on public transportation due to their income. If anything, it would be more hobby or like Commissioner Wilson said, out of like sport or recreation. I appreciated that that was brought up, though, in this conversation. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'm going to give you a HUD form of what affordable is. Affordable is 30 percent of your income on your housing expenses. It doesn't matter income, 30 percent of that makes --

is what you're afford -- what you can afford. So whatever these houses are, affordability depends on 30 percent of your income. That's the definition of affordable. It's a scale. It doesn't mean Section 8, doesn't mean rich, doesn't mean poor. It means 30 percent of your income is what you should be spending on your living expenses. Anything -- a lot of us live above 30 percent. That's called house cost burden, but 30 percent of your income is affordable to you. That's the definition of affordable housing.

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

MR. BRODSKY: Just want to express my support for this rezoning to R-2. There is a fair amount of R-2 zoning to the south and southwest of this property along Ballenger primarily, so I don't see this as a single-family home exclusive area. But this has been informative for me as a Commissioner, as we are going through these cottage development standards that we want to, you know, I think encourage these types of developments, and maybe we need to give some more thought to not only making these developments -- I don't want to say easier for the developers, but that, you know, they don't have to go through this multi-step process and it's more of an administrative function. But we probably need to give some -- some thought to how we make these more palatable to existing neighbors because there seems to be quite a bit of conflict around that. And I will note, being a little cheeky here, but one thing I have not heard anyone say is that more variety of housing types would make this more palatable for folks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Ms. Loe had --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: That comment may come up when we talk about the plan versus the zoning, so let's see.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MS. LOE: A couple comments. First, I appreciated the comment on sidewalks because I thought of that when I was reviewing R-2 zoning for this, because you're bringing more residents to a neighborhood, and one of the things I think about naturally regardless of income level is how they're connected to the rest of the community. And I agree that Wyatt Lane is challenging for pedestrians and finding your way to public transportation. So for me that was actually a mark in the negative column for putting a higher density project on this -- at this location. That said, this project is zoned R-S in County, and R-S does allow a 7,000 lot for single family, so this could be rezoned, or it could be platted without rezoning. It also -- R-S in the county with a conditional use permit, allows for two-family dwellings. So you could potentially achieve a comparable density in the County with a conditional use. So I understand we're on the border, and we have County coming up against City, but I -- I do think there is some comparability, and this plat has not been developed to the ability it is currently zoned to, and this request is asking to go one step further, which I don't feel is a reach beyond where it is now. So I do think I support the zoning.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton, and then Commissioner Williams.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Gebhardt has been the pioneer on several projects concerning cottage

developments. We talk about it here. We talk about density. I'm sorry he has to go through this, but he's got to be the pioneer and take the shots, the first shots until we -- you know, till this becomes more common. But this is what urban planners, City planners are looking to do. We have to -- the cost and all that stuff are causing developers and I, too, pour commercial concrete all day, every day. Don't let the sweater fool you. So there's got to be a point where we walk the walk and talk the talk, and this is where we are. I feel that if you put this anywhere, it was going to be a problem because it's new, it's provocative, it's all of that, that's why we're talking about it in work session now. This is new to us in America, and Europe and everywhere else in the world, they do this all the time. This is new to us here. And I plan to support it just for the fact that he gave it a shot, and, you know, we'll have to see if he -- what I heard from the presentations, that these will be sold. If he makes me a liar, then the next time Mr. Gebhardt comes up here with a cottage, I'm going to say heck, no, because you didn't -- you didn't pioneer this and make this what you said. And I will look him in his eye and I will hold him accountable for everything I give him the grace to try to develop, and if he lies to me, then he won't have my vote the next time he comes up here with a cottage development. That's part of being a pioneer. This is where the world is -- we have to -- we have to be more dense. Yes, I understand it's on the edge of the county. I get it. I understand that the neighbors -- and that's the reason why I say watch that word affordable housing. It just creates a whole other conversation that wasn't even necessary in this -- in this discussion, because affordability is a formula, and I just told you that formula, and it really -- it really boils down to how much I can build for X amount of price point and that's just the reality of where we're at. So good luck, Mr. Gebhardt, and keep taking these bullets, and maybe this will pass, maybe it won't. I don't know. But we need to keep walking the walk and talking the talk.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I think that -- I'm planning to support it, and the plot, to me, is -- I understand we have to discuss that, but, as I understand it, with the R-2, you could build the same amount of houses, you just change the layout so -- and the density issue is really being decided here. It's just a matter of whether you put the walls together or whether you keep them separated and put grass in between is really the second question. So, you know, I agree this is -- this is the vision that we've set out is to create the opportunity for more people to own homes and -- or to just live in homes in the city. And so I understand and I empathize and in some way regret always that -- that it creates friction and discomfort for existing property owners. I completely understand, especially those who -- who look out on this property why they would not want something other than what is here or something that's less dense. I think everyone enjoys looking out towards nature. So it's certainly not without a degree of appreciation and empathy for -- for those who live nearby. But again, there is no way of us looking at this and saying this is going to be a problem. All we know is that there is going to be a certain number of houses, yet I can't say in good conscience that that number of houses is going to create problems. So I intend to vote to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. I also intend to support this. I think that given the zoning of property surrounding, especially the fact that there is manufactured homes just north that there are people here from that community that live in a dense community already, I think that really sells it for me that it's working how it is now in that area, given the density, and they don't think it would be inappropriate to have a higher density area there, as well. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues do not have any other questions, I'd like to entertain a motion, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I have something else. I do. Is that okay?

MR. STANTON: Oh, all right, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Appreciate it. I -- I think that the unknown is scary, and I think that change is scary. And I understand that folks moved out to this part of the county because they didn't want neighbors, essentially. I get that. I think in the staff report, we heard that several of these lots were eight-acre lots or more. But the way of life has changed, and I personally am disturbed by the assumptions that a lot of people are making, and I'm not going to assign motivations to those because that would be just as assumptive on my part. But I -- I think that folks are thinking in worst case scenario, and they aren't considering a couple of important factors, one, that over the last I would say probably 20 years, maybe 25, this area has already grown in density significantly, and that a lot of those homes are probably the same level of lot coverage that you're going to see with cottage. They're very large homes on minimal size lots. A lot of those homes are in the 1,500 to 1,600 square foot range, too, on lots that are, you know, minimal setbacks around them. So I'm not sure how we get to this is the one that people are upset about, especially if you look at some of the spacing of the homes on Leisure, like, those are close together on small lots. That's a community. You can tell. You all talk to each other. So I'm struggling to see how we get to this is going to be something different. And to Commissioner Williams' point, even if cottage doesn't get approved, even if, for some reason, the plat doesn't get approved, if this is R-2 or R-1, you're going to see similar levels of density to what they're wanting in cottage, because this is going to be built out to the maximum of whatever it can be because we are in desperate need of housing in our city, and this area of the city is going -- or this area of the county is likely going to get annexed. If you look at the map, we've already gotten to a point where we're creating islands. Those are likely to get absorbed. And I think doing it in a way that is forward-thinking and in small chunks and cautious is the way to go, and this is a relatively small chunk and cautious, and a way to see does this work. So I would just -- I would just say that I think that for those of you that are here tonight that are worried about what is going to happen here, and who may move in here, you can't control who your neighbors are ever. You can't control who your neighbors are if you move into a new place, and can meet all of them because those folks are going to move. I -- I think that rather than coming at this from a viewpoint of worst-case scenario, it would behoove us all as in our lives we see change, to think about what's the best-case scenario. Who could move in here that we might actually like, and try to come at it from -- from that viewpoint, and I --

again, I'm trying really hard not to attribute motivation to some of the things that I've heard, but I think that people are making assumptions about who their new neighbors are going to be in ways that are harmful to everyone involved, and would encourage you to think about who the best person could be that would move in there, who you would like to see move in there, and how would you feel about 32 houses if it's, you know, your ideal neighbor, you know, someone who goes to church with you or something. But that's -- that's all. And I know I don't usually pontificate like this, but I think it's worth saying because I was disturbed by some of the tone tonight, and not from just any one person, it was several. Anyone else? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just a comment to the City staff which can be answered or not answered. It just seemed like there was a lot of concern about the -- just the road itself. I don't -- I didn't notice in the -- the written report maybe mentioned it orally about whether a traffic study was conducted or what have you. But assuming that this all moves through, it seems like there has been a universal concern about that road and its current condition, and adding additional traffic to it on a daily basis, which would only have one direction to go, which is south. So, you know, if you're leaving the neighborhood or coming in, so to the extent that can be forwarded on as a concern within the relevant City departments, I think it's worth -- worth raising.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. STANTON: -- if my colleagues are done with the questions. As it relates to Case 86-2025, 4100 North Wyatt Lane permanent zoning, I move to approve the permanent zoning request to R-2 zoning district upon annexation.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. ORTIZ: I second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. 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. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine yeses and zero nos.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. For the platting action on the same property.

Case Number 87-2025

A request by A Civil group on behalf of Adam Kopriva (owner), for approval of a 32-lot preliminary plat of County R-S zoned property, to be known as Wyatt Acres. Concurrent requests seeking approval of permanent zoning (Case Number 88-2025) and annexation of the property into

the corporate limits under review. City Council approval of the permanent zoning and annexation, as well as Board of Adjustment approval to use "cottage" optional dimensional standards are required prior to final City Council approval of the preliminary plat. This matter is sought to be approved such that the future development of the site under the proposed R-2 designation has been illustrated. The approximately 5.05-acre subject site is located about 200 feet northeast of the intersection of Mule Deer Drive and North Wyatt Lane, and includes the address 4100 North Wyatt Lane.

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 preliminary plat of Wyatt Acres subject to:

- (1) Approval of permanent zoning to R-2 and annexation of the 5.05 acres into the City, and
- (2) Board of Adjustment approval of the "cottage" optional dimensional standards.

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? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Question on the plat. The one that's attached to the documents we have does not show the 20-foot building setback. Were there any other differences between the material you're presenting and what we were provided with for review?

MR. KUNZ: I believe the building lines being marked as 20 feet is a difference. The three notes that I referenced at the beginning may also be a difference, notes 12, 13, 14, those are all the same. And it may not stub up exactly to the north right to the property line. There might be a nine-foot buffer of right-of-way. We discussed with Public Works and Building and Site Development, and it definitely is considered something that could be a feasible connection in the future; therefore, it needs to stub up to the property line.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

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

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. This particular case brought up the issue of the parking, of not having any parking on either side of the streets and having to accommodate cars for each house within the driveway or garage -- and/or garage. It may not happen very often, but I can see this -- and I understand the necessity because of the fire access, but -- and it may not happen very often, but in this case, there is a personal connection because my brother lives in a development very like this, and on holidays, he cannot have company come and park. And so in some of these proposals, we have seen that there have been extra lots or extra space for guest parking, but this one does not have that. Again, I understand exactly why, but I'm just saying that will have to be a consequence explained to the buyers, and I don't know if the applicants considered any other solutions.

MR. KUNZ: Sorry. Is the question what the applicant intends to provide for parking on the site,

or was it a comment of how it could be a problem, I suppose?

MS. PLACIER: Well, how it could be a problem, and if any solution to the problem had been considered?]

MR. KUNZ: I can't say we discussed the idea of dedicating a particular lot or something along those lines for the sake of guest parking. My understanding is that if a garage is to be supplied for the site and they're building a driveway to the garage and tandem parking is permitted, it would be reasonable for all four cars to be parked within this site, and that's if they're building a garage and that's what is implied, the intent is, with the building line. But that -- yeah. If they're only required to provide two parking spots, and guest parking isn't considered in the cottage standards, then perhaps that's a, you know, a shortcoming of those more than anything else.

MS. PLACIER: Maybe that's just life.

MR. KUNZ: Maybe.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I have a quick question and then I know Commissioner Williams does. Who controls Wyatt? Is that City or County?

MR. KUNZ: County maintained, I believe.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Yes. Maintained is the word I was looking for, not control.

MR. KUNZ: Glad I could help.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: What is -- just help me out, please. What's the minimum, practically speaking, from math, the smallest R-1 lot size, what is the minimum depth that that property could have?

MR. KUNZ: I mean, it needs to be 7,000 square feet, if it has 60 feet of width, I think that's like 115 or so feet of depth.

MR. WILLIAMS: But it could be wider, so it could have less --

MR. KUNZ: It could. Oh, what's the minimum depth?

MR. WILLIAMS: The minimum depth?

MR. KUNZ: Not to be too esoteric, but, like, zero, if you had 7,000.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: But, yeah. I don't really know. Sorry.

MR. ZENNER: In order to create a buildable lot in the R-1 zoning district, you have to take a 25-foot front yard setback, 25-foot rear yard setback, so that's going to take 50 feet out of a dimensional lot, and then 12 feet combined for your side yards. So let's just for instance say you're dealing with a 40 -- a 90-foot-deep lot, 50 feet out of that gives you a 40 by -- and it's 60 feet, take 12 off of that, a 40 by 42 building envelope at that point. That's a sizable building envelope for a footprint, but that would be a 90 -- and that would probably be under 7,000 square feet, though. So your lot width is going to grow significantly.

MR. KUNZ: You would need at least more than 50 feet of depth to have any sort of structure at all.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right. Well, the rear yard setback is the lesser of 25 percent of the lot, or 25 feet, so you could have a lesser. So it could be smaller than 25 feet, which was -- these are my follow-up question, which is practically speaking, how many R-1 lots have -- and I understand that this probably seems unrelated, but it does -- it's related in my mind. The -- as-built, to your knowledge, how frequent is it that you have less than 25 feet of a setback behind a house to the lot edge?

MR. ZENNER: In 16 years of reviewing development plans with the City of Columbia, it is very, very uncommon. The ability for one to be able to grade from the foundation back to the rear property line to a rear yard swale normally necessitates a lot that's probably no less than 100 feet deep, and I think that that will be illustrated as we request our design consultants to evaluate the cottage standards, and that is one reason why we have based all of our dimensional requirements for those that we are presenting discussing on a 100-foot deep lot, generally, as the optimal. I have also heard that tangentially as we have discussed the cottage lot standard amendment that we are working on as being a necessity. A 90-foot-deep lot, depending on the conditions, may not work, or shallower. And so I think what you will see is a -- is a more traditional 70 by 100 if you're going to go with a 7,000 square foot lot, so 70 feet width by 100 feet deep.

MR. WILLIAMS: So then you would end up with a 25-foot minimum?

MR. ZENNER: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: And again, in 16 years of reviewing plans with the City, I have not seen, with the exception of probably planned districts, lot depths that are much less.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And the -- what we're talking about here is a ten-foot setoff in the rear. Correct?

MR. ZENNER: On the -- for a cottage lot, if approved by the Board with the optional dimensional standards, yes. It would be a ten-foot rear yard, but even with that, you're not seeing cottage lots that are going to the Board of Adjustment that are much less than 100 feet in depth.

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm just looking -- based on the proposal here, isn't it proposing ten feet, or is that just outlining what the --

MR. KUNZ: That's the utility easement. The building line is at 20 feet, or are you saying for the rear setback?

MR. WILLIAMS: The rear setback?

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. That would be ten, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: It follows --

MR. WILLIAMS: The proposal for the plot is that these homes would be -- I mean, I know the homes aren't on the plot, but it will at least be allowed to put it within ten feet of the rear.

MR. KUNZ: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: And the Board of Adjustment, just for purposes of clarification again, being the liaison to the Board and taking every cottage standard proposal that has gone through, the Board of Adjustment is a public hearing process. So the residents that are here that surround this development that would like to come to the Board of Adjustment, they will get public notice just like they did for this. The Board of Adjustment members are very attuned, like this body, to the impacts associated with something that is being introduced in a built environment. And I can tell you from my own personal experience in dealing with about a half of dozen of these, the Board has assessed particular enhanced rear-yard setbacks in order to mitigate the potential impact. I cannot guarantee that they would do that in this instance, and I cannot guarantee that it would go to a standard 25-foot rear yard, but I can probably speak to the fact that that will be something that will be considered by them.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

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

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public would like to come and speak on this case, please step forward. State your name and address for the record. We do six minutes for the applicant and groups, and three minutes for individuals.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. Jay Gebhardt with A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. And if I could get the PowerPoint back up, I would appreciate it, because I don't know how to do it. So I'm just going to assume you're going to ask questions of things that you have for me, but things that I've been hearing is -- is there was a question about sidewalks. Yes, they will be built with the development, even across the common area lot along Wyatt Lane and connect to the existing sidewalk on the south end of this property. So there will be a continuous sidewalk on Wyatt to Mule -- Mule Drive -- Mule -- whatever the name of that street is just to the south of us. And the, you know, there is a fundamental conflict between the UDC and the IFC, and that is if you take a 50-foot right-of-way street, you know, a normal residential street 28 feet wide that allows parking on both sides, you don't have the 20-foot clear lane that's required. In this case, we're asking to use the access street standards in, you know, not having parking on -- on either side of the street. I knew that would be a concern, so part of the reason is I put this little -- Adam put this little drawing together is to illustrate how cars could park. So the bottom area is a 1,200-square-foot home with a two-car garage, and showing four cars parked. And the one-car garage option on the north side, I've gone ahead and made the driveway wide enough so that you could have three, and we've done several of these out in the county for C&C Construction, and it's very popular to have that extra-wide driveway for cars just so you don't have to park behind your wife's car and have to move it in a tandem situation all the time. And so the question, you know, can we -- we can't park on the street, so where are the people going to park? They're going to have to park in the -- in the driveways. And even if the fire department hadn't required this 20-foot clear lane, I want to illustrate in this drawing

that by the time you put -- on a 40-foot lot, you put two houses, two driveways, there is not 23 feet of curb left to parallel park between. So fundamentally, cottage lots can't have on-street parking. Now in our case, on our layout, we have one street on the south that has the -- has the detention pond on it with no home, so theoretically, we could have had parking there, but with the fire department asking for that 20-foot clear lane, we've -- we've just agreed, okay, there won't be any parking. But as you guys move forward with looking at the standards of these things, parking is something you're going to need to address because even if this was a 28-foot street, or a 32-foot-wide street, we wouldn't be able to put parking because of the driveways. So I just wanted to bring that up and talk about the sidewalks, but if you guys have any other specific questions, you've seen the PowerPoint, I can show other things or answer questions for you guys.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Could -- oh, good, the plot is up, although it's a little hard to see from this vantage point. But on Lots 9 through 14, which I believe would -- which are at the end of the street on the north on the --

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. It's on the T.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. It's hard to tell, but it looks to me like those would be abutting directly the properties on Cottonwood -- the existing properties on Cottonwood Drive.

MR. GEBHARDT: They would.

MR. WILLIAMS: And I will tell you that I have a lot of concern about permitting a house to be built with a ten-foot setoff to an existing R-1 property.

MR. GEBHARDT: Why is that different than the ten-foot setoff for an internal lot in this subdivision?

MR. WILLIAMS: Because those people are choosing to buy a house that's a cottage lot and be neighboring a cottage lot, but people who have purchased an R-1 lot presumably would have anticipated that they would have at least on the other side of them a setoff that would be equivalent to an R-1 lot.

MR. GEBHARDT: Okay. Mr. Williams, I -- if the Board of Adjustment, as Pat indicated, decides that that needs to be a larger setback, that, you know, the negative of that is the house will get smaller. It probably would be a two-story home instead of a single-story home just because the footprint is going to get smaller. So, you know, we've heard tonight a lot of concern about the size of these homes, the cost of these homes, living next to these homes. I mean, having a two-story house behind you may be -- that's 25 feet away -- may be as imposing as having a single-story home that's 15. And in my drawings, you know, I show -- I show the ten-foot rear yard, and that back part of that -- I probably should have made that gray, but that's just showing a patio. So the house itself is actually, you know, not right up to that, and that's a 1,200-square-foot home. And I -- that's like 1,200-square-foot footprint for a single family -- or a single-story home. So if it's a two-story, it's going to be smaller and be further away, more than likely from the rear yard. But I understand your -- your concern, but that is the standard, so that's what we were --

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, right. But there's a way of redesigning this that would not require putting

lots. You could expand Bush Drive instead of -- you would lose some lots, but you wouldn't be proposing putting -- and you're probably more than ten feet away from me right now. So I do have a lot of concern about that level of encroachment on an existing R-1 property, and I'm probably, unless you can convince me otherwise, not going to vote in favor of this unless -- if I'm -- I'm not going to rely on the Board of Adjustment for that. So unless you can give me some comfort, otherwise that -- because again, you're not developing it --

MR. GEBHARDT: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS: -- so once it's handed off, it could be -- I mean, without any other restrictions listed on here, you know, on the plot, or an adjustment to the plot design, there is nothing preventing a future developer from putting a house that close to the edge of an existing R-1.

MR. GEBHARDT: Yes. I can't argue with that, and I can't provide you any comfort and be able to vote yes for this, but, you know, Mr. Williams, it is the standard that is adopted. And if the standard isn't satisfactory, then I suggest you guys look at changing that standard when you have a cottage that abuts an R-1. But as Pat Zenner was indicating, you know, these lots are 100 feet deep. They have a 20-foot setback in the front because of the garage. I just don't believe that you're going to see these homes being built from front building line to rear building line. They're just not going to be that deep. And we are trying to provide some outdoor space for people to have some yard, some patio area, things of that nature, so --

MR. WILLIAMS: And then the other property is that the Lot 27, since it's going to be a side yard, that would only require -- and that -- that would be true, I will grant you, whether it was R-1, R-2, in a normal context, the side yard setoff is still six feet. But again, the way the plot is designed, they still have to give some consideration to the property owner that's abutting it, and I recognize that property is sort of facing at an angle to there, but, again, I find that concerning. And the last one -- point I'll raise, which is probably moot given my other points, is on Lot 30, the lagoon -- I assume that that was -- is no longer an active lagoon, or is it?

MR. GEBHARDT: The existing house is on that lagoon. It's not connected to City sewer. And when this gets developed, that -- the City sewer will be extended and the house will be put on City sewer and the lagoon will be removed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Is it typical to build real estate on top of a lot that had a lagoon on it?

MR. GEBHARDT: It's -- so what will happen is that lagoon will be excavated and any unsuitable fill or material there will be excavated and removed, and then adequate fill clay, whatever, will be put in and compacted, tested, and then the home will be built on it, so it's more frequent -- that happens more frequently than you would think. And even we take out farm ponds quite a bit when we are doing development and it's the same -- same situation.

MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.

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

MS. LOE: Mr. Gebhardt, thank you for sharing the diagrams of parking. That is one of my

questions after reading the report. As I stated earlier, the plan we received did not have the 20-foot building line setback indicated, so my understanding was buildings could still be set up to the ten-foot setback, which would -- provided very little possibility for parking. Understanding the 20-foot setback will be included in the plan definitely alleviates some concern about parking provided for the homes. However, I did still wonder about the question Commissioner Placier raised regarding guest parking, and I'm also wondering about moving vans, that type of parking, especially since there's no parking on Wyatt and there's no access to through streets which do have parking on them. So what accommodation has been made for other vehicles that will just be necessary?

MR. GEBHARDT: You know, there's what's being said is there would be no parking on there, but if there's a Super Bowl party at one of these homes, there's going to be people parked on the street. That's just going to happen. There is not going to be enforcement of this thing. I've already pointed out that you can't park between the driveways, so the only street that you could do that on would be, you know, the south street that abuts the detention pond. So no -- could we widen that street out four feet and put some additional parking on that? Yeah. But part of the -- I thought part of the goal of this was to keep costs down, and to lose a lot to create a parking lot or widen streets beyond what's required by the Code just seems wrong, especially when it's all being generated by the fire department wanting this 20-foot clear lane, which they don't have on any residential street in any neighborhood, because you can park on both sides. If you take the existing neighborhood to the east, it's a 28-foot street. You've got parking on both sides. You take 16 feet out of that, you don't have 20 feet left, so it's -- they don't have their clear lane on any public street. And then I said that it's a fundamental problem with the Code, the two codes not aligning. So it's come to light on this one because they're using the access street, but I just want to point out that we're not -- we're not trying to accommodate additional parking on this. I mean, I would assume that most of these people will have two cars parked in the garage, and if they have guests, they'll park in the -- in the driveway. If they have more than two guests, they may have to arrange with the neighbor to park in their driveway or take the risk of getting a ticket and park on the street, but that's -- that's what we're proposing, Sara.

MS. LOE: So what about delivery trucks or vans that are longer than 20 feet? They can't do deliveries to this neighborhood?

MR. GEBHARDT: They don't -- on my experience, it's UPS doesn't park in the parking --

MS. LOE: Longer than a UPS delivery. It usually takes a couple of hours to unpack a van.

MR. GEBHARDT: Okay. You're talking about moving vans?

MS. LOE: A moving van, yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: All right. I mean, isn't that a problem in every residential neighborhood?

MS. LOE: I had a semi-trailer. My street is wide enough that they left it for a couple of days, and it wasn't a problem, but that could not happen here.

MR. GEBHARDT: Right.

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. GEBHARDT: It couldn't happen on any access street. Right? You've got 24 feet. Even with parking on one side, you wouldn't be able to accommodate a semi-truck parked there in 24 feet. It needs to be a one-way traffic for sure.

MS. LOE: So maybe this is not the best application of an access street. I mean, was that an exception that was asked for due to the length of the street?

MR. ZENNER: It's a permissible option given the ADTs that are being generated in the development. It is -- as Mr. Gebhardt has pointed out, that is how the Code is written.

MS. LOE: I understand.

MR. ZENNER: And I believe the concerns that you are expressing, Ms. Loe, are ones that are accepted exceptions under circumstances that result in temporary inconvenience in our subdivisions as a part of daily living. I think it becomes an issue if it is parked there for extended periods of time, blocking the ability of the fire service which then would have to be the ones to act upon that. The Code is what the Code says, and therefore what Mr. Gebhardt is presenting here is Code compliant. And we have asked that the note be placed on the plat, because that is what the fire service needs. The project will be signed accordingly that there is no parking on either side of the street. But in any instance, if you have to access your own personal property to offload a moving van to move in, that's a temporary action that I think is acceptable even though it is not in direct conformance with how the Code is written because it is a reality.

MS. LOE: So, I mean, I do understand there's Code compliance, but I -- I do take exception to being backed into some issues, such as not being able to park between driveways because it's been designed to minimum standards. Whereas I think if you sharpened your pencil, and did some adjustments, it could be modified to create some opportunities to better accommodate daily living. And those are what I'm trying to get to with this discussion.

MR. ZENNER: The widening of the -- the widening of the street, however, is --

MS. LOE: I'm talking about turning some of the lots so we have more than 18 feet between driveways in some locations, widening the street, perhaps, but one point that Mr. Gebhardt raised was simply the distance between driveways, and that's due to how they have laid out the lots. Thank you.

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

MR. BRODSKY: Not necessarily to your development here, but we are going through this process to look at the small-lot developments. And, currently, the way that's written, if you have a garage, you have to be, you know, 20-foot building setback in the front. If you don't have a garage, then only ten feet, but that doesn't really leave room for parking if it's just ten feet. Does that -- does the ten -- allowing ten-foot building lines, lot lines in the front without a garage, is that something we're even ever going to see?

MR. GEBHARDT: Not until you allow the two required parking spaces to be on the street.

MR. BRODSKY: Yeah. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Let's do our best to keep it to this case. I know that's what's on our mind.

MR. GEBHARDT: One thing I would like just to point out, you know, it -- yes, we chose 42-foot-wide lots, but in the cottage standard, it could be a 30-foot lot. We're choosing to do basically a two-car wide driveway to accommodate this parking issue. And, you know, no builder is going to build something in here that he can't sell. And if he -- if this is obvious if -- if there's a house without a garage or a house without parking, the people are going to ask where am I supposed to park, and they're not going to buy the house. So, I mean, these things, I think can be -- they're more common sense, and I don't think we have to necessarily knock down the weeds on these things like this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Thank you very much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case, please come forward. And I know you all probably just did this, but could you say your name and address again?

MR. CROW: That's fine. Emery Crow; I live at 4250 North Wyatt Lane there. And I was just noticing, you know, he said how wide was the lots?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Forty-five feet.

MR. CROW: Thirty-five feet?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Forty-five. Four, five.

MR. CROW: Forty-five feet?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. KUNZ: Forty-two. Excuse me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Forty-two to -- yeah.

MR. KUNZ: Forty-two was what most of them are going to be in with.

MR. CROW: That's not even as wide as my trailer lot, and how far apart are the buildings going to be?

MR. KUNZ: The side yard setback for cottage standards is five feet --

MR. ZENNER: Six feet.

MR. KUNZ: -- so they be -- or six, excuse me. Thank you, Pat. So 12 feet between.

MR. CROW: Between.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MR. CROW: And I know for our trailers, and my son's trailer burnt not all that long ago, because of substandard wiring from a previous owner, but anyway, it burnt. And his trailer was over, you know, what, 35 to 37 feet away from my back door, and I already know it was so hot, it scorched the whole side of my trailer. To me, being that close is extremely dangerous for any dwelling. And that -- and that lot is smaller than the one I live on, and that I -- I can't see fire standard-wise and that, how they can even be that close, especially with a garage right there. And with today's vehicles, if they've got an electric vehicle, there's a pretty good chance. I know not everybody likes them. I don't, but some people do. The -- what does the backyard, you said was how far from the rear -- from the rear property line on that far side -- the far north side?

MR. WILLIAMS: It's ten feet is what's permissible.

MR. CROW: Ten feet.

MR. WILLIAMS: We don't have a diagram of what the house would actually look like.

MR. CROW: Okay. So, yeah. And this part is on, like, the annexation, also? Was that this part?

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. We don't actually get to vote on the annexation. That's City Council.

MR. CROW: Well, it said in here, so I --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know. It's -- it's confusing. City Council does annexation, we do everything else.

MR. CROW: Because you brought up about, you know, certain parts being absorbed into that, you know, and we don't want to be absorbed in there. I know Suzanne that lives directly on that property line has that -- that property just north of that. She's got enough health problems and with her family and everything else, she don't need that hassle and that, but, you know, I think you said you don't deal with that here. But as far as, you know, people say trailers are dangerous, you know, and because we're so close. Well, where I live out there on Leisure Drive, it used to be that you had everything was close like that. Well, they were sold off. Everything is private lots now, they are double lots. So my nearest neighbor from where -- (inaudible) --

MS. ORTIZ: You need to be in the microphone.

MR. CROW: Okay. Well, I'm sorry. I'm just trying -- but from where this gentleman over here with the nice haircut, you know, to the other side of the lady over here, you know it's pretty good ways, you know, in between and that. Well, I'm sorry. I didn't have any other way to explain. But, you know, to me, you know, having 12 feet in between, you know, and then between the issues of no space on the main street, you know, trying to get, like you said, a U-Haul or something up in there to move stuff in, that is quite a hassle. Well, what if you get all the kids out there and they end up playing in the street and everything else and all this, we don't know who's going to move in there. You know, like you said, we have no idea. So, I mean, it doesn't make sense with as many as they're wanting to put on that property. And if there was way less or a possibility, but does it mean I still want them there? No. But, to me, it looks like a fire hazard at 12 feet apart knowing that even with the trailers, you know, being over 30 feet apart still scorched my trees and everything on the backside of my lot and all my siding on the backside, and we had to sit there with a hose and wet the whole backside of my property to keep it from burning while they were putting the other one out. You know, so I would like for you all to keep that in consideration, you know. These small homes, they may be able to put a lot of them in there, but is it really safe?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing -- oh. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you for the comments. I would just like to note that that distance meets the adopted building code and fire code for separation, so --

MR. CROW: Oh, I'm surprised that that's even --

MS. LOE: I understand your concern, but it does meet the accepted standard.

MR. CROW: I just don't understand, you know. I watch the house burn, and the flames that any house can put off, and them being this close, even though, you know, you think it's safe, but what they say, it is not. And I feel sorry for the next-door neighbors got to deal with their house burning because of the other one. That's where -- you know, what my meaning is.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you very much for being here tonight. Next person to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, again. Kevin Murphy, A Civil Group, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court. I'm just going to go over some notes here. Mr. Williams was speaking of the setbacks some of those lots that abut the existing -- once again, it's been brought up by Jay, these are the standards -- the cottage standards that we're working within. These lots could be 30-foot-wide lots, we're doing 42-foot-wide lots, so this could be more dense. The -- the purpose of the cottage standards is to allow density. The -- some of the previously approved cottage lots are very similar or even smaller lots than these. The tried-and-true model of these, what is working here, what has worked elsewhere, these size homes with this amount of yard for these price points is what happens. I don't -- these houses aren't going to be built to that ten-foot setback. Again, this picture that's showing up here now, even the back porch doesn't quite reach. That's probably 12 feet off the line. The house is 20 feet off the property line. Now given the fact that the existing R-1 is behind them, they're built 25 foot plus from the property line, that same common property line, so we're talking 35 feet or more between these houses. We're not talking from -- from you and I. But I would just like to say that again. Ms. Loe brought up the side-yard setbacks, a ten foot, a five foot from the property line is what the IRC would say. The City of Columbia requires six foot, so you're getting two more foot there. As far as the parking, this was a one-way street, and there's many one-way streets in town, no parking, or two-way streets that have no parking on one side of the street, but there's still houses on that side. Folks temporarily park there. I know we see on Walnut or on Campus when, you know, kids come to town or are going home, it is a temporary allowance. I think a point that Jay needs to point out, and I'm not sure why the fire department insisted that on this on this case where they haven't done it on other ones, these cottage standards, but on a 32-foot wide street, if you take in eight feet in Deer Ridge, anyone of those streets, are 32-foot wide, for parking on both sides, eight feet, that leaves you a 16-foot driving lane. What the -- what the fire department is requiring of us here is a 20-foot driving lane. If we could park on one side of the street, on a 24-foot-wide street, we'd have that same 16 foot. So I just don't understand that, but that's what we're dealt with.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Murphy. That's three minutes and --

MR. MURPHY: Thanks so much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Murphy? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I guess this is more of a comment, but I live in East Campus, and I'm very familiar

with move in and move out. And it is something -- well, and I would want a no outlet, as well. So -- with a lot of smaller I guess like apartments, I guess, they are, or houses that are converted into apartments, and it's something that you deal with for move in and move out, and then you go on with your lives. So I -- I imagine moving into a cottage home, it's similar to moving into a campus or and East Campus dwelling, so you live with it, yeah.

MR. MURPHY: And not everyone here is going to be moving on the same day.

MS. ORTIZ: Yeah. But on campus, they do, and we deal with it, and we move on, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you very much. Next speaker on this case?

MS. FERGUSON: Denise Ferguson, 5 -- I'm getting so tired, I can hardly speak, but 5401 Axis Court. I would like to point out, I wish that the picture was up there with the streets so you could see where my house is a little bit. Like I said, I have a very small, narrow backyard. You can -- you can barely -- we did that on purpose. You know, we like that. We like to have a small space for ourselves. So, of course, them being close to us does concern us, but I'm going to tell you the Lagoon -- I see the lagoon out of my backyard, and maybe that one with the streets would help me. So I see the lagoon, and I -- I kind of question why a person would build something on a lagoon, but I'm not a builder, so I didn't question that so much. But what I do kind of question a little bit there is -- and I didn't get a clear answer from multiple people. I tried to ask this. The stormwater drain off of Axis Court which, by the way, is a cul-de-sac, and, yes, we have had to call the fire department and, oh, my goodness, I'm sure glad there was never a party on that street when we had to call the fire department and ambulance for my husband's stroke because we couldn't have gotten him in and out of there. So that's certainly something to look at with the streets. And also for our home with the stormwater drainage right now off of Axis Court, it goes into -- it drains off of our property out into that property to the lagoon. When it rains and it pours, there is on that whole corner, and thank you for bringing that -- that picture up, that whole corner, I don't know what property numbers those are, but those two will be flooded with water unless -- I'm not an engineer -- unless an engineer can figure out how to drain that. I understand there's going to be some kind of drainage at that little pond or something, but I don't know really how the water will move. I'm a little concerned, to be quite honest, that those people that might live there, what might happen for them, and I'm not thinking of myself there. I'm just wondering, and I did, I tried to call and I'm sorry, you and I tried to connect today, and I was extremely busy. But I don't know what we're going to do about -- again, it's a density issue. What -- where does the water go? It goes to the lagoon right now, you know, it kind of drains naturally, I guess. So that's my comment, and it's really kind of a question that I have still not heard an answer about.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Well, I was going to comment. I'm looking here at the plat and it does show a culvert that will be extended, if I'm reading this right, along lots 30 and 31, which is behind you.

MS. FERGUSON: Okay.

MR. WALTERS: And it looks like there is a box culvert perhaps that is at the end of that drainage easement that you're speaking of, and that routes northward under the street and it ties in. So, anyway, I think there's -- there's been an attempt to deal with it.

MS. FERGUSON: Okay. And let's just hope so.

MR. WALTERS: Yeah.

MS. FERGUSON: Because, right now, all I'm seeing is really cute houses. Actually, we did look at some of those houses when we started to think about where we were going to go, and I just -- I just worry about the folks that are going to move in. But maybe if they're going to put something in there that works for it, that's wonderful. But, yeah, I'm telling you on the cul-de-sac, there's not a lot of space for the emergency vehicles.

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

MS. FERGUSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case? Going once, twice. Okay. Thank you. We will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on the platting action? Sorry. Commissioner Williams, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: I appreciate, Mr. Gebhardt, your frankness as -- just with respect to my concerns and acknowledging that there are some things you just can't give me the comfort that I'm -- I'm looking for. I do appreciate that some of the -- my concerns about the setoff are a product of what exists for the cottage standards currently, and I am a supporter of the cottage work that we're doing -- the work on the cottage standards that we're doing, but this -- this particular case does raise some issues for me about how that's going to be implemented. Now this is -- this is green field, but there might be some different ways this applies infill, but here, I do think it's important that we consider what expectation people would have reasonably had when they purchased their property in an R-1 about how much setoff they would have behind them. And so for that reason, I wouldn't -- I can't support it with the current plot. I think there are ways that this could be redone that would eliminate on the buffer where it backs up against an existing R-1 property. The other thing I'll note just for our own -- based on our conversation this -- earlier this evening is because the current owner intends to leave the residents that exist in the new development, our design standards would not apply -- architectural design standards and each one of these -- because we voted for -- not voted. We collectively decided 100 percent might be the best approach. It would not apply in this case, and so there wouldn't be any architectural deviation requirements. Because didn't we say 100 percent of --

MS. LOE: Thirty-two.

MR. WILLIAMS: I thought it would be 100 percent. Thirty-two and 100 percent. But there's --

one of these is not a cottage lot.

MS. LOE: Right. Of 31 that are.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It actually is a cottage lot.

MS. LOE: I believe this does meet the minimum standard that we were --

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, this is not really germane for that. I just wanted to throw it out there as -- so that it's in our memories as we discuss these things further.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. WILLIAMS: But those are my comments.

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

MR. BRODSKY: I just want to -- want to acknowledge your comment, Commissioner Williams, about the -- the rear setbacks. I think that is something that I -- we can't apply it here tonight, and I do intend to support this, but something for us to consider in the future when we are putting cottages next to existing R-1 homes. I think you're right to point that out. I'm okay with the no parking on the road situation. I think the road is plenty wide to accommodate moving trucks on the occasion that they do happen. One thing I do want to point out, could you bring the plat up, perhaps? That'll work fine. So the -- the T or hammerhead intersection in the northeast there, you know, we have -- we have a -- there's a lot of sidewalk. I'm always -- you know, I like sidewalks. Sidewalks are great, but sometimes with these small developments, it's, like, man, that's a lot of sidewalk. So if -- if parking is a concern, you know, there is opportunity to eliminate sidewalks on that -- on that T of that intersection, and then also along the curved section with the lagoon, if we did want to eliminate that sidewalk, there would be space for off-street parking.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other Commissioner comments? I think Commissioner Loe. Commissioner Loe, did you have something?

MS. LOE: Oh, I do, yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please?

MS. LOE: So typically when making a decision, I point to the regulations, but first, the plan needs to make sense to me. And we just spent a work session debating at what level minimum standards need to be identified, with -- with some Commissioners leaning towards relying on the common sense of the developer. And in this case, I feel like there's not a level of common sense, and if it -- I understand it may meet regulations that are identified, but in that case, I think we need a few more because I feel it's missing. So -- and to that point, I'm just going to say that my decision is based on being an architect trained in life safety code, and I understand those code regulations may -- they're written for worst-case scenarios, and may seem overzealous at times. However, as an architect, I'm also familiar with some of the case history that shaped those code requirements in the first place, and, as such, I can't accept a plan that requires those life safety requirements to be compromised in order to work, so I can't support the plan as proposed. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: I just had a clarifying question. Commissioner Brodsky, you said that we can't -- you noted that -- about the concerns of the ten foot, that we can't apply that tonight, and I guess I -- I'm confused by that comment, because I think we can apply it tonight. The way we apply it is we vote against it. So I was just confused if there was something else that you were intending by that?

MR. BRODSKY: No. I think I was more just alluding to, you know, we couldn't say we approve this, but with 25-yard setbacks for those lots.

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

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I just wanted to ask Commissioner Loe to expand on what she meant by life safety so I can understand it better.

MS. LOE: We've been informed by staff and there's some general feeling that it's appropriate for cars to park in the streets for various occasions, not overnight perhaps, but on various occasions. But as we've heard from some testimony from the public, that this -- this would impact the ability of emergency vehicles to access. And I said, codes are written for worst case scenarios, and I can't in good judgment support a plan that relies on compromising the minimum life safety code.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further -- Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I've only been on the Commission seven months, and I was not part of the Commission when quite a bit of time was spent on the cottage standards. But it seems as if you published standards, and an applicant meets those standards, we should be judging it by the standards that are in effect, not by the standards that we would wish them to be. If we seek corrections that need to be made, which I do see some. I agree with the setback thing you mentioned. I agree with the parking considerations, but that's not on the books. And so they've submitted a plan that meets the specifications, the staff supports it. We also on Bristol Lake, remember in January, we approved a subdivision with 40-foot-wide lots, and the only difference I can see here -- I pulled it up -- is about a dozen lots were 50 feet wide, but the majority were 40 feet wide, and the only other noticeable difference was the streets were 28 feet instead of 24 feet, so that did benefit the fire things. But, nevertheless, like I say, the standards are published, the applicant made the submittal. It meets the requirements. The staff approves it, so I plan to -- I plan to support it.

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

MR. STANTON: I agree with my colleagues -- (inaudible).

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, could you -- sorry.

MR. STANTON: We see things we need to fix, we need to take note, take that the work session. But, Madam Chair, I would like to entertain a motion if my colleagues have no other questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I believe we're ready.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 87-2025, 4100 North Wyatt Lane, preliminary plat. Staff, can you roll up the -- there we go. Thank you. Approval of the preliminary plat contingent upon approval of R-2 permanent zoning and annexation and Board of Adjustment approval of cottage development standards.

MS. ORTIZ: I second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Approval moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you're ready.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones. Voting No: Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 7-2.

MR. WILLIAMS: Seven yeses and two nos.

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

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 85-2025

A request by Mark Silveria (owner) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 100 Gipson Street to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of six transient guests and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.26-acre R-1 (Single-family Dwelling) zoned subject site is located at the corner of North Garth Avenue and Gipson Street and includes the address 100 Gipson Street.

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 100 Gibson Street to be operated as an STR subject to:

- (1) The occupancy permitted within the dwelling being limited to a maximum of six transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code(IPMC); and
- (2) A maximum of 210 nights of annual usage.

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 Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I apologize. Did you say that there were some open issues, but they had been resolved? And if there were open issues, what were they?

MR. HALLIGAN: They have been resolved, and they were from 2021, and it is related to the non-compliance with the City's landscape management and growth of poisonous sumac, but those were resolved in 2021.

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. Just as a reminder, name and address for the record, and three minutes for individuals, six minutes for the applicant and groups. Go ahead.

MR. SILVERIA: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you. I'm Mark Silveria, and I'm the applicant. I live at 3205 Alsup Drive here in Columbia. And I'm looking for the short-term conditional use permit and I'm here to answer any questions if anyone has any. We've been operating since 2018. I used to live in that house, and we were operating when I lived there, and then we moved out and we've continued to operate. And when we moved in, it actually had been previously used as a long-term rental, and there was lots and lots of deferred maintenance. And having in the short-term rental actually requires us to keep up on the maintenance and to keep the house in good order because you get reviews based on what you -- what you have. So I'm here to answer any questions and so just I'm in support of this.

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

MR. SILVERIA: Yes?

MS. LOE: Thank you for coming. So I did look up the listings, and agreed with staff's report that you appear to be or you had been listing both the upstairs and the downstairs separately?

MR. SILVERIA: Yes.

MS. LOE: You understand moving forward, that would not be allowed?

MR. SILVERIA: So I actually had a question on that, because I read that, and if you are using a short-term rental, are you not allowed to rent individual rooms, or does the entire house have to be a single -- okay. Then, yes. I do understand that.

MS. LOE: All right. And -- right. I mean, the other thing you're running into is that it's in an R-1 district --

MR. SILVERIA: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- so it's a single unit. And under the rental, you can only have one rental agreement at a time.

MR. SILVERIA: Right.

MS. LOE: I mean, you could do one or the other, but you can't -- you're going to run into a problem doing both.

MR. SILVERIA: Right. That's understood.

MS. LOE: All right. I just wanted to make sure.

MR. SILVERIA: Yeah. Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And just to clarify, you could rent out a single room if it were your primary residence, but what you can't do is rent to multiple people different rooms is what we're saying.

MS. LOE: Right. If you lived there --

MR. SILVERIA: Yeah. I understand the clarification.

MS. LOE: Yeah. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Sorry. Just we're all muddling our way through this to some degree.

MR. SILVERIA: It's late, I -- you know.

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

MR. STANTON: So that's currently on the listing right now?

MS. LOE: It is, though I think your listing is the one that says minimum of 31 days?

MR. SILVERIA: So since we have the -- we're looking for a minimum for long-term rentals, essentially, is what we're looking for.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. SILVERIA: And our -- because we have the long-term rental license, the idea is just to fill in anytime when we don't have a long term with a short-term rental. So for longer outdates, we're looking for longer -- yeah.

MS. LOE: And I want to congratulate you because you did list it for 31 days, and that's good.

The other case for us had a 30-day minimum--

MR. SILVERIA: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: -- and it should be 31, as well, if they --

MR. SILVERIA: Right. Right.

MS. LOE: Good interpretation.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So I was asking him -- so that's currently how he's listing it up and down. do you plan to change that, like, two minutes from now?

MR. SILVERIA: The 31 days?

MR. STANTON: Change your listing to being compliant with if you get this, like --

MR. SILVERIA: Oh.

MR. STANTON: -- you're going to do it, like, two minutes from now?

MR. SILVERIA: I can change it as soon as I am able to, yeah. I mean, I can't promise 30 minutes from now, but as soon as I can --

MR. STANTON: Like, five minutes from now?

MR. SILVERIA: -- you know, yes.

MR. STANTON: Like five minutes from now.

MR. SILVERIA: I -- yeah.

MR. STANTON: I'm saying that because just like that Commissioner --

MR. SILVERIA: Right.

MR. STANTON: -- they're looking at it.

MR. SILVERIA: No. I -- I understand, and I'm here because I want it to be in compliance with the City. And so if there's something I'm doing that's not in compliance with the City, then I'm -- I'm happy to take care of that, yes.

MR. STANTON: Like, real quick.

MR. SILVERIA: As soon as I can.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. SILVERIA: Five minutes. Yeah. Yeah.

MR. STANTON: That's all my questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson had asked about the violations. It sounds like it was poison sumac. Was that while you were owner?

MR. SILVERIA: When I moved in, there was -- it -- the place was infested.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. SILVERIA: So I -- I -- it took a few summers of removing and it still comes back, so this summer, I'll still be out there and I'll -- I'll be removing this summer again probably. I will hopefully not. I did -- we did a lot of work last summer getting rid of a lot of brush, so hopefully it's gone, but we'll see what happens.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Have you been successful doing monthly stays?

MR. SILVERIA: Yes. We had -- there are lots of traveling nurses that are looking for monthly -- monthly stays in town, yes.

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

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I wanted to ask you about the one objection that we received.

MR. SILVERIA: Yes. And --

MS. PLACIER: It had to do with safety, and apparently this person was unaware that you were already in operation. They thought it was going to be some new thing with these transient guests.

MR. SILVERIA: So --

MS. PLACIER: Is there anything that you do to communicate with the neighbors about this?

MR. SILVERIA: Yeah. I can comment to that. And first, I'd -- I'll comment on the -- the one objection, and that was -- let me have my notes here. That was done by Greg and Joan Cason, and they own the property across the street, 101 Gipson, but that's been a rental property and they've never lived there, as far as I've known. They're -- and they signed it Cason -- Casey Rentals, LLC. It's been a rental property and it's actually been vacant for several months, probably four-ish, but I'm not exactly sure how long. So that -- that one has been vacant, and the neighbor across the street, when she lived there, she knew I was operating the short-term rental. Her husband, well, they -- they split up, but he was taking care of the lawn care for me while I was there. Our direct neighbors, we were also good friends with, and when we moved out, they -- they knew what we were doing there, too. So -- and then the one person behind us, like, shortly after we moved in and we started doing it, they asked us, and we said, yeah, we're doing this, and they said okay, great. We were wondering, because we see people, yeah.

MS. PLACIER: You're readily available if --

MR. SILVERIA: Absolutely. Yeah. Uh-huh.

MS. PLACIER: -- a neighbor did have -- they have a way to get ahold of you?

MR. SILVERIA: So, the direct neighbors have my phone number. The across-the-street

neighbors are -- they're gone, so, but I am available. If I see them, I'll -- and someone moving in, I'm happy to say hi to them, so, yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight. We appreciate it.

MR. SILVERIA: Yeah. Thank you, guys.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other people to speak on this case tonight? Seeing none. We will close public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will close public hearing and go to Commissioner comments. Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Do my colleagues have any additional questions? If my colleagues don't have any additional questions, Madam Chair, I'd like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please go for it.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 85-2025, 100 Gipson Street, STR conditional use permit, I move to approve the STR conditional use permit subject to the following: 210 nights of rental, and a maximum of six transient guests, unless -- regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion?

MR. WILLIAMS: I just --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, sorry.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just for the record. Just for the record. I think we've previously put a lot of weight on someone who has been operating for a long period of time without any known complaints, and when neighbors say that there's an issue and they don't realize it's just because, theoretically, they don't like it and -- and yet, they're -- it's been ongoing without any -- any complaints from those neighbors, then we've put a lot of weight on that, and I don't see a reason to change it. Here, I'll note for the record -- thank you, staff, for identifying it's close to a school, which has been an issue that's been near and dear to hearts on this Commission and probably some consciences on trying to figure out what to do with that. But I just -- probably that one for the record, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other discussion on the motion? Seeing none. When you're ready Commissioner -- oh, sorry. Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: Continue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams, when you're ready.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine to zero.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Our last case for the evening.

Case Number 93-2025

A request by Annette Humphries (agent), on behalf of KSBF Properties, L.P. (owner) to allow 1510 Marylee Drive to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of eight transient guests and up to 210 nights annually pursuant to Section 29-3.3(vv) and Section 29-6.4(m)(2) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.23-acre, R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoned, subject site is located at the corner of Mills Drive and Marylee Drive and includes the address of 1510 Marylee 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 allowing 1510 Marylee Drive to be operated as an STR:

- (1) A maximum occupancy of eight transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC); and
- (2) A maximum 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?

MS. ORTIZ: I have a question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I saw that you said that we have a letter in support, but I don't see that in our material.

MR. HALLIGAN: That might have been lost in translation. Like, I apologize, or rather an error.

MS. ORTIZ: So there was no letter of support?

MR. HALLIGAN: I felt like I recall the -- a phone call at the very least, but I don't recall -- do not recall a letter off the top of my head?

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. So just the one letter --

MR. HALLIGAN: Was the -- was the letter that was in the correspondence file a written letter?

MS. ORTIZ: Yes.

MR. HALLIGAN: So there should have been provided -- there was in my file, there was another -- okay. Well, there was a letter of support, yes. I recalled that correctly. I don't know how that didn't get to you guys, but there, in our file where we record all the correspondence, there is a letter of support. I apologize that didn't make it to the meeting.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any other questions? Seeing none. We'll go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If there any members of the public, please come forward now.

MR. HUMPHRIES: I'm Steve Humphries, 2005 Hatton Court. I'm here to represent grandma's house at 1510 Marylee. The home has been in our family since 1977. In September of 2020, we began hosting with Airbnb. We average 32 weekends a year, approximately 96 days. This past year, we had 97 days of occupancy. Our typical guests come on Friday afternoon. They check out on Sunday morning. They're usually here for some sort of University related event. We routinely get five-star ratings, something that we are very proud of. We do all the maintenance of the property ourselves, and we've invested in new HVAC and appliances. So if anybody has any questions about what we're doing?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you for coming, Mr. Humphries. I was curious about -- I read your reviews. They're very nice.]

MR. HUMPHRIES: Thank you.

MS. LOE: I was interested in how many parties over eight. Just how much is the cap going to impact you.

MR. HUMPHRIES: Well, currently, we've been accepting up to 12.

MS. LOE: Uh-huh. I saw that in the --

MR. HUMPHRIES: And we're certainly have no problem with going to eight. Yeah.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. HUMPHRIES: Not an issue at all.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. HUMPHRIES: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MR. HUMPHRIES: Thank you. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will -- or anyone else from the public here to speak on this case? Seeing none, we will close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

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

MR. STANTON: If my colleagues do not have any other questions relating to this case --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please

MR. STANTON: -- I would entertain a motion, Madam Chair. As it relates to Case 93-2025, 1510 Marylee Drive, STR conditional use permit, I move to approve the request subject to the following: 210 nights of rental and a maximum of eight transient guests, regardless of the allowance permitted by IPMC.

MS. ORTIZ: I second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe. Motion carries 9-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Nine yeses and zero nos.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Seeing no other cases to come before us tonight.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any member of the public has a comment of a general nature to bring before us, please do so now. Seeing none.

X. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Your next meeting will be on March 20th. We will serve coffee before we get there. We have our PSA that we have to introduce. We will be having a community summit on March 15th from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. It will actually be in this room, as well as throughout the first floor of City Hall. It's not going to your typical government meeting. You get to participate in some interactive activities, ask staff from multiple departments questions and offer input as it relates to our strategic plan and the future of the City of Columbia, and how you, as a resident, may be interested in seeing us grow. Everyone is invited. There will be food and refreshments and other entertainment activities. Bring the kids because they will have opportunities, as well, to participate, as well as to be occupied. With that, I will move on to why you will have coffee. So on March 20th, as I have forewarned you all for weeks, you have that many cases. So if you think tonight was a long meeting, just wait. So we have before you two categories of cases, and you will be seeing your agendas presented to you in this fashion moving forward. You will have general business items which we will be taking care of, and then we will basically be segregating in our meeting all of the conditional use permits for short-term rental. Of these cases, the first one, 74-25 is a repeat. This is at 201 East Old Plank Road. It's the current church at the corner of Old Plank and South Bethel requested originally a permanent zoning for R-1. They requested tabling to allow us to readvertise for R-2, and this is in anticipation of future development activity on the eastern portion of the acreage. We have Case 89-25. Some of you that are familiar with this particular area, this is in the southeast corner of Vandiver and U.S. 63. It is a parcel that has -- was part of the Center State Development where Bass Pro and Menard's is located on the west side. This is the eastern undeveloped tract directly across from all of the existing commercial development. This is an existing PD parcel; however, there has never been a PD plan approved on it, so they are coming in with a PD plan for approval which includes three developed lots being shown on that plan, and a remaining five lots -- or three additional development lots and then two lots that would be used for stormwater and tree preservation purposes to be able to get and secure the PD plan approval. There is a revision to the

Statement of Intent, and this revision to the Statement of Intent includes a lot of different details. This is a particular site that is being sought to be developed with two hotels and a convention center. So one of the things that you will be encountering with this Statement of Intent is actually a design exception which is a unique element of a planned district to allow for increased building height. Mr. Palmer will unpack the entire package for you at our next meeting. A lot of detail. This one actually was delayed to allow us to get several of our questions answered, and to get the project in order. The PD plan also serves as the project's preliminary plat, and then a final plat would be required to come forward to secure permits for the future developable lots that will be shown on the plan. Mr. Halligan here to my right will be handling 92-25. This is Discovery Apartments. It's one of the last developable parcels that is left at Discovery Park, and this is at the -- it's north of Artemis Drive and at the very end of Endeavor Avenue, which is the parcel or the roadway that bisects the southwest corner of the property, and it is the road that is immediately adjoining where The Kitchen is. The development parcel, however, is behind all of the existing development. This does have an apartment complex to it built as a new town center type of feel, and it has been reviewed quite heavily as it relates to the impervious and other maximum floor area coverages relating to the commercial development of Discovery, and that will be unpacked during the meeting, as well. A complex plan, but one that's exciting for us because we are nearing the end, hopefully of unknowns. 100-25, this is on Chapel Hill Road directly across from the car wash, if you all are familiar. This is a rezoning request from a former request PD to an MN, and Mr. Kirtis Orendorff will be handling that for you. And then another planned district project, at -- and it's 102-25, that is 3101 Carter Lane. This is the parcel that was immediately to the northeast of Tacos for Life, and immediately abuts the adjoining multi-family residential subdivision that is north of that particular open acreage. This is a major amendment to the existing PD plan. It includes two lots of the three that are on the south -- or northeast side of Carter Lane. It does also have a Statement of Intent revision, so it is requesting some additional uses to be added to the Statement of Intent that were not previously permitted. And then your short-term rental cavalcade of cases. 2107 Grant Lane, this is in an R-1 zoning district. It is seeking 210 nights for eight transient guests. 97-25, 206 Third Avenue, this is a duplex, so it is apartment 100. It is in an R-2 zone, seeking if I am not incorrect, four transient guests at 210 nights. 98-25, 2301 Primrose Drive. This is townhouse project. It is one of the first that we have seen. It is Unit D. It is R-MF zoned, and again, 210 nights, and that occupancy is, I believe, two. 504 Campusview Drive, that's case 104-25. Again, an R-1 short-term rental, 210 nights, eight transient guests. This is in the Seven Oaks Subdivision. That name probably should sound familiar because that was where Boulder Drive was back in November of this year. And then Case 105-25, 801 Norman Drive. That is again another R-1 STR. It is sought for 210 nights, as well as eight transient guests, and again, in the Seven Oaks Subdivision. Here are your maps. Your Old Plank property, which is a repeat from a delayed case with the upgraded zoning. Our U.S. 63 southeast of the roundabout Center State property. And then we are looking at the planned development down at Discovery at the end of Endeavor north of Artemis. And our last two general items, our Chapel Hill property, and then our property that is off of Carter Lane just to the northeast of Tacos for Live. Short-

term Rentals Properties, your Grant Lane property. This is down Chapel Hill and then Grant Lane, your 206 Third Avenue, somewhat close to the high school, Hickman, and then 2 -- 2301 Primrose, that little dot, and is the end of a multi-family building that is a townhouse project. And then our two that are in the Seven Oaks environment, the one at 504 Campusview Drive and then the one that is at 801 Norman. Those are your cases. I can tell you that we have had a closing of an application period for our April 10th meeting. If I get my dates right here. Your April 10th meeting has 11 items on it, nine of which are short-term rentals. So what happens moving forward? That's a good question. I don't know, but I will be glad when we maybe reach June 1st, and compliance should have been arrived at, but of the studies that we have had and our access to Airbnb data, as well as our vendors that we have consulted with as it relates to short-term rental monitoring, there are approximately 475 total short-term rentals presently within the market. To date, 38 of them have come before us or will be before us. There are 17 pending public hearings right now. If we continue to move at the volume we're moving at, we may have to consider potentially opening an additional meeting. Tonight's meeting has now run for almost four and a half hours or three and a half hours. I would anticipate probably your 20th's meeting and then the 10th's meeting to run closer to four and a half, maybe five. May be able to get through all of our short-term rentals as we did tonight in about 35 minutes, and if that is the case, we will continue to endeavor to give you good staff reports so you don't ask a lot of questions. And hopefully, what you did see tonight was helpful for you, based on our conversations at our last work session as it related to those questions. We continue to try to strive to meet the expectation of the Commission, and our working with our applicants to get them to get us the information we need in order to be able to give you what you need. With that, I thank you very much for your time, your attention, your service this evening, and for the direction that you did provide during work session as it relates to our small-lot integration project. Some of the conversation this evening with Mr. Gebhardt's project will be considered as we move forward, and we look forward to the continued discussion as we try to work out those use specific standards, specifically to be able to give our proposed regulations to the design firms in town to break. With that, thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, and hopefully we seem to be getting faster at the short-term rentals, so hopefully we can --

XI. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS.

MR. STANTON: I had a comment, Madam Chair, when you get through.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead, Commissioner Stanton.

MR. STANTON: I would like to commend the Commission and staff in particular, because I feel like they give us enough information, we didn't have to have too much back and forth with the STRs. Continue that good work so we can push through these as efficiently as possible, and it is Women's History Month. I'm too tired to make an explanation or give any history tidbits tonight, so I'll just say in general to my colleagues on the -- on the P & Z, Happy Women's History Month. I'll have something next time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We appreciate you. Any other Commissioner comments?

MS. ORTIZ: I do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: There were some things said here tonight that were very personally hurtful to me and my upbringing. And I don't want to get emotional, but if the worst possible case is that you live next to Section 8, that's where I grew up, and I would love to be my neighbor. I don't think it would be that bad.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MS. WILSON: I think that, first of all, thank you for sharing that. And everybody here already knows, I usually speak up for things, and I was -- I was ready because I'm living through this right now with a family member who could not find a place to stay because everybody is like, oh, you have a Section 8 voucher, no thank you. And I'm, like, she's a human being with children. What's the problem? But I think that -- take the opportunity to share that because sometimes people just don't know. We don't -- we -- (inaudible) -- each other so much that we don't get to look in the face of people and see this is a person just like me. And so I think I've had so many opportunities, and I'm grateful for those opportunities to share my experiences and I would welcome you to share yours, as well.

MR. STANTON: I tried to keep my mouth shut, and I couldn't. So depend on me, if you want my -- hey, I'll run my mouth whenever -- whenever feasible, ladies.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I was very disappointed. Anyway, anyone else?

XII. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, I would move to adjourn this meeting as soon as possible.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have a motion to adjourn and a second. Without objection, we stand adjourned.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting adjourned at 10:31 p.m.)