

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
October 19, 2023

Case Number 247-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of The Roxie Grant Revocable Trust (owner), seeking approval of 41.17 acres of R-1 (One-Family Dwelling), 14.48 acres of R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling), and 4.7 acres of R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) district zoning as permanent zoning, subject to annexation, of the applicant's 60.4-acre subject parcel. The property is currently zoned Boone County R-S and is located at 3705 Gibbs Road.

MS. GEUEA JONES: To be clear, this is only on the zoning, not on the subject of annexation. May we please have a staff report?

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to permanently zone the subject 60.4 acres as follows and as depicted on the attached zoning graphic:

- 41.17 acres of R-1
- 14.48 acres of R-2
- 4.7 acres of R-MF.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. This may be a question for Mr. Zenner, but whichever one of you wants to answer it. This property's location and its timing has a bearing on our potential future West Area Plan, would you say? Where are we planning schools, roads? It's a little bit north. We have discussed on the West Area Plan whether or not -- if I recall correctly, it has been some time ago, given the pandemic, but one of the last places we left that conversation with the County was, do we cross 70 with the plan.

MR. ZENNER: And you are correct. It's been a -- it's been a moment. The planning activities for the West Area Plan really were being driven south of Interstate 70. And as many of you may be aware, and as the public may be aware, the County is working on an update to its County Comprehensive Plan at this point. So with respect to the West Area Plan, this actually, because it is north of 70, isn't in the area that we were originally looking at, so we would default to our other planning documents that we have in place; i.e., the CATSO Major Roadway Plan --

MR. MACMANN: CATSO and USA?

MR. ZENNER: Yeah. And the CATSO and the USA. So the Comp Plan and then the CATSO plan, both of which the project fits within. There are -- it's been identified in both with possible improvements to make access to the site and connectivity to other major roadway networks possible. So I think as Rusty was trying to point out, this may appear to be premature at this point because there is nothing around it. However, when we look at the broader context and what is planned for the area, which is driven by development, unfortunately, it is not as remote as one may think. And therefore, when you look at the -- the infrastructure that must be brought to the site and the offset of that cost, this proposal is what the applicant believes is necessary in order to assist with that. Ultimately, this decision, however, of zoning, as well as annexation, lie first zoning with you all with a recommendation, ultimately with Council on both sides. If this is viewed as being premature at this point, given the lack of maybe existing infrastructure, that may have an impact as it relates to its final decision.

MR. MACMANN: I don't have a question. Sorry, folks, this is a bit of arcana, but it goes to everyone in the City and the County, and hope that Council watches this section. I agree with you. I think we're just beyond the parameter of where we left those discussions at. I would caution that we don't necessarily let this development be a guide or a driver thereof what we end up doing with the West Area Plan.

MR. ZENNER: I would tend to agree, and we are waiting to find out. I think when the County finishes its land-use plan, it's up to do its comprehensive plan, should this property not have been addressed by that point, I think there may be better direction as it relates to how the County envisions this. But as is the case in most instances where you are immediately adjoining the City's --

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: --municipal boundary with access to City's municipal services, this would be a site that they likely would be more inclined --

MR. MACMANN: It's connected already. Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: -- to get to the City.

MR. MACMANN: Right. Yeah. Right. I just wanted to -- wanted to raise that point. Thank you very much. Thank you for that digression, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Palmer, I realize this is a request for zoning, so maybe this is premature, but I'm interested in the land analysis map, given the size of this parcel. Is that something that we would expect at a later presentation?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. It would be typically submitted with the prelim plat.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

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

MR. DUNN: Part of the reason why I asked the question about the water main line is actually in relation to this project. And I know the water main line, if you look at the map, is pretty far north on the plat, farther from the develop -- the proposed development. Do we have any concerns, just as it relates

to the increase in usage on that water main line that's --

MR. PALMER: I think you're actually referring to the sewer main on the north end?

MR. DUNN: Yeah.

MR. PALMER: And then the water is accessible along Gibbs. And actually, that is a six-inch line, which would potentially need to be upgraded to at least an eight-inch line to serve this, but that would be part of the developer's cost in -- in building the site, so --

MR. DUNN: And then I know we got some correspondence as it relates to the proposed road. You know, for the property owners that provided that correspondence, would they be losing out on that part of the property due to eminent domain or what's the process for --

MR. PALMER: So our process for obtaining right-of-way, typically, is when a developer comes to us with a property and proposes development, we look at our CATSO map, and if there's a roadway indicated that's a need that has been identified by our CATSO Committee, we would accommodate that through obtaining right-of-way at the time of a plat. Right? And so the conceptual plan shows what is also shown on our CATSO map, and that is, basically, accounting for what will eventually be dedicated right-of-way on this property. Now that kind of cements in place, if you will, where that road will go through their property, and therefore, where it enters the -- the neighboring properties. And so that does affect those neighboring properties, but their piece of that right-of-way most likely would not be obtained until they, too, come to us with a request to develop their property. In extreme cases, you know, where we find a greater public need for the sum connection, we may proactively pursue a right-of-way, obtaining of right-of-way, but we would -- the owners would be compensated for that at that time, and that's just not typically how we do that at this stage, so --

MR. DUNN: Thank you.

MR. PALMER: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. Just to be extra clear about right-of-ways in this process as it applies to the surrounding land, as well as the developer and the City, the future collector that is marked on this, that's planned in the CATSO plan, would that go forward regardless of this current application?

MR. PALMER: So like I said, it's identified in the CATSO as a -- as a need, and then also in the other documents I shared with you, you know, regarding the connection of Scott to an interchange at Sorrell's Overpass. And so, as this area is developed at some point in the future, that need would be addressed and like we do it generally is in a piecemeal -- piecemeal fashion. And so that doesn't go away without the CATSO map being modified. Does that make sense?

MS. CARROLL: The CATSO map is modified if there's a development in place because the right-of-way dedicated here?

MR. PALMER: No. No. No. The right-of-way is prioritized based on what is shown on the CATSO map. The CATSO map is the conceptual connections from point A to B, but as the land is developed, we have to address those needs by obtaining right-of-way in those areas.

MS. CARROLL: So it will add priority to that project -- or to that CATSO project?

MR. PALMER: Oh, I -- yeah. I understand your question. So not exactly, but as it becomes more and more built out, it becomes more and more likely that that -- you know, that last piece would be added in, but, yeah. It's done in such a piecemeal, long-range kind of fashion that I wouldn't say that it adds a priority to a certain project over another.

MS. CARROLL: And for the area of the road that is marked, but -- or designated future road, not through this development, who is requesting right-of-way? Is that the City and not the developer?

MR. PALMER: Yeah. The CATSO organization is the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization, so it's a regional --

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. PALMER: -- organization with representatives from the City, County, and MoDOT and others. So it is the City that gains the right-of-way for a property in the City, but generally, it's a regional concern, so --

MS. CARROLL: Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff at this time? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. Name and address for the record. Six minutes for a group and three minutes for an individual.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Just a real quick overview again. Tonight we're just looking for the rezoning of this piece of property. That's what we're looking to do. Typically, we do have the preliminary plat that accompanies the annexation request and zoning as it goes through the process. However, for the R-2 development, we are asking, we are seeking cottage standards. So we're not looking at doing duplexes, we're looking at doing the smaller single-family homes for sale. So with that, the next step would be if we were to gain approval on the zoning, our next step is to go to the Board of Adjustment to obtain the cottage standards, and then we would come back before this Commissioner with the preliminary plat. So that is the reason why you don't have the preliminary plat in front of you tonight, like you -- like you do many times is because we're going for the cottage standards. For the multi-family, we're looking at doing town homes at that location, as well. We're not looking to doing apartments. And again, it's 64 acres that's currently zoned single-family residential in the County. We're simply asking to rezone it to a similar zone for R-1, and then it's, of course, the R-2 for cottage, and then R-MF in the City. Again, you've seen the location. You know location of the site. Again, the conceptual plan, you can see here, roughly 45 percent of the site or so is going to be -- remain in open space. There's -- it gets really rough. It gets tough terrain as you go north. We want to leave that -- leave that in green space. And actually more of the developable -- more of the yellow area may become green space as we move forward, as well. Just to make sure there's no misunderstandings or misconceptions, the main east-west

road that runs through the property there, that is the collector street that is identified by CATSO. That will be built on this property be built by the developer themselves. They're not looking for, not seeking, not asking for any other additional right-of-way offsite for that road as it goes off of this property. I just want to make sure that we're not looking to encroach onto the neighbors with regards to that. I mean, this is the CATSO plan, and we want to abide by that, and we're going to construct the road accordingly. This is a surrounding zoning exhibit. This meshes, basically, the County and the City zoning map into one. The dark dash line there is the current City limits. You can kind of see it's a mix of single-family residential on both sides of the City limit line. There is some ag land -- ag zoned property. There is a significant amount of multi-family or moderate density residential to the south. There's quite a few duplexes to the southeast. So it's kind of a mixed -- mixed-use zoning in that entire area. So what we're looking to do is have a single-family development, but in different types of uses, basically, 60-foot-wide lots, the cottage standard, and then attached single-family, as well. Again, I think you've seen this before. This is the CATSO map, so our -- our layout conforms to this CATSO map. You know, many times we're asking to modify, change or do something different other than what CATSO shows. In this case, we -- we're holding to it pretty firm. Columbia Imagined, it's identified as a neighborhood district on the land-use plan that's included in Columbia Imagined, and that calls for a broad mix of residential uses, and I think that's exactly what we're proposing here tonight, different types of single-family residential uses for this area. It supports a diverse and inclusive housing options, you know, smaller lot sizes, promoting home ownership, and encouraging integrated residential densification. Now I wouldn't say this is a dense development by any means. If you look at our total area and our amount of green space that we're preserving, we're sitting around two units per acre. Now, if we were to take that on a regular single-family residential development, I would say that's not very dense in the City of Columbia. But given how the property to the north really kind of falls off, we ought to leave that as open space and keep our density on the developable areas. We think that's -- that's a sensitive move. Again, we're located inside the urban service area. It runs to the west, further to the west, so we are inside the urban service area, and there are utilities in place to serve the development. There is a 15-inch sanitary sewer that crosses the subject tract. And, Mr. Dunn, you asked about that. That is underutilized as far as capacity goes. There's plenty of capacity in that 15-inch sewer line, and that goes right down into -- right down into the trunk sewer that runs along -- along the -- along Perche Creek. And so there's adequate capacity in all the sewers. We checked that with the sewer department, and there's no issues there. Staff has also talked about the six-inch water line that crosses the property. There is a six-inch water line there. It will probably need to be upgraded, but there is a 12-inch water just -- just a little bit further to the east adjacent to the site. So there's adequate water to serve this development, as well. And so I think that's important when we talk about -- talk about water and sewer. And, of course, storm water would be per the City regulations and the electric will be served by Boone Electric. The request is consistent with the goals and objectives of Columbia Imagined, including the land-use plan. I think that was shown and illustrated in the staff report, and we -- we concur with that. It's compatible with the surrounding land and with the zoning and uses.

There are a mixed use out there -- no doubt. There are some larger tracts of land. There are some agricultural-zoned properties, but there's a lot of multi-family and smaller tracts out there, as well. So given that we're preserving a lot of area and keeping our density to one location, I think it kind of -- it's compatible. And then, of course, it's also supported by the City staff. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, good evening.

MR. CROCKETT: Hello.

MR. MACMANN: That area to the north, that's pretty rough.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir.

MR. MACMANN: Do you anticipate, given your engineering background, getting all that storm water on the north end up there? I notice there's a south -- there's a proposed southern catchment basin. I'm just wondering about how difficult it's going to be to carry the water there because it's -- it's multiple hollers, if you will.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. Yes.

MR. MACMANN: There will have to be an extensive amount of dirt work to carry that storm water north.

MR. CROCKETT: Not too bad, Mr. MacMann, to be honest with you, because the -- the terrain falls for, you know, pretty much --

MR. MACMANN: On the west side, it certainly does.

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. MACMANN: I'm just wondering from the -- on the east side --

MR. CROCKETT: On the east -- on the southeast, on the south portion or the --

MR. MACMANN: On the east side of the development overall, but you get -- it looks like you have to come over a ridge or something there?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, if you look on -- on the northeast, there's -- where the green space kind of protrudes coming south, there's a draw there, and so that's going to portray -- that's going to convey a lot of the storm water to the north through that draw. There's also a draw between the two cul-de-sacs. There's a reason why the cul-de-sacs aren't connected. There's a significant draw there. There's another draw a little bit further to the west there, so --

MR. MACMANN: All right. I was just wondering how much those trees are going to remain; that's what I was wondering.

MR. CROCKETT: The vast majority. I mean, we're going to do very little work in there. We have to bring the sewer. The sewer crosses this property, so the 15-inch trunk sewer actually crosses the property to the north, so we'll have to bring the sewer through there, as well, through that draw. But, you know, we have no intention to clear out hardly any of those trees if we can keep from it. I mean, the

storm sewer, we can put it into -- into channels that are there now. We're not going to pipe that water. So we can put it in the channels, and then also put it --

MR. MACMANN: That was my next question. Are we going to end up pumping water here, clean or otherwise?

MR. CROCKETT: No.

MR. MACMANN: That was my main concern. Thank you very much. Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other -- Commissioner Stanton?]

MR. STANTON: Mr. Crockett --

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: -- I see cottage style. Is this in name only, or are you truly going to be cottage?

MR. CROCKETT: Well, cottage standards according to the UDC, that's what we're looking for. We're looking to doing 40 foot, probably, you know, single-car garages, smaller homes, maybe two bedroom. You know, my client is a builder. He -- that's what he does, and he has another cottage development that came before this Commission in the recent past, and he's getting a lot of interest on that. There's a big hole in the market. I am trying to hit the smaller price point, and so he's getting a lot of interest in that, and so that's what we want to try and do here, is trying to make sure that we can hit a market that can't be reached right now. And so, in doing that, we need the smaller footprints.

MR. STANTON: But not just in look, but in actual definition, footprint?

MR. CROCKETT: Correct. Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Square footage?

MR. CROCKETT: Square footage, absolutely.

MR. STANTON: All that. Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: He developed -- he developed his floor plans for that other development and he wants to carry them over into this development, as well.

MR. STANTON: Thank you, sir.

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

MR. DUNN: You know, just given the correspondence in looking at the proposed collector road and seeing how close it does kind of butt up against their property, and specifically, their house, you know. What would the challenges be to shift that development a little bit west so that way if we needed to take that road a little bit closer to the property line --

MR. CROCKETT: I think we can look at that, absolutely. And I think that's something we definitely want to look at on the preliminary plat stage, should this project move forward. I think we can take that road and take that collector road and maybe start curving it over a little bit sooner and get it in more of a northerly direction to pull it away from -- from the neighbor's house to -- that's to the east. Absolutely.

MR. DUNN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? I have one or will you indulge me with a little

exercise?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So we are not here tonight approving your development plan?

MR. CROCKETT: That is correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We are here tonight talking about what the zoning will be on this property should the City decide to annex it?

MR. CROCKETT: Correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And I appreciate very much the fact that you are thinking ahead and trying to show everybody in the area, this is what we're thinking about. But at this stage, this is what you're thinking about. Right?

MR. CROCKETT: It's -- it's -- yes. It's what we're thinking about, but we have our application completed and ready to go to the Board of Adjustment. That's our next step. We're ready to make that application as soon as we -- should we clear the Planning and Zoning Commission. We definitely want to -- I mean, I say that's what we're thinking about, but that's -- that's -- that's the initial game plan, and that's still the game plan today. So, yes. It's more than just a -- we're not just thinking about it, we actually want to execute on that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct. Yes. What I want to emphasize to my fellow Commissioners and to those watching is you have to get a recommendation from us on the zoning. The City Council then has to approve annexation and zoning. The Board of Adjustment would then have to approve the cottage standard. The building department, the highway department, and the CATSO folks and everyone would then have to come through and look at this. So just because -- again, I appreciate the plan and I appreciate the fact that you took into account CATSO and wanted to say, you know, this is where CATSO shows the road, so this is where we're going to show the road. What I want to emphasize is when it actually comes time to break ground, all of the things that we've been talking about with the placement of existing houses with the storm water runoff, with the trees and the, you know, forest that has to be preserved, all of that will also be taken into account and be accommodated.

MR. CROCKETT: Absolutely.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So as you said, and I'd like for you to say it again, when it comes time to actually build this road, you will put it wherever the transportation department and everybody else says it needs to go, and it does -- it's not necessarily going to abut your neighbor's house?

MR. CROCKETT: Correct. Yes. We will work with them, and not just -- not just the members of CATSO, but also with that neighbor to make sure that we can best accommodate them. It may not be to their exact liking, but certainly take their input and do what we can. Also with the members of CATSO, as well. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And another question. In the past when we've seen developments like this that are multi- or mixed housing-type developments and that sort of thing, you're not going to break ground and build all of these at once necessarily or --

MR. CROCKETT: I don't anticipate it all being built at one time, no. I would probably see something like this probably being broke into two, maybe three, possibly four different phases.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. And those will also take into account water runoff during building and all that kind of stuff?

MR. CROCKETT: A hundred percent. Absolutely. And all those plans have to be submitted and approved by the City through the City storm water engineers, and it's all being inspected as it gets installed. We can't have additional runoff during construction, all those gets inspected by the City during construction. Absolutely.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Including traffic department, all of that kind of stuff? So I, again, really appreciate you saying this is what we want to do with the property, and I believe you when you say you actually want to do true cottage-style development and all of that. But I want to emphasize for folks, we're a long way from a bulldozer pulling off of Gibbs Road?

MR. CROCKETT: Right. Right. And this kind of goes back to the previous discussions that we have had with this Commissioner with regards to how we may want to modify the direction that we go forward with cottage standards in the future because it is a long, drawn-out process, and we do have to get that important R-2 zoning. And I don't think anybody disagrees with that, it's just one of those things in the UDC that we have to modify as we work through it, because we don't want to give the impression or the impersonation that we're doing duplexes when we're really looking for cottage standards, and that's really what we're looking for.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much for indulging me.

MR. CROCKETT: Appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anybody else? Seeing none. Oh, sorry. Commissioner MacMann wants a second bite.

MR. MACMANN: Just -- just a little bit of a point of order. In the information for you, that very problem, the last one you mentioned, we worked on that today.

MR. CROCKETT: Excellent. I appreciate that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, Mr. Crockett. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. WEIRICH: Jason Weirich, 3875 West Gibbs Road. I find it very interesting, Mr. Palmer, that -- that's your name; is that right?

MR. PALMER: Yeah.

MR. WEIRICH: We weren't supposed to talk about anything else besides the zoning portion, but I think you stated your case to get exactly what you guys want. He specifically told me, don't bring up anything besides the zoning portion, so I find it very disturbing about the other discussions that have happened to support that. Let's imagine for a moment that you join a football team, and as an adult, you do some research before joining, making sure that you know the rules, the playing field where you will spend your time, defending your team, and who will be in charge. Like many teams formed, you do not

know all your team mates, but you intend to interact with them in a way that builds relationships, camaraderie, and after research, you decide to join this particular team. And for all intent and purposes, let's call that Team Gibbs. You are excited to begin playing the game, and all seems to be going well in the first half. Both teams and the ref seem to be playing and calling the game fairly. But halftime is approaching and the other team has a plan. The other team sees the opportunity to win and beat team Gibbs, so during halftime, the ref's collude with the other team to change the rules and to change the area in what the game is being played. Leaving Team Gibbs scrambling, unfairly trying to understand why, in the middle of the game that has lasted for decades, the rules are being modified to benefit one team. The goal of a true and real game is to win. Naturally, you want to be a winner, coming out on top, having competed in a manner that shows strength, mental toughness, and downright grit, winning can seem like everything, an accolade to who you are as an individual, and display to the world your tenacity with this football game instead of giving it Superbowl status could be equated to a five-year-old game of flag football. Parents in their hearts are keeping the score, and the ref's are present to ensure the players are adhering to the rules set in place to keep the game equal and the players from harm. In that end -- in that end, tough, the winners are both teams. Five-year-olds just happy that they got to play the game and get a snack and juice when the final whistle blows. Our property, purchased more than ten years ago, was zoned R-1 or R-S in Boone County. In going into the sale of our home, we knew that one day the land behind us would eventually be developed for homes, but upon our initial research, and based on the zoning, we were committed to the idea of having a few neighbors, whose land was similar to ours, equals as teammates, spread out throughout 35 developable acres or 40. The traffic increase would be minimal to the area and the roads on which we drive, except the City's proposal changed the zoning to R-2 and R-MF is changing the rules, and this change will only benefit the other team and their referees. Bringing in more than 120 homes upwards of 200, 300 cars, factoring in college and young people filling these cottages, does nothing but damage our team in a way that the players could never financially recover. The rules will change the playing field and damage our equipment, making the already poor road conditions worse, leaving the team broken facilities, no funds to repair or replace them. Plans set in motion to make the connector ZZ and Stadium has been in the works for over ten years now. We saw the plan before we signed on the dotted line, however, at present, there is still no action being taken, nor none that we see in the immediate future to alleviate the traffic situation that will occur upon changing the zoning. Over a half a million dollars has been spent on the sidewalks connected CIS to Cosmo Park. We can't even fathom what it would cost to construct the proposed road, or what time frame this would be built. One team can go home holding the Lombardi trophy, their income to the sale of the property, and the sale of those 120 cottages over their heads in pride and satisfaction in completing the switch and bait on the property owners around the grant land with the rezoning. There is another way, though, that in a fair and humble attitude, neither team loses. Games, as we know, do not end in a tie, but teams should be able to walk away from a game and say the rules upheld, the referees to help to judge -- and keep it zoned at what it is. I bought that property at -- zoned at that, and I want it to stay the same. I've got one

last thing. I made a call. My house has been shot. I've had the cops at my house five times in the last four years. I've had bullet holes through my house. I've had people in my house when me and my kids were asleep, robbed -- robbed us. I made a call to one of the people in this room and I said, you know, I have a concern with people walking around our property. My wife and kids were home. An engineer, a surveyor was on the property walking around. I got told it's their right to be on that property. It may be their right, but common courtesy where I come from, you could knock on the door and say, hey, we're out here doing this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. If you would give us just a moment, sir. Does anyone have any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MS. WEIRICH: Megan Weirich, 3875 West Gibbs Road. Proposing that the potential residential neighborhood on West Gibbs Road will be affordable housing is a ruse. Because Columbia is a college dense town and full of transient residents, only half of the homes in this city are actually occupied by their owners. The other 25,000 people who are inhabited our renters, and most of who are not going to be in Columbia for a long term. The idea regarding affordable housing should be homes that are affordable to purchase by owners who will live in them. People who are just starting out, people with no children or a couple of little toddlers running around, purchasing a home should be a way for families to begin to build wealth, putting equity into their home. They should take pride in achieving what many Midwesterners love to do, have it all -- a house with a two-car garage. But this is not affordable housing that is being proposed. Building this type of neighborhood with 120 homes in 30 acres is not beneficial to the school district, to the Valley View neighborhood, surrounding homes, or the roads on which we drive. The last place -- the last place that affordable housing should be built is in the West Boulevard School District. In 2016, 75 percent of their children are eligible for free and reduced lunches, and now, after Covid, it is 99 percent. Our children attended West Boulevard for six years, and we have personally seen how the distribution of the burden -- that burdens the teachers, the administrators, and the staff. The disproportion of low-income families strains the systems in ways that only people who have seen it can understand. Building what this contractor has touted as the cheapest housing in Columbia, our division in this area will only increase the amount of students in that school district who qualify for free and reduced lunches. Valley View and Valley Ridge Subdivisions are neatly situated. They are homed by people who are long-term live there -- rent their -- many are not renters. Cars that are through this neighborhood are not going to be home once they get through that neighborhood. Now they are going to travel three-quarters of a mile with barely maintained, narrow, windy roads, and these -- the City street from Sunflower to Gibbs Road is marginally passable with two cars. There are steep drop-offs. You may even remember that the manhunt on West Gibbs Road that took place after four men had stolen a vehicle and wrecked into a tree in my front yard. Let's just gloss over the uptick in crime and focus on the alarming increase of the use of the already poorly maintained roads, causing more and more -- more wear and tear to the personal vehicles of those who have lived on West Gibbs Road. Can I be so naive to think that this land would

never be developed? One could hope that the land would stay in the family as Ms. Roxie Grant had hoped, but I understand that the land is of no use to the family if they personally do not want to live on it. But who does this type of neighborhood benefit? Changing R-1 to R-2 and R-MF is beneficial to this seller and the developer. The developer is a savvy businessman with a smooth talker to use all the right phrasing to have the City's approval for the proposed affordable housing neighborhood. Affordable housing lines the pockets of the developers and the prospective landlords who are renting the homes out to young college students or families who are unable to purchase a home of their own. This proposal would never fly in the backyards of families on the south side of Columbia, Thornbrook, Copper Street, or Copper's Edge where the houses are upwards of \$1 million. The developer would not want to share fences with a cottage style the size of their garage. The passing of this proposal demonstrates how the City of Columbia is an active participant in segregation, continuing to grow the City in a way that separates low-income families from the south and is a proponent of making the wealthy wealthier with little to no regard of the lower or middle-class individuals in our area.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ma'am, I'm sorry. That's your time. Did you have one last --

MS. WEIRICH: I have -- I have a quote that I found from Patrick Zenner back in 2016 regarding the Brookside Apartments that says, "We have failed you and I admit it. Our failures have left carnage at the edge of your neighborhood."

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I hear you. I think you're making a lot of assumptions. What would you like there? What would make your neighborhood --

MS. WEIRICH: I mean I --

MR. STANTON: What would like there? If it was your property, what would you do with it that would be -- if you're taking one for the team, your community, what would you put there?

MS. WEIRICH: How could this land be better used by the City of Columbia? What if the land was developed as it is zoned right now? What if it's R-1, and instead of these 30-foot lots, two acre lots are sectioned that are similar to the homes that are already in the area. What if the homes that are built draw owners whose children attend West Boulevard and become valuable participants in their school district?

MR. STANTON: Well, if I had had two-acre lots, is -- you know that's a half million, million dollars house.

MS. WEIRICH: So you think I can sell my house for a half a million dollars? No way.

MR. STANTON: So you have --

MS. WEIRICH: I live in that little square that has nothing on it right by the pond. That's where I live, and I'm not going to be able to sell my house for that.

MR. STANTON: So bigger lots, bigger houses?

MS. WEIRICH: I'm not asking -- I don't have -- I feel like I don't have a big house. But a lot that

is similar to what's already around there, yeah. I drive by. I drive through the neighborhood, and there are -- it is a small neighborhood of duplexes. But the houses who live to the west of me and on down Gibbs Road, all of those are houses that live on two acres or more.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very -- oh, I'm sorry. Commissioner MacMann, go ahead.

MR. MACMANN: Just a comment. I rent. My son went to school at West Boulevard. As of yet, neither one of us have been arrested for any crimes. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I was going to speak towards the West Boulevard School, as well. My children attend West Boulevard. I do think that there may be some assumptions made here. The -- the cottage developments that have been going forward very recently have all been for sale and have been purchased by families much like the ones that you're describing, actually. And I'm looking at the recently placed cottage developments using the same setbacks as described here. I -- I guess I --

MS. WEIRICH: So you're saying that we -- we have a different experience at West Boulevard than you did? I just am not understanding.

MS. CARROLL: No. I'm not arguing with you. The vast majority of West Boulevard is -- is lunch -- free and reduced lunch. After Covid, they made it free and reduced lunch for all students.

MS. WEIRICH: But it -- (inaudible) -- there's 25 percent free and reduced lunches.

MS. CARROLL: I understand.

MS. WEIRICH: What if -- what if someone was to decide to buy back the land that was donated by Larry Potterfield that's on the other side, and then though they're -- it's a completely open area. It's developable also, and they would be in a district that could hold capacitywise some of -- alleviate some of the tensions that happens at West Boulevard.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I guess the questions that I had were regarding the zoning here, and the knowledge of, you know, the fact that this is for zoning and not for building.

MS. WEIRICH: But for purposes of zoning --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Excuse me. Please do not interrupt the Commissioners. Thank you.

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I do see what you're saying about the way that the City grows and the disproportionate way that we tend to see the growth. I would generally support cottage-style south of town, as well. I guess I will leave it at that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much for coming. Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward. Just is a reminder, three minutes for individuals, six minutes if you're representing a group.

MR. DOUGLASS: Joe Douglass, 4855 Roemer Road. I'm not here on behalf of -- I grew up on Gibbs Road. I went to West Boulevard. Lived there most of my early life -- you know, early childhood life. My grandmother, who is here in the crowd, she asked me to speak on her behalf. She's 95 years old. She owns the 40 acres immediately west of this property. She does not want this to be rezoned. And

respectfully, I know there's been a lot of talk and discussions about the cottages, but that wasn't brought up till the developer came up and started talking, and I think we're just talking about the zoning, is what's presented, so what we're all not liking is the R-2 or the R-MF. So the cottage things shouldn't really even be discussed if it's not official, it's not writing, it's just talk. I know there's been some talk -- getting back to the -- to the road project, I know that they only go back to like 2009, but for like the last 30 years, they've been talking about Scott Boulevard going through. And all the people on the road know that. We know it's inevitable, but there's been talk about what comes first, the road or these kind of developments, and it's kind of like the chicken and the egg, but I would argue that it's more putting the cart before the horse. It makes a lot more sense logically to get the infrastructure in place so you can be more flexible and put it in what's best in what spots. Maybe there has to be some multi-family there, but it's going to make a lot more sense once all the infrastructure is in place. Maybe it would be better to have another school there. Maybe it would be better to have a park. There's only so much land there -- and you've already heard on that site. There's only so much land in that entire area. Even my grandma's land, that's actually you can do stuff with. There's of bluffs, there's tons of hollers. And once you put this place in, it's going to really limit the City's flexibility to make any kind of changes to future plans of that road because it's already changed multiple times. It's probably going to change some more, and it doesn't make sense to build the middle of a road in a development before you build the whole thing. I think it's illogical, and there's not enough infrastructure right now to support it on that road, and there's already issues with crime, and it's just going to make things worse right now. And if it's -- I was hopefully just to kind of -- I'd ask the Council if it would be all right if I asked the room to raise their hand in show of support, because I think a lot of people here are for it. It might save you all some time than everybody coming and talking. But if you guys don't mind, if I could ask the room to raise their hand.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, while I appreciate the idea, please don't. Thank you.

MR. DOUGLASS: I guess you would rather not. Okay. I didn't know if you did or not. Okay. I didn't know if that was allowed or not. So that's all I have.

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

MS. PLACIER: Oh, just a clarification. And you can see it on the screen now. Forty acres of this will be R-1, which is what we traditionally call single-family, so most of it is single family housing for sale. Fourteen acres is labeled R-2, but that is only because our current plan is really confusing, that to do these smaller single-family homes called cottages, right now the zoning is R-2. That doesn't mean they're duplexes. It means that they are single-family homes that will be for sale, they'll just be smaller than usual. So R-2, we are trying to fix that because it's really confusing. People think it means duplex.

MR. DOUGLASS: What does the R-MF mean then, like, that five acres.

MS. PLACIER: R-MF will also be single-family townhouses. They'll be side-by-side-by-side, but single family, not some kind of giant apartment building or something. At least that -- but that's the intention. Now I realize -- I'm not naive enough to think that whatever is said at this time, because this is

very preliminary, is what is going to happen, because as our Chair pointed out, lots of things have to happen. But I just wanted to clarify what those zoning categories mean and what it is that we're looking at, or what we were told anyhow would be a variety of single-family housing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd refer you back to when I spoke earlier, and asked Mr. Zenner a question. It referred directly to what you're talking about. I referred to the West Area Plan, and that was us and the County and CPS, and was there anyone else -- those type of entities, plan -- CATSO, plan where the roads go, plan where the schools go, et cetera. The type of thing you were talking about. This area was not included in that. By West Area, we're mostly referring to the west of Perche. I agree with you. I think many in this room agree with you. Gosh, it would be great to have that planned out in the, in the first place, but it's not here, and this is the process that we currently have. And I would suggest to you folks if you are -- if the strength of your concern maintains, I would suggest that you go to all of the meetings that our Chair, Ms. Geuea Jones, mentioned, and share your things, and that's the best way to modify these types of things going forward. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I've heard three speakers say this, and I didn't say anything until I seen a pattern. The reason why we're heavily talking about the zoning, the why, the what maybe, because that will -- that weighs heavily on our decision on the zoning. I can't speak for everybody, but I'm very skeptical of what I can't have solid. So if you listen to the questions that I asked the engineer specifically, not in -- not in look, but in actual specifications of a cottage, that's why I asked that. We want to know that because you have to justify to us why we would want to change, so where is your thinking at. That's why we're talking about cottage, that's why we're talking about these things, because it is instrumental that we're thinking 50 to 100 years ahead. So that's why we're talking that, and it's kind of hard to separate the two because if we just talked zoning, there's a whole bunch of mistrust there. And we're trying to nail down both parties and get it on the record what comes out of his mouth so that in the future and for the future for you guys following this case, which I strongly recommend. Put your feet in your mouth where your concerns are because at every step that the Chairman talked about, you're -- you're putting the bug in everybody's ear that's making the decisions what -- what's going on and what your concerns are, and we do take those in consideration. The cottage style from my -- and I can only speak from my experience -- from my experience is generally for empty nesters, families that have downsized. If you -- if you remember the questions asked the engineer about the square footage, this could be single mom, two kids, one kid. Just it's not a Brady Bunch type level of housing that we're building out here. To the other speaker, the back-end lots are big. I'm going to stay on this, but it does trouble me that the kind of characterization of the free and reduced lunch. It's kind of bothering me, but I'm just going to leave that alone. I think this is a good idea. I think it's something that you guys need to stay on and pursue as citizens so that you can stay on top of it, and the powers that be have to listen. And when it comes down to the final decision, all your concerns will be recorded and they will be considered. We're considering

everything you guys are saying, and every step of the way, they will also be considered. So, thank you for voicing your opinions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? I have a quick one. If -- if they get denied and decide they're going to build anyway, under R-S zoning, it appears to me that they would be able to build somewhere between 200 and 240 single-family homes here. Would that be preferable to you?

MR. DOUGLASS: Yeah. R-S would definitely be preferable, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You understand that would be a lot more. That's almost twice as many houses.

MR. DOUGLASS: I -- just based on what I know from the land, the way it lays, there's no way they could build that many, but I understand what you're saying from an acreage and things, and plus the -- with the -- just with the road, too, it wouldn't support it. But, you know, there's no -- I don't think there's any way you could build that many houses on that land the way it lays, but --

MS. GEUEA JONES: But I'm telling you that's what they could legally do if we say no.

MR. DOUGLASS: Well, then why are they coming here and getting it rezoned then, I guess, if they can just do that already anyway. I'm confused. I don't that much about zoning, but, I'm sorry. I don't understand --

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's okay. I'm just trying to do what Commissioner Stanton often does which is the would you prefer it with us saying nothing, but -- Commissioner Stanton, go ahead.

MR. STANTON: They're trying to propose, I would say, a bleeding edge, cutting edge concept of -- and that's why we had to change these zonings around because our law, as it sits, does not allow you to do it the way they're thinking about doing it, so they're doing it -- they have to fall within certain zonings, and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It's a lot more work than just -- they could just put a road in and put a bunch of houses. They could give you what one of the speakers said you want the two-acre lots, you want the this, that. They can do that and have no consideration whatever you all thought. They could just do it. This is almost -- I hate to use this word. Mr. Zenner, don't -- it's almost like a planned development and we're still way away from that, but that's kind of where he's at, and, yeah. He can -- he can back out of this whole thing, make one big cul-de-sac down there, and make two-, three-acre lots, or whatever you guys think you --

MR. DOUGLASS: And they can do that whether it's County or City, or does it matter.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are you finished, Commissioner Stanton? I'm sorry.

MR. STANTON: Oh, he can get it in there. He can get all of that that you want. He could -- he could get it in there.

MR. DOUGLASS: And does it matter if it's County or City, and he can put as many he wants, or I -- I don't know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: I don't want to get in the weeds like that, but that's why this -- we're going

through this rigamarole because he has a certain way he wants to build, and it's way easier not to ask us for all this stuff, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I apologize. For the last three speakers, I have been trying to clarify in my pea brain, what is the actual objection to this proposal. Outside of we don't like they're changing the zoning, when you say you don't like that they're asking for a different zoning, what is the problem?

MR. DOUGLASS: Well I think the impression that I think my grandma and the neighbors have is that it's going to be very cheap housing or rental property, and that's the impression that's -- you know, when people -- because on here it says multiple family dwellings and two-family dwellings in the -- what's written here on this -- on the agenda, so that people think that -- assume that means duplexes and, you know, apartments. So that's the reason why we're down here, so --

MS. WILSON: Okay.

MR. DOUGLASS: I don't know if that helps or not.

MS. WILSON: So I'll just follow up -- follow up, a couple of follow-up questions. Have you all spoken to each other and this is the conclusion that you've drawn?

MR. DOUGLASS: I don't represent the group. I'm just here --

MS. WILSON: No. No. I'm just asking.

MR. DOUGLASS: But I know that the neighbors have spoke to each other about it, I don't live on the road anymore because I moved to the north. I live on Roemer Road now, so -- but I don't know what conversations the neighbors have had, but that might be a good question for maybe someone else can come up and answer that for you. I just -- that actually lives on the road, I'm sure there's somebody -- I'm pretty sure there's somebody coming right after me that probably can, so --

MS. WILSON: Having asked that question, my next question is, does everything have to be a negative outcome? What if, as Commissioner Stanton proposed, yes, it's a cottage-style home, and at one point, I was considering buying a cottage-style home, and it cost \$300,000. So just because it's a cottage-style home doesn't mean that some low-life terrible person is going to live there and perhaps it may behoove us to think positive of why this developer wants to create multiple styles of housing so that individuals who may not be able to afford a two-acre lot, which is becoming something that is probably going to be a little bit more expensive now even though one person said I can't sell my house for that much. Probably not, because when you bought it -- right? But now Columbia is becoming more dense, and so it may be worth much more. I think we need to sort of open our brains a little bit and consider that just because it's a different styled housing doesn't mean it's going to invite bad neighbors.

MR. DOUGLASS: I think that's a fair statement. I still would think my -- back to my original argument. I would just say that I still think that all those things can happen after the main road comes through. I just think it would make a lot more sense -- if we really want what's best for the area and the City, it would make sense to do the -- to get the entire road there first -- the road first, and then figure these kind of things out. But I do -- I do completely agree with what you're saying. There's nothing wrong

with a \$300,000 town home, because, to me, you're describing like a town home. Town home sounds great to me, but I hear a cottage, a little bitty house, that's the size of a little big garage. I don't -- you know -- you know, we --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: The definition of a cottage, I was raised in Europe. Cottages are not -- they're in between a -- they're in between a tiny home and a conventional 1,200 square foot home. Most cottages are around 1,000, 1,200 square feet, maybe. They're the rave -- your ancestors probably lived in a cottage if you're from Europe. That's the style to address density. They're just -- cottage really is associated to square footage. It has nothing to do with the quality. It has to do with what they do within a particular footprint. And, generally, the cottages are being built right now, and I'm a big proponent, and I work in the space of affordable housing. Most cottages are not into those free or reduced large family incomes.

MR. DOUGLASS: Well, personally, I don't have a problem with anybody being on free reduced lunch, so --

MR. STANTON: No. I'm just saying that there'll be, you know, affordable means not half a million dollars, you know, and they could be, because there's cottages that go for that. So let's not get into the size means more or less money. I live in a 900 square foot home, and I'm papered up, so -- meaning I have money, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Thank you for your indulgence, sir.

MR. DOUGLASS: Thank you for your time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward?

MR. JAMES: Hal James; live at 3605 Barberry Avenue. I'm the one that sent you the wrong map. Apparently, there's more than one map. I've learned a lot in four days. This has been more than confusing. Learned a lot tonight. This has been more than confusing. I -- I don't see how anybody could build as many units as you say on that parcel, that there's a lot of things that would go into that. The biggest issue is that road is -- at the moment, is not going to be able to handle this. I don't know if any of you guys have driven on that road. It's 20-foot wide county road. It's got six to two-foot ditches on either side. You know, this kind of -- this kind of housing makes a lot of sense in -- in Columbia. I've financed a lot of them, seen a lot of them. It's a -- you know, where you've got a wider street, and you've got sidewalks and you've got storm sewers and you've got street lights, it makes sense to fill in corners where areas aren't completed, or something needs to be rejuvenated or changed. It makes a lot of sense to fill in corners. Gibbs and Barberry Road don't have any of this. It's nothing. The -- I thought it also interesting, just a sidebar, I didn't -- I was surprised Boone County is going to be your electric out there. That's an interesting thing. But the real issue here is that, you know, this is all -- all predicated. The City's approval is predicated on a concept of a road that's on a piece of paper. Move this down 20 years in the City, they still didn't have any money to build this road, and by opening this door, there's a lot of parcels up here that are going to get developed. And you're opening the door to have different zoning than

exists, everything from Barberry Road north of Route E is single family right now. There's several really nice developments up there, all nice, a lot of middle-sized homes. There's nothing wrong with them. We're not talking giant places, but it's all the same. It's all similar. It's all uniform. And this would be the first time that you open that up. There's a lot of discussion about the -- the property in the south. Almost all the property except for one small section has access to the outer road. They're not on Barberry. This is -- every -- this is all going to go in and out on Barberry and Gibbs, and that road is not going to be able to handle it. I mean, you can't even walk on that road. You'll get killed. I can't imagine some kid walking -- running his bicycle out there and getting run over, but as kids are, it's real likely to happen. This is -- this -- the fact that a road may be built to justify expanding this out, this just isn't a way to annex property into the City of Columbia. You know, keep it similar, keep it the same, but you start doing this all over the place, you're going to have a crazy patchwork of all different kinds of properties out there, and this is -- this is your opportunity to make sure that it's all similar and it's all the same, because whoever sits in these chairs 20 years from now is probably going to cuss you for doing this if you don't keep it the same. It's a difficult -- it's a difficult task, but a lot of these roads may never be built. I've got -- my property is owned by an LLC. It may never change hands, and it doesn't have to when I'm gone, so, you know, that'll be a fun fight about trying to take it over. I appreciate compensation, but I don't give a shit about the money. That's not -- that's not what the deal is. So -- but you've really got to think about the change that you're doing here. That's -- that's the biggest point of all of this, and I think -- I found it very bizarre that this was predicated on a road that's on a piece of paper. That's -- that's not logical.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, sir. Anyone else to speak on this case? Going once -- there we go.

MR. DOUGLASS: Good afternoon -- good evening. Michael Douglass, 4001 Barberry. I'm against the rezoning. I would like to have it stay the same as R-1, and also similar -- keep the houses similar to what's in the neighborhood right now. Most of them are anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 square feet, what we should have on there, not multi-house -- not multi-family houses.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for your time, sir. Anyone else to speak?

MR. REDDICK: Good evening. Scott Reddick, 4200 West Gibbs Road. I'll make this brief because I think most of this has been covered. But I would ask any of you all to take a ride out there, especially about 4:00, 5:00 in the afternoon rush hour. It's not safe to have your kids anywhere near the road. I have grandkids now that come out there, and I have to keep them away. It's like the Autobahn through there. Okay? And I'm not -- I'm not making that up. I mean, I've yelled at cars, slow down. You know, there's been nothing -- I mean, that road is nasty. Okay? And I live just west of my neighbor, Lois, who was brought up a minute ago. And when they put in the apartment complex to the east of both of us, they did nothing for the road because it fell in the City. But once people figured out that you could use that road to get over to Scott Boulevard, it has created a major, major traffic problem. And he is right. You would be -- you would be crazy to ride a bicycle or try to walk on this road. There's no lighting at

night. So I'm just really -- I'm just kind of going over the points again of my concerns of converting this into R-2 and R-MF, the amount of people, because this road may never happen. And if it doesn't, then we're going to have to sustain the road we have now, and you're talking maybe how many cars versus 200-plus cars? I mean, that's all I really have. I mean, I'm not going to sit up here and go over all the rest of the points. It's just my concerns for myself and my family and my neighbors.

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

MR. STANTON: So what's a win-win between you, as a neighbor, and a person that owns this parcel? What would make both of you happy where you could respect his land rights and respect his ability to develop, but keep you happy at the same time? What's a win-win?

MR. REDDICK: Well, first of all, each -- it would be one of two things. Either the road be put in first, a better road that could handle the congestion, and/or either keep it the same, R-1. Now I was under the impression and, I mean, I'm not going to deny or say I know. I thought you had to have five acres in the county to build a house, but maybe that's wrong now. I don't know what it is. I'm not going to argue that point. Maybe it's one acre, maybe it's two, whatever it is. But to keep the neighborhood the way that it is would be the one option or, two, the -- a road before you start building these things because they put that new complex in there several years ago, and didn't do anything for the road. And we bear the brunt of that, the people who live out there. So that's my concern. And that would mean -- I mean I don't know what else he has to offer. I don't really have a lot of different other options.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. REDDICK: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak, please come forward. Going once, going twice. All right. We'll close public hearing on this case and go to Commission comment. .

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any comments from the Commissioners? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Here's what I'm getting at, that our Chair brought up at the very beginning of this statement -- of this hearing, and that's that we don't approve any kind of annexation. That's not in our court, that's not a decision that's being made here tonight. The only thing that we're allowed to -- the only decision that we're allowed to influence here is what the zoning would be if it were annexed. If City Council doesn't choose to annex it, then all of that is a wash anyway. Part of my consideration goes towards urban sprawl. I dislike the slow moving out of our borders and annexing more and more R-1 in a way that makes the City harder to sustain and puts more burden on the infrastructure. I tend to like mixed zoning. We don't see that in annexations very often actually. I tend to like that this could support a variety of housing styles. I -- I'd like to point out that most of our existing -- much of our existing housing would be considered cottage by these standards already. Aside from that point, I don't like very much annexation requests that are pending the need for the City to build infrastructure in the forms of roads to

support it. This is already in the CATSO plan, but I -- I do feel the cart before the horse argument quite a bit. That is something that City Council decides on; we don't get to make that decision. So those are my comments related to this case.

MS. GEUEA HONES: Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Dunn, and then Commissioner Placier.

MR. DUNN: Madam Chair, am I allowed to address another Commissioner?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. DUNN: Commissioner Ford, do you mind indulging me for a moment?

MR. FORD: I can try.

MR. DUNN: You're -- you're a realtor Correct?

MR. FORD: Yes, sir.

MR. DUNN: Do you know what the median household cost in Boone County is currently -- roughly, if you had to ballpark?

MR. FORD: Two eighty, but I'm not very confident on that.

MR. DUNN: It's actually -- I looked it up on -- it's in the newspaper recently, \$392,000 is the median household cost in Boone County.

MR. FORD: I'm off.

MR. DUNN: You know, I'm -- I'm a young guy. Haven't owned a house yet, and it's really not obtainable because of the housing cost and high interest rates. And so, personally, when I see developments proposed like this and zoning kind of changing with the intention of building more affordable housing, I like it. And one of the things that I also like about this is how they are using the R-1 and the R-2 zonings to kind of encapsulate that R-MF. And so for me, if you were to drive by this development, it would really look no different than any other neighborhood in Columbia or anywhere else because it's going to be cottage style single-family homes. You know, when I received some of the correspondence from the neighbors, you know, I certainly hear those concerns. I definitely was looking to try and find ways to hopefully get the neighbors to work with the developer on certain aspects, and, you know, I think that road is definitely going to be a challenge, and hopefully that's something that can be solved down the road. It's not going to be solved here today. You know, we're here to focus on the zoning. And so, you know, just as it relates to zoning, I think I support this.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I generally do support this style of development. Whether it is cart before the horse is a -- is a consideration because the -- it's kind of a new style urbanism or kind of a -- I don't know if I want to use that word, but it is -- in the setting where it is, it's kind of moving into the future. In other words, it's -- it's probably the way we're going to grow from now on instead of annexing big, odd developments of big lots. But I have to admit that I was hesitating to comment because of the misunderstandings of what this was going to be as if it was going to be -- I think Commissioner Wilson called it low-lifes, criminals, low-income people, when it is true what Commissioner Dunn said, that these

are probably going -- not going to be super low-cost housing, certainly not at the level of subsidized housing. There's no plan for that. And I got triggered because of things in my background that would have led people to judge people from my old neighborhood as a kid as being that kind of place, and it wasn't. And so I'm going to put those feelings aside and just consider is this the right thing for this particular area. These are all single-family for sale housing as it has been described to us. We're not the developer, however. We cannot constrain the developer into doing that, but the boundaries of the proposed zones do indicate that the vast majority of it is the traditional R-1, and the smaller parts of it are the alternatives, the -- the more dense housing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner. Anyone else to make a comment?
Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I know this is not set in stone, but I think getting with Crockett and looking at his proposed lots, it's not up here now, but looking at the lot layouts may give you a better understanding, because, yeah. He's giving everything everybody has asked him for. I got big lots wrapping around the outside perimeters of the cul-de-sacs. The density is more closer to the road. I get it. I get it. But, yeah, it's hard for me to wrap around the misconceptions of what these houses can be or will be, hopefully. But I think this -- this graph right here can give a better graph of what they're thinking about.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other comments from Commissioners? I think my comment, and the way that I often look at requested zoning changes is what are they allowed to do now versus what they would be allowed to do if we approve what they're asking for. And I know that a lot of the people who spoke tonight think that R-S in the County means one- and two-acre lots because that's what people have built around there. But from what I can tell looking at County zoning, County zoning actually allows for even smaller lots than our City zoning does. So they could build more densely under County R-S zoning than they could under City R-1 zoning. And I -- when I am looking at what could they do if we do nothing versus what are they asking for, even if they are completely lying to us, Commissioner Stanton, and they build out to the maximum density, I still think that we are looking at something that fits with the trend heading that direction. Now, I also think that we are so early in this process that all we are talking about is what can they possibly do in the future. We're not talking about what they're going to do tomorrow. And I -- I think that, in my experience, the way that the CATSO folks work is they don't improve the road until there are people there to use it. And is that backwards thinking? Maybe, but I don't control everything. I'm just one person. As much as I would love to have a Fiat stick, which is what we called it back when I did debate, where you could just hit people over the head and make them do whatever you wanted. If I could, I would say build this out to a four-lane road, because, clearly, people are moving in that direction and it should be a four-lane road, and it should have nice shoulders, and it should probably have a bike lane, it should probably have a pedway, Commissioner Carroll. But I don't get to make that choice, and it's not going to get improved until someone breaks ground. That's just the truth of it. So I -- weighing all that, I -- I think that should the City Council decide to annex this, doing this kind of mixed housing types where the density is surrounded by less denseness is a responsible way to do it. And so

I'm generally supportive. Anyone else? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If none of my fellow Commissioners have any more questions or concerns, I'm going to make a motion. In the matter of 3705 West Gibbs Road permanent zoning, Case 247-2023, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Okay. Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, whenever you're ready.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Ford, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier. Motion carries 9-0.

MS. CARROLL: The final vote is nine to approve; the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any other motion regarding this case? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Do I have a motion on this one?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Do I have that flexibility? I move that this be taken off of the -- I move -- the annexation is moved off of consent on City Council's agenda.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann has moved to remove this case from --

MR. DUNN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. -- from the City Council consent agenda, Commissioner Dunn has seconded. I believe we can do thumbs up approval on this?

MS. THOMPSON: Appropriate.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thumbs up approval on this motion, please?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Thank you very much.

MR. MACMANN: Madam Chair?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes, Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Point of order, or a suggestion. Could you kindly explain to our guests what we just did.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Of course. If I can stop coughing. So the City Council as an item on their agenda every time they meet called the consent agenda. Items on that generally don't get discussed individually. City Council votes on them as a whole. By removing it from that agenda, this particular case and the annexation associated with it will be held out separately, and you will have opportunity to comment and discuss on it individually instead of as part of a larger package. So it gives you a chance to do what you did here tonight in front of City Council, which has the final say. All right. With that, Commissioner Loe, would you mind reading the next case. I'm sorry.

MS. LOE: Of course. We're going to move on to the next case of the evening.