



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, June 6, 2024
7:00 PM

REGULAR MEETING

Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now call the Thursday, June 6, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Ford?

MR. FORD: Present. Sorry. I wasn't expecting to go first.

MS. CARROLL: We rotate. It's your turn. Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Present.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Baysinger?

MR. BAYSINGER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: I am here. Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: We have nine; we have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

Present: 9 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier, Shannon Wilson, Matt Ford, Carl Baysinger and Thomas Williams

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to approve?

MS. LOE: Move to approve the agenda.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval was moved by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Could I get a thumbs up approval on the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you all very much.

Move to approve the agenda.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 23, 2024 Regular Meeting

MS. GEUEA JONES: We should have all received a copy of the May 23rd, 2024 regular session minutes. Are there any changes or adjustments to the minutes?

MR. STANTON: Move to approve the minutes.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Approval was moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Thumbs up approval on the minutes.

(Seven votes for approval; two abstentions.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous with our two newcomers abstaining. I'm sorry. I guess I should actually say Baysinger and Williams abstaining. Very good. First up on our agenda for the evening are tabling requests.

Move to approve the minutes.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

Case # 158-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Walter T Sorrels & Dorothy M Sorrels Family Trust (owner), seeking approval of 17.52 acres of M-N (Mixed use Neighborhood) district zoning as permanent zoning, subject to annexation, of the applicant's 18.62-acre subject parcel. The property is currently zoned Boone County R-S and is located at 1003 East Brown School Road. **(Case # 158-2024)** A concurrent request (Case 159-2024) seeking to preliminarily plat the property as 1 lot is also under consideration. **(A request to table this matter to the June 20, 2024 Commission meeting has been submitted).**

Case # 159-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent) on behalf of Walter T Sorrels & Dorothy M Sorrels Family Trust (owner) for approval of a 1-lot Preliminary Plat of M-C (mixed-use corridor) zoned property, to be known as Central Humane Society. The approximately 18.62-acre subject site is located northwest of the intersection of Brown School Road and Highway 763, and includes the address 1003 E Brown School Road. **(Case # 159-2024)** A concurrent request (Case 158-2024) seeking to annex and permanently zone the property to M-N is also under consideration. **(A request to table this matter to the June 20, 2024 Commission meeting has been submitted).**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, may we have a staff report?

MR. ZENNER: You can. So the first two items are related to each other. We have two separate slides for them, but they're, in essence, basically the same graphic. I'm just going to cover these together. The property is addressed as 1003 East Brown School Road. The property acreage is 17.52 acres. And the first item, 158-2024, was an advertised public hearing for this evening. It is a permanent zoning request for this parcel, and the applicant is seeking a delay in the project in order to work through some additional issues associated with the rezoning of the property or the zoning of the property. The actual description of this particular project as on the agenda today is actually -- it errantly identified M-N as the requested zone. It actually is a request for M-C zoning as depicted here on the slide. And then the second case is the same address, same acreage. It is a one-lot preliminary plat that will be known as the Central Humane Society plat, and this is, since it is connected with the permanent zoning request, the applicant has requested that both items be tabled to the June 20th meeting. The second item is Case 159-2024. It was not an advertised public hearing and therefore,

it is being -- this tabling is being provided to you as information. It does not technically require a vote of the Planning Commission; however, if you would like to make a motion to table both Case 158-2024 and 159-2024, you are welcome to do so. If you have any questions, I or Mr. Kunz will be here to answer them for you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Thank you. As this is a tabling motion, we will not be discussing the merits of the case this evening, merely whether or not to delay it for two weeks. Before we go to questions for staff, if any Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there any questions to staff about the motion to table? I have one. Is one motion acceptable, or do we want separate for each case number?

MR. CRAIG: I think it would be clearer --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Divide?

MR. CRAIG: -- to just -- yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good.

MR. CRAIG: It would be a cleaner record, please, ma'am. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public hearing. Again, this is not about the merits of the case, merely a motion to table.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Seeing no one from the public here to discuss, close public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: And go to Commissioner comment. Are there any comments or motions? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion, Madam Chair. As it relates to Case 158-2024, I move to table until the June 20th Commission meeting.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would you like to include Case 159-2424, as well?

MR. STANTON: I thought he wanted to do it separate.

MS. LOE: He wanted to do separate.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh. I thought we were doing it together.

MR. CRAIG: Separate, please.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, separate. Sorry. Thank you. There is a motion that has been made. Is there a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, roll call, please?

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine to approve. The motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other motions on this section? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I'd like to entertain a motion, Madam.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 159-2024, I move to table this case until the June 20th Commissioner meeting.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to table was made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call?

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine to approve, the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Those recommendations -- or those cases will be tabled until our next June meeting.

As it relates to Case 158-2024, move to table until the June 20th Commission meeting.

As it relates to Case 159-2024, move to table this case until the June 20th Commissioner meeting.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 130-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Springbrook Crossing L.L.C. (owners), for approval of a design adjustment seeking relief from the provisions of Appendix A Section A.5 - Curves of the UDC. If approved, the design adjustment would allow the internal street network to have tighter curves than outlined in the design standards for a road classified as a neighborhood collector. The subject street is named Ledger Drive as shown on the preliminary plat of Springbrook Crossing North (Case # 59-2024) that was reviewed and recommended for approval at the Planning Commission's May 9, 2024 meeting.

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 requested design adjustment from Appendix A, Section A.5 - Curves in regards to Ledger Drive, shown on the preliminary plat of Springbrook Crossing North.

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. Are there any questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open -- oh. Sorry. Go ahead, Commissioner Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: My questions actually relate more broadly to the development, which I understand was -- to the plat, which was discussed at a prior meeting, but I -- for context, I'd just like to understand. This road connects up to State Farm Parkway and on the other side -- if you could go to the slide with the larger panoramic view of the site. There you go.

MR. KUNZ: That one?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. So my concern is is I'm wondering about what thought went into when Veterans United does their holiday lights, and there is a substantial amount of traffic that comes down that road and it's basically turned into a parking lot. And where that -- I think is it Crosby is the road that -- it's going to be -- it's going to come out the opposite of Veterans United? What discussion, if any, may have been had about how this neighborhood is going to be impacted in the context of that, or how that neighborhood being there is going impact the traffic flow and how that's set up for entrance into Veterans United during that season?

MR. KUNZ: Yeah. I'm not -- I'm not sure if I'm answering your question correctly, but tell me if I'm not. There was a development agreement that is associated with the preliminary plat which features some road improvements, one of which notably would be a second lane added to a roundabout at the -- that would align with what will be -- or has been identified as Crackley Drive on the preliminary plat. Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. It's the middle drive for Veterans United is where the roundabout would be, and there would be a second lane added to that. That was identified by the transportation -- or the traffic impact studies that were provided to us by the applicant. Yeah. That was a requisite improvement. There was also -- it's two points of ingress and egress splitting between Lots 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 on Veterans United and State Farm Parkway, respectively. So I believe they're addressing, or they have addressed concerns about potential congestion through the development agreement.

MR. ZENNER: And if I may add, Mr. Williams, the development that is mainly to the west of the VU campus, which is referred to as Springbrook, so the traffic improvements, there's two separate traffic studies here. There are two separate development plans that

are being constructed by the same developer. The parcel that is to the west of the VU campus has obligations associated with South Providence Road, as well as with Veterans United Drive. The roundabout is intended to be installed at the existing entry to the medical complex, and that roundabout has not yet been constructed. It is in design at this point, and that is, in essence, to the east of the double-barrel access that is the current main entry into the campus. So -- and that is referred to in the traffic study for Springbrook as VU Middle Drive, and the MU Hospital Campus Drive. So that is a -- that was evaluated. That traffic study and those requirements of the traffic analysis for Springbrook became a basis for our traffic engineer requiring a traffic study for the property that we are dealing with that is known as Springbrook Crossing North, and it has its own separate traffic study that had requirements associated with it as Mr. Kunz has indicated. It had identified an additional westbound bypass lane around the future roundabout that will be constructed, which is required to be a single-lane roundabout. It requires separation between Crackley Drive and the eastern entry to the parking lot of VU, so it will have a restricted -- there will be a restriction at that point to where the only turning movements allowed at Crackley and the eastern entry to VU will be right-hand movements. You will not be able to make a left-hand turn, and that is part of the development agreement specifically associated with Springbrook Crossing North, and then the other two three-quarter turn pocket improvements along -- one along Veterans United to lots one and -- two and three, and then another one that would be on State Farm Parkway to four and five. There have been addendums provided by the applicant to the traffic studies as it relates to the development that is proposed on Lot 10 of the preliminary plat right now, that have provided sufficient justification to our City's traffic engineer that the roundabout that is part of the obligations of Springbrook does not need to be installed before Lot 10 could be platted with the existing development and then that also includes development impacts that are being created by the Thompson Autism Center which is being built by the University of Missouri, which is an exempt entity from compliance with the City's requirements of development. So that traffic, while we are aware of it, and we are aware that there are a number of implications associated with the medical traffic, as well as other traffic that flows in this corridor, all of those are taken into account as it relates to our traffic study standards. The particular activity that is annual at VU with their lights, you can't develop a street network plan to address something that's of that nature, but we have taken the steps necessary and as required and specified by the Code to ensure that long-term regular daily traffic is being addressed. The occasional inconvenience of high volumes of traffic at seasonal times is just something that as a community we have to deal with, and VU utilizes private services, if

I'm not incorrect, for traffic coordination, as well as approaches the City as necessary to help mitigate that. The development to the north actually may provide some additional relief when fully constructed for staging for circulation purposes. We just don't know. And then the roundabout that is yet to be installed may also assist in that as a way of being able to help distribute traffic more effectively than it is today. Hence, the reason why we use a lot of roundabouts instead of traffic signals. It helps to keep traffic flowing. I'm not sure if that -- our combined answer gave you the answer you wanted, but that's the reality of what's going on down here.

MR. WILLIAMS: I think it -- thank you. I think it answered -- at least in general, it answered my question. It sounds like, to a certain degree, it's a little -- there will be some adjustments with the roundabout at Crackley Drive, but it's still somewhat to be determined how that -- the Veterans United lights will -- may be impacted, or this neighborhood may be impacted, you could say it both ways, when those two things converge for several weeks every year.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would point out that what we are being asked tonight is the angle of the curves here. And, I mean, I appreciate the discussion and certainly traffic flow is going to be problematic at least during that month, I think, that they run the lights. But the question isn't is there going to be a road connecting State Farm Parkway to Veterans United through these two lots or however many lots. The question is how steep will those curves be. And frankly, and we can get more into it when we get to the discussion part, but just reminding all of our Commissioners, like, there's going to be a road here that developers are going to build. The question is what is it going to look like? Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. Name and address for the record, and you know all the things.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. I believe Mr. Kunz did a good -- good job in his staff report for -- for this project, and I appreciate him putting in, included in that staff report, the definitions of and the various types of roads, because when this project started, I believe that really we believed that there were going to be local non-residential, and I believe the staff did, to some degree, as well, believed that this area was going to be filled with local non-residential streets and not necessarily neighborhood collectors. If you look again, he briefly mentioned it, but the across the University property to our west, and you can kind of see from this depiction here, it's the yellow lines that kind of traverse the area just north of the M-OF designation, all of those roads are designed with the

same neighborhood -- or, excuse me -- with the same local non-residential standard. And so I believe what the idea there was is that's what these roads are going to be -- be constructed as. That was our belief, that was our thought, and, again, it makes -- you know, it makes more sense that -- that they get built that way with a tighter curve. Again, we're not going to decrease the amount of traffic. We're not going to decrease the volumes that those roads can handle, and it does slow them down through the commercial areas. And -- excuse me -- in this case, the office areas. And then also it's not going to take away any of the other modes of transportation. We still have sidewalks on both sides, just like a neighborhood collector, The width of the road, depending upon -- I mean, it used to be the fact that we had a neighborhood collector -- or we had collectors, we had arterials, and we had residential and local non-residential, and each one of them had one street width and one classification. Now we have a varying and wider range of different options for all these different street standards. So basically what we're talking about here is the road width is going to be basically the same, maybe actually a little wider than that of a neighborhood collector depending upon what option you go with on the neighborhood collector standard. So really the road is going to be basically the same, just a little tighter curve. And so, again, those -- those curves are nowhere near the minimum that you would have for, like, a residential neighborhood. They're still wide angles much larger than that, more than twice that requirement. So it's not an unsafe situation by any means. And so with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have, but do concur with Mr. Kunz' staff report.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any other member of the public that would like to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close the public hearing and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commissioner who wishes to comment on this case? Go ahead, Commissioner Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: I recognize that this -- that the plot, the overall development is already considered by my colleagues and before I was part of the Commissioner and so I say these comments with respect to them, and the fact that I wasn't here to hear all the information that -- that was presented. I do have concerns -- I don't have concerns with the road. I understand the issue -- the current issue with respect to the curvature and I don't have any concerns with the curvature of the road. My concern is more broadly.

When I think about Columbia as a whole, I look at where the space is and I'm not sure that this is the best use of space here. I don't have concerns with these kind of developments, I'm just not sure that this particular location for a development like this is the right place. Moreover, I do have some concerns about how it might impact both -- how the holiday lights, it's an important part of -- these kind of events are an important of community, and I think that having the neighborhood here could have an impact on that in terms of -- there's going to have to be an effort to try to make sure that people can get in and out of that neighborhood, that emergency personnel can get in and out of that neighborhood if necessary. And the way the traffic has -- flows now, it's really just every bit of that road, it becomes a parking lot to push people towards the lights. And I have a little bit of concern if we shut down a lane on State Farm Parkway so people can get into the neighborhood, it's going to push more traffic out onto Grindstone, or what happens if people need to come in, they usually shut Veterans United Parkway down heading -- so you can't head east on Veterans United Parkway, you can only exit that way. So if someone has come to the neighborhood east, well that -- that road is going to be blocked. So I do have some concerns about how the traffic is going to work for people who live there or if there's emergency needs or -- again, if space is made available to accommodate that, how that's going to affect the traffic flow into the surrounding streets, because Grindstone does get backed up particularly on peak nights as a result of the event, as well. So those are my comments. I just say them for the record, for future consideration, and thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any other Commissioner comments?
Commissioner Stanton?

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: You need to do it into the microphone.

MR. STANTON: As it relates --

MR. CRAIG: If you're wrapping it up, I think Commissioner Placier had a comment that you -- missed out on you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, thank you very much.

MR. STANTON: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier, go ahead. I'm sorry. I didn't see you.

MS. PLACIER: It wasn't that necessary, but I was just going to point out that the lights are an issue for a small part of the year and also at night. And so I'm not sure that the traffic through this particular development is going to crash into that that much. And - - and with the curves, anything we can do to slow the traffic is good, so that people aren't going to try to use that as a shortcut of some kind or a pass through and speeding

through there. I think the curves will actually have a good effect on that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else to make comments that I may have missed? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I don't usually do this. It's against what I like to do, but I'm going to go on record of making just a comment of my thoughts, and I tend to agree with Commissioner Thomas [sic], because I enjoy the lights, so I go, and it is horrible. And traffic does get backed up on Grindstone and traffic is only allowed to go one way, and it is terrible. And even though it's one time of year, it's about, like, ten days for one time of year. So if you're in that neighborhood, it's -- it's going to be problematic.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton, I think we're ready for you.

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, can I entertain a motion at this time?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 130-2024, Springbrook Crossing North design adjustment -- curves, I move to approve the design adjustment providing relief from Appendix A, Section A.5 -- Curves from maximum degree of centerline curvature.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do we have --

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion for approval was made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there discussion on the motion? Seeing no discussion. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call?

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine votes to approve; the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That motion -- or that recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

As it relates to Case 130-2024, Springbrook Crossing North design adjustment -- curves, move to approve

Yes: 10 - Loe, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Placier, Wilson, Ford, Baysinger and Williams

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will now open the floor to general public comments. If anyone has a general comment from the public? Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. I would introduce and welcome our two newest Commissioners, Carl Baysinger and Thomas Williams joining the dais, and we would like to welcome back Chairman Geuea Jones for a second full term. As many of you were aware, we have an impending vacation coming, and that vote is anticipated to occur on the 17th of June, so we will hopefully have a seated additional Commissioner come our first meeting in July, which will be July 18th. We had notified that you all should have packed your bags and scheduled vacation for the 20th. If you have, I'm sorry. We are recalling you. Send those tickets back and unpack. We do have a meeting, thanks to Mr. Crockett's need to table some cases, so it's a tough crowd that we run around here, but -- so the only two -- the only two cases that we have are the two that were tabled, and because they are a tabled forward case, should there be for some unforeseen reason another need to table, we do all need to assemble because they are tabled to date certain, so maybe schedule your plans for 7:30 on the 20th, and then you can leave, because you do not have a meeting on July 4th. That is the first Thursday in the month of July. That is a holiday, of course. We are closed. I may be out of town personally myself, so I won't be here. And whenever I'm gone, you should all be able to be able to be gone. But I have well equipped staff, and to my right, for those of our new Commissioners that did not get to meet Mr. Kunz, David Kunz is one of my planners that is with our staff, the one lone one I have left, and hopefully in July, you'll get to meet two more, as well as a senior planner that I'm short right now, as well. And Rusty Palmer is my -- my existing senior planner, and Rusty did not have any cases this evening. But these are your two cases that for the -- for tonight -- or for June 20th's meeting, just so we're familiar with where they are from the locator maps this morning. Same location, two different aspects; one is a permanent zoning request, which is what is handled prior or concurrently with a Council consideration of annexation of property into the City of Columbia, meaning this current parcel is outside the City's corporate limits today, and is proposed to be brought into the City's corporate limits. That's the annexation, and permanently zoned the proposed M-C at this point, and then the preliminary plat is the other item. As we discussed this evening during our work session, which we will back in 1A-1B for the 20th. Today we were asked to relocate due to a fire chief meet and greet this evening, so thank you for working with us over in 1C. We will bring back some additional information. Tonight was very interesting and vigorous conversations related to how do we not let parking drive the future development pattern of small lot subdivisions. We will come back with, I believe, God willing, I have the opportunity and I can focus my attention on Item Number 5 from the list of seven of the use specific standards, and we will continue to just methodically move through. Following our July meeting, we are likely

going to have a presentation associated with the Sunshine Law, which is an annual training presentation by Earl Kraus, one of our City Councilors that sat in prior to Jesse being hired. He will provide that training. We will also at a work session most likely in July, I believe, we will end up having the consultant for the Central City study directly communicating with the Planning Commission as to what is currently going on with the research and the commentary that's been provided up to this point. If that is a July 18th meeting, we would greatly appreciate all of the Commissioners to be present. If you do know you will be gone, if you can, please let me know so I can let Mr. Teddy know, as he coordinates with our consultant. That also would mean we would be suspending any discussion as it relates to the small lot integration project itself. I'm going to leave it at that for right now. We have a number of other projects that I will preview during a work session for you that we have on the docket. We have some significant material that we will need to be getting to later in this calendar year, some of which requires some additional consultant acquisition. I also will be able to provide probably an update as it relates to total applications received for the June 10th application deadline for short-term rental conditional use permits. What I can tell you is there are three right now that are pending for the July 18th meeting. So again, they will be the first three, and that will be -- we'll be started probably a regular diet of those every Planning Commission meeting and as we know what our volumes are, we may have to have some discussions as it relates to either supplemental meetings so we can continue to move those through without slowing down the rest of our regular business agenda, or if we want to just incorporate them in and then meter them accordingly, so we're not adding additional meetings that may not necessarily be required. At this point, what I can tell you as given, I don't have any significant -- we have not received significant submissions for the July 18th meeting. We will be able to accommodate these three without really disrupting our regular flow of activity. With that, that's all we have to offer for this evening. Thank you very much for your time and for your attendance.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

IX. COMMISSION COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would like to start off by welcoming our two new Commissioners. Thank you. I know we throw you into the deep end, so appreciate all of your input and thought and attention tonight. And I believe this may be Commissioner Ford's last meeting? If not, we may have you one more. We'll find out but --

MR. FORD: Yeah. If we have one more, we'll have one more.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Regardless, if we don't get another chance, thank you very much for your service and we will miss you.

MR. FORD: I will miss you guys. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thanks. Are there any other Commissioner comments?

Seeing none.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - June 20, 2024 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. STANTON: I move to adjourn.

MS. LOE: Second.

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

(The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.)

(Off the record.)

Move to adjourn.