

**MINUTES**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**

**AUGUST 20, 2020**

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

**Ms. Valerie Carroll**  
**Mr. Michael MacMann**  
**Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones**  
**Mr. Anthony Stanton**  
**Ms. Joy Rushing**  
**Ms. Lee Russell**  
**Mr. Brian Toohey**  
**Ms. Tootie Burns**

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

**Ms. Sara Loe**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MR. TOOHEY: I'd like to call the August 20, 2020, City of Columbia Planning and Commission to order.

**II. INTRODUCTIONS**

MR. TOOHEY: May I have a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Yes. I believe Mr. Stanton is here. He's not here to respond to roll call, so may we leave his spot to be determined in a few minutes?

MR. TOOHEY: Sure.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. We have seven responding to roll call. We have a quorum.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Zenner, are there any adjustments to the agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, sir.

MS. RUSSELL: I move to approve.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: All right. All those in favor, can I get a thumbs up.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Great.

**IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. TOOHEY: You should have all received copies of the August 6, 2020 minutes from our regular meeting. Are there any corrections or modifications that need to be made?

MS. RUSSELL: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Hang on a second. Thank you, Mr. Stanton.

MS. BURNS: May I make a note that Mr. Stanton is here. Mr. Stanton, you are here and your response to roll call?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Going back to approval of minutes, can I get a thumbs up if you approve the minutes.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. TOOHEY: Great.

## **V. SUBDIVISIONS**

### **Case Number 08-2020**

**A request by Engineering Surveys and Services (ESS) (agent) on behalf of Randy Rogers Romines and Matthew Collins Rogers (owners) for a one-lot subdivision to be known as "Moon Valley Subdivision Plat 1". The approximate 3.1-acre subdivision is located southeast of the terminus of Moon Valley Road and is zoned R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) district.**

MR. TOOHEY: Before we proceed, at this time, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had ex parte communications prior to this meeting related to this case to please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case before us. Seeing none, we can continue. So this is a subdivision, so this case does not require a public hearing, but if anyone from the public would like to come up and provide any additional information, you can do so at this time. All right. If none, then, Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: I will let Ms. Bacon make the presentation here this evening.

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the final plat for Moon Valley Subdivision - Block III subject to minor technical corrections.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. Any of the Commissioners have questions?  
Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Bacon, two things real quick. The upgrades to the water line must be complete before a CO is issued for a domicile on this property?

MS. BACON: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: All right. It says in your notes that you received three inquiries seeking more information?

MS. BACON: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Can you expand on that a little bit?

MS. BACON: So there is a very active neighborhood association, Shepard Boulevard, and so I

did get some -- some questions from those property owners. Additionally, my best friend has had a lot of questions. She lives in this property right here, as well. So I don't know that there were any concerns expressed by the calls that I received, but generally there were inquiries as to what did they want to do with the property.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Stanton, did you have something you wanted to say?

MR. STANTON: No.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Any other questions for staff? Oh, Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Quick question, just to orient myself here. That private access road, Moon Valley Road, was that the existing gravel road on the property?

MS. BACON: Yes. Yeah.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. I'm just making sure I'm looking at the right property.

MS. BACON: Uh-huh. Yeah. So from about this point on, it's gravel and it's a private road, and it's not the City's.

MS. CARROLL: Okay.

MR. TOOHEY: Anyone else? Anyone like to make a motion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 8-2020, I move for approval of the final plat of Moon Valley Subdivision - Block III, subject to minor technical corrections.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you for your second. Any further discussion?

MS. RUSHING: Who did the second?

MR. STANTON: I did.

MR. TOOHEY: If none, Ms. Burns, will you please call the roll.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohy. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Great.

## **VI. SUBDIVISIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **Case Number 74-2020**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Gary Pfau (owner), seeking approval of a two-lot final plat containing approximately 0.35 acres of R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling) zoned property located at the NE corner of N. Sixth Street and Wilkes Boulevard to be known as "Nowell's Addition, Plat No. 2". In addition to plat approval, a design adjustment from Chapter 29-5.1 (Subdivision) relating to dedication of a 10-foot utility assessment along N. Sixth**

**Street is requested. The intent of plat is to split the existing lot so the homes (600 and 602 Wilkes Boulevard) will be on individual lots.**

MR. TOOHEY: Before we proceed, I just want to say again, I would like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte communication prior to this meeting related to Case No. 74-2020, please disclose that now so all Commissioners have the same information to consider on behalf of this case before us. Hearing none, may we have a staff report.

Staff report was given by Ms. Rachel Bacon of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the design adjustment from Section 29-5.1(g)(4) to permit a reduction of the required ten-foot utility easement on a portion of N. Sixth Street in the vicinity of the existing home at 600 Wilkes Boulevard as reflected on the plat.

2. Approval of the final plat for Nowell's Addition, Plat No. 2.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Ms. Bacon. That was a Zenner mouthful. We've got lots of questions, so I'm going to start on this side and go to the right. Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: When we get to the motion, do you want one motion or two?

MR. ZENNER: Two.

MR. TOOHEY: Okay. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Was the applicant agreeable to maintaining the single-family character that the Board of Adjustment suggested?

MS. BACON: He is nodding in the affirmative.

MS. BURNS: Okay. And then would that convey to subsequent property owners?

MS. BACON: So it convey -- yes. So redevelopment of the property --

MS. BURNS: Since it's zoned R-MF. Okay.

MS. BACON: Yes. So let's say that the property transfers in the future and they wanted to use it for multi-family, they wouldn't be able to use those substandard lot widths. They would have to reconsolidate the two off. Yeah.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: All variances and the conditions associated with them and granted by the Board transfer to subsequent purchasers. They run with the land.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have a similar question. So this isn't going to bite us in the behind later because the zoning hasn't changed, but they agreed to a particular condition even though the zoning allows them to have multi-family?

MS. BACON: Correct.

MR. STANTON: So they would have to come back, consolidate that into one lot, and then

proceed for --

MS. BACON: Correct. Uh-huh.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Bacon, first off, I'd like to say the neighborhood has been very engaged in this area of late, but not specifically these properties. And I'd want to say that, the narrow lot -- the narrow lot widths -- I did the same thing you did --

MS. BACON: It's a mouthful.

MR. MACMANN: It is a mouthful. -- don't bother us, and also there are a lot of narrow lots if you just look up and down the street. Could these properties qualify for an ADU? They're big enough?

MS. BACON: OH, no. They -- well, let me take a step back. You have to have 50 feet of lot width to have an ADU. So this one here would not be able to sustain a --

MR. MACMANN: But the right hand would potentially?

MS. BACON: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: Okay.

MS. BACON: Well, yes. Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. How did we parse out driveways?

MS. BACON: So they'll -- there are two things to that -- or to that question. So there's an existing shared driveway right here.

MR. MACMANN: Uh-huh.

MS. BACON: And so one of the variance requests was actually to be able to keep that, so we don't -- we don't allow, basically, new shared driveways to occur. The Code specifically says you can't have a driveway within six feet of the adjoining property line.

MR. MACMANN: The neighborhood is fraught with shared driveways.

MS. BACON: Yeah. Uh-huh. So this -- so this, they were granted a variance for that, so this shared driveway situation is going to be allowed to persist. Any additional driveway activity is going to be subject to any -- like what any other property would in the Code.

MR. MACMANN: All right. And the next question would be as follows. I notice that these have a private sanitary sewer that services them; is that correct?

MS. BACON: So that -- there is one there; however, there is a second public line. That -- that came up. Actually, Mr. Zenner specifically asked me that, as well.

MR. MACMANN: All right. We had some issues recently on the west side where both of those systems are actually operational. Is this one -- is the private sewer currently working?

MS. BACON: I don't believe they're connected to it.

MR. MACMANN: You don't know?

MS. BACON: Yeah. It came up as part of the review questions. I can tell you that.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. That's -- that's been a problem, just to let you all know here on the Commission that we've run into that in a couple of houses recently on Alexander where they're both functioning. The -- the narrow utility easement where it goes down to three feet on the side of the house -- I'm familiar with this property. I live right around the corner. Is that a problem for the utilities?

MS. BACON: So they reviewed this particular case. Because of the additional five feet of right-of-way dedication would give them a little bit more space. Given what's there, what future plans are for this area, they felt like they could work within that constraint.

MR. MACMANN: All right. The last question I have is as follows. The new quote/unquote property line -- I mean, I realize they were both one property before. It moves to the east of the fence. Are you with me on the drawing, where it cuts out to the southeast and then drops straight back to the south? That can create confusion going forward. I just wanted to point that out, because someone assumes that the fence line is their property and it is not. That's all I have for the moment. Thank you very much.

MR. TOOHEY: Anyone else have any additional questions for staff? All right. If not, we'll go ahead and open up the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. TOOHEY: If you have any information that you would like to present to the Commission, please come forward. All right. Seeing none, the hearing is closed.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. TOOHEY: Any further comment, discussion, questions for staff? Want to make a motion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 74-2020, Nowell's Addition Plat No. 2, I move to approve the design adjustment from Section 29-5.1(g)(4) to permit a reduction of the required ten-foot utility easement on a portion of North Sixth Street in the vicinity of the existing home at 600 Wilkes Boulevard as reflected on the plat.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. TOOHEY: I think we got a second from Mr. Stanton. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Russell, for your motion. Any other discussion? If not, Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes. Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries. Recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. TOOHEY: All right. Moving on to Public Hearings.

MS. RUSSELL: I have a second motion.

MR. TOOHEY: Oh, I forgot about that. Thank you, Ms. Russell.

MS. RUSSELL: In the case of 74-2020, Nowell's Addition Plat No. 2, I move to approve the final plat for Nowell's Addition Plat No. 2.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. MacMann had the second. Thank you. Any further discussion? All right. If not, Ms. Burns, will you call roll, please

MS. BURNS: Who made that second, please?

MR. MACMANN: I did.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote: (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohy. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries. Recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

## **VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **Case Number 148-2020**

**A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Boone Development, Inc. (owner), for a major amendment to the Schapira Clinic Final O-P Development Plan's Statement of Intent to include "Medical Marijuana Testing Facility" and "Personal Services-General" as permissible on-site uses. The Schapira Clinic Final O-P Development Plan was approved in 1987, permitting office uses and revised August 2019 to permit "Medical Marijuana Dispensary," as permitted uses on the site. The 0.37-acre property is zoned PD (Planned Development), located at the southwest corner of College Avenue and Rogers Street, and addressed 411 N. College Avenue.**

MR. TOOHEY: Before we continue, again, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had ex parte communication prior to this meeting related to this to please disclose that so all Commissioners have the same information. Seeing none, can 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 revised statement of intent to add "Medical Marijuana Testing Facility" and "Personal Services - General" to the permitted list of uses allowed on the site.

MR. TOOHEY: Any questions for staff? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Refresh my memory. Council approved this and this is not indicative of the way I'm going to vote, but we voted this down, did we not?

MR. PALMER: I believe it was a tie vote, so no recommendation.

MR. MACMANN: Was that what happened? I couldn't recall exactly how that played out. Mr. Zenner's – I could see Mr. Zenner's mind working over there. It doesn't really matter. I was just trying to refresh my memory. Thank you very much.

MR. TOOHEY: Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So they're replacing the approved dispensary use with a custom facility use; is that what's happening?

MR. PALMER: No. They're adding the testing facility.

MS. GEUEA JONES: They're adding the testing facility use. And there's enough square footage there to do that? That -- you don't know. Okay.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think they have a perspective user and it apparently would meet their needs. I think the property owner is here and maybe he could expand on that.

MR. ZENNER: The property owner is here for that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And that's my other question. Are -- are they already possessing a license as they're coming to us with this, or do they need us to approve it to get the license?

MR. ZENNER: The user that is -- that precipitated the request to expand -- to expand the statement of intent's use list has nothing to do with medical marijuana. It is a personal service user that had sought a business license. We determined that the business license could not be issued due to the nature of the business that was a personal service business not being permitted. The advice provided to the applicant at the time when they inquired as to what the procedure would be was to ask to have the statement of intent expanded to ensure it captures all potential future uses given this is the second request to come back and amend this statement of intent in less than a 12-month period of time. So while a medical marijuana facility's testing and if -- if this approved, testing would be added in the medical marijuana dispensary facility has permitted or has been approved for use on this site. The statutory requirements and the opening for licensure of either facilities has come and gone. So the maximum number of permits within the congressional district for medical marijuana facilities has been exceeded, so additional medical marijuana dispensary facilities would not be likely. And given the State's desire to have a restricted number of testing facilities, which there were only two, if I recall correctly, in the legislation. One has been permitted and I'm not sure if the other one is at this point. But, as well, there is licensure -- there was a licensure window for that, and both have closed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's why I'm asking, because it -- it seems to me that it was a moot question.

MR. ZENNER: It is to the extent that there's an immediate likelihood of something. However, given the nature of the site and its prominent location, the possibility for the State to revise the maximum number of licensures to be issued within the congressional districts is unknown, and they just want to be able to have an opportunity should that -- should an opening occur to be able to apply for either a dispensary licensure or possibly a testing facility licensure, both of which are subject to a whole series and litany of requirements at the State level.

MR. TOOHEY: Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Reviewing -- Mr. MacMann, you're referring to tie vote back in 2019 on the dispensary addition; is that correct?



MR. MACMANN: That's the question I was asking.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. And do we remember from -- I guess, from the current review or from back then, is this a two-story?

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Do we have the square footage?

MR. PALMER: Not in front of me, no.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. That's the extent of my questions. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: The PD plan as it exists today, however, does have a maximum square footage limitation. When the addition was added, there was an addition that was put on. That's the Plan 2 that was referred to in the report. That is to the southwest of the property, which was for some parking. And I believe there's an existing residence on the property at this point. The square footage, however, is pretty well established. The building is not being proposed to be modified in any form or fashion. It's just trying to expand that use list to accommodate the personal services.

MS. CARROLL: I'm just trying to get a perspective of the property and the future of the property. What is -- do you know what that max square footage is?

MR. ZENNER: Unfortunately, I do not. I just know there is one established, and anything beyond that maximum square footage would require another major amendment to the PD coming back before this body and through a full public process.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks.

MR. TOOHEY: Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Circling back, Mr. Palmer, you said that the use would be similar to Walt's Bike Shop or the design studio that's in the area, law offices, but maybe I misunderstood. Mr. Zenner, did you say that they needed to add this revised statement because the use is not included in those uses?

MR. ZENNER: No. The use is not included in the current statement of intent. It is restricted generally to office uses pursuant to the O-P zoning district of 1987 in 01 uses, which do not have any personal service -- barber shop, beauty salon --

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: -- or anything included within that grouping of uses. So the ability to be able to have those personal services that have maybe the minor retail, it -- that's really the more -- the bigger thrust of this request than it is to have the medical marijuana given other regulatory requirements.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. I was just concerned about the use and why we were adding maybe a use that wasn't permitted, but I understand now. Thank you.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. MacMann, do you have a follow up?

MR. MACMANN: Yes. Real quickly, for Ms. Carroll. If you'll notice that the site is quite small, and the building couldn't get much bigger given an office use, just, you know, the parking and things like that and driveways.

MS. CARROLL: I was going -- (inaudible).

MR. TOOHEY: Ms. Carroll, can you speak in the microphone?

MS. CARROLL: I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. MacMann. I was going to take the max square footage of the ballpark approximate of what it's likely currently at.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. That's --

MR. TOOHEY: Any other questions for Mr. Palmer or Mr. Zenner? All right. Seeing none, we'll go ahead and open the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.**

MR. TOOHEY: If anyone from the public would like to come up and provide us more information in this case, please do so. Please know that you -- if you're speaking on behalf of yourself, you have three minutes. If you're speaking for a group, you have six, and please state your name and your address before speaking clearly into the microphone.

MR. BECKETT: I'm Dan Beckett, and I'm an attorney with Smith Lewis, with offices in Columbia, and I represent the applicant, Boone Development, Inc. And I just wanted to expand on what Mr. Zenner shared with you. We agree everything -- with everything that was in Mr. Palmer's report. And I'd just like to state that what spurred this request is we have a prospective tenant that wants to operate an esthetician business on the second floor. Currently, the building is occupied by a real estate brokerage firm, and this esthetician business we thought was permitted under office use. It's not, so we needed to expand the use to include personal services - general. At the time the application was submitted, we thought we would go ahead at the time because we had already been previously approved for a medical marijuana dispensary business, that we would see what we could do about expanding the use to including a medical marijuana testing facility. I understand that that's expanding the use to include testing facilities is a little bit more contentious than personal services - general, so we would ask the -- the Commission to consider both separately, if you would, if you're hesitant or reluctant to agree to both expanded uses, to consider them separately because we're more concerned with getting this Commission's approval with respect to the personal services - general. And I'm here with Tyler Simpleton, who is a representative of the applicant, as well, should you have any questions for either of us.

MR. TOOHEY: Any commissioners have any questions for Mr. Beckett? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real short. Previously, my concern, and it was a no vote last time, was the traffic flow -- traffic-flow business here if it was a full-service marijuana place would be the dispensary. Your testing services don't bother me at all. Just FYI.

MR. BECKETT: Thank you.

MR. TOOHEY: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Beckett.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry.

MR. TOOHEY: Oh. I'm sorry. Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm way over here in the corner. To be -- so to be clear, your -- what you

actually want to do is rent the second floor to an esthetician?

MR. BECKETT: Yes, ma'am. That's our aim.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're just also trying to expand it to anything and everything?

MR. BECKETT: Well, in the event -- because we are interested in pursuing expanding --

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Beckett, can you speak in the microphone?

MR. BECKETT: Yes, ma'am. Because we are interested in expanding and it would entertain the likelihood of accommodating a tenant that -- that was awarded a medical marijuana testing license. If we could accommodate them, we would like it.

MR. TOOHEY: Anyone else? Are there any additional speakers who would like to come forward? If not, we'll go ahead and close the public hearing.

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. TOOHEY: Commissioners, any discussion, additional questions for staff? Ms. Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I'm amenable to both of the motions to clarify. I think that based on zoning, it's perfectly suitable for marijuana testing. I question the feasibility, but I don't have a problem with the zoning request for clarification.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: This seems pretty cut and dry. The market will determine if the marijuana uses will be feasible or not. There's enough regulations and stipulations in place. They're either going to meet those or they're not. I simply see this as a -- as a property owner making his property as appealing to as many groups as he possibly can and that's how I see this. So the market and the current regulations will determine if marijuana dispensary or testing facilities would be housed in this area.

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If there are no other comments --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well -- sorry.

MR. TOOHEY: Oh, we've got one. Ms. Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: The -- I guess I don't know why I feel compelled to say, but I feel compelled to say that I agree with Mr. Stanton that I don't -- I honestly do not think they can put a medical marijuana testing facility in that location. I don't think they've got the space to do it, and I don't think the other tenants would want them to. It is a very different proposition than a dispensary. However, that's not our role and there are hundreds of pages of regulation that will answer that question that are not before us. So, I mean, if they want to throw it in there just for funzies, I suppose that's fine.

MR. TOOHEY: Anyone else? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If there are no other comments or questions, in the matter of Case 149-2020 [sic], a major amendment to the PD plan for Schapira Clinic, I move to approve.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. TOOHEY: Second was Ms. Russell. Any other further discussion? If none, Ms. Burns.

MS. BURNS: Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 8-0.**

MS. BURNS: Eight to zero, motion carries. Recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Now with that, we're done with those agenda items.

#### **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

MR. TOOHEY: Is there anyone from the public who would like to come up and speak? You may do so at this time. Seeing, none. I guess we'll move to staff comments. Mr. Zenner?

#### **IX. STAFF COMMENTS**

MR. ZENNER: The next meeting is September 10th. You do have a couple of items on the agenda at this point. So your upcoming cases are two. We have a plat. This is MPC Station No. 94. This is better known as the ZX gas station at the corner of Locust Street and Providence directly across from the Eat Well, the former Lucky's site, and immediately to the north of the Hardee's. They are asking for a final plat approval to do a lot consolidation of multiple lots that they own, which include the former 9Round building that is to the immediate north and south of our Flat Branch property, in order to facilitate redevelopment of the ZX gas station site itself. It does have a design adjustment with it, which will be described in greater detail during the reporting. And your second project is a rezoning request that is to assist the City of Columbia in construction of a new fire station on the south end of town, and it's Lot 58 of Deerfield Ridge. It is a rezoning request from PD to R-1. And just to familiarize yourself with the locations, here are the locations. As I said, directly across from the Eat Well, former Lucky's store, is the MPC plat, and then on the right-hand side of your screen is the Lot 58 of Deerfield Ridge, Plat 2, seeking that rezoning from PD to R-1, and that is to facilitate the construction of a new fire station for the City of Columbia. We will have a work session, as well, on 10th that will start at 5:30 p.m. We'll be discussing matters yet to be determined. I have a selection of topics, as we talked today in work session. I'll try to pick a couple of what will be interesting and result in a robust discussion. Thank you for your attention this evening. I know there are some that need to get to a debate, or an acceptance speech for the Democratic Convention, so that is all I have to offer, and we will look forward to seeing you on the 10th of September.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Mr. Zenner.

#### **X. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

MR. TOOHEY: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I have one. Like I said, as long as we're dealing with a lot of things politically, I'm going to have a little statement at every meeting. My statement today is about voting. I want to let the public be aware that ex-felons can vote in Missouri as it relates to State Statute 115-133-1. Any ex-felon that has completed their probation and parole and is clear of all obligations to the State can register to vote. So if you can go to the county clerk's office and register and start that process if you are not voting

at this time. Ex-felons can vote in the State of Missouri.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Any other Commissioners have comments?

Mr. MacMann?

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. MACMANN: I move to adjourn.

MR. TOOHEY: Thank you. We are adjourned.

(Off the record)

(The meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.)