

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
DECEMBER 22, 2022

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones
Ms. Valerie Carroll
Ms. Sara Loe
Ms. Tootie Burns
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Michael MacMann
Ms. Peggy Placier
Ms. Robbin Kimbell
Ms. Shannon Wilson

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. Tim Teddy
Ms. Rebecca Thompson

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now call the December 22nd meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order. Uh-huh. I'm sorry. Our secretary stepped away for a moment.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll, when you're ready, may we have a roll call.

MS. CARROLL: We've solved our technical issue.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We changed the computer, as it turns out.

MS. CARROLL: Very nice. Okay. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any changes or adjustments to our agenda?

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. With that, I'd take a motion.

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton.

Thumbs up approval on the agenda? Unanimous. Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. GEUEA JONES: A copy of the December 8th regular meeting minutes were -- was attached to this agenda. Are there any changes or adjustments to those minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Thumbs up approval on the minutes? I see eight and one abstention.

(Eight votes for approval; one abstention.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you all very much.

V. TABLING REQUESTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: First off on our docket are some tabling requests.

Case Number 16-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of RB34LLC (owner), seeking approval of a rezoning from R-MF (Multi-family Dwelling) to PD (Planned Development), a PD Plan, and various statements of intent containing multi-family, office, and self-service storage uses. The approximately 2.76-acre property is located at the southeast corner of Balboa Lane and Sieville Avenue, approximately 500 feet south of El Cortez Drive, and includes the addresses 3416 & 3418 Balboa Lane and 202 Sieville Avenue. (A request to table this item to the January 19, 2023 Planning Commission meeting has been received.)

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

MR. ZENNER: This is a request table for the purposes of addressing several technical comments, as well as potentially some adjustments to the desired zoning associated with the site that has been previously advertised. The zoning would likely become a more restrictive zoning classification, therefore, not requiring any type of readvertising. And it actually would not be particularly a change in zoning from PD to something else, it would be changes within the Statement of Intent associated with one or more of the tracts as it relates to their intended land uses, which are related to zoning districts. So this is supported by staff to allow for corrections to be made and additional clarity to be provided, as well. The tabling to the January 19th meeting is considered sufficient for us to be able to resolve those outstanding items; and therefore, we would recommend support of that date.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Was this advertised for public hearing?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it was, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Are there questions for staff on this?

Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I have a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You don't yet.

MR. MACMANN: I don't have -- what?

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. Sorry. It was advertised.

MR. MACMANN: Oh, okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry.

MR. MACMANN: That's okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll go quick. We will not be voting on this case tonight. Instead, we are voting to delay the discussion until January 19th. However, because it was advertised, if anyone is here to speak on this, we will hear your comments on the tabling motion itself. I'm going to give you to the court of three to raise your hands. Very good. Okay. Thank you very much. Any Commissioner comments, Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do have a motion. In the matter of Case 16-2023, a zoning map amendment for Balboa Lane, I move to table to date certain, 19 January -- 19 January 2023.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the tabling motion? Seeing none. May we please have a roll call.

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

MS. CARROLL: We have nine yes votes; the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The case will be tabled till January 19th.

Case Number 23-2023

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of DREW Properties, LLC (owner), to rezone two tracts of land. The northern half of parcel 12-701-00-02-240.00 01 is requested to be rezoned from M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) to IG (Industrial), Parcel 12-701-00-00-002.0001 is requested to be rezoned from PD (Planned Development to M-C (Mixed-use Corridor). The subject sites are located directly northwest of the intersection of East Brown School Road and North Roger Wilson Memorial Drive. (A request to table this item to the January 19, 2023 Planning Commission meeting has been received.)

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

MR. ZENNER: Yes. This is a request for tabling again of the 13.12-acre tract of land total that you see highlighted in the red. The southwest corner of the property is an independent parcel, 1.45 acres. It is currently zoned PD, requesting to be changed to M-C. And then the northern portion of the long strip along Roger Wilson Boulevard is zoned M-C, and the proposal was to rezone 5.62 acres to IG, and that is the northern portion of the eastern side of the hatched area. The request to table is again to allow for some additional staff comments as it relates to the actual necessity of the zoning changes that are being sought, as well as it is in response to the applicant desiring to have more public engagement with the surrounding property owners based on staff's -- staff's conveyance of additional public comments that we have received to date. They were wanting to try to get ahead of, potentially, comments made here by engaging with the neighborhood itself. Again, the two weeks that -- or the two meetings that are being requested to be tabled to are believed sufficient to allow for that to happen, given the holiday.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. And was this one advertised for public hearing?

MR. ZENNER: Yes, it was.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Once again, we will not be voting on the merits of this case tonight. We will just be voting to table it. However, if you are here to speak about it, I will give you a chance to do so. Seeing none. Commissioner comments on the case -- the tabling motion. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yes. In the matter of Case 23-2023, 2205 East Brown School Road zoning map amendment, I move to table to January 19th, 2023.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Burns; seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the tabling motion? Seeing none. May we please have a roll call.

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

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. Thank you all for that.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 20-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Bowling Street, LLC (owner), for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a "Temporary Shelter" as a conditional use in the M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) zoning district. The proposed use is subject to review criteria set forth in Section 29-6.4(m)(2) and the use-specific standards of Section 29-3.3(i) of the Unified Development Code. The 5.51-acre subject site is identified as Lot 1 of *E.C. More's Subdivision, Plat 1A* and is located at the northeast corner of East Business Loop 70 and Bowling Street. (This case was tabled at the December 8, 2022 Planning Commission meeting.)

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit to allow a "Temporary Shelter" on Lot 1 of E.C. More's Subdivision, Plat 1A, subject to the following:

1. Such shelter being constructed in substantial compliance with the site plan prepared by PW Architects, Inc., and dated 12/14/2022, and
2. The operational characteristics and services to be offered within such facility shall be restricted to those occupancy limits, duration of stay limits, and support services outlined with Crockett Engineering Consultants' correspondence dated December 13, 2022.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for that very detailed report. Appreciate it. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact or communication with either the parties or other interested parties on this case, we would ask that you share it now so that we can all be using the same information. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN; Thank you, Madam Chair. Just as an FYI, I have been in contact with Mr. Stansberry and Mr. Palmer from VAC in relationship to this and the potential of this, essentially, over several years. However, I really have nothing to report as these gentlemen were supposed to report to me so I could communicate with the neighborhood groups, and despite asking several times, that never happened. So you're up to speed with where I am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other Commissioners have additional information on the case? Seeing none. Questions for staff? Really? Okay. All right. In that case, we will go to public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: For those of you who have not been with us before, we do allow three minutes for an individual, six minutes if you're with a group, and please state your name and address for the record.

MR. CROCKETT: As a point of clarification, I'll only take three minutes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. CROCKETT: And reserve the six for Mr. Stansberry, if you don't mind.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. All right. Just bear with us one moment.

MR. CROCKETT: There we go. Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering Consultants, 1000 West Nifong. With me tonight, Ed Stansberry, Executive Director of VAC, as well as Caleb Colbert and Eric Miller with PW Architects. I'm going to go relatively quick, given I get three minutes. Again the overview, I don't think there's anything new here. You're familiar with the information provided in the staff report, as well as by Mr. -- Mr. Zenner. Location map, you're familiar with that. Here's a copy of the zoning map. You can see obviously residential to the north, industrial zonings around us, as well as a lot of M-C or corridor commercial. A little bit about the Opportunity Campus that -- that VAC desires to build at this location. It will have about 13,600 square foot of office use for VAC-related business. This is for -- for personnel of VAC for offices on the vicinity, on the site. It'll also include 10,000 square foot of office use for tenant space. The -- the desire is to rent those spaces out to -- to VAC partners and other entities that would use the space intended -- that would -- could be supplemental to the uses that VAC uses on the property. Again, about 4,700 square feet of office that would be an accessory use to the -- to the shelter, so that would be spaces that would be directly -- office space that would be in the -- in the shelter building itself that would be, basically, only, you know, 8:00 to 5:00 hour -- 8:00 to 5:00 business hours, closed off during the evening time uses, but included in that building. And then, of course, about 21,500 square foot of temporary shelter and support services. It seems like a large number, but when you break it down, of that, only 8,200 square feet is for the communal overnight sleeping quarters, and about 1850 square feet are for the isolating sleeping rooms. The other space is for the -- for the support services; the laundry facilities, the kitchen, the storage, uses like that. And you've seen the Opportunity Campus, you've seen our layout. The yellow is the office, the blue is the tenant space, and, again, the green is the client services or the shelter itself. The request that comes before you tonight is for the entire client service building. So this schematic here shows the yellow portion that's the office space but given that they are -- that office space is being used for shelter purposes, for client services, it's included in the request before you tonight. As Mr. Zenner went through, there are six general criteria for the conditional use permit. We won't go through those specifically. We submitted written correspondence with our application that was also talked about in the staff report, and I think Mr. Zenner did a good job of going through each of those. So in the sake of time, I'll scroll through those. If you have any questions, I'm happy to answer any of the questions you may have with that regard. Also the three use of specific standards, we went into it in detail, and our request is one of our application, as well. Really quickly, we want to talk about the mitigation and screen to the R-1 property as indicated. Mr. Zenner kind of touched on that a little bit. We are doing a self-imposed increase of the building line from 20 feet to 30 feet. We are reducing our building height from 45 feet to 35 feet, and we're also going to install a type-three landscape buffer along that north property line up against the R-1 portion. It is an eight-foot-tall screening device and a ten-foot landscape buffer, so it's

both vegetation as well as the device itself. But we're also going to place the building at a lower elevation, so they actually -- it'll sit below the adjacent grade of the building. Okay? So if you can kind of see, and it's kind of hard to see here. The upper schematic is basically the aerial view, and this is to scale -- vertical scale. And then the item below kind of shows the house that's in question, the R-1 house to the north. There is some existing vegetation between the house and the property line, and then it drops down as it goes to the Business Loop. You can see that our building that's further to the south, you can see that it sits at roughly about 20 feet lower than the home itself, so it sits at a lower elevation. We're also cutting that into our property, so if you look at our property line and where are eight-foot screen device and our ten-foot landscape buffer will be, that actually sits above our building. So our building is going to be cut into the hillside a little bit. We'll have an embankment that goes up, and then we'll have the screening device and the fence and the landscaping that sits higher than that. So really you're not going to be looking into the building, you would actually look over the building. Not only is that for screening of the building, but also when we talk about lighting. That's a big help for lighting, as well, because that lighting is going to sit at a much lower elevation because we're screening our parking lot. That 20 foot is measured from our parking lot, not from our property line. Our property line is much higher, so those poles are going to be lower, thus the landscape is -- buffer is going to help with that a lot more. So again, I'm apologizing. I get three minutes and my time is up. In my conclusion, I always like going through it back -- back through the items a little bit. But really, honestly, when I looked at the conclusion, really, if you look at the very first paragraph in the staff -- in the written staff report, it says -- it says about everything you need to know right there. And so I think it is very, very well written. We really appreciate that. We've worked very hard on this project, trying to find a spot for this piece of -- for this development that suits the needs that's out there. We all understand the need is out there. We're all talking about the needs and here's VAC that really wants to come forward and try to do what they can to help solve that problem. So with that, I'm happy to give it over to Ed Stansberry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Let us ask you questions first, if that's okay.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. I'm sorry. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, the site will trigger EPA Part 58 review, won't it?

MR. CROCKETT: Which -- which is that referring to?

MR. MACMANN: That's the -- the hazardous materials review on the property because of where it is and what's going in there -- a HUD review.

MR. CROCKETT: Well, it -- well, it's -- if they require that, it'll be a phase one -- a phase one environmental, which will probably trigger into a phase two environmental. And then that phase two, depending upon what the outcome is, we'd talk about that. I believe there is some information that had been done on that, I believe, Ed, and phase one has been done. There is some level -- I can't remember

what was -- came about on the phase one. Can you speak on that?

MR. STANSBERRY: No.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Okay. But if -- if one is needed, I mean, HUD -- HUD will review that information. If phase two is needed, we'll perform a phase two, but I don't believe there's going to be much of an issue with that regard. Understand that the -- with regards to the power plant next door, with the cinders and all of that, there's been some concerns over that through the years.

MR. MACMANN: More's Lake and the whole --

MR. CROCKETT: More's Lake, it's further to the north, to the northwest, absolutely. But if you look at the -- how the -- how the train falls, it falls away from this site and doesn't drain through this site. So really all we would get is some leach coming back up through the soils, and I think it's far enough distance, it won't be a problem.

MR. MACMANN: I think I am and then EPA in their review would be just as concerned, despite the topography, with the airborne contaminants.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: So we'll have to see if there's a 58 that gets triggered on this. Okay?

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. I understand.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thanks.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Crockett, thank you for the report. I -- one of our recent cases with a commercial use going in adjacent to residential, the residential owners were very interested in the screening device. Any thoughts or ideas of what that eight-foot screening device may include?

MR. CROCKETT: We -- we have not gotten into that yet. We're still in discussion. And so we don't know. Specifics for the City standards are somewhat limited, but, you know, we do -- we will comply with that -- with that type three. Most likely, a fence of some type, I'm just not sure what kind. So whether it's going to be, you know, a wood basket weave or how it's going to be, we just don't know yet.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next person to speak in favor, and you are speaking on behalf of VAC, so six minutes. Very good.

MR. STANSBERRY: Ed Stansberry, 5001 White Fish Court, Ward 4. I appreciate the opportunity to share with the City's Planning and Zoning Commission our project and request a conditional use permit. As I said, I'm Ed Stansberry, and I am the Executive Director of the Voluntary Action Center. The innovative community development project presented tonight and known as the

Opportunity Campus will include the new construction and operation of an emergency shelter, a community resource center, and a medical clinic. The facilities on this site will provide services for those experiencing homelessness, those at risk of homelessness, as well as those experiencing economic and housing hardship. In addition, the Voluntary Action Center, an anchor in the Columbia community for more than 50 years, will continue to provide outreach annually to more than 7,000 people in our community with critical basic needs and services. This hearing for a conditional use permit applies exclusively to the construction of the emergency shelter to be located on the site of the Opportunity Campus. I would like to offer my sincere thanks to our primary partners in this effort, Turning Point, Room at the Inn, Loaves and Fishes, the VAC board and staff, and the Faith Voices Housing Justice Team. These folks and countless others have been thoughtfully considering a project like this for decades. The development of the specific plans being discussed tonight have been almost two years in the making. Increased homeless services are part of the City's current strategic plan, and housing and unsheltered issues have been a high priority in citizen surveys and focus groups for years. The time is now to make a difference for our unhoused neighbors. This facility is not a car camp. It is not a sanctioned tent camp. It is not a multi-storied monolith. It is not a hotel. Rather, it is a place of dignity, compassion, and care that will provide a holistic array of wrap-around and follow-on services to clients taking advantage of the Opportunity Campus. These services will be provided by community partners with expertise in specific areas of benefit to the unsheltered. VAC does not pretend to have all the expertise to run a facility like this as we exist today. No one does. Otherwise, this would have been done long ago. What VAC does have is the expertise to hire expert staff and develop agreements with community partners to make this facility the best it can be. The Opportunity Campus will be transformational and collaborative as we build an example of what a community like Columbia can do when we work together to address an issue we have all agreed needs our attention. The development site is approximately five and a half acres and located at Business Loop 70 and Bowling Lane in Columbia. Along with the property owner, Bowling Street, LLC, the Voluntary Action Center is requesting a conditional use permit for Lot 1 of E.C. More's Subdivision, Plat 1A, as recorded in the Boone County records. The identified site for the Opportunity Campus is a well-suited and desirable location for this project. The construction will not negatively impact the surrounding property values. Located to the west is the long-standing adjacent power plant, and the site is also surrounded by businesses, industrial structures, as well as the VFW Hall. As you know, this Hall was recently acquired by the City of Columbia to provide a temporary location for Room at the Inn until the Opportunity Campus is operational. I am happy to say it is up and running successfully. Fortunately, relocating Room at the Inn to a temporary site provides excellent timing to test out and evaluate potential strengths and challenges of the Opportunity Campus, and the ability to make modifications to plans in an efficient and effective manner. The Voluntary Action Center reached out to the previous owners, who are also neighbors to the north, as well as others expressing concerns to discuss the Opportunity Campus. An

honest conversation was had by the parties that chose to attend. We will make every effort possible to address their concerns and have pledged to include them as the project moves forward. The Voluntary Action Center is fully and whole-heartedly committed to being a good neighbor. We will maintain the land with high standards regarding landscaping and grounds-keeping. The Opportunity Campus emergency shelter will operate 365 days a year, 24 hours a day, which will reduce the presence of wanderers and loiterers. As many of you know, current services provided by Turning Point and REDI do not cover 24/7/365. With the support of our collaborative support network, many of whom have provided letters of support for the application before you, an ongoing development of strong partnerships with law enforcement, as well as mental health, substance abuse treatment, and medical providers, the Opportunity Campus will make a positive impact in the Columbia community by doing its part in providing critical and needed services to those in our community experiencing homelessness. Last night, we memorialized 15 of our unsheltered neighbors who passed away in 2022. As we gather tonight in the midst of bitter temperatures and life-threatening weather, I am convinced that the Opportunity Campus, once it is up and running, can reduce the number of deaths annually amongst our unsheltered neighbors while providing evidence-based services to our neighbors that lead to better outcomes and quality of life. We can do this. The time is now, and I ask for your approval of the conditional use permit related to the temporary shelter portion of the Opportunity Campus. Thank you. I would be happy to answer any questions.

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

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Stansberry, thank you. Let me preface my comments by saying I am whole-heartedly in support of having services of these natures provided to the individuals who you are targeting. To that end -- to that end, and to the end as enunciated by Manager Zenner that this plan essentially, as Mr. Crockett and PW Architects stated, I have a couple questions for you to get to the heart of feasibility of the long run. Are you with me? Okay. Will you all, yourselves, VAC, be providing the management of the client services center, or will another entity be doing that?

MR. STANSBERRY: VAC. However, with this caveat. Our three partners, Turning Point, Loaves and Fishes, and Room at the Inn, have yet to determine, and they each will individually determine, whether they would like to be a tenant or be absorbed into the VAC operations. Each of those entities will use the next two years plus to make that decision.

MR. MACMANN: Do you have -- so there are no -- it sounds as if you don't have a firm operational plan, but you might have some firm operational people; is that what you're saying there? Agreement or contract or MOU with any of these folks?

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct. Correct. We will use the next two years to establish those MOUs and contracts with everything from medical providers to mental-health providers.

MR. MACMANN: To that end -- are you having a hard time hearing me?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Your mic keeps cutting in and out.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry.

MR. STANSBERRY: You're just cutting out a little bit.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. I'm echoing in my own ear, so maybe that's the case. To that end, you'll be raising and spending a great deal of money. Not all of that is firm yet. And some of that's okay, and we do these things. A lot of that money, either directly or indirectly, will be federal money, and that will require you all to comply with a lot of federal regulations, audits, and things like that, A133s. Mr. Palmer is over there nodding his head. And I'm putting some of this on the record for Council, and I'm -- and for you guys. I would hope that you exercise a level of focus and transparency that maybe you all haven't firmly embraced with us, because I'm very concerned about the money. I don't want this thing to fail. From a stewardship standpoint, yeah. You're looking to raise \$15 to \$18 million dollars and have a budget of \$1.5 million plus; right?

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: And that's not all nailed down by any stretch of the imagination.

MR. STANSBERRY: That's not all nailed down.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. Correct.

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct.

MR. MACMANN: All right. With that said, I'm going to hold my other questions till later. That was just a statement. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Stansberry, back to the project at hand. The application letter and staff report note that the residential occupants may stay at this facility for up to 90 days. I was curious as to whether they may stay at the shelter during daytime hours.

MR. STANSBERRY: Yes.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. STANSBERRY: Turning Point's day services will be expanded from their current half-day Monday through Friday to a full day -- full business day Monday through Friday.

MS. LOE: So does that mean a residential tenant or client could check in and stay for up to 90 days at the facility?

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct. Now I think it's important, without -- I mean, we're -- we're here for the conditional use, so without getting into the weeds too much, we're basing this operation on what is known as Housing First principle. So we will move folks into housing as quickly as we possibly can. Now we're -- we're all aware of the current state of affordable housing, so we realize the challenge that is. But still the priority will be to use partners. VAC, as you know, does rent and mortgage assistance, and can place -- works with the MI -- HMIS system and the Boone County Coalition to end homelessness. So those -- those programs are in place. The bottleneck is the affordable housing inventory. So even

with that, we will be attempting to move people into housing as quickly as possible regardless of their mental-health status, regardless of their substance-abuse status. Research shows that folks launch recovery better from a place they can call home.

MS. LOE: Thank you. I'm also just interested in clarifying the model of temporary housing that you're proposing --

MR. STANSBERRY: Sure.

MS. LOE: -- because I believe you're using the term the City uses, you know, in the -- or uses as a definition in our -- in our Code. But this is more supportive housing than overnight housing. Does Room at the Inn allow the residents to stay during the daytime?

MR. STANSBERRY: No. Room at the Inn is an overnight shelter only. Now --

MS. LOE: This is a different model than current?

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct.

MS. LOE: All right. That's what I was trying to clarify.

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MR. STANSBERRY: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Anyone else? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. Good evening. We received, and I'm not sure who produced this, as a handout at the beginning of this meeting, one page, with people who have spoken or written in support, and another page -- I don't know if you've seen this -- of communications from mostly business owners or Business Loop CID who have spoken in opposition. How are you dealing with the opposition? What's your strategy for approaching that?

MR. STANSBERRY: Well, our first step was to invite them, through their counsel, to engage us in a session to discuss their objections, and we did have that session, as I mentioned. And the only opposition that chose to attend, and I would let their counsel speak to this more than me, was Ms. Napier, our neighbor to the north. I can't -- until we own the property, which the CUP is an important part of moving to a closing on the property, we didn't feel it was necessarily important to engage the neighbors on something theoretical. So once we're able to close on the property, we would be very intentional about engaging them in a much deeper level about what our plans are as policies and procedures are developed that relate to the Opportunity Campus, and how those policies and procedures may be received by our neighbors.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? If not, I've got a couple of questions. As noted in the staff report, you've got 30 spaces that we can play with as the Planning and Zoning Commission. If we were to reduce the parking requirement for you, do you have an idea of what you might do with that extra space? Would you turn it into green space? Do you think you need those 30 spaces? What kind of are your thoughts about that?

MR. STANSBERRY: We don't need 128 parking places. I would say that in conversations with Urban Ag, they'd love to have a garden, a community garden out there. I -- I can't -- without Tim's -- Mr. Crockett's input, know how that might be absorbed and where that would sit on the property, so it's hard. I wouldn't anticipate any development if we lost -- if parking was reduced.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you wouldn't expand the building, you would find --

MR. STANSBERRY: I think, and, Mr. Crockett, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we're substantially tied to what we presented to you at this point.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. My other question is, you know, when you say low barrier, I have an idea in my head of what that means, but one of the concerns that we're hearing is the -- you know, the people who are going to be turned away are going to be the worst of, you know, people who are actively engaged in criminal activity or something. Can you explain a little bit about what -- I know you're not in full operations mode yet --

MR. STANSBERRY: Right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- but what does low barrier mean in this context?

MR. STANSBERRY: That's a great question. First of all, the day the Opportunity Campus shelter services building is open, 100 percent of the homeless population will be eligible. Certainly, some will self-select out of coming to the facility, and that's where street outreach partners will become so important to what we do to try to build on those relationships that they have to invite these folks, encourage these folks to give the facility a try. Having said that, low barrier, you don't need an ID, you can come in drunk, you can come in high. You can't bring your liquor; you can't bring your drugs. You're not required to do chores. You're not required to engage case management. That's low barrier. There is a difference between that and no barrier, which is what we experience at the Wabash. And your characterization of those being the most difficult of the people we're trying to serve is accurate. Now having said that, I think we're -- we're on the cusp of building something that can create a nexus of resources for those folks. And what we've done even this year with what Brad and Turning Point have stepped up to at Wilkes Boulevard to replace Wabash, we'll have to see what Wilkes' intentions are going forward. But I think we're beginning to build that network that can address even our most difficult. So we're acutely aware that this population carries mental-health issues and substance-abuse issues, and those are the primary partnerships we're going to need to have imbedded in this facility to help make it function and be as effective as it can be for the folks we're trying to serve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is -- it seems to me that that might also be a role of the isolation rooms, if you've got someone who is just, you know, having a mental-health episode, but they need to be someplace safe, or someone who is very, very intoxicated, and you don't want them with everyone else, you can put them in the isolation rooms, which isolation room sounds harsh, but these are basically just bedrooms. Correct?

MR. STANSBERRY: That's correct. That's correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Okay. These aren't -- these aren't cells, these are just --

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- rooms where they can be alone and not in a big, open area?

MR. STANSBERRY: Yeah. Right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. And then my last question is, you know, one of the recommendations of staff is to kind of tie you to this site plan. You are admittedly very early, and I understand we're kind of the first step. How restricting would that be if we said you had to substantially do what's on the site plan at this point? Is that -- yeah. Mr. Crockett, feel free to come back up and --

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you. Tim Crockett, 1000 West Nifong. Yes. We had that discussion with -- with staff with regards to substantial conformance. It's part of the reason why we initiated a self-imposed building line to the north up against the residential property that increased it. We want the ability to maybe slide the building around slightly here and there. The entrance might slide just a little bit, but in generality, we're looking at two buildings placed in this configuration. The parking lot might slide to the south of the building. The building might slide to the north a little bit, but not beyond that 30-foot building line. And so we feel very comfortable that the two buildings are the sizes that they are, and the piece of property is the size that it is. And so there's not a lot that we can really do with it. And so we understand that, you know, we feel comfortable stating that we can be in general conformance with that site plan that's been submitted. Even though it's very preliminary stages with regard VAC, we have looked at it on a site plan aspect.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So square footage and orientation will remain the same?

MR. CROCKETT: Square footage and orientation, we feel very comfortable with.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CROCKETT: And if I may?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: Your questions with regards to the reduced parking, you know, if we look at the schematic and I don't -- run back here, just real quick, I want to get you an answer to your question. There we go.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: So really, if we were to reduce the parking spaces, obviously, they would probably be -- be reduced not from the office area, but more of the client services building. So really there's about 32, 33, 34 spaces across that north parking array. Those would probably be the ones that would be removed, so it would -- it would increase the green space and buffer between our development and the property to the north, but those are the spaces that we would probably reduce if we were to be allowed to take out 30 spaces.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Oh, sorry. Mr. Crockett, Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Mr. Crockett. Parameters question. And this may be better answered by Mr. Stansberry and a planning group. If they are not able to raise the funds that they hope to raise, where in this client services area can they save money? What would -- what would go first and still allow them to operate as they --

MR. CROCKETT: That would be -- that would be Mr. Stansberry question.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Crockett.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you say your name and address again?

MR. STANSBERRY: Ed Stansberry, 5001 White Fish Court. If I could, Mr. MacMann, give you a -- a brief outline on where we stand with funding. We were fortunate to be included in some state legislation designating \$6 million in matching funds for this project. We have been identified as the single feasible source for those funds, and we expect a contract for that \$6 million to -- we're actually expecting it this week, so shortly. As it relates to the \$6 million matching, we -- the County has asked us to apply for their ARPA funds. We have filled out the ARPA application for them. Our intent all along has been to match the \$6 million from the state with \$3 million from the County and \$3 million from the City in ARPA funds, and then raise an additional \$4 million in private funds through a capital campaign. Now if any of those dominoes don't fall, the project in general is in jeopardy. I don't think it's reasonable to expect us to make up any of those dollar amounts in an addition in a private capital campaign. But if we are faced with a choice, the shelter, the green building is priority one.

MR. MACMANN: Not your headquarters building?

MR. STANSBERRY: Correct. That's secondary.

MR. MACMANN: Are there any facilities that are presented herein, quarantine spaces, case management, kitchen, laundry, are any of those facilities potentially on the block, also? These are all ancillary uses to that central room, if you will?

MR. STANSBERRY: I think the best answer I can give you is our response to the City's planning RFP, that directed us to address single adult males and females, not only with a shelter, but with a resource center to support those services will be critical to get the City's support, so --

MR. MACMANN: Exactly where I'm going.

MR. STANSBERRY: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: That's exactly where I'm going.

MR. STANSBERRY: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: And I am concerned about the money beyond the \$6 or \$7 million from the governmental agencies, plus the six from the state. And I don't want to see us in the position where we approve this and you guys come up short and other things start -- you know things start to get cut -- starting to get cut. But if we have your all's commitment, and I'm hoping you give the same commitment to Council that that resource center or the client services center goes up first and foremost, I am more comfortable with that statement. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I am sure we'll have plenty of time to discuss that, Commissioner. Thank you. Thank you very much. Any further questions? Thank you very much. The next person to speak on this case? Again, name and address for the record. Three minutes if you're an individual, six if you're a group.

MR. MILLER: Good evening. My name is Erik Miller; I am a principal with PW Architects located at 2120 Forum Boulevard, Suite 101. Don't want to take up too much of your time. You've heard from Mr. Stansberry and Mr. Crockett in great detail about what we're proposing. I just wanted to make myself available for any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for that. Any questions for this gentleman? No. Thank you very much for coming tonight. Next person to speak on this case? Name and address for the record.

MR. BRYAN: My name is Brad Bryan, 26 East Thurman Street. I'm the pastor of Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church, and Executive Director of Turning Point Day Center. I'm here to let you all know that Turning Point Day Center, Loaves and Fishes, and Room at the Inn Emergency Shelter have all been a part of this process and this -- and this conversation since the very beginning. We are still a part of this conversation and -- and those of us in this network that have the most direct daily act -- connection with our -- our neighbors who are unsheltered are all 100 percent on board and involved in this process, and we 100 percent believe the priorities of VAC of this client services center. We will not have an opportunity like we do right now again. And if we wait until we have everything in place to run this thing for 20 years, we're going to miss our opportunity. Also, I want to let you know that there is a guy sleeping in the parking structure just over here that was there when I was -- when I came in at 7:00 o'clock. I don't have a financial argument for you. I don't have a legal argument for you. This is the right thing to do, and this is the right moment to do it. And he seems fine. He's got big coveralls and he's covered in -- he's one of our pros, and he was okay when I checked on him, but there -- there -- this is life-threatening work that we're -- that we're talking about right here, and this is -- this is a life-saving opportunity that we're talking about. But I just want to let you know that speaking for Room at the Inn and Loaves and Fishes, who couldn't be here because they're doing their stuff, and Turning Point Day Center, have been a part of this process. We've been -- we've been working together throughout this whole thing and we're in 100 percent support and all three of us ask you to recommend the conditional use permit.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Any questions for this speaker? Thank you for coming tonight. The next person to speak on this case? Going once -- there we go. Come on. There is not a line. You're good.

MS. LEWIS: May I speak in opposition:

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure. We're not that formal, just come on.

MS. LEWIS: All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Name and address for the record?

MS. LEWIS: Marjorie Lewis; I'm an attorney with Evans and Dixon, with offices at 501 Cherry Street in Columbia, Missouri. I represent the owners of the 23-acre R-1 property that's immediately to the north of the subject property. The owners are the trustees of the trust owners, including Julie Napier, who is one of the trustees, and also who lives in one of the houses on the property. Unfortunately, the trustees could not be here. One of them was traveling out of town, and the other one, Julie Napier, is in a wheelchair and unable to travel to nighttime meetings. And I would -- I guess I would like to clarify how much time I get. Can I also get six minutes?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MS. LEWIS: All right. And my client's property is known as 1619 and 1717 More's Boulevard. As I indicated, we're here today -- I'm here today in opposition to the conditional use permit request of Bowling Street, LLC. We submitted a detailed opposition, which I won't have time to go through, but I'm happy to answer any questions about it. The trust property consists of two historic homes occupied by Laura and Julie Napier and to Laura --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry, ma'am. Could you pull the microphone down closer to you?

MS. LEWIS: Uh-huh. Sure. Is that better?

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's much better. Thank you. We -- we do broadcast this, so it's not just us that you're talking to. Thank you.

MS. LEWIS: All right. Thank you. So the trust property has two historic homes occupied by Laura and Julie Napier until Laura's death in March. Laura's home is currently undergoing a \$1.2 million renovation after water damage. Unfortunately, that was broken into and -- and items were stolen a couple of weeks ago. There was a police report made, but there's not been any -- any arrests or anything, to my knowledge. The remainder of the trust property is wooded and grassy areas. The property at issue, the subject property, and the applicant's property were owned by Bowling and Rollins families from the 1870s until the subject tract was sold to Bowling Street, LLC, last year. So just to make that clear, my client's property to the north and the Bowling Street property were part of the -- were jointly owned by the trustees. My clients were, until 2021, also the owners of the subject property. In 2009, my clients sought to rezone the existing trust property from R-1 to M-1; however, this was strongly opposed by the Historic Preservation Commission, and the Downtown Leadership Council eventually citing concerns such as the historic nature of the properties and preserving and creating a gateway to Columbia, and preserving green space, the application was denied in 2010. The property to this day remains R-1 property, and has two large, beautiful historic homes on the property. In 2021, my clients sold the subject property to Bowling Street. They were not aware, however, of the intended use of the property for a homeless shelter when it was sold. Julie Napier understood the intended use was for a retirement village. It was not until August of this year that they learned of the intended use. I do understand that there are letters of support for the Opportunity Campus. I did provide a chart that shows the letters of support that I've seen, along with the -- the letters of opposition. And I just wanted to point

out that the letters of support are, for the most part, by persons involved in presenting the comprehensive homeless center plan or other interested parties. They are not -- the letters of support are not from neighbors or from closely related properties. The -- the other thing I really want to point out is -- and I think it's kind of lost in the weeds, is that there -- there is, I think, a large amount of support for an Opportunity Campus. There's a large amount of support for wanting to help homeless people, and I don't -- I don't think any of us can -- can argue with that. You know, the unsheltered obviously need our care and support, but that is not the standard that's applied for a conditional use permit. The standard is not we can't find another suitable property. We can't -- we need to help people. The standard is, is there -- I mean, part of the standard is, is there a negative adverse impact on the neighboring properties. And I think when you look at the conditional use permit criteria, the applicants just cannot overcome particularly that element, the substantial adverse impact element. The elements that were set forth earlier are in 29-6.4. These are strict requirements, and all of the elements must be met. We've gone through each of the elements in detail in the materials that we provided. Two of the big issues, though, for an adverse impact are, you know, the safety, trash, trespassing, other issues. I submitted photos as Exhibit 16. You can see that there has recently been a homeless camp on the trust property, and there -- we understand, we believe that now the homeless individuals have left that property, but we haven't been able to verify yet. We did contact someone to clean up the homeless camp, but that hasn't been done yet. It's a monumental undertaking. It's -- it's really hard to find someone who can move large tents, tiles, all sorts of things, and we haven't been able to get that removed yet.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You are -- sorry. You are at six minutes.

MS. LEWIS: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If you have something else to wrap up quick, that's fine. That brings up other questions.

MS. LEWIS: Yeah. Let me just wrap it up real quickly then. So the other issue is the loss of property value, and I submitted a report, a study for a Manhattan study that was done, and it's a very comprehensive study, but it's the only one I could find that does show a decrease in property values. Finally, I just want to say that, you know, this is your decision. I mean, it is whatever the -- has been decided on the -- the plat process earlier, this is your decision to make, and whether or not you recommend it to the City Council. And so we would ask that you deny at a preliminary -- I mean, that you deny the conditional use permit application or, alternatively, that you have -- that you require some of the details that we set forth in our materials, such as requiring a preliminary plat. I know that staff has indicated that that is not required, but it is something that would be in your power to require.

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

MR. STANTON: Good evening. How you doing?

MS. LEWIS: Good evening. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Two questions. Question number one: Is there a way to make you happy with this project in any way? Is there a way that would satisfy you if -- to make this happen?

MS. LEWIS: And that is a good question. I don't think there's anything that would -- that could be done to make my clients in favor of this being located on this property. With that said though, I do appreciate that -- and we do appreciate that Mr. Stanton -- or Stansberry reached out to us, and we do appreciate the efforts that are being made, but we just have great concerns about security, lack of police presence, the low barrier shelter requirements, so we still have lots of concerns. But that doesn't mean we don't appreciate the efforts that are being made.

MR. STANTON: So I guess what I'm getting at, I'm famous for saying this. I try not to say it, but I'm just going to have to say it. Is there a win-win? I mean, this -- I mean, I'm hearing both arguments. It's easy to say no. How can you say yes? And if it's a no, my next question is going to be if it's no, this can't happen, then where? If it doesn't happen here, then where would you suggest -- if it's a no, then where, and where would you suggest that -- that wouldn't have similar issues, or, I mean, well, we're -- by the river? I don't know. What's -- what's -- what's an alternative to this place, and how can we make this a win-win and, if not, where can we make this a win in our community, from your perspective?

MS. LEWIS: Well, unfortunately, the way that the Code is written, it doesn't ask that question. It asks what's the negative impact on this property. And so -- and it -- it -- it's our belief and is our testimony that it will have a substantially negative impact on my clients' property, and that's what the conditional use permit process requires is a finding that it's not going to have, you know, a substantial negative impact on my clients' property. So I don't know the answer to that question that you're asking. Where else is a better place? I don't know the answer to that. You know, I'm -- my clients are concerned with their property and -- and I understand that that's not a popular point of view. And -- but that's -- that's kind of where we're at on this, and so I'm -- I know I'm not giving you a very satisfactory answer, but I think that, you know, the criteria is, is there a negative impact on my clients' property, and there is.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Let me rewind. I'm sorry. Permission?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: Let's go back to my original question. Win-win. Don't worry about the ordinance. Don't worry about -- tell me what will make this a win-win from your perspective. Don't worry about what the ordinance says, what -- none of that. Dream scenario, what makes this work for you here?

MS. LEWIS: I'm a little limited in what I can say, since I'm the -- the attorney for my clients, and they weren't able to be here tonight.

MR. STANTON: We're just dreaming. We're dreaming.

MS. LEWIS: Right. And I -- I mean, I think that concerns that they have expressed to me are, you know, safety, trespassing, and property values. And so I think any -- any plan -- you know, if this -- if

this would proceed, it has to address those things. And so that -- you know, one of the questions that I had asked was, well, what's the response time for police presence right now. Right now, it's about 20 minutes, which is not very effective. And my clients have had to call the police multiple times, and it's -- you know, a 20-minute follow up. And so, you know, having a police presence closer would be helpful. Having -- and I heard earlier talk about surveillance, but I -- and that came from staff, but I have not heard that from VAC that there will be any type of security or, you know, surveillance. And my -- in fact, it's the opposite. I understand that they don't want -- it's a low barrier shelter, so they want to encourage people to come, so they don't want police presence surveillance or security or things. I mean, maybe -- you know, maybe they'll have one security person. I don't know. But, right. So I think it would have to address those issues. It would have to address, you know, safety, security, trespassing, and -- and property value. And those things are probably tied together, I mean, if you can address one, you're probably addressing some of the others.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: Looking through your document that you submitted, on the page that I pull up, it's on page 12, you mentioned about a conflict of interest and --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hey, Robbin, can you pull your mike down? Sorry.

MS. KIMBELL: I'm so sorry. On page 12 in the document submitted, there is something mentioned about a conflict of interest in regards -- I wonder if you could expand on that. And then the second thing I wanted to ask about is your closing statement and conclusion, if the applicant fails to establish any of the required elements, et cetera, et cetera. I have not read through the whole thing that -- that was submitted, but that did catch my attention. So can you -- what is the conflict of interest?

MR. ZENNER: If I may before Ms. Lewis responds. I think Ms. Thompson needs to maybe say something in regards to this.

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah. I think Ms. Lewis can respond. My comment to the Commission would be that -- that the funding for this project and including the use of CBD -- CDBG funding and any conflict of interest that may be related thereto really isn't in the scope of the consideration of the land use that's at issue here and the conditional use permit. So I would keep that in mind however Ms. Lewis decides to respond.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. LEWIS: And so it's our position that -- you know, that absolutely is some connection be taken into consideration at this point because I think, as you mentioned, funding is a huge issue, and what happens if the funding is not obtained. The lack of funding could affect the services that are provided, whether or not there are phones for providing security. In any event, what our research showed is that, you know, HUD has regulations under 24 CFR 570.611 regarding conflicts of interest. And so as we know that City Councilperson Betsy Peters is the owner of Bowling Street, which is one of

the applicants, and the section that I cited states that a City Council member who exercises or has exercised any functions or responsibilities with regard to CDBG activities or who is in a position to participate in the decision-making process or gain inside information with regard to such activities -- so I think -- so I tried to underline the parts of the regulation because it's -- like all these regulations, it's hard to read. So I tried to underline what I thought were the important parts of it. But first of all, it does identify that someone who is a City Council member, who can gain inside information, and who may obtain a financial interest or benefit from the CDBG assisted activity, or who has any financial interest in a contract or with respect to the proceeds of the activity has a conflict. Now HUD can grant some exceptions, but we have not heard any discussion of that. I don't know that -- if any application for an exception has been -- has been made. But in our reading of -- of the regulation, there is a conflict of interest which would require HUD to grant an exception.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you have anything further? Commissioner Wilson, and then Commissioner Placier, and then Commissioner MacMann.

MS. WILSON: Thank you. Thank you for speaking to us this evening. I want to reflect back to something that Commissioner Stanton mentioned, which was how do we come to a win-win. And I know you're limited in what you can say because your clients are not here. So I want to be careful in the question that I ask you. Given the scenario that you've already shared with us this evening, that there have been homeless individuals who had to be removed, or have been asked to be removed from the property, would you think that your clients would prefer a formal place that is legal and has the potential to have security and surveillance and all those things as opposed to potentially individuals reusing that place illegally as trespassers?

MS. LEWIS: So I have, I guess, two answers to that. One is -- I mean, and Mr. Stansberry is here, and he can speak to this, but I don't think there's any intention to have surveillance. And I think if -- if there is -- if there is security, it may be limited to one person, but Mr. Stansberry can -- can talk about that. But I guess our concern is this will be -- it's going to attract, you know, unsheltered individuals to the area, so it's going to actually increase the presence of persons that are homeless in the area, which will in the -- and I also -- I know it is low barrier, but they're not allowed to -- my understanding is they're not allowed to use drugs or use alcohol on the premises. And so it is our belief and the concern of my clients that, therefore, many of these persons who -- who are substance abusers will then look for a place where they can use substances, and it'll be off the property, which my clients' property is right next to it. And so that -- that's the concern. I -- you know, I completely understand the points you have made, by my clients' concern is that it will just increase the presence of unsheltered individuals and also could increase the presence of people who are -- you know, that it may be a low barrier shelter would attract.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Hang on. Hang on. We've got a line. Are you done, Commissioner Wilson?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yes. I -- I don't want to prolong this because you've already had enough time to make a lengthy, lengthy argument, and we're not a court. And so you've had more time than any other of our speakers or guests. But it seems that your concerns are based on two things. One is past experience, which we've heard anecdotal stories about things that have happened, which preceded this plan, which does look like, as Commissioner Wilson, said a net improvement on that. But also on these hypothetical fears of what might happen, what people might do, and that is not a substantive argument from that -- my perspective. I really can't sit here and listen to those kinds of speculations. Thank you.

MS. LEWIS: Can I respond?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please?

MS. LEWIS: In -- in our documents, we did outline specific occurrences that have occurred. So while none of us can know what's going to happen in the future, the beliefs are based on things that have occurred. There have been thefts recently. My clients' cat was killed. There are homeless people that have been living on her property that she has struggled mightily to have removed. I have nothing further on that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner MacMann? Okay.

MR. MACMANN: I think I'm going to reserve these comments to when we're talking, because I think there's a more -- a general discussion we should have amongst ourselves.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Commissioner Stanton, did you have --

MR. STANTON: I yield my time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, Ms. Lewis.

MS. LEWIS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak? Name and address?

MS. MAZE: Hello. My name is Susan Maze; I live at 902 North Seventh Street, which, if you know anything about the neighborhood, is across the street from Turning Point and Loaves and Fishes. It's also across the street from Hickman High School. So I wanted to say that I have lived there for the entire existence. I moved there in 2006, which was before Turning Point existed, and when Loaves and Fishes was in -- on Park Avenue. I've lived there for nine years. I have never once called the police, not a single time have I called the police. There's a lot of police presence at Turning Point, and most of the time, it's because people are poor and sick in public. Another issue that people should be aware of is that the -- I don't want to say it's perfect; it's not perfect. It's not always fun, but neither is it fun getting woken up at 7:00 in the morning by a marching band practice or the soccer team playing really bad '90s hair metal at ear-splitting things when you can't even talk to each other in your yard. We live in a city that requires compassion and decency. Normally when there's issues, it's because Turning Point is closed, Loaves and Fishes is closed, and there's no place to go. I have spent -- I cannot -- one night last year.

It was before REDI opened, and somebody had started a fire in the lot next door because they were cold, because it was 25 degrees outside, and there was no place for them to be. What am I going to do, call the cops? That's not -- that's a failure for who we are as a city. I am trying to be aware that not everybody is comfortable, and I'm not always comfortable, but again, nine years, people living in my -- under my porch periodically, and I have never called the police. I have never felt unsafe. I don't know if you all have any questions, but I'm happy to answer any about living next door to a place that's offering services that are desperately needed. I'm also currently fostering a puppy because REDI doesn't allow puppies, and people would rather freeze than not have their animals. So just as an FYI. Any other questions you have for me, feel free.

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

MS. MAZE: Yes, sir?

MR. STANTON: Good evening. How are you doing this evening?

MS. MAZE: Good. How are you?

MR. STANTON: All right. Hearing the previous speaker and me trying to glean a win-win, hearing both sides, do you have any suggestions on how we can maybe address the issues from the other side of this issue?

MS. MAZE: I think communication is very important. I think people are scared. Being poor in public only happens in certain areas in town, and if you're not familiar with it, then it can be uncomfortable and scary. So I think that everybody needs to talk, everybody needs to be open, people need to be introduced to each other, people need to learn about de-escalation and how to speak with people even though you're uncomfortable. I think it's really important to maintain that line because fear makes people say things they don't really mean, and makes you seem small, and nobody wants to feel small. But it's in my experience an unfounded fear.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? No. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MS. MAZE: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case? Again, name and address for the record, and get real comfortable with that microphone.

MR. RUCKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Austin Rucker; I live at 4110 Monsoon Lane. I would just like to reiterate and kind of echo what Ms. Lewis had mentioned about the standards for the conditional use permit. And while this is a very hotly contested issue -- or maybe not hotly contested, but it is -- it is an issue that most of us are passionate about. Almost all of us are probably passionate about, but I ask this Commission, whenever you guys take a step back and you -- and you're discussing this -- the granting or the suggesting to grant the permit, to maybe take a homeless shelter out of the equation, because I -- I feel like the homeless shelter is weighing a heavy thumb on the scale of whether to grant the permit or not. So if you remove that aspect from here and -- and have another, say, industrial or commercial enterprise requesting a permit, the Commission would look at the

criteria, and if it -- if it negatively impacted the areas around it, you would likely rule to not grant the permit. And as the Business Loop organization -- I think it's CID; I'm not 100 percent sure. But they have mentioned in their letter to the Commission and Council that it would negatively impact the Business Loop, the shelter would. And so if -- if there was another enterprise doing anything besides trying to care for the homeless, and you had a letter of opposition stating that it was going to -- going to negatively impact the Business Loop area or areas around this, I feel -- I would assume that would weigh heavy in your decision to grant the permit or not. Whereas, as I mentioned, I believe that the fact that this is a homeless opportunity center, that it's in itself is weighing heavily on the scale to approve the permit. So, thank you.

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

MR. STANTON: So you're saying if it was some other kind of business, we would be fighting it tooth and nail. Is that what you're saying?

MR. RUCKER: No, sir. What I'm saying is if it was another business, not maybe -- not one of a social -- a social advancement, if it was just another private business, and you had the CID come out and say it was -- it would negatively affect the Business Loop, or you had residential around the area, say it's going to negatively impact their property or whatnot, that -- that you would likely not grant the permit because it would not meet the criteria of the regulation that grants -- that the permit must meet.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real short, and I'm going to take up a little bit of your time. Pat, you could help refresh my memory. Business Loop CID -- and this is not directed at you. Business Loop CID stops at College. This is not in the CID area; is that correct?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MR. MACMANN: All right. I just wanted to point that out. We're quite a bit away from it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I'd like to ask staff a question. In your professional opinion, does the stated land use and site plan meet the use-specific criteria outlined in Chapter 29.6.4?

MR. ZENNER: In our opinion, yes, it does.

MS. CARROLL: Thank you.

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

MR. RUCKER: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else from the public to speak on this case? Please come forward. Name and address for the record.

CHRIS: Is it okay that I don't give my name and address, and I still speak?

MS. GEUEA JONES: You don't have to give your address, but we do need some sort of way to note you in the minutes. I'm sorry.

CHRIS: My name is Chris.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Chris. Could you pull the microphone up a little bit? Thank you.

CHRIS: I'm not a good speaker. I apologize for my appearance. I was plowing snow today. I'd like to address -- I'm not a good speaker. If this was something else, like this gentleman said, they would talk about the sidewalks being required for where, like, Business Loop goes down to two lanes where the railroad tracks are. Do we know where we're talking about? There's no way for people to walk there safely. They walk in dark clothes and stuff like that. If this was anywhere else, they would say that there would be a problem. As far as you, ma'am, you said that you didn't want to hear anything about, you know, something happened to her. I would like to point out another fact that you may not know about. Do you know where the old Mid-City building is on Paris Road? That used to be a place where Mike Teel, who owns Mid-City, let people stay. Now, I understand that there's -- there was no security there, and that's why that failed. You know that failed. Right? There were, like, cars, and there was crime and all that stuff? Do you know what I'm talking about?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you please get to your point, sir? Thank you.

CHRIS: So she said, well, she didn't want to hear about some poor old lady and her cat dying and stuff like that. Well, there's -- there's other -- there's history, there's a precedence of things failing because there wasn't good plans or everybody has a good heart. As far as you, sir, you brought up a very good point about money.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please stop doing that.

CHRIS: Okay. I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. If you've got a point to make, we'd like to hear it. This isn't a debate.

CHRIS: Is that money is concern a long time -- long term -- long term money is a problem. Having a high density of anybody in one area is not going to be good, you know. If your solution, sir, that you had was what would make people happy. Having a smaller density of people. Any time you put a lot of -- of low-income, you know, like in big cities and stuff like that, it becomes a problem for law enforcement, and it is negatively -- negatively impacted the community. So the problem is is this is a high density project.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you very much. Who wants to go first. Please, sir, come back. You've people who want to ask you questions now.

CHRIS: I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Good evening.

CHRIS: Good evening, sir.

MR. STANTON: What's your solution? It's easy to say no.

CHRIS: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: What is your solution? I kind of heard less density --

CHRIS: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: -- so maybe scattered along various sites. This a big spot. How do you make this work, make this a win-win? And let's use Midway; that's a very good example. How do you make it work -- instead of just no, how we make yeses happen?

CHRIS: Okay. We all have our own personal experiences in life, and we all have our own -- you're going to all vote for this. We know -- it's just like the City Council. So my answer to you is that low density, you're not going to change people. I guess I'm going to say you're not going to change people. I've had employees and I've tried to mentor them, say please don't use drugs, you know, watch -- you know, watch what you do after hours. You're not going to change people. So this 90-day thing that they're going to stay there 90 days, they're going to be -- these people have problems, and I'm compassionate to that. And -- and we all are, but 90 days is going to be up at some point, and these people are homeless for a reason. There's very few -- there are resources already out there in the community to help people that may lose their job and stuff like that. And -- and I'm not saying that -- that they can't be helped, but you're talking about 90 days. You're going to have the same problem again. And then what about the money when -- you know, in 10, 15 years? What's going to happen then? So the density is a big problem, and I would have to say that everybody keeps saying that we're going to help these people. Well, they've arrived at the situation for various reasons, and you can't force somebody into a cell and tell them you can't do this. And you're not going to be able to change the majority of these people no matter what you do in 90 days.

MR. STANTON: Are you aware there's many famous entrepreneurs. You know, we talk about business and property values and businesses being -- and there's a lot of famous people that were homeless and came from homelessness and rose up to be millionaires and billionaires and --

CHRIS: I'm friends with one, sir. He's a brain surgeon.

MR. STANTON: Okay. So, I mean --

CHRIS: He had a mentor.

MR. STANTON: So I guess where I'm at is sometimes it's just a matter of -- like tonight. It's a matter of having a place to sleep tonight, and just having a place to eat tonight. And if we worry about the drugs and the dope and the prostitution later, just give me a place to sleep tonight. I mean, that might be the turning point from here to there.

CHRIS: But we already have those.

MR. STANTON: Huh?

CHRIS: We already have those services. We have people like the mentors --

MR. STANTON: Well, why is there a guy sleeping in the -- in the parking garage then if we've got all those services covered?

CHRIS: I don't have answers to this. That's why you guys are here.

MR. STANTON: That's why we're trying to solve this here. And I just want to -- I don't want to get in a debate with you, but -- and I don't want to get in generalizations and profiles, either, so I do -- I do mind -- I do charge you to kind of watch those people, they can't be helped.

CHRIS: All right. I apologize. I said I wasn't a good speaker, so --

MR. STANTON: That kind of sparks -- yeah -- who we talk about, so --

CHRIS: Yeah. Yeah. I apologize. I did not mean to offend anybody.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

CHRIS: I said I wasn't a good speaker. I'm not -- I'm not a politician.

MR. STANTON: But I appreciate your position, and I just wanted to hear a win-win. And a good point, less density might work. Spreading places out, that might work, but thank you for your time and thank you for your opinion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much, sir. Any other members of the public to speak on this case? Last call. Okay.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Let's get into it. Who wants to start with Commissioner comments? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: I appreciate everybody coming out and sharing the upsides and down sides and personal viewpoints on this. I appreciate the staff report, which was incredibly thorough and supports this, and that carries a lot of weight with me. I also recognize the entities that are involved with this -- Voluntary Action Center, Room at the Inn, Turning Point. I trust these agencies. Randy Cole and the Housing Authority, I trust them to do what's right. I trust them to address problems in a timely manner. I trust them to have good communication with those that have issues or concerns about this, and so I plan on supporting the conditional use permit.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I've thought about whether or not I would say this, but I'm going to say it. I think that it's very important for us to be compassionate. I have been homeless three times in my life, but now I have a six-figure job and I own a home. So we cannot say what will happen to whom, when, where, how, or why, or why an individual is in the state that they're in. There are many reasons that have nothing to do with drugs, alcohol, any of that. It's just life circumstances. That's -- that's really what I wanted to share.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I've also been homeless before; just to say that. And I'm a bad Mama Jama now, so I'll just say that, too. I've wanted to bring out the win-win situations because I want the people

that are involved with this project to listen. If this passes and you get the support, your success for failure will determine how this issue is addressed in the future. So if you drop the ball on the security, on the services, on the quality of this facility, you are -- you are killing the issue for city-wide. So I need you, if this passes, to go 100 percent, plus 10. This has -- you have to step up to the plate and do what you say and say what you do if this happens to pass. And that's why I posed the questions I did because the business -- the business opinion and the opinion of your neighbors is very valuable. We take that very seriously up here, so we do hear the other side of this -- of this issue. We listen very seriously about it. So I hope you did, too. We have to be good neighbors. I want you guys to do your best plus, if you get the chance to do it at this location.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Kimbell?

MS. KIMBELL: This is a question for Counsel, I think. I do want to piggyback off of Commission Stanton. I'm in agreement with you. It's got to be a success because you set a precedent for other ones that are coming down the same way -- that opportunity to come down that same way. I'm going to go back to the document that was submitted by Marjorie Lewis. On that last page where it says in her conclusion there, if the applicants fail to establish any of the required elements for obtaining a conditional use permit, it must be denied. The trustees respectfully assert that the applicants have failed to establish any of these elements. Although there is pressure to provide a solution to the homeless issue in Columbia, the Commission must abide by the City's requirements for the granting of a conditional use permit. Under the City's criteria, the permit cannot be granted. Can you help me understand --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Robbin, can you --

MS. KIMBELL: Can you help understand what that means?

MS. THOMPSON: So what she's pointing to were the criteria that you're directed through the ordinances to consider when you're making a decision about a conditional use permit. There -- and the staff report went through what those criteria are, and they're the criteria that are found in 29-6.4, and then there's also the three use-specific criteria. The ordinances direct that after giving due considerations to those criteria, you may recommend to the Council that they grant a conditional use permit. And do you have any specific questions about the criteria in particular?

MS. KIMBELL: No. I understand, it's a zoning.

MS. THOMPSON: Okay. Okay. So -- and you have discretion as to how you evaluate those criteria, but you're to take the facts that you've been given today and apply those to those criteria.

MS. KIMBELL: Thank you.

MS. THOMPSON: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I'm going to follow up on Commissioner Kimbell's comment, because I do believe in evaluating consistency in how we evaluate cases. So I appreciate the comments of potential adverse impacts from a neighbor. And to that point, I really appreciate the article you gave us because, in the

summary, it identifies the difference between transitory homeless shelters and supportive housing, which is one of the reasons I was asking Mr. Stansberry to clarify the type of facility that was being proposed. And it acknowledges that the study in this is really based on transitory homeless shelters, meaning overnight where there are not day facilities. But there's another study by the New York University Furman Center, and their analysis actually shows that for properties within 500 feet of supportive housing facilities, there is an increase in the sales price of the properties because owners do not consider it a liability the same way they do transitory housing. So the concern about adverse impact due to property value doesn't appear to be substantiated by the documentation that was provided. In addition, the issues of safety, security, and trespassing, again, I think, are stemming from the fact perhaps that Room at the Inn is being operated as an overnight facility and does not have the daytime supportive that would be offered by this. So again, I don't believe the concerns are supported, and I do believe the criteria has been met. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Commissioner Loe. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. To follow up on that point, I'm going to recall something from disclosure which -- it was a conversation I had in passing. It was while these folks were doing their presentation to Council. I was standing next to Chief Jones, the Chief of police with City of Columbia. Now, I said to him, Geoff -- I know Geoff -- have you been asked about a budget to service this. He said no, I had not, and I did find that disappointing. And he said but probably because of the data of what Commissioner Loe just said, our overall amounts of instances for service calls of all types will go down. I thought that was worthwhile to bring up. Now, of course, this is secondhand, a conversation I had with Chief Jones, but I thought that was important to bring that up for two reasons. Number one, he wasn't asked, and number two, because of what Commissioner Loe said and what I believe from my other readings, that's the case. Something else that Mr. Stansberry said, and I'm going to follow up on Commissioner Stanton and Commissioner Kimbell, Mr. Stansberry had said that he didn't want to go to the neighbors with a theoretical concept. I'm going to -- I'm going to direct you to your agent, Mr. Crockett, and probably also to Mr. Ott. It has been our experience that anyone who comes before us that goes early to the neighbors, I want to do X. Go to the neighbors, tell them what you want, and you can help alleviate these fears and staying in communication the entire time. And also, I don't know the answer to that question is valid, not responding to them. All it does is it builds up this anger type stuff. That's all I have for the moment, Madam Chair. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. My comments are this. I do evaluate this case and all cases against the use specific criteria, and I do find that it meets the use specific criteria. I agree with staff. What I see is a plan that addresses potential adverse impacts. I see a plan that self-limits and goes beyond what we would typically require to address such impacts, and I appreciate that. I do trust the agencies, VAC, Room at the Inn, Turning Point. I understand that there is some footwork to bring people together.

That's still happening, but I believe that these are groups that have experience in handling some of the adverse impacts that we are concerned about, and I think that they would be the most likely individuals to help alleviate the issues that you are currently experiencing on that property, so I view this as an application that might improve the property. And we do evaluate all things based on the land use, not based on a softer desire to see a certain use go forward.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Placier, did -- go ahead.

MS. PLACIER: Yes. Just to correct the record, I never did say that I didn't care about older women, being one myself, and having been a crime victim, and I also love cats. But I'm glad that Mr. MacMann said what he did because I was concerned when I asked the question about whether the people with the opposition had been consulted. Apparently, your client was the only one who responded to that, and I do think it is a problem in proposals like this where you know that there will be divided opinion. And so apologies if I came across as insensitive to people my age. I'll try not to do that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. So my fellow Commissioners have all made very good points about the project overall. I would like to be the stick in the mud a little bit, I guess, and get down to what we're actually going to be voting on on this. I don't think I can add anything to the discussion that's already been had about the overall. So we've got on the screen the recommendation and the two criteria. Staff and legal, the way operational characteristics and services are described, would that include the fact that it's got daytime services operations?

MR. ZENNER: In the operational characteristics letter that was submitted by the actual -- by Crockett Engineering, it doesn't directly state day related services. However, I think the mere fact that VAC's staff that would be providing case management, as well as other elements that would typically be considered a day activity such as mental and substance abuse services, which would generally be correlated to those daytime activities, in my mind, would cover that who provides those services or what agencies do is not the purpose of that letter.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: The purpose of that letter is to give the broad spectrum of what will occur within the facility and does not necessarily specify either in hours limitation. This is a 24-hour, 365-day-a-year center. What we are trying to state within this criterion is that the scope of those services is somewhat -- is not somewhat but is contained to be within the family that's listed, not to be something else.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Do you think drop-in center, is that enough to -- what I am trying to get at is I think that it's clear from what we've been talking about and the design of this that one of the benefits will be people aren't kicked out at 6:00 a.m. And so I'm trying to figure out is something in one of these two requirements going to hold them to that in the way that's official. I am sure you are going to do it. I don't doubt that you intend to do it. I'm just trying to figure out is there something official.

MR. ZENNER: We've had a tremendous amount of discussion here this evening, and I know

Mr. Stansberry had used a term associated with the facility's operations. It's not wrap-around services, but it's a different term. Holistic may be a characteristic of which could be added to the second criterion. You know, holistic -- the holistic operational characteristics and services may help to clarify that, but the way that I -- I review what Mr. Crockett's office prepared on behalf of the applicant doesn't stipulate a 6:00 a.m. -- a time period in which the services are cut off. And I don't think we would interpret from a permitting perspective that that is what this facility is intended to provide is limited hours of services.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And then the other comment, and then I'll go to my fellow Commissioners again, is I would be in favor of removing the 30 parking spaces and having more of a buffer along the northern line, if we are allowed to do that. And with that, I'll allow -- which of you two want to go first.

MS. BURNS: I will.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: When we said the operational characteristics, if you want to add the word "complete services," that might indicate that it is full service.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Something like that. I like that. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: While I appreciate what Mr. Zenner and Commissioner Burns have said, I think it's a 24-hour shelter. Just -- they've got to have a roof over their head.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The temporary 24-hour shelter.

MR. MACMANN: Because we're housing first. Housing first.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Can we do that? Can we add temporary 24-hour shelter?

MR. ZENNER: The way that I would suggest then taking what Mr. MacMann has offered is is the operational characteristics and services of a 24-hour, 365-day-a-year, temporary shelter as outlined.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. MACMANN: There we go.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Is that good?

MS. BURNS: Parking. Though I agree with you, that would just be an additional -- subject to --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Uh-huh.

MS. LOE: Could it be noted on the first item, since that's where we're identifying the site plan?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: You would prefer to have an amended site plan with the spaces removed. That's fine, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I think you're right. I think we add it to the first criteria. Any other nuts and bolts, thoughts, comments, questions? Okay. You're going to have to do some of this extemporaneously.

MR. MACMANN: Yes. I am going to have to some of this extemporaneously. I plan to make a motion unless my fellow Commissioners have any questions or concerns. I'm going to be leaning on staff here, you, Ms. Thompson, and you, Mr. Zenner. And as you just guided us to the end here, Madam

Chair, you, as well. I would like to, you know, move to approve 2023. Where do we want the 24-hour, 365 --

MS. BURNS: I can do it, if that's helpful.

MR. MACMANN: You want to do it, then go for it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go for it. Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: In the case of 20-2023, the Voluntary Action Center Opportunity Campus conditional use permit, I would like to recommend approval of a CUP for a temporary shelter subject to site construction of a temporary shelter and substantial compliance with PW Architects incorporated site plan dated 12/14/2022 removing the 30 parking spaces to the north indicated on that site plan, and the operational characteristics and services of the temporary shelter that will operate 365 days and 24/7 a year to be as outlined as Crockett Engineering Consultants dated 12/13/2022.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Burns; seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Well done. Any further 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: Ms. Placier, Ms. Kimbell, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones. Motion carries 9-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Such recommendation shall be forwarded to City Council.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: With that, are there any general public comments for this evening? Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. The next meeting is going to be January 5th. We just don't stop. We will have a regular work session at 5:30 p.m., and then we will have our regular scheduled public hearings meeting at 7:00 p.m. that same evening. You have a couple of cases that will be appearing on that agenda. We have a tabled item that was tabled two meetings ago, and that is off of Oakland Gravel Road. This is a rezoning request from R-1 to R-2, and this is to allow for future submission of a cottage subdivision request to our Board of Adjustment and followed by a platting action to allow for smaller lot housing to be created up off of Oakland Gravel. And then as we discussed this evening in our work session, we will be presenting to you an amendment to the Unified Development Code to address changes that are necessary to accommodate medical marijuana -- or marijuana changes precipitated by Amendment 3's passage in November of this year. Those changes are generally associated with additional -- additions of regulations and then modification of several use-specific standards. Distance

and spacing, however, that is currently in the use-specific standards and the total number of licensed facilities for the sale, manufacture, or growing of marijuana are not changing as a result of this amendment. This is simply to accommodate the first of two phases of new marijuana facilities based on the recreational component. The first phase will deal with comprehensive, which is comprehensive marijuana facilities. The second phase will deal with micro-business facilities, and we will discuss at a later date micro-business facility changes. So we know where we are on the one property, which is probably pretty well known. That is our Oakland Gravel request for rezoning. That is all we have as we close out 2022 as a rather extensive year of work that we have done as a Commission. Short-term rental, after a year and a half of discussion in committee, has been presented to City Council. We are receiving public comment at this point that is being submitted to our Council members. Those are being forwarded to staff for inclusiveness and transparency purposes. Staff is receiving comments from the general public, as well, at this point. We are aware that a number of the comments are requesting some clarification on the data tables that were presented during Council's work session on Monday of this week. Ms. Carroll and Ms. Loe are working on an appropriate response to that, given that they are the Commissioners responsible for that data. We will formally have that hopefully available shortly after the beginning of the new year, and then we'll be providing additional response to the public should they need that to address their questions. My position as it relates to this particular ordinance and the findings and the recommendations made by the Commission is it is a Commission ordinance. Many questions that we will receive, I will not be answering personally. The Commission will need to address issues potentially as they come in, and I may be seeking advice from the Chair, the Vice Chair, and the Secretary to do so. That may warrant having to have work session discussion as to how you would like those responses done. This is done solely for the purposes that the City of Columbia staff is not the generator of the regulation but happen to be the pen that moved them. So we want to make sure that everybody understands this is your position. The City may not have the same position at a different level. It has been a pleasure to work with you to draft these regulations; however, their success or their failure will rely on the Commission's further work as we move into the public hearing process, which will occur later in the spring after we have closed out the public comment period. With that, that is all I have to offer this evening. I thank you very much for your attendance tonight on a very cold evening, and we wish you the best of the Christmas season. Have a Happy New Year, and we will see you at the beginning of January.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

IX. COMMISSION COMMENTS

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

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MACMANN: Move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Stanton.
Any opposed? No. We're out of here. Thank you all very much.
(Off the record)
(The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.)