

EXCERPTS
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
June 11, 2026

Case Number 124-2026.

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Grindstone Acres, LLC, (owner) for approval to rezone 32.7 acres from A (Agricultural) to PD (Planned Development), to approve a planned development plan serving as a preliminary plat to be known as "The Retreat at Columbia", and approve associated statement of intent. Approval of the request would permit the 32.7 acres to be developed with a 194-unit multi-family development. The approximately 32.7-acre subject site is located around 350 feet north of the terminus of Gray Oak Drive, and it's presently unaddressed. (This case was previously tabled at both the May 7 and June 4 Planning Commission meetings to June 11, 2026.)

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

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the site from A to PD, the proposed PD Plan, serving as a preliminary plat, and associated statement of intent, subject to the following conditions:

1. Technical corrections
2. Approved tract split prior to introduction at City Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Now then, before we go to questions for staff on Case Number 124-2026, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Hi. Thank you. I'm wondering if you could illuminate for me. I understand how the kind of housing study fits into or is in service with the Comprehensive Plan. I don't quite understand the Rock Quarry Special Area Plan as it pertains to the criteria that are before us.

MR. KUNZ: I guess, what particular -- what criteria are --

DR. GRAY: I -- so does it comport with the Comprehensive Plan, the UDC? And I'm curious about, like, what role this plays in making a land-use decision.

MR. KUNZ: The Special Area Plan?

DR. GRAY: Yes.

MR. KUNZ: Understood. I think the Special Area Plan is part of what led to the creation of the scenic roadway overlay, if I'm not mistaken. And it also, since it does recommend that PD zoning be pursued for residential development -- that is stated within the residential objectives and policies of that plan. That was part of the consideration also for why PD rezoning was pursued rather than residential multi-family. Yeah. Does that adequately answer it? It doesn't look like it, but --

DR. GRAY: So does it kind of go into -- and maybe this is not a question for you -- like neighborhood, like compatibility?

MR. KUNZ: No. It says that development should roughly follow what is illustrated on the development plan, which is here on this slide.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. KUNZ: And they did describe all of the tracts that were included in this, and they -- I don't know if they interviewed property owners or what have you, but they asked if there was intent for development and things along those lines when the plan was adopted. But ultimately, yeah, it says that development should occur as it's illustrated in the development plan. Our position would be that -- that development around this area has kind of strayed away from that, particularly with the commercial corridor expansion of Grindstone. So it -- it may not be prudent to exclusively follow the development plan that was adopted in 2002.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. CRAIG: And, Commissioner Gray, if -- I think what you're getting at, the Comprehensive Plan, this 2002 study, anything that conflicts with that, of course, subsequently, there's been the Comprehensive Plan. So that would control. I mean, if you -- if there's anything conflicting in that 2002 report, the Comp Plan would be -- would be what you would consult and go by.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CRAIG: Yeah.

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

MR. BRODSKY: Just as a follow-up to that. Did staff look to see if there was anything in the Comprehensive Plan that conflicts with the Special Area Plan that would override the Special Area Plan?

MR. KUNZ: I would say particularly the -- wanting to encourage residential density around commercial nodes is potentially something that's at conflict with this, and part of that is also because the area that's been identified as mixed use being between Rock Quarry and Green Meadows, if I'm not mistaken, has turned into exclusively commercial development in nature. I would -- yeah. I would say the Comprehensive Plan does encourage more density in areas around this than what was initially considered with the 2002 Special Area Plan.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I may have missed this when you were discussing the traffic impact study in terms -- relationship to the intersection with Stadium.

MR. KUNZ: Uh-huh.

MR. WALTERS: Did you mention or discuss -- you talked about PMP, but did -- was there any discussion about AMP?

MR. KUNZ: They did not include the -- what the counts would be for the midday peak in the supplemental traffic memo, but it is informed by the number of outbound and inbound trips, like if you're heading north out of Retreat Way towards Stadium or if you're heading west onto Retreat Way, those would be all of the trips that are going from that intersection to this development or vice versa, and that would end up being 105 trips during the midday peak. But that information was not included in the supplemental traffic memo.

MR. WALTERS: That's midday peaks?

MR. KUNZ: Midday peak. They did not do -- there was no graphic that illustrated what traffic distribution would be during the a.m. peak, if I'm not mistaken, so it would -- I would not be able to derive it.

MR. WALTERS: All right. Thank you.

MR. KUNZ: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? I have one question, just generally, about our policies. We aren't including housing where there is a criteria in the lease that you are a student and the definition of student housing? We're including that as general multi-family?

MR. KUNZ: Per the housing study, it does not distinguish between purpose-built student housing as not being multi-family units for rent. I did reach out to the author of the study to confirm this was the case. Those are households in the community that would be counted as households per the census.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm a little bit concerned about that because of the fact that our universities are no longer really providing dormitories in the way that they did when I, many, many moons ago, was in college. So that is interesting to me because we have forced the students off campus essentially. We have created a marketplace of purpose-built and criteriarized, not just marketed to, but you can't live here unless housing -- and we're including that in our definition of general multi-family need. So just not anything for you to do, because you didn't write the study, but just so it's on the record. It concerns me that we're including them in our definition of -- of what's meeting our multi-family need generally. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. We've got a lot of folks here tonight, so I'm going to be strict on the time. We will give six minutes for the applicant and representatives of a group, three minutes for staff. Please state your name and address for the record and get comfortable with that microphone.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Madam Chair, I'll request my three minutes, if you don't mind, and I'll reserve the six minutes for our traffic engineer tonight. Here we go. Again, with me tonight is Caleb Colbert, Brian Rensing with CBB, and Chase Powell and Madison Whitaker with Landmark Properties. A quick little overview. I think we talked about this before. Most of my presentation was given at the last Planning and Zoning meeting that this was presented at. And so, again, I think that our density is around -- I think our density is about six. It depends if we use net or gross acreage based on our density calculation. So if we look at how PDs are calculated, I believe we would use the right-of-way which would include a little bit of extra property, which would make it around six units per acre, which is not a high-density residential entity in my -- in my view. Again, you've seen the location, you've seen the PD plan. The opening green space that was calculated here, yes, it does have 10 percent landscaping, but the question we've always had is what is considered landscaping and open space. And I think that's kind of an open-ended question. More importantly here is about 65 percent of the entire piece of property is going to be green space, whether it's preserved, whether it's a manicured yard, whether it's landscaping, whether it's tree preservation, climax forest, stream buffer. About 65 percent of the site is going to remain as -- as seen. As noted before, the darker green is a stream buffer that's not going to be touched, and

then the hatched areas are our two tree preservation areas on the site. And so -- and if you'll notice how that's kind of laid out, the whole point was that we want to screen the bulk of the development away from Rock Quarry Road. That was -- that is by design. Just a few of the units on the far east are adjacent to them. Again, the traffic report, we had supplemental information. Brian is here to talk specifically about that, and I'll let him cover that. Utilities, again, an important part of the development is, you know, what are utilities, are they there, and can they serve the development? Yes, they are, and, yes, they can. Columbia Imagined, I mean, again, I don't want to beat -- beat this too much, but the tracts identified as neighborhood district and land-use plan, located inside the urban service area, and it's identified as a tier one growth priority area, and we think all those are important items to consider when we're looking at this -- looking at this development. In 2002 when the study was done, the City of Columbia had a different view of what density was. And now that we've grown over the past nearly 25 years, we have a different look and a different -- you know, a different outlook on what density is and how we need to increase density in our city core. So, in conclusion, again, the requesting PD zoning over R-MF is for protection purposes. That's part of the area plan. We talked to City staff about that, and that's what we're proposing. It's not because we're trying to ask for anything that we normally wouldn't be allowed in R-MF, it's because it gives everyone in the city and the neighbors the assurances of what we're proposing. We comply with the SRO overlay district. We're enhancing the landscaping along Rock Quarry Road, and so we're doing more there. Times up?

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's your three. Yeah.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Okay. And with that, I will turn it over to Brian. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: My red light is not connected, people in the magic room. Sorry. Are you our traffic engineer?

MR. RENSING: Yeah. I am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You'll get your six minutes.

MR. RENSING: Thank you. My name is Brian Rensing; I'm a traffic engineer with CBB. I have 24 years of experience. I'm a licensed professional engineer, a certified professional traffic operations engineer, as well as a road safety professional, level two, with emphasis on infrastructure. Over my 24 years, I have done hundreds of traffic impact studies. Briefly, go over what a traffic impact study is. A traffic impact study assumes whatever is being proposed would be built, be successful, and generate more traffic. Basically, the traffic study looks at that additional traffic, identifies the impact that it has on the adjacent roadways and intersections, determines whether improvements are needed. Through our process, we did engage with the City, and so that we -- our traffic impact study meets the needs of what the City desires. So through that we identified study area with the appropriate intersections, the appropriate timeframes, any sort of additional scenarios that they wanted. So we did provide a technical memorandum that summarizes all our base assumptions. They reviewed it, accepted it, and then we completed the traffic impact study. After completing the traffic impact study, we submitted it to the City again for their review. The City staff agreed with the conclusions and the recommendations made in the traffic impact study. We provided a supplemental memo to provide any additional information, and they reviewed that. They did a good job summarizing a lot of that data here, as well, and agreed with that. So we're going -- I'm going to kind of quickly go over the supplemental traffic information in my time allowed. Typically, we do look at a.m. and the p.m. peak hour when we evaluate traffic. However, based on the land use, the midday peak hour and the p.m. peak hour are much heavier than the a.m. peak hour. I don't know about you, but when I was in college, I didn't want to get up for an 8:00 a.m. class, so they kind of real-- you know, makes it a little more comprehensible on why the a.m. peak hour is lower. So looking at the p.m. -- in the day and p.m. peak hour, that's nearly double. So staff agreed, along with us, that evaluating the midday peak hour and the p.m. peak hour would, in fact, evaluate the worst-case scenario. Trip generation estimates, based on local data. So we looked at the -- counted the driveways for the central house across the road. We summarized those trips in the midday MPM peak hour, looked at a per bed ratio, and basically increased and applied that ratio to the number of beds that are proposed, and then generated some -- some trip generation based on local data. So for that we have 140 total trips in the midday peak hour, and 170 trips in the p.m. peak hour. So if you compare that back to the previous slide with the ITE trip generation, it's about 63 -- or 160 -- the ITE trip generation is about 163 percent higher during the midday, and 133 percent higher during the p.m. peak hour. So our traffic impact study looks at the worst-case scenario when we look at local data. Trip distribution, as part of the trip generation, and then we assigned it to the roadways, based on the existing travel patterns, we looked at trip generation for all the different routes that go there. So, you know, we looked at 35, 45 percent using Rock Quarry, with the school and everything up there. But we also considered all the other lane uses around. During the midday, students are going to want to go shopping, they're going to go out to lunch, they're going to go visit friends, go to jobs, whatever, so they're not all going to go to Rock Quarry Road. So we had a 25 percent -- or 20 to 30 percent, also using Gray Oak Drive, possibly going to shopping or Green Meadows into the west there. So City staff didn't request to look at Stadium and Rock Quarry Road, so that was

not included in our initial traffic impact study. However, they did supply a traffic study from 2025 that looked at this intersection during the a.m. and p.m. peak hour, so that's why we only looked at the p.m. peak hour here. When we add our traffic in there, we've got basically 40 per -- additional traffic per direction there, so that's about a two-percent increase in the overall intersection traffic volume. So if you think about that, you know, how long you're sitting there in the cycle, that's about two vehicles every cycle, so, really, you're not going to notice the additional traffic for this development with two vehicles every cycle. We also looked at the crash history here. Over the last five years, there was 41 crashes from south of Stadium to north of Grindstone. That relates to about eight crashes per year on average, and we calculate that into a crash rate for the whole segment. That's 181 crashes per 100 million miles traveled. We also looked -- compared that to the statewide averages to see if it was way out of line, and it's actually lower than the statewide average for both major collectors, as well as two-lane roadways. That was a quick summary of our supplemental traffic memo. If I can answer any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Almost perfect on time. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Thank you so much for showing your homework for us. Just a point of clarification, because I am not a traffic engineer. When you talk about the trips generated and the number of vehicles, is that the same number?

MR. RENSING: Correct.

DR. GRAY: Okay.

MR. RENSING: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Second point of clarification, the more conservative estimate is based on the manual, and then you have another point of comparison, which is the other -- the Central -- whatever we --

MR. RENSING: Central House.

DR. GRAY: Central House. In these estimates in the supplemental memo, how does that compare in terms of seconds of delay that was mentioned in the traffic impact study? Is it different?

MR. RENSING: No. The seconds of delay are the same, because we didn't -- you know, reassign all the traffic based on that lower local trip generation rate, so we didn't change any of that. Just to be conservative, again, extra conservative, 30 percent higher, you know, in both peak hours there.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Yes. I had a couple of questions. Do -- do -- when you do these traffic studies, particularly with developments that have a lot of students, and some of these developments often have shuttle buses, did you -- was that taken into account? I don't know if they have proposed shuttle buses, but would a traffic count -- would differ if the development relied on shuttle buses, I would assume.

MR. RENSING: So the Central House has buses -- shuttles. And then it's my understanding that this development would too.

MR. WALTERS: And in doing so, would that affect the -- how you -- the data that you come up with?

MR. RENSING: It's included -- it would be included with the local data. Right? Because it's currently running with -- and has that impact included in it. The ITE's land use for the student housing doesn't specifically say it includes, so it's unknown in the data set that's available through ITE. It doesn't tell you each in particular study whether shuttles were included or not.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RENSING: It's a worst-case scenario, looking at ITE.

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

MR. BRODSKY: I just have one question. For me, at least, I'm not necessarily terribly concerned about the peak hour travels. I'm more concerned about the additional average daily trips on Rock Quarry between Stadium and Grindstone. I'm not a traffic engineer, but I've read your study in detail. What is your estimate of the percentage increase of trips that will be on that road because of this development?

MR. RENSING: So currently, there's about 8,333, I think it was, vehicles per day on -- on Rock Quarry Road. If we assume 40 percent over the course of the day to the development would go there, it would add about 1,150 total daily trips. And then -- then, cumulatively for the existing -- adding the existing plus the development traffic, you're at 9,485. So, you know, well below the capacity of a two-lane roadway.

MR. BRODSKY: So a 15 percent increase but, roughly --

MR. RENSING: Yeah. A little less than that. What is it? Let me see. Yeah. Around there.

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

MR. DARR: I have a couple, and just not in specific order, I guess. What -- what sort of delay at an intersection would necessitate, in your opinion, an offside improvement? Like, these delays are increased by six seconds at most, but what kind of delay does necessitate something to be done?

MR. RENSING: So in the particular case of the northbound approach of Rock Quarry at Grindstone,

we're adding five trips to the whole northbound approach during the p.m. peak hour, and it increases it -- I think it was, like, two seconds. And during midday peak hour, we do increase it a little bit more. However, again, our estimate is adding five vehicles, so that's one vehicle every, what, 12 minutes? So, you know, the additional delay, according -- you know, based on the additional traffic is very low. The intersection still offers acceptable levels of service, so, you know, that's why we didn't recommend any roadway improvements there.

MR. DARR: And I wasn't saying that I think there should be any improvements. It was more that it was showing a small increase, but if you look at the first slide he put up, that there was three tracks of equal size, you could presume that they could come forward next year or the following year with another 720, and then another 720, and then you just triple the increase of your delay. And we kind of -- are we not setting a precedent for this kind of housing with -- on this road right here. So that's why I was asking about what kind of additional delay would necessitate an improvement -- an off-site improvement.

MR. RENSING: It's my understanding you would require traffic impact study for those other developments, and those developments then would be required to do a traffic impact study to see if those were -- those developments needed to be --

MR. DARR: Okay. So I did like how you did the study and compared it to some objective criteria, the MoDOT crashes per 100,000,000 miles. Not using that criteria, just using your professional judgment, do you think Rock Quarry Road is on par safety-wise with other two-lane roads of a similar nature?

MR. RENSING: It's a roadway that's two lanes, it has curves, vertical, horizontal, you know, go through all the out of the state any, you know, lettered route -- two-lane lettered route is very similar, somewhere between, you know, 22 to 24 feet. It's just one of those roads where you've got to go 30 miles per hour, so --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- (inaudible.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Hey. Let's keep our comments to ourselves for --

MR. DARR: So that, yeah. It is what it is, kind of you're saying, but I would also mention that your -- your objective criteria just looks backwards, and it doesn't look forwards as far as applying additional traffic. I don't know if there's a linear relationship between the traffic volume and the number of crashes, but you add another 720, you just said it was, like, 10 percent increase of average daily traffic on that road. Is there going to be a 10 percent increase in crashes, do you think?

MR. RENSING: We didn't do a specific evaluation, but it's generally not a linear relationship for crash predictions. It's more -- it's heavily based on volume, but it's not a direct linear relationship.

MR. DARR: So you think -- I mean, I know you haven't crunched the numbers, but does that take you up to -- from 181 to 185, or is that like -- and, like, what number do you get into a realm of -- of maybe this is an issue, maybe we need to start looking at making improvements on this road?

MR. RENSING: That, I don't -- I haven't crunched the numbers on there, so I don't really know what that would go to or can't speculate on what that would go to.

MR. DARR: Yeah. Okay. That's -- I think that was all the questions I have for you now. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you. The next speaker on this case, please come forward. I don't have a list up here, folks. Whoever wants to go needs to come.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Anthony Davis -- Tony Davis. I live at -- on Rock Quarry Road, 4655 South Rock Quarry Road. First of all, I want to address the Rock Quarry Road Special Area Plan. We really -- this came from a concern of the neighborhood not only there, but across the City of Columbia, too, because of the sensitivity of this particular area, but, in particular, the -- the condition of Rock Quarry Road, and that was 23 years ago. And in that plan, the goals -- and this was put together by the City Planning Department and was adopted by the City Council, and it said this was to prepare a land use for the area and an appropriate level for residential density and predicts the residential character of the neighborhood, and that's really what we felt at the time is what everyone still feels. It says provide for safe and orderly flow of vehicular traffic through the area while maintaining scenic quality of life, and that's what -- when we -- a number of us worked for the Rock Quarry Road to be a scenic roadway. At the time when the City Council was addressing this, the community interest was very strong. It still is, and we still have the same concerns about the importance of keeping Rock Quarry Road as a scenic roadway. And I think the -- the planned unit development is a good plan development. And it's -- it's -- and it has the infrastructure that would also apply to residential development and keeping something more in keeping with what we wanted 23 years ago, as did the City Planning, as did the City Council. And we see it drifting away from that. Even though it's a good planned unit development, Rock Quarry Road simply cannot sustain it. And I can mention a few things, and it will be addressed even in more detail, but the comparative study with Central, the apartments across the street, that was done, I think, in one day, one time, and was kind of a -- what was coming and going. It's also a projection of what 720 parking spots and cars can be coming and going out of this proposed development. We just really don't know. And some of the comparisons that are being used for MoDOT and some of the other studies, they are within one-half mile of a campus, and that's really a walkable community. And for those of you who have probably been in another

campus, you see residential areas that are within walking distance, and this certainly is not. It's more like a mile and a half from campus, and all -- it leads toward all of the various campuses that are there, that would be using this roadway. And I think the question that's been brought up, what about evenings and other times and the unknowns that we have about that, it still seems to be the most important thing right now is safety and concerns with Rock Quarry Road.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. DAVIS: And I bet I'm close to time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's it, exactly.

MR. DAVIS: Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. WILSON: Members of the Commission, good evening. David Wilson. I reside at 1810 Riback Road right across from this development. I think you all are asking all the right questions. I have a few others I would like to add. Obviously, I know they won't get answered in the moment, but maybe you all can ask them later. In the -- in the traffic study, the IT guidelines, I'm curious if they were using purpose-built guidelines for student housing. I mean, you've correctly identified this as student housing in name and deed. There are studies out there that are away from the general urban planning development that show a multiplier for student purpose-built housing over multi-family high-density housing in terms of numbers of trips a day. So if those data -- if that data is not being adjusted for that, then we're seeing far too low numbers. As somebody who drives that road every morning, I think most of these students aren't skipping their morning classes, and, in fact, are actually going to school. It's especially busy right before 8:00 a.m. Ultimately, for me, this is development that we will all live with for the next 50 years maybe. It doesn't seem too much to ask -- I appreciate what's been cobbled together by staff and the developers in terms of the traffic study, but a specific traffic study dedicated to this, conducted for this development when students are in town, for a very large development, three large developments, as you point out, doesn't seem too much to ask. And we're making a lot of guesswork on these numbers. I did -- the crash data, which is obviously at the heart, the most important thing that we're saving lives here, was done between 2020 and 2024. Notably, those years, we saw a huge reduction in driving because of Covid. I would be really curious what the crash data was like for, say, the previous five years of that and why those five years were picked. I guess, at the end of day for me, you know, it's fine to say it only goes up by 15 percent, although, as pointed out, it goes up by 15 percent every time they add one more, and we will end up feeling like the frog in the boiling water. And the reality is a pitcher that's full, if you add 15 percent to that pitcher, it just overflows, whether you add 10 percent or 15 percent or 20 percent. It's the road is not ready for this development. Thank you.

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

DR. GRAY: Welcome back.

MR. WILSON: Thanks.

DR. GRAY: I asked you a not dissimilar question, I think, last time, and if the data were not coupled together, as you say, and was in support of your thesis that maybe these estimates were not -- are not accounting for students in the way that we had hoped. Again, I'm curious about the threshold for what is an acceptable level to you, given that we are pro-housing and we're looking to add more housing.

MR. WILSON: Absolutely. And I should say, like, I'm -- I'm also -- I'm a resident. I'm also a landlord. The -- my neighborhood is made up of students. It's made up of working folks. It's made up of retirees. It's a mix of people who are all, you know, contributing to Columbia in different ways. I respectfully disagree with staff that the -- that an indirect benefit of student housing is that you free up other housing. I think we should be looking for direct benefits in housing. Families don't use housing the same way as students use housing. Housing built for families is more likely. I think the transition to housing for other families in the future, I think housing built for students is more likely to transition to cheaper or poorer quality housing for other students in the future. So I think if this was being brought to us as a true multi-family development, I think you would find the neighborhood a lot more amenable. It doesn't mean we'd love access onto Rock Quarry, it doesn't mean we would love everything about it, but, at least for me personally, I'm -- I'm more open to that.

DR. GRAY: So just to clarify.

MR. WILSON: Yeah.

DR. GRAY: If it were another kind of multi-family housing, you would be okay with this 10 percent increase?

MR. WILSON: On the road?

DR. GRAY: Uh-huh.

MR. WILSON: I guess I would like to see less increase on the road because what we've been told is that that's going to create more accidents. But I think that I would be more open to exploring things like, you know, whether the Rock Quarry access can be emergency only or other options. There is plenty of access south of here. No one is disputing that. I would dispute the idea that -- that when we create a scenic roadway, something that is not the scenic roadway isn't about -- shouldn't serve -- reflect on the scenic roadway. Right? Like, there's a -- yes, there's a Walmart near here. It doesn't mean that we should then start building Walmarts all the way up the west side of Rock Quarry. That's not what the scenic roadway overlay is for. So we do have to draw a line. That line was drawn at the corner of Grindstone Parkway and Rock Quarry. And so I think we should be thinking very, very carefully about things that impact a scenic roadway. I think that's a -- it's part of a gem of Columbia.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? I think to follow up with what Commissioner Gray was saying, if this were a different kind of housing, do you think you would be as concerned about everybody trying to get downtown in the morning? Do you think that would change your perspective if -- if people are going multiple places instead of everyone trying to get to campus?

MR. WILSON: This is being built here, to be clear, by out-of-town developers to access the university. Right?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. WILSON: If it's a different kind of housing, hey, maybe somebody works over at that Walmart. Maybe they work southwest of there. Maybe they have to head over 63 for their work. There's a lot more traffic patterns, I think, that would arise in multi-family housing than student built housing where everyone is going to the exact same place at the exact same time every day.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any final questions? Seeing none. Thank you for being here.

MR. WILSON: Thank you so much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case, please come forward. And just as a show of hands, how many folks are here to speak on this case tonight? Okay. I'm just trying to gauge when we'll take a break.

MR. BINDBEUTEL: Good evening. My name is Joe Bindbeutel; I live at 1701 East Gans Road, which is at the intersection of Gans Road and Rock Quarry Road. I've lived there for too many decades to even mention. I will -- I will try to be brief. I think I would implore the Commissioners to look at this plan and read it very, very carefully. It is succinct, it is prescient, it is spot on, frankly, with respect to a lot of what's happened in our neighborhood. The intense commercial development right along --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you stay close to the microphone?

MR. BINDBEUTEL: -- right along -- the intense commercial development right along what's called Route AC, it's now Grindstone, but, voila, that has happened. And if you look at the parameters and the densities, it -- and -- and the -- and the considerations that were made in this plan, I think they all mitigate towards denying this particular development. It's simply too dense, and the infrastructure, quite honestly, to respectfully disagree, is not there. The road infrastructure is not there. My concern primarily is safety, but I don't see anything that has happened in that area that is fundamentally inconsistent with this plan. I think it should be given quite a bit of deference. In terms of density, the -- this particular 194 dwelling unit development is a tremendous amount of -- of increase over the density that's called for in this plan. And this isn't some tree-hugging, no -- you know, not on planet Earth sort of plan. This calls for about 1,200 units, as I -- as I read it, in this area. That's a lot of units. This is -- this is not a -- a zero-sum game, this is not a no game, but adding this kind of density in this particular area when there's so much more of this area that needs to be developed, is simply unjust. But my fundamental comment is about -- is about the crash history and the -- and the concept of road safety. I fundamentally believe that the crashes per 100,000,000 miles traveled is not an appropriate standard. The appropriate standard is how many serious accidents have happened. The fender benders, Allstate can take care of that. State Farm can take care of that. We'll take care of that. But the fatal crashes and the serious injury crashes, there's been -- there's been two fatal and two serious-injury crashes in the last five years. And as David pointed out, the study is during Covid years, so those -- those probably are going to be increased, not just with the increase of -- of the traffic since Covid, but also this development and the development that's going to come in this area. But I -- I took the liberty of asking City staff this afternoon, are there any other roadways in Columbia that have had two serious accidents and two fatalities in the last five years, and it was not a comprehensive detailed study, it was a quick look, and the answer was none. The answer was none. This is the most dangerous section of Columbia roadway we have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. BINDBEUTEL: Shouldn't be adding to it. And I would --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions for this speaker?

MR. BINDBEUTEL: I would simply implore -- also, just one thing, that this not be placed on the consent agenda for the Council. Thank you.

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

MR. BINDBEUTEL: I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next speaker?

MR. RIBACK: Good evening. I'm Martin Riback; 1711 Riback Road. Up to -- I'm retired now. Up to 11 years ago, I owned one of the biggest plumbing supply houses in -- in Missouri. And of all the development on Rock Quarry Road, Old 63, and Grindstone, the student housing, Riback Supply sold none. The plumbers in Columbia were not employed. The only time that we -- the plumbers got work was when they went in to repair what they called shoddy work. They were from -- it was put in very, very quickly by outside contractors. Now, I'm normally in favor of anything --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Can you back up just a little bit?

MR. RIBACK: Yeah. I'm normally in favor of anything that has running water and flush toilets, but anything that does absolutely nothing for the economy of Columbia, and doesn't give anybody any work, I think is the wrong way to go. And I -- and as the previous speakers have said, having -- having single-family or multi-family -- lighter multi-family development would probably be healthier for the economy of Columbia. Thanks. Any questions?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, Mr. Riback. Next speaker on this case, please come forward.

MR. LUGER: I'm Alan Luger; I live at --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you get a lot closer?

MR. LUGER: A lot closer. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll find it in the middle somehow, I promise.

MR. LUGER: Well, you -- you chased the last speaker away from the microphone, so I'm being a little cautious.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I know. I know.

MR. LUGER: I'm Alan Luger; I live at 2105 Rock Quarry Road. Two or three days ago, there was a serious crash at the foot of our driveway, which made it impossible for us to get in and out of our driveway for an hour or so while they cleaned up the mess. Rock Quarry Road, for any -- any of you who have actually driven on it, is a curvy two-lane road, narrow lanes, double yellow line the whole way. I've been passed by motorcycles and cars across the double yellow line. I have driven 30 miles an hour. I -- I confess, 32 or 33 miles an hour on a 30-mile-an-hour road, and six, eight, ten cars line up behind me waiting anxiously for me to go faster than the speed limit. The plan shows the entrance and exit onto Rock Quarry Road. There are -- there is a four-lane to the south. There's access to another road to the west. Why is it we have to have the entrance and exit on a two-lane double yellow lined road? If there was any other way to -- to gain entrance and exit, it would certainly ease the issue that this development is going to cause on a curvy two-lane double-yellow lined road.

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

MR. SHANKER: Hello, again. Rick Shanker, Sixth Ward. I wanted to know, how old is Columbia Imagined? How old is that?

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Mr. Shanker, could you do your name and address again?

MR. SHANKER: Rick Shanker, Cliff Drive, Sixth Ward. How old is Columbia Imagined?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Columbia Imagined, I believe --

MR. PALMER: I believe the last full rewrite was 2013, with updates two or three years ago.

MR. SHANKER: Thanks. I'm concerned also about the traffic in the a.m., because I travel that road, too, and maybe some of the people are sleeping, but there's a lot of traffic in the morning. Number two, as you provided questions about -- tracts two and three are going to add to this problem. And I was curious to know why there is not an exit to the west, as the last speaker said. Lastly, I was curious to know, as some of you said, how in the world multi-family housing is enclosed with student housing? One more thing is we might consider a moratorium on development on Rock Quarry. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Shanker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here tonight. Next speaker on this case, please come forward. Going once -- there we go.

MR. LOWE: Hello. My name is Shane Lowe, 1660 High Ridge Circle over in the Fourth Ward. I think there's a couple of things that I would like to point out with this. I agree that this is a site that's a little bit more complicated due to Rock Quarry Road and such, and I think that's probably the reason why PD zoning is something to deeply consider here. We have existing utilities here. This is a pretty central part of town still, and I would really love to see us get the value of acre that we could get out of this with a more dense development.

Part of the reason why I'm going to advocate for a dense development is because that's essential if we're going to have this be a reliable transit node some day in the future, and we need that if we're going to meet our climate adaption plan, and we're going to need that if we really want to be able to utilize Rock Quarry Road for getting the most amount of people down it without having to put huge amounts of money into it to expand and develop that roadway in a fashion that would likely also be inconsistent with the scenic nature of the road. I think PD is really important here because it allows us a little bit more use, a little bit more control. We're talking about, hey, how can we develop this area in such a fashion that we don't create induced demand with the parking. The current development has, like, 3.75 parking stalls per dwelling unit, as far as I'm aware. I'm a little bit concerned that that might encourage a little bit of over-use of vehicles. However, you know, like, that's part of the thing with a PD, we get the opportunity to discuss these things. And if that leads to parking overflow, there's other means outside of zoning we can do to deal with that. To address one of the questions earlier, as far as if we add additional traffic here, is that going to increase accidents and such? And I think, again, we should look at, hey, as far as per the amount of people traveling down, how is that impacted? And in many roads, we have higher traffic roads. We actually have less serious injuries per passenger mile because traffic slows down speeds, slower speeds save lives. I know the Rock Quarry Road access was originally there as part of the fire code. If there's concerns about that, I would just be curious that that's something we might be able to put, like, temporary barriers. So, for example, I know that some places have done the little flexible fiberglass posts that in an emergency, a fire truck can run down if it needs access to a property, but, nevertheless, block vehicles for undesired use of an entrance or exit to a road. I would take any questions, and that's all I have for now.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you so much. Next speaker on this case, please come forward. Mr. Colbert, in all fairness, there was one more person from the neighborhood. I thought maybe he was waiting for all of you to go, ma'am. Did I guess correctly, Caleb? Yes. Okay. Please continue.

MS. SCHWEITZER: Gail Schweitzer, 1601 Cunningham Road. And I'm actually in favor of the project. I think it will be an asset to the south part of town. I think they're taken a lot of care --

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sorry. Could you pull this forward?

MS. SCHWEITZER: I think they've taken a lot of care to try to address the concerns of the neighbors, and I think they are taking a lot of care in preserving the green space. Sorry. I'm nervous.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You're fine.

MS. SCHWEITZER: I just think it will be a positive influence. There's not going to be -- I think it's going to be more than just student housing. And I -- I have lived in Columbia for 58 years. I don't go up and down Rock Quarry Road. I think people will go other routes, you know, because it will be safer and accessible to downtown. Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you, ma'am, for being here tonight. Anyone else to speak on this case? Mr. Colbert?

MR. COLBERT: Good evening, Madam Chair and members of the Commissioner, Caleb Colbert, attorney, at 1203 West Broadway. I just wanted to follow up on a couple of points. Number one, as to the question on leasing this exclusively to students, Landmark does not have a provision in their lease that requires their tenants to be enrolled in an institution. Approximately 10 percent of their tenants across the country are not students, so that would be -- it would be open to non-students. Additionally, they do run shuttles seven days a week. During the week, those shuttles leave every 30 minutes, so they do provide transportation directly to campus. As to the gentleman that spoke to the relationship between student housing and demand for general market housing, I do think there's a connection, and I'll use, you know, my experience here as a student at Mizzou in undergrad and law school, and my wife's experience. When my wife went through undergrad, she rented an apartment at Courtyard Apartments. That was an apartment that would have been available to non-students, but, as a student, she needed a place to live. As she moved through the University, our undergraduate system, she rented a single-family home on Audubon Drive, which, again, would have been housing stock available to non-students, but then there was no student housing. So she got together with a lot of her friends and rented that house. So I respectfully believe there is a connection between the supply of student housing versus supply for the general market. I also want to briefly touch on this Rock Quarry Special Area Plan. It was adopted in 2002 as part of the Metro 2020 Comprehensive Plan. The Metro 2020 Comprehensive Plan was replaced by Columbia Imagined in 2013. And when you look at the ordinance that adopted Columbia Imagined, it's that all parts of Metro 2020 have been repealed. Going forward, we're going to refer to Columbia Imagined. I have not been able to find any place where in the Rock Quarry Special Area plan was incorporated and carried forward. But if we're going to use it as a guidepost, I want to point out a couple of things. On page three, if we follow the land or the development plans proposed in the Rock Quarry Plan, there should be up to 1,200 dwelling units in this area. We have a fraction of that. So there's plenty of capacity of dwelling units in the study area if we're going to follow the plan. Additionally, and that's on page three. If we

turn to page four, Rock Quarry in 2020 was predicted to accommodate 18,944 trips per day. We're half of that. So again, if we're going to follow this plan, we need to look at the prediction that there were going to be 19,000 vehicles using this road every day. Finally, if we look at page six, transportation. Every tract of record will be allowed a driveway access onto Rock Quarry Road. That's number two on page six. There can be a driveway every 220 feet of frontage. This project checks all of those boxes. So if we're going to treat the Rock Quarry plan as being the gospel, having the force of law, we're entitled to the driveway access on Rock Quarry. And with that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

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

MR. WALTERS: Was the 19,000 trips that you just cited, what year was that prediction?

MR. COLBERT: That was part of the Special Area Plan adopted in 2002. They predicted that as of 2020.

MR. WALTERS: As of 2020. Okay.

MR. COLBERT: So obviously, that has not come to fruition.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you very much. All right. Last call. Anyone else to speak on this case this evening? Seeing none. I will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments? Anyone at all? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Somebody has got to start. Lots of comments. This -- these aren't necessarily in any order of importance. I appreciate the traffic engineer, that 15 percent increase was actually the number that I came to as well. I just wanted to verify that and get that on the record from you as the professional. My -- my main concern is still this road, I don't know. I want to hear with my other Commissioners have to say, but I -- I do think the applicant has produced some compelling evidence, so I will commend them on that. Commissioner Darr, I think you bring up a great point. There's, you know, two other tracts that we could see a very similar development. And I want to point out, and this is, perhaps, a little bit not as direct as those two other tracts of land, but we do have a very large piece of land on the lower east property to the south of this that is going to probably be developed in the -- I don't want to say near future, but, you know, I don't think we're looking at 30, 40 years before that gets developed. So I -- I do think all of that should be considered. As far as comparisons -- and I appreciate the tracking down the -- the traffic incidents on the roadway. I actually did some of that myself, speaking with the fire department and -- and Joint Communications. I think Old 63 between Stadium -- or excuse me -- yeah -- Stadium and Grindstone would be a better comparison in the community here. And I think Mr. Wilson brought up an excellent point that the 2020 to 2025 time period that was looked at, you know, those were our heavy Covid years where traffic was -- was certainly reduced. I don't necessarily agree with staff's assessment that this area has changed tremendously from the original Special Area Plan. We -- the one portion that was going to be mixed use, it sounds like that is going to be coming to us as strictly commercial, but I don't necessarily see that as -- as being a reason to -- to them saying this should be multi-family instead of single-family as it was -- was discussed. This was brought up before, but I just want to reiterate it. The Central House comparison, you know, just one day at one development seems a little too anecdotal for me to -- to really make a direct comparison. The last thing I want to point out is -- is just the -- the timeline of improving Rock Quarry Road and the discussions in the past about when that's going to happen. So in 2010, on the City's Capital Improvement Plan, it was three- to five-year project. It was going to cost nine and half million dollars. In 2014, it showed up again on the CIP plan as a six- to ten-year project. That would be -- cost around \$10 million. In 2023, it was included in the Capital Improvement sales tax ten-year -- ten-year renewal as a listed project, and it was listed in importance as Number 5 out of 18 on -- on roadways. 2025, it's on the CATSO long-term plan at \$13.4 million, and on the CATSO documents, a long-term plan is some -- a plan or an improvement that is going to happen sometime between 2030 and 2054. So it just seems like this project just keeps getting -- the can just keeps getting kicked down the road. I do like the idea of at least mitigating to some degree looking -- the access to Rock Quarry. I understand that's a fire -- fire department requirement, but I -- I kind of like the idea of -- of having that just be an emergency -- (inaudible). So with that, I would -- do want to hear what everyone else has to say.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Can I ask follow-up questions of my fellow Commissioner?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

DR. GRAY: Okay. I understand what you're saying about -- Commissioner Brodsky, this kind of, like, denial and deferral of improvements, but I am a little cautious about how we have squirrely definitions of adequate infrastructure. And so, if that is a criteria that is maybe impacting your decision significantly, I'm curious about, like, specific improvements to infrastructure that you may feel are necessary in order to move

forward with development on this site.

MR. BRODSKY: I will say I have not looked at specifically what was -- what was proposed in terms of improving that roadway, but I -- if my memory serves me correctly, it was taking some of the sharpness out of the curves, a shoulder. I believe those would be -- would probably be the two main things. And I apologize. If you don't mind if I might make one last comment. I -- I forgot to make this, but earlier this year, we had that development -- that triplex development off of WW. And that was denied by -- we approved it as a Commission, but it was denied by City Council. And it was denied because of roadway infrastructure concerns on a roadway that had no safety issues, but was more of a subjective -- the neighbors didn't like it. So, you know, comparing those two, it just seems a little bit disjointed. But sorry to take over.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray, anything else?

DR. GRAY: Yeah. I -- I am deeply appreciative of the supplemental information. I want to trust what is put before me. I am not an expert in these fields, and it is not my role to attempt to undermine the data, given how it's being presented. I want to trust that it is being presented in a way that is truthful and in service to the larger goals, which, to me, is accounted for in the Comprehensive Plan. I appreciate the clarification from staff about the kind of order of the criteria, and I understand that when these documents are looking into the future, they potentially account for a level of change that may make people uncomfortable. However, I am not compelled by this argument that we necessarily need to distinguish between student housing and other types of residential, multi-family housing. I'm open to being convinced otherwise. But I did go through the housing study because it keeps coming up, and the idea that we have temporary residents does not mean that they don't need housing or they don't need consideration. The fact is that students are an unprotected class of people, and that we legally can discriminate against them in a lot of ways that we can't in other scenarios. I understand there are a lot of big feelings about generally, and I don't say that dismissively, student housing and rooms that are leased or leases that account for different rooms. I don't know how to say that. But the end goal is housing, and I suspect that given what has been presented to me, what has been accounted for in terms of how it aligns with the Comprehensive Plan, the infrastructure and the -- looking at what the thresholds are for mitigation, I am troubled by some things about these developments, but I am willing to support it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone -- Commissioner Darr?

MR. DARR: Although it seemed like the traffic report seemed to suggest that no off-site improvements needed to be made, I did really appreciate CBB suggesting the curve study, and making some recommendations on improvements to the road that could increase safety up to 18 percent, which seems like a substantial increase for a minimal cost. So I think the City should really look into that, and, I mean, I believe we're a vision zero community, so, I mean, an average roadway shouldn't be our standard. It should be better than that. But, also, a little troubling to me is -- is kind of the precedent which I know it's not a precedent. You know, we're evaluating this as a PD plan, as a stand-alone thing with the criteria for PD plans or PD zoning. But I just know the other two tracts are going to be developed in the future, and sure, they're going to have to do traffic impact studies, and it may or may not say off-site improvements have to be made. Eventually, somebody has got to say there's going to be off-site improvements needed to be made because it's just -- to me, it's obvious that it's a substandard road, and it will need improvements eventually, which you're kind of just kicking the can for these improvements down the road later, and they're not getting done upfront where you might be able to better plan something. I'm kind of thinking about it as -- for example, Grindstone Plaza, I think the traffic study relied on improvements that are being made by another developer on the west side of Grindstone Plaza to increase -- to make improvements to that intersection, you know, and I don't believe they contributed any to those improvements, but, you know, they're being able to use them in their study as if they're there. So kind of just some random thoughts, but I think, ultimately -- I definitely don't have any problem with the development, the housing, or, you know, the location. I think the density is good, and I think we -- our goals have definitely changed since the 2002 Rock Quarry Scenic Overlay where, you know, it showed low-density housing in this area. I think this is a great area for high density. I just wish we could, as a city, make this higher priority to increase the functionality of this road and the safety of this road. So I probably will vote to recommend to approve this, but I do have some concerns on Rock Quarry, and I hope the City takes those seriously.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: All my Commissioners have brought up great points, and definitely, in particular, Rock Quarry. There is not much improvement you can do there. It's going to be a curvy -- I will call it like a professional driver's road, if you know what I mean. I used to have a Mustang, and I would only drive it on Rock Quarry to test my suspension and my -- you know what I mean? It's the -- it's not a road I take to get to or from, it's a driving experience. I'll put it like that. You can unsharpen a curve. It's not going to matter. There's -- it's called Rock Quarry for a reason. You can't really put a shoulder there without causing more damage on the other side where you put the shoulder at. It's not much you can do to improve that road. I do like the development, but, like my fellow Commissioner Mr. Darr said, those -- once this goes, those other two that are

going to be developed, and the only way that we're going to have to come up with an alternative is more accidents are going to have to happen. Right? So the pressure on that road is going to have to happen. Not much you can do to improve it. Only through the uses is there going to be an alternative way to address the traffic there. I'm sad to say that's the reality, but I do want to say this for the record, because I didn't actually hear from the developer of this property. Mr. Riback brought up a very good point. And since they didn't come up, I'm going to say this for City Council to ask. If you're going to make money in our town, use local labor and materials, and I want City Council to ask that of the developer and the owner of this property. Again, if you're going to make money in our town, use our local labor and material, and I want City Council to ask that question during their cycle. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I -- yeah. I have some loose comments. I don't know if they make much of a point, but I developed real estate here in town from 1985 through around 2015 and was involved in numerous residential projects. And in many of those cases, we had to give money to the City to help facilitate off-site improvements. And I'm talking about single-family, low-density developments. And where we had to pay for additional right-of-way, we had to pay for additional paving. We had to pay for major improvements to intersection -- intersections. We had to pay for part of Gillespie Bridge Road. So anyway -- and those costs have to be absorbed and passed on to the consumer, which I realize is a big, big problem right now. But when we were -- when I was doing it, I think we were -- we were developing in advance of the infrastructure that we had, and I think this is an example of a development -- an intense development that is overtaxing the available infrastructure, and so I have concerns about that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I guess that just leaves me. My concern isn't who lives in the housing, my concern is its suitability for multiple types of people to live within it. And while they say that there isn't a requirement any longer that you be a student to live there, only ten percent of the housing is desirable to non-students. If these were one-, two-, three-bedroom apartments, I wouldn't care if they were going to students. I would be concerned about the Rock Quarry Road, because I do think it matters that everybody is going to the same place at roughly the same time. But I -- if this were a traditional multi-family house -- housing development, I wouldn't have as many concerns with it because you don't have everybody leaving on the same schedule going to the same place, and you don't have a limitation on who in our community could find a place to live there. So for those reasons, I'm really -- I don't think this is the right place for this. I -- I really don't. I think that it is exacerbating a problem that I drive through every morning. I don't go on Rock Quarry Road, but I drive through Rock Quarry and Stadium every morning between 7:30 and 8:30. And you cannot convince me that having more folks, like 10 percent more, two more cars per light, is a huge deal in that intersection. So, I mean, I just -- I -- I think that because everything is concentrated with folks going to the same place at essentially the same time, because classes are on set schedules, is what causes my concerns about the traffic problem more so than it would if it were a -- you know, more marketable one-, two-, three-bedroom apartment complex, if that makes sense. And maybe it doesn't, but, hey, it's a PD plan and I get a vote the same as the other five of you. So with that, would anyone like to make a motion? For everyone's knowledge, all motions must be made in the affirmative, even if the motion maker may not support the project. Would anyone like to make a motion? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 124-2026, the Retreat at Columbia rezoning PD plan and preliminary plat, I move to approve the proposed rezoned from A to PD. I also approve -- move to approve the proposed PD plan and associated statement of intent serving as a preliminary plat known as The Retreat at Columbia, and all subject to -- to a tract split prior to induction -- introduction to City Council.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MR. DARR: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner Darr. Is there any further discussion on the motion. Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Darr, Dr. Gray, Mr. Stanton. Voting No: Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky. The motion is tied 3-3.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That, by my count, is a tie vote, which means no recommendation to City Council. What that also means is that it will not be on the consent agenda, so it will have two hearings before City Council. Any further business on that case from staff? Seeing none. We will move on to our next case. Before we do, though, how many folks are here to speak on case number 162-2026? This is the University Avenue. Okay. Okay. We're going to take a five-minute bio break, because, as -- we Commissioners can't leave the dais tonight without stopping the hearing. So five minutes, we will stand at ease.

(Off the record)

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. We will return to order -- 8 52 p.m. We were almost exactly five minutes. Good job everyone. All right. Our next case for the evening.