

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**JANUARY 5, 2017**

**Case # 16-110**

**A request by the City of Columbia to adopt a Unified Development Code (UDC) governing subdivision and land use regulations throughout the City of Columbia's corporate limits as requested by the City Council and supported by the City's 2013 comprehensive plan entitled "Columbia Imagined - The Plan for How We Live and Grow." The UDC will replace Chapter 20 (Planning), Chapter 23 (Signs), Chapter 25 (Subdivisions), and Chapter 29 (Zoning) of the existing City Code. It will also amend Chapter 12A (Land Preservation) by relocating the provisions of Article III (Tree Preservation and Landscaping Requirements) into a single document.**

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, Mr. Teddy, would you like to have a few words?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff is presenting the Unified Development Code for adoption as amended per the UDC Errata Sheet dated December 30, 2016.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Any questions, Commissioners, of staff at this point so far? Good. With that we will go ahead. We've got six segments that are open, and so I would like to start with Segment One. Commissioners, are there any additional amendments or discussion needed on Segment One? I see none. I would be looking for a motion to close Segment One. Ms. --

MS. RUSHING: I move -- oh, go ahead.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Move to close Segment One.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion to close Segment One that was made by Ms. Loe and seconded by Ms. Rushing. Commissioners, discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you get a chance.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Segment Two, Commissioners? Any discussion needed? Amendments to Segment Two? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I move to close Segment Two.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. We have a motion that has been put on the floor to close Segment Two by Mr. MacMann and seconded by Ms. Rushing.

MS. RUSSELL: Russell.

MR. STRODTMAN: I'm sorry. Ms. Russell. Sorry. Any -- Commissioners, any discussion needed on this motion? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohy.**  
**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Segment Three, Commissioners, is open. Is there any discussion or amendments needed for Segment Three? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Yes. If you have -- it's on page 23 of the errata sheet and page --

MR. MACMANN: Page --

MS. LOE: Page 23 of the errata sheet and page 196 of the UDC. I'll give you all a minute to find those.

MS. RUSHING: You're talking about buildable area?

MS. LOE: I am talking about building area.

MS. RUSHING: At the bottom of page 196.

MS. LOE: So it is Item 29-4.2(d)(7)1. We revised the language from private or public open area shall be provided for buildings greater than 1,000 square feet in gross floor area according to the following schedule. Schedule 2, if you look at the errata sheet, non-residential open space requirements, private or public open areas shall be provided for buildings greater than 1,000 square feet in buildable area according to the following schedule. We had five pages of discussion on this in the October 27th meeting, pages 54-58 if you want to look at the meeting minutes, about how to describe that buildable area. And we had talked about it being a footprint, but we had decided -- moved away from that because footprint is not defined in our definitions, buildable area is. My issue with this right now is that buildable area is defined as the area of a lot, not the area of a building. So I find this to be confusing that it states for building with greater than 10,000 square feet in buildable area when buildable area is defined as the area of a lot. I would like to propose it be changed to "provided for lots with greater than 10,000 square feet in buildable area", which I believe was my original intent when I made the motion.

MS. RUSHING: And which -- on (B) buildable area, is that where you are?

MR. STRODTMAN: (B) 1, yes.

MS. RUSHING: And, to me, it says "gross floor area".

MS. LOE: You're looking at the original language. If you look at the errata sheet --

MS. RUSHING: Oh, okay.

MS. LOE: -- it's been changed. Any comments from staff?

MR. ZENNER: I would tend to agree with you that I believe that that probably is what we wanted, and we may have in five pages of discussion --

MS. LOE: I understand.

MR. ZENNER: -- lost a little bit of it as well. So I think I would tend to agree with you. A building does not have a buildable area per se. If you want to refer to it as gross floor area, which would have been all floors, but that's not what we wanted.

MS. LOE: That's what we were moving away from.

MR. ZENNER: We wanted to look at the lot. So I would tend to agree with where your position is, Ms. Loe, that it would be "public or private open space shall be provided for lots greater than 10,000 square feet in buildable area according to the schedule". And that definitely then makes sense, and I believe you would need to make a similar change to Item No. 2 as well within this same section on page 23 of the errata sheet. Yes.

MS. LOE: Provided for any lot, regardless of its buildable area.

MR. MACMANN: Whereby "building" would be deleted and "lot" would be added? Is that where you're going, Mr. Zenner, in that sentence?

MR. ZENNER: I believe that is correct.

MR. TEDDY: Lots greater than 10,000.

MR. ZENNER: Well, yeah, "shall be provided for lots". I'm looking at No. 2, and we'll get there in a moment. So after -- in that first line -- end of the first line following 4 on page 23, this would be -- the revision to Section 29-4.2(d)(7), Item No. 1, end of the first line of 1, strike "buildings", add "lot", and that would correct the error or the -- resolve the conflict --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- that exists, so that we're tying a lot greater than 10,000 square feet in buildable area to providing open space in accordance to Items (i) through (vi).

MR. MACMANN: I'll second that.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. MacMann. An amendment has been made by Ms. Loe and seconded by Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, discussion on this amendment? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you're ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Yes.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.**

**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Additional discussion on Segment Three? Yes, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: So similarly then at Item 2 of that same Section 29-4.2(d)(7) 2, strike out "building" at the end of the first line, and replace that with "lot" -- public -- private or public open area shall be provided in any lot, regardless of its buildable area.

MR. ZENNER: No.

MS. LOE: Or --

MR. ZENNER: It should be -- you should strike "regardless of its buildable area", and it would read then "Public or private open space shall be provided in any building which contains four or more dwelling units, according to the following schedule".

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion -- an amendment has been made by Ms. Loe and seconded by Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, discussion on this amendment? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.**  
**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: In the Code, page 188, under balconies, and the errata sheet, page 24. Okay. These don't line up right now, but the added Item 29-4.2(e)(1)(iv)(B) 2 --

MS. BURNS: Could you repeat that, please?

MS. LOE: 29-4 -- I haven't made the motion yet.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MS. LOE: Okay. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. 29-4.2(e)(1)(iv)(B). We added the language "Balconies are permitted and may be counted as private open area when their minimum size is eight feet wide and five feet deep. Balconies shall not project more than two feet forward of the required building line, RBL." We added this at the section. It is not added at 188. We added it under the Section 4, urban general or urban storefront on page 199 under building projections. My question -- and I was checking this just because I was looking for that minimum square footage where we count balconies toward open area. Under balconies here, it says, Check -- if you look on page 188, Item (8)(ii), "Where an individual building form standard includes balconies as a method for achieving the required" -- it goes on and it says to check those individual standard forms for those definitions. Urban general/urban storefront is the only section that includes language for balconies. So that means we are not allowing balconies to count toward private open space in urban general west because it doesn't define balconies. And we don't define it in townhouses, except for in a diagram. So my concern is that it is not being uniformly defined,

and wouldn't we want it to be counted toward private open space, provided it meet that eight foot by five foot in any of those areas?

MR. MACMANN: You're stating throughout the City, throughout the -- all zoning districts where open space --

MS. LOE: This is M-DT. We're in M-DT.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. All right. I just wanted to make sure how big we were going.

MS. LOE: Urban, urban general, urban -- so if you look at 190, that's where we've added it. And it's under the section, building projections. We don't even have a building projections description under urban general west. And then under the townhouses, we just don't define balconies. So I'm thinking let's just define it on page 188 under "balconies" and say -- where we have all the general requirements for balconies. And can we do that and let it count toward all the other sections moving forward?

MR. TEDDY: If it's identified as a general provision that applies to all buildings, then it's a yes.

MS. LOE: Is there any reason we wouldn't allow balconies in all of the areas and/or let it count toward open space?

MR. STRODTMAN: Within the M-DT?

MS. LOE: Within M-DT. We're in the M-DT section.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Well, it's a partial allowance. I mean, there's nothing that says you can rely on balconies to get 100 percent of it required, so I don't see --

MS. LOE: We allow residential in urban general west. Right? So I'm thinking if they provide balconies, we would want to allow them to count towards the open space if they are big enough.

MR. STRODTMAN: If they meet this minimum?

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: So procedurally, where would you put that then?

MS. LOE: I'd put it in under balconies on page 188.

MR. MACMANN: Just -- and move that up then so it --

MS. LOE: Moving -- yeah. And delete it on the page 199 simply because if we do it there, we're going to have to define it in each section.

MR. MACMANN: Understood.

MS. LOE: This balcony section is a general overall.

MR. MACMANN: So would you --

MR. STRODTMAN: Where was the -- you said 199, Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: We added it -- okay. So where we add it in the errata sheet is under Item B on -- at the top of that sheet is building projections. If you look at the errata sheet, we're adding it under that shop fronts may extend -- it's a new Item 2 under that Item B. That's where we have added it. And that's what I'm saying. We've only added it there.

MS. BURNS: So to clarify, we need to add this in the M-DT --

MS. LOE: Or move it.

MS. BURNS: -- or move it. Okay.

MR. MACMANN: We need to move it in toto? Do we need new language?

MS. LOE: I don't think we need new language.

MR. MACMANN: I was going to say, would you like -- what would that sound like?

MS. LOE: Well, if everyone is in agreement, I would propose -- or I would move moving that language "balconies are permitted and may be counted as private open area when their minimum size is eight feet wide by five feet deep. Balconies shall not project more than two feet forward of the RBL", from 29-4.2(e)(1)(iv)(B) 2 to 29-4.2(d)(8)(ii)(D).

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: An amendment has been put on the floor by Ms. Loe and seconded by Ms. Russell.

MR. MACMANN: Point of order. Do you want to delete it? Did you mention that specifically?

MS. LOE: Moving it -- oh.

MR. MACMANN: And so --

MS. LOE: Moved means --

MR. MACMANN: All right. All right.

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: That's fine. I just wanted to make sure move, slash, delete.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, discussion on this amendment? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: We added on -- and I'm trying to find it here right now, but for some odd reason in my notes, unless I am incorrect, under balconies on page 188, we added a new Item (ii). And that new Item (ii), I'm trying to find where it would otherwise be here in our errata sheet itself because it's going to show up as a separate -- it's on page 19.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: Page 19 of your --

MS. LOE: Yeah.

MR. ZENNER: -- errata sheet under balconies. And this is 29-4(d)(8)(iii)(C). And, in essence, basically we were creating a new section, so we have moved what was (ii), which is what I believe what Ms. Loe was wanting to have amended to add an Item (d), that's now Item (iii) under the revision that is on page 19. So basically we added the projection language that you could not project --

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. ZENNER: The balcony shall not generally -- and this would be the general balcony standard -- shall not project more than two feet forward of the required building line. So that covers, in essence, your -- that covers you in all form standards -- all BFS. Now, what I would question then is given that that amendment has been made, on page 19, the amendment that is now on page 24 --

MS. LOE: Uh-huh.

MR. ZENNER: -- is that amendment necessary given that you have already specified that it is -- you specify the two-foot extension.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. ZENNER: The question now that is left unresolved is that balcony can count as private open area. That is what on page 24, Item (ii) includes. So if you are wanting to allow balconies in all form standards, i.e. urban general west and then apartment/small townhouse -- or townhouse/small apartment to count as open space -- private space, I believe Item 3 in balconies general does that already. You have to meet these particular criteria or to count as private open space.

MS. LOE: Except it doesn't identify the minimum size.

MR. ZENNER: It --

MS. LOE: And it also -- this is bringing up, which I hadn't noticed before, that it also says that it has to be identified as a means for achieving it, which again in urban general west, I'm not -- I don't see balconies as defined.

MR. ZENNER: I believe that may fall under the ability for a balcony to be able to be used as public or private open space. That would be in a general provision as well.

MS. LOE: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: So I guess we've addressed --

MS. LOE: So I agree we don't -- we can strike the second sentence, but I believe we still need that first sentence under what is now Item (iii) would be Item D --

MR. ZENNER: D.

MS. LOE: -- stating --

MR. ZENNER: Yeah.

MS. LOE: -- it has to be four -- or eight feet by five feet minimum if it's going to counted toward the open space.

MR. ZENNER: And I have come across a reference that originally -- and had had a conflict with it actually. It had to be seven feet and 70 square feet. And that is actually in your open space standards. So let's jump back here. I'm sorry.

MS. LOE: That's except when it's not an individual balcony. It can't be less than seven feet.

MR. ZENNER: So --

MS. LOE: It's all but --

MR. MACMANN: I thought we'd --

MR. ZENNER: And here's -- here's where -- and this is -- this is -- I'm glad we're going through this. So if we -- do you have -- on page 19, we deal with the two foot projection, which is what's on page 24. And then on page 23, under residential open space requirements, we -- this is -- we retitled this section private or public open space. And if you look under 2, Item 2(iii), any private or public open space with the exception of an individual balcony -- okay. So the exception is you can't make an individual

balcony. Yes, that would then -- if we add the first half of what is on page 24 (ii), indicating that it must be eight by five, that's fine, or if you would prefer, it may be better to amend Item (ii) -- add -- add that open space standard as a new roman numeral under open space. So it's -- all the open space standards are there, so if you have a balcony, the balcony must be eight by five to count as your private space -- private -- the private open space.

MS. LOE: I would accept that.

MR. ZENNER: Okay.

MS. LOE: So I withdraw my previous motion.

MR. ZENNER: And then we can figure out how we are going to craft this next one.

MS. LOE: Well, let's move to strike -- delete the language on --

MR. ZENNER: Page 24.

MS. LOE: -- on page 24.

MR. ZENNER: That would be section -- so the amendment on page 24 that is referenced to Section 29-4.2(e)(1)(iv)(B) -- that is the top amendment. We are going to delete that entire amendment.

MS. LOE: Correct.

MR. ZENNER: Is that a motion?

MS. LOE: Yes. Move to -- what Mr. Zenner said.

MR. STRODTMAN: Would you say that again, please?

MS. LOE: Move to strike the language added at 29-4.2(e)(1)(iv)(B)(ii).

MR. ZENNER: Top of page 24 of the errata sheet.

MR. STRODTMAN: Yeah.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been put on the -- on the floor by Ms. Loe and seconded by Ms. Russell. Commissioners, discussion? Questions? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you're ready.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.**

**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: Okay. Then to stitch this up, add Item -- page 23 of the errata sheet, Item 29-4.2(d)(7) 2 --

MS. BURNS: I'm sorry. One more time, please.

MS. LOE: 29-4.2(d)(7) 2, add Item (iv) "Balconies may be counted as private open area when their minimum size is eight feet wide and five feet deep." "Individual balconies" -- sorry. "Individual balconies may be counted as" --

MR. MACMANN: Private open space.



MS. LOE: -- "private open space -- open area" -- that's how we have it here -- "when their minimum size is eight feet wide by five feet deep".

MR. MACMANN: Those are set as minimums then?

MS. LOE: Minimums.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. LOE: Minimum.

MR. MACMANN: I'll second that motion if that language is good. Second the motion, excuse me.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made by Ms. Loe and seconded by Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, discussion? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Additional motions, discussion? Mr. Zenner?

MR. ZENNER: Point of clarification. Are you also, Ms. Loe, wanting to add that same language under Item No. 1 within that same section as (vii) to ensure that balconies may be permitted in buildings greater than -- for lots greater than 10,000 square feet of buildable area as an option or not?

MS. LOE: So in this case it would be non -- it's nonresidential, so we're considering a balcony off an office -- a private office space or --

MR. ZENNER: That would be -- that would be how it would be interpreted. Yes.

MS. LOE: Correct. People in agreement to add it there? All right. So let's add it there as well. 29-4.2(d)(7) 1, add Item (vii) "Individual balconies may be counted as private open area with their minimum size is eight feet wide by five feet deep".

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made by Ms. Loe and seconded by Mr. MacMann. Commissioners, discussions, questions? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.**

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners? Ms. Loe?

MS. LOE: I move to close Segment Three.

MS. RUSSELL: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made to close Segment Three and -- by Ms. Loe and seconded by Ms. Russell. Commissioners, discussion on closing Segment Three? I see none. When you're ready, Ms. Burns.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.**

**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Commissioners, Segment Four is still open. Is there any additional discussion or motions for amendments on Segment Four? Would anyone like to -- is there any discussion on Segment Four? If not, I would take a motion to close. Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I move to close Segment Four.

MS. BURNS: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made to close Segment Four by Ms. Russell and seconded by Ms. Burns. Commissioners, discussion on closing Segment Four? I see none. Ms. Burns, when you are ready, please.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey.**

**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Commissioners, Segment Five is open with the amended -- motion amendments that we have made in the past. Is there any additional discussion needed on Segment Five? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: I just have a correction on page 15 of the errata sheet. I don't think it needs an amendment. The minutes handled that on 12/2.

MS. LOE: 12/12.

MS. RUSSELL: 12/12. On the table 4.8-2, residential use signs, other, the maximum area of an open house sign, I withdrew my motion to increase it to 7.5 square feet. So it should remain 4 square feet.

MR. STRODTMAN: Mr. Zenner, would that require a motion since it was already --

MR. ZENNER: If the minutes clearly reflect that it is --

MS. RUSSELL: They do.

MR. ZENNER: -- and it is an error on my part, we'll go back and re-review --

MS. RUSSELL: Okay

MR. ZENNER: -- the minutes from the 12th.

MS. LOE: Page 10.

MR. ZENNER: Page 10 of the minutes from the 12th.

MS. LOE: Right.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you. We will -- we do not need an amendment on that. That is a scrivener's error on my part.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Ms. Russell, any other--

MS. RUSSELL: No. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you. Commissioners, any additional items on Segment Five for discussion?

MS. LOE: Move to close Segment Five.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made to close Segment Five by Ms. Loe and seconded by Mr. Stanton. Commissioners, any discussion on this motion? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you are ready.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Wow. Segment Six is open with the amendments that we've made in the past. Is there any additional discussion on those amendments or any additional amendments needed to Segment Six? Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I move to close Segment Six.

MS. RUSHING: Second.

MR. STRODTMAN: A motion has been made by Mr. MacMann to close Segment Six and seconded by Ms. Rushing. Commissioners, any discussion? I see none. Ms. Secretary, when you are ready.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohey. Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Motion carries nine to zero.

MR. STRODTMAN: Wow. Commissioners, we are so close to that finish line. So Commissioners, all of the segments have been closed at this point. Is there additional discussion? Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: Is each Commissioner making final comments --

MR. STRODTMAN: We can if you would like, if --

MS. RUSHING: Is this the appropriate --

MR. STRODTMAN: -- there is no additional specific information, then we can start. So I will start with Mr. MacMann. So what I would like to do is just give each of you an opportunity to give us any input that you would like before we make our -- before we would maybe consider a motion to approve

Case 16-110 as amended. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: If it's all right with the Chair, I would like to withhold my comments for just this exact moment for a short time. I may not -- I may not be making any.

MR. STRODTMAN: We'll honor that.

MR. MACMANN: Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: Yes. I do have a few comments. In the UDO it refers to Columbia Imagined as supporting documentation. I am somewhat concerned that that would be perceived as making Columbia Imagined a regulatory document, so I want to make sure that there is an understanding that that is supporting documentation. I understand that change is hard, and this document will cause a lot of angst in the community. I do believe that initially there is going to be an economic downturn, but I think that will turn around as people get used to the document. We've put in a number of hours -- I think over 40 in just meetings. The hours that everybody has put in has been just huge. I believe we have made the best document that we could go to City Council. I want to thank City Council for putting up with us and the City staff. We have -- have been demanding, and you have handled it very nicely. Thank you. I want a special thank you to Commissioner Loe. Your attention to detail has been invaluable for all of us. I do plan to approve this document and send it to City Council. I would like the minutes to show that I really encourage City Council to approve this document with our amendments. We have listened to the public. They have hung in there with us. And I'm going to approve it, but I -- I would just like to see the City Council acknowledge that -- the hours of work we've put in. Thank you.

MR. STRODTMAN: So you're suggesting a pay raise?

MR. TEDDY: A thousand percent.

MR. STRODTMAN: With a zero. Double the zero.

MR. MACMANN: I'll just take a doubling.

MR. STRODTMAN: Ms. Loe, any comments?

MS. LOE: I think it has been -- I've enjoyed the process. It has been long hours, but I've enjoyed it. There was one -- there has been some areas that we have received comments on that we simply haven't had the ability to get into in this process. They have simply been bigger than what this process could handle. And I would simply like to make a recommendation for one of those to be carried on after the process, separate from the UDO approval -- is this the right time to make this comment? And that -- the question was about whether or not we were including enough for affordable housing, and what came to my attention in re-read -- working through the Code was that we have bonus densities for single-family or duplex housing where subdivision housing in our cluster density bonus and our solar orientation density bonus, but we don't have one for our multi-family density bonus. And I would like to encourage City Council to develop a density bonus for the multi-family incentive to be developed to incentivize affordable housing.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Loe. Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: I, too, want to thank City staff for providing us with -- I don't know how much time you all must have spent on providing the information that we used to come to our recommendations. And I want to thank the community members who have come forward to share their opinions and their thoughts. And I'm proud of the work that we have done, and I want people to know that have contributed to the process that we looked at every document and at every comment. It might not have been discussed here, but -- and I want them to know that it was done thoughtfully and thoroughly as far as responding to comments that we received -- and whether it was somebody coming to the podium or an email correspondence. And I plan on supporting this document, and I'm proud of this document.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Burns. Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would also like to thank staff for your outstanding work and tenacity and patience with us. This document, I know there was a lot of protest about change and don't fix something that isn't broken, but apparently, it was broken or we wouldn't have spent the money to get the Code looked at. So I am proud of the work that the Commission has done, and history will show that we made the right decisions. It might not be -- be now, but history will be on our side in the near future.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Stanton. Mr. Harder?

MR. HARDER: This has been quite an experience. Like everybody, it has been very busy these last six months. I appreciate all the work that staff has done. The public input as well, too, I think has allowed us to make it to be the best document that it possibly could be. I definitely am going to support it. I think we got it the best we possibly can get it, and I'm glad we're to this point.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Harder. Ms. Rushing?

MS. RUSHING: I'm just going to echo what's already been said, I believe. And I did look up the Gettysburg Address, which was delivered in two minutes, not 20. I want to thank the members of the public because I have a lot of respect, even if I didn't agree with you -- with people who came forth and were calm and rational and presented good arguments for their positions. I think that speaks very well for this community. I also thank staff for their ability to respond to questions to provide us with the information we needed without maybe perhaps saying, oh, no, not that again, but with just being professional at all times. And members of the Commission for their ability to maintain their sense of humor -- and we didn't get in big arguments with one another. It was always arguments of positions and facts. And, again, to Ms. Loe for her attention to detail, which I do not have any of -- and I appreciate that. And also, in just whipping through the minutes, the ability of the Chairman to keep our discussion on track, even though it seemed like we were here forever, when I was reading the minutes, it was really clear that you were trying to keep us on track, and I appreciate that. I came into this process in the middle, and I was very concerned, and I have mentioned this several times. The purpose of the UDC it says is to implement the vision and recommendations of the City and the Columbia Imagined Comprehensive Plan, and yet I saw obstructions to accessibility, which I think we took care of, no attempt to address affordability, which Ms. Loe has proposed that we -- that the City now pursue. The City is taking, I think, the total obligation for providing public space, and I suppose that's the City's decision. And

I think some of the residents have mentioned attempts to try and maintain the diversity of their neighborhoods, and I didn't see any particular provisions in the Code right now as proposed that would do that. And I had my own personal concerns about whether or not it's flexible enough. Some neighbors -- I mean, some individuals said it is too complex, but, I mean, it's very complex, but then how do you get around that? And another concern I had was including the overlay districts. What that means to me is that we may be crossing one finish line, but I really see us starting on a whole other process, and that is seeing how this development code is actually going to work. And is it actually going to do what we thought it would, what we want it to? And it's not -- it's not a dead object. It is going to be a living object which the City can change as the need arises. So with that in mind, I do intend to -- even though I don't think it's perfect, I do intend to support it.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Ms. Rushing. Mr. Toohey?

MR. TOOHEY: I just want to reiterate and thank staff and the public for coming to all of these meetings and staying late. I also want to thank the other Commissioners. I think that it is great that we all have unique backgrounds and varying opinions that we can all bring to the table so we can look at issues from different standpoints and that we are able to enlighten each other from our diverse backgrounds. And I actually think that is one thing that's made a lot of the changes a lot better.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Toohey. Mr. MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I shall be brief. I would like to thank the support staff, our translators, and other folks who are busy copying what we are doing right now, the staff and our fellow Commissioners. And that's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR. STRODTMAN: Short and sweet. Well, I guess it's up to me. You know, I'll try not to echo a lot of the comments that I've already heard, but it's hard not to. So, you know, a couple of areas that I would like see us maybe spend a little more time on later after the Council has had a chance is, you know, the neighborhood protection standards. I think, you know, it's a challenge to handle property rights and neighborhood protection standards. There is a fine line where some people believe that we crossed it or some of us may have thought we crossed the line, but, you know, that's a tough area to deal with at times and I definitely learned a lot related to that. So I think those are a couple of areas that -- you know, our neighborhood protections standards, I would like to see us maybe spend more time on afterwards, if City Council doesn't on their own, and give us a chance to maybe work through a couple of items. You know, historical preservation, we didn't really do a whole lot on. We discussed it, but that might be another area that we could potentially work on going forward. You know, I'll single out Mr. Zenner -- Pat Zenner. I really do think that we would still be on Segment Two right now if it hadn't been for you and the bull whip in the background driving me to drive everybody else to keep going. And, you know, originally I thought that that was unnecessary and unneeded, but it definitely was the case because this is a very huge complex document, even though as Ms. Rushing said, we were trying to make it easier. I don't think you can and do it justice and be fair. I mean, you can, but I don't think you would do it right or better. So, Mr. Zenner, I do appreciate everything you did and -- even if you have less hair, you at least

have hair. So, Commissioners, you know, before a lot of you joined -- I guess I'm the most senior -- not in reality, but in time with the -- I'm just going to pull it out. With the Commission, I'm the longest serving person right now, and, you know, in -- before a lot of you joined us, we were having a tough time just getting quorums on our regular meetings at times. We had several times in about a year's span that we had several meetings that we had to cancel in front of the public because we couldn't get a quorum. We met at times two times a week, and we met every week for months, and we never ever, ever had a quorum issue. So that really goes to you guys and your dedication, especially when we were doing a meeting on Thursday and we had no idea that we were having a meeting the next Monday. And, you know, before the night was over, we had a meeting the next Monday, and everybody shows up. So I really want to thank you guys for that because this is definitely in my six years of doing this, this is well above and beyond anything that we have ever tackled, and you guys did it -- and most times we were full house, nine of us, all of us. So I just really wanted to thank you guys for that because it happened in the past, but it never has happened with you guys, so I really do want to thank you. The public, I can't speak enough. You know, I'll reiterate of Ms. -- what Ms. Burns said is you -- even if you didn't see your specific comment in the document specifically the way you had suggested it to us, we, I believe, reviewed every single comment that came from the public. Now, I can't say that's 100 percent because I'm not the gate controller, but I do believe we received 100 percent of the items that were sent in by you and also the ones that came in. So trust me that we did talk about it internally. We used it as a speaking platform to get dialogue going. And as Ms. Rushing mentioned, we may have not agreed on it, we may have not implemented it, but we talked about it. So I don't think anybody's comments went on deaf ears, and we heard a lot of comments. So I think we really did try hard to do that. My last comment I think is, you know, I hope City Council and City staff will work with the general public on this document going forward. I hope there is some flexibility. There might be some unintended consequences that come out of this document, and I just hope that City staff and City Council is not so rigid, and Planning and Zoning is not so rigid that we won't work through some of those unintended consequences rationally and do it right. So I would assume, as Ms. Rushing said, we're just getting started on another race. It's the implementation potential side of it, and I think it will be just as challenging, but different. So hang in there, and I appreciate everybody's time. With that, unless someone has -- Mr. MacMann? You only get one chance.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry?

MR. STRODTMAN: Go ahead.

MR. MACMANN: I wanted to make sure that you were done speaking. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

MR. STRODTMAN: I am.

MR. MACMANN: I'm sorry.

MR. STRODTMAN: All yours.

MR. MACMANN: My apologies. Would the Chair entertain a motion?

MR. STRODTMAN: Would I entertain a motion?

MR. MACMANN: Yes.

MR. STRODTMAN: Do we have a motion -- but, yes.

MR. MACMANN: In the matter regarding Case 16-110, a request by the City of Columbia to adopt a Unified Development Code (UDC) governing subdivision and land use regulations throughout the City of Columbia's corporate limits as requested by the City Council and supported by the City's 2013 comprehensive plan entitled "Columbia Imagined as amended and accepted here this evening, I so move.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. MacMann. Do we have a second?

MR. STANTON: I second that.

MR. STRODTMAN: We have a motion to move this case 16-110 to City Council as amended by Mr. MacMann and seconded by Mr. Stanton. Commissioners, discussion? Ms. Russell?

MS. RUSSELL: So are the -- is the errata sheet going to be read to the -- into the minutes?

MR. ZENNER: Read the errata sheet into the minutes, if there is no further discussion.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, any additional comments, needs, discussion? If not, Mr. Zenner, are you going to be reading in the errata sheet and then Ms. Burns and Ms. Loe -- no, Ms. Burns will make the changes tonight.

MR. ZENNER: I don't believe -- and let me just make sure I am -- I am going to start this. The errata sheet has been amended per discussion. Those amendments are going to be incorporated into what I am going to now read into the public record, saving Ms. Burns the nightmare of having to capture anything. And we will submit the revised errata sheet as an attachment to your motion. That will be how I would prefer to probably do this, so you have the actual items. The other way that this will be done for the public record and for the public, I am going to consolidate same section amendments. I will make reference to, for example, we have a number from Chapter 1, which deal with definitions. They all fall under that same section, but I will read the definition number -- or the definition title, not the full definition, just so we know that we have made those amendments to each of those particular definitions. Where we have a specific section, and only that section, I will reference just the section number. The actual text, again, will be an addendum to the motion that you will vote on or that has been made. So with that if you have no other comments and there are no other amendments that we need to make to the errata sheet, I will go ahead and I will proceed through the roughly 30 pages worth of revisions.

MR. STRODTMAN: Commissioners, last chance. None? All yours, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: So amendments to Chapter 1 - General Provisions: Section 29-1.11, Artisan Industry; Personal Services, General; Front Porch/Stoop; the introduction of a new definition for Gas Station/Fueling Center; and then a revision to Mechanical and Construction Contractors; revisions to the definition of Light Industry; revision to the definition of Heavy Industry; revision to the definition of Group Home, Small. Those are all the revisions to Chapter 1.

Amendments to Chapter 2 - Zoning Districts: Section 29-2.2(c)(4), Permitted Use Table Item (1); revisions to Section 29-2.3 and Section 29-2.3 & 29-2.3(ii)(F).



Amendments to Chapter 3 - Permitted Uses: Table 29-3.1, and that is defined in Attachment A, which is Table 29-3.1: Permitted Use Table; Section 29-3.3(d); 29-3.3(cc); 29-3.3(ee) Item (1); 29-3.3(mm); 29-3.3(oo).

Amendments to Chapter 4 - Form and Development Controls (except M-DT (Mixed-use Downtown): Section 29-4.1(b)(1); Section 29-4.3(b)(ii)(B) - this Section will become 29-5.1(b)(1)(ii); Section 29-4.3(c)(3)(i)(K) - this Section becomes 29.5-1(c)(7); Section 29-4.4(a)(2)(i)(B) - this Section becomes 29-4.3(a)(2)(i)(B); Section 29-4.4(e) - this Section becomes 29-4.3(3); revision to Table 4.4.5 - this Table becomes Table 4.3.5; Section 29-4.5 - this Section becomes 29-4.4(b)(3) and 29-4.4(g)(1); Section 29-4.5(b)(4) - Section becomes 29-4.4(d)(4); Section 29-4.5 (c)(1)(i)(b) – this Section becomes 29-4.4(c)(1)(i)(b); revision to Table 4.5.1 - this Table becomes 4.4-1; Section 29-4.5 (c)(1)(x)(a) – this Section becomes 29-4.4(c)(1)(x)(a); Section 29-4.5 (c)(1)(x)(b) – this Section becomes 29-4.4(c)(1)(x)(b); Section 29-4.5(d)(i) – this Section becomes Section 29-4.4(d)(i); revision to Figure 4.5-1 - this Figure becomes Figure 4.4-1; Section 29-4.5 (e)(2)(iii)(c) – this Section becomes 29-4.4 (e)(2)(iii)(c); revision to Section 29-4.5(e), Table 4.5-4 - this Section becomes 29-4.4(e), Table 4.4-4); Section 29-4.5(g)(3)(i) – this Section becomes 29-4.4(g)(3)(i); Section 29-4.5(g)(3)(ii)(a) – this Section becomes 29-4.4(g)(3)(ii)(a); Section 29-4.8 (c)(1) and (2) – Sections become 29-4.7(c)(1) and (2); Section 29-4.8(d) – this Section becomes 29-4.7(d); Section 29-4.9(d)(1), Table 4.9-1 – this Section becomes 29-4.8(d)(1), Table 4.8-1; Section 29-4.9(d)(1), Table 4.9-2 – Section becomes 29-4.8(d)(1), Table 4.8-2.

Amendments to M-DT (Mixed-use Downtown): And we have multiple amendments to Section 29-4.2. We are deleting in the first reference, Section 29-4.2 Item (4), detached frontage from the M-DT regulations; and then we have a series of amendments to the Regulating Plan map, which is Section 29-4.2(c). Those are shown on the Regulating Plan map and include multiple revisions to the exterior boundary, as well as to the identification of alleys and historic civic structures that are exempt. We also have some reversing amendments within this particular section, and an amendment that was made as it related to a boundary adjustment on the St. James Street frontage that was retracted and replaced with the original amendment. Again, all amendments to the M-DT Regulating Plan map as defined within the errata sheet are shown on the updated M-DT Regulating Plan, just an attachment to the errata sheet. Section 29-4.2(d)(6)(v) and Section 29-4.2(d)(9)(iii), we have deleted the words “shopfronts” and “bay windows” from both sections; Section 29-4.2(d)(6)(vii), we have adjusted the graphic for rear alley setback from 25 feet to 12 feet -- we have also adjusted the text in that referenced section accordingly to remove “25 feet” and replace with “12 feet”; Section 29-4.2(d)(6)(ix)(B), we have stricken 24 feet and we have revised it no closer to six feet to the required building line -- this deals with siting and the relationship for parking; Section 29-4.2(d)(6)(xii), we have stricken the words “metal picket” and replaced with “material” as it relates to our screening; Section 29-4.2(d)(6)(xii), we have revised the street wall landscaping standard to include a private landscape buffer as an option -- the proceeding language where we eliminated “metal picket” has been carried forward and replaced with “materials”; Section 29-4.2(d)(8), as it relates to balcony projections, that has been amended; and then we have also

amended Section 29-4.2(d)(8)(ii)(A), and that section was revised to be (iii)(A), per the amendment that was just made, and we have deleted -- we have deleted "or other means" from that section; and then Section 29-4.2(d)(8)(iii)(C), which has been revised to (iv)(c), per the proceeding amendment, and we have deleted that entire section -- the entire statement; Section 29-4.2(d)(9)(xii), we have revised the privacy height -- privacy fence maximum height to read "eight feet"; Section 29-4.2(d), we have added a new paragraph 12 that deals with Gas Stations and Fueling Centers with Convenience Stores -- we have subsequently renumbered former paragraph (12) to paragraph (13), which deals with solid waste management; Section 29-4.2 (d)(12), that paragraph becomes paragraph (13), and it has been revised to include additional text dealing with all new buildings and/or a change of use shall require -- shall have a plan for management -- collection, storage and disposal of solid waste; Section 29-4.2(e)(1)(iii)(B), we have removed the open space requirements from that section, and we have created a new open space standard section within the Code and retitled (B) to be Buildable and Open Area as the section title, and made the appropriate cross-reference; Section 29-4.2(e)(2)(iii)(B)(4), we have revised the siting section -- the siting requirements, again, changed the title of the subsection to Buildable and Open Area, and then provided the appropriate cross-reference to the new open area requirements; revision to Section 29-4.2(e)(3)(iii)(B), again adding open area to the Item (B), and then providing the appropriate cross-reference; revision to Section 29-4.2(d)(7), this is the new open space requirements as amended this evening at our meeting -- we have added Item -- under Item (1), (ii) -- or (vii) and we have added under Item (2), (iv), and both of those items read balconies may be counted as private open area when their minimum size is eight feet wide by five feet deep; Section 29-4.2 (e)(1)(iv)(b), we have deleted the word "façade" from the particular section, and what is shown on page 24 is the second amendment, which is what we are referring to does not become a new subsection number based on the elimination of the amendment at the top of page 24, so the items that is shown as stricken case in Item (i) will remain, and then Item (ii) based on the elimination of the first amendment on page 24 has been stricken from the errata sheet; Section 29-4.2(e)(1)(v)(B)(1), we have deleted "or retail uses" from the Upper Stories category; Section 29-4.2(e)(2)(v)(B)(1), again, we have deleted "or retail uses" from the provision; Section 29-4.2(e)(3)(v)(C)(3), we have indicated that on townhome sites, a detached dwelling unit is permitted in the buildable area at the rear of the site or lot line subject to the provisions of 29-3.3(gg)(4), and that has to deal with the specific standards as they relate to an Accessory Dwelling Unit. Revisions to the figures within the M-DT section: Revisions to Figure 4.2-7 and Figure 4.2-11, Figures 4.2-8, 4.2-11, 4.2-15, 4.2-16, 4.2-18; Figure 4.2-12, and Figure 4.2-17 are amended with multiple amendments to deal with open space, the addition of public after private in the open space designation, elimination of elevation requirements where necessary adjustments to the buildable area in order to define the appropriate buildable area. Those amendments to these figures will be represented in the updated document provided to City Council and are currently in the final review. And those are all of the revisions that were to Chapter 4, M-DT.

We are moving now to Chapter 5 Amendments, and these are the amendments to the Procedures and Enforcement Section: Section 29-5.2, Table 5.2-1 – and it becomes 29-6.2, Table 6.2-1, we have added the provisions for demolition permitting, and that is Attachment (b) to the errata sheet; Section 29-5.4(n)(iv)(g)(4) and (5) – Section becomes 29-5.2(c)(3)(ii)(g)(4) and (5), this is a revision as it relates to movement of the procedural requirements for subdivision development, and this particular revision has to deal with a preliminary plat approval and the requirement that one-third of the lots or one-quarter of the lots be approved within the first three years following preliminary plat approval; Section 29-5.5(a)(1)(i)(c) – this Section becomes 29-6.5(a)(1)(i)(c), and this is a revision to the nonconforming use standards to restore the 12 month time limit on a nonconforming use prior to it expiring; Section 29-5.5(d)(4) – Section become 29-6.5(d)4, in dealing with nonconforming use standards and dealing specifically with site features.

And Amendments to Appendix A: In Appendix A, the M-DT Urban Space Standards (d)(3)(ii)(DT Alley) diagram as well as table. The diagram has been amended to reflect the appropriate right-of-way widths, and the table has been up -- revised in order to match the table. As I had indicated, Attachment A has included the revisions that were proposed or requested to add conditional uses for several items, and then Attachment B is the regulatory procedures table, which has been amended to include the demolition permitting process.

Said amendments to be incorporated as an addendum to the motion of the Planning and Zoning Commission as it relates to Case No. 16-110, a recommendation to approve the Unified Development Code as amended as entered into the public record.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. Well done. Commissioners, any additional discussion needed? Any questions on what was just read?

MR. TOOHEY: Can you read that again?

MR. STRODTMAN: Start with the second item and go forward?

MR. ZENNER: I'll read backwards if you would like.

MR. STRODTMAN: We're good. Thank you. If there is no additional discussion, Commissioners, I will ask Ms. Burns to do a roll call, please.

MS. BURNS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, of course, we're talking about 16-112, move to adopt the Unified Development Code. This motion was made by Mr. MacMann, second by Mr. Stanton.

MR. STRODTMAN: 110?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. 110.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Burns, Ms. Loe, Mr. Harder, Mr. MacMann, Mr. Stanton, Mr. Strodtman, Ms. Rushing, Ms. Russell, Mr. Toohy.**  
**Motion carries 9-0.**

MS. BURNS: Nine to zero, motion carries.

MR. STRODTMAN: Thank you, Commissioners. Much appreciated. Now back to the actual --