

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes**  
**January 5, 2023**  
**Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**Call to Order**

Commissioners Present – Burns, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Loe, MacMann, Stanton, Placier, and Wilson  
Commissioners Absent – Kimbell  
Staff Present – Smith, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner

**Introductions**

**Approval of Agenda**

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously

**Approval of Minutes**

December 22, 2022 work session minutes adopted as presented.

**New Business**

**A. UDC Text Change – Drive-through facilities (remand)**

Mr. Smith gave an overview of the topic indicating that he was seeking consensus on potential revisions to the text change and how staff envisioned on engaging the public as requested by City Council. He explained that the text change was remanded following several comments made during the Council's November 7 meeting most specifically concerns expressed by the Columbia Board of Realtors (CBOR).

Mr. Smith stated that with the November 7 remand there was a request that the Commission respond with any changes to the amendment by the Council's January 17 meeting. Given the Commission was focused on completing the STR ordinance, Mr. Smith noted, meeting this deadline was not possible. He indicated that staff had prepared a report for Council's consideration explaining the situation and sought to have until the Council's March 6 meeting to respond. The report will be presented with the revision's reappearance on the Council's January 17 agenda. The delayed deadline for a Commission response was believed to sufficient to accommodate the Council's request for public outreach.

Mr. Smith further noted that within the body of the report he had attempted to address several questions raised during the November 7 meeting. These questions were generally the result of there being some confusion on what provisions were really being amended versus being restated or moved. Commissioner Loe sought greater clarification on the actual direction provided to the Commission from the Council with the remand. Mr. Smith noted there really were only three topics raised during the Council meeting - signs facing R-1 & R-2 districts, consideration of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) policy resolution compliance stemming from the porte-cochere requirement), and the need additional Neighborhood Association (NA) involvement.

There was general discussion of the content of the remand and there was concern expressed that no specific changes to the actual provisions of the amendment were asked to be examined. Several Commission expressed frustration that the comments offered by the CBOR were not provided to them at the Commission's public hearing. Mr. Zenner noted that it was not uncommon that Council was provided correspondence and public comments following the Commission's review process. He noted that this is often strategic and seen as an "end-run" by those opposed to regulatory changes given the Council has final say on such matters. The Commission acknowledged they understood this fact; however, stated it did not follow established procedures for providing comment.

Mr. Zenner stated he understood the Commission frustration, but this type of tactic is something that occurs frequently and given the Council's authority relating to legislation, the remand is providing the Commission an

opportunity to respond to the comments now. The alternative, should the item not have been remanded, would have been to have had Council deal with the amendment with no additional comment from the Commission.

Mr. Zenner caution the Commission that not considering the concerns expressed by the CBOR as well as others during the Council hearing may create a situation similar to that which occurred within the first STR ordinance review process whereby the PZC submitted its version, the Council requested 14 amendments, and the Commission recommended denial of the Council amended ordinance. This response ultimately failed to produce any text change hence the reason for the second STR attempt that was just presented.

There was general Commission discussion on what, if any, amendments to what was presented were necessary. Several Commission expressed that they had worked diligently on the amendment and many comments raised in the CBOR letter were given consideration and discarded for various reasons. The majority of the Commission indicated that they did not feel that changes to the amendment as presented was necessary.

There was additional discussion on ways to improve communicating the purpose of the amendment and expressing it was actually an “expansion” of opportunities for applicants to meet the UDC’s intent. Several Commissioner’s expressed that if the Council were not happy with the amendment, the UDC provisions relating could be left as it is currently written requiring applicants to go before the Board of Adjustment for relief. Commissioner MacMann stated he had explained to several Council Members what the intent of the amendment was, but was not successful in making those members understand its benefits.

There was also discussion of more public engagement with Neighborhood Associations. Several Commissioners expressed a belief this was not likely necessary and that the focus of communication needed to be on those that had expressed concern due to potentially not understanding the amendment. Commissioners offered several recommendations such as using graphics to illustrate the need for the changes as well as keeping the purpose of the amendment simplified. Mr. Smith noted that he had considered making the request for additional public comment more like a survey versus open-ended questions. Mr. Zenner noted that while the Commission did not believe additional public comment was necessary in this particular instance the remand specifically requested that it be solicited by Council. As such, staff will have to do it and will incorporate the Commission’s recommendations for better outcomes once the request for comment is released.

Mr. Smith noted that he was intending on preparing the survey questions and a response to the CBOR letter for the Commission’s review for the January 19 work session. He also noted he intended to prepared a “cleaned-up” version of the proposed amendment to address the confusion of what was actually being revised versus what was just being restated or moved. There was Commission discussion on this approach.

Mr. Zenner noted that preparing the response to CBOR and the survey questions really needed to be handled by the staff to ensure that progress was made with addressing the Council directive. Chair Geuea Jones stated that she agreed the Commission did not need to be involved in the response or survey given they are not typically. The remaining Commission indicated that they supported a “staff-driven” response and survey.

Mr. Smith summarized the direction that staff was provided during the work session. There were to be no changes made to the content of the amendment present on November 7. Staff was to prepare a response for CBOR and survey questions to solicit additional public input as requested by City Council. On January 19, a “cleaned-up” version of the amendment would be shared attempting better address what was being amended and just moved or restated. Commission agreed that this was a correct summation.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 pm

## **ACTION(S) TAKEN:**

Motion made by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Wilson, to approve the agenda as proposed. Motion passed unanimously. Motion made by Commissioner Loe, seconded by Commissioner MacMann, to approve the December 22, 2022 work session minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.