



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, January 20, 2026
7:00 PM

Regular

City Hall
Council Chamber
701 E. Broadway
Columbia, MO

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20, 2026, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Mayor BARBARA BUFFALOE, Council Member VALERIE CARROLL, Council Member VERA ELWOOD, Council Member JACQUE SAMPLE, Council Member NICK FOSTER, Council Member DON WATERMAN, and Council Member BETSY PETERS were present. City Manager De'Carlton Seewood, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 5, 2026 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Buffaloe and a second by Council Member Foster.

Council Member Sample asked that B16-26 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mayor Buffaloe indicated REP5-26 and REP6-26 would be tabled to the February 16, 2026 Council Meeting.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B16-26 being moved to old business, and REP5-26 and REP6-26 being tabled to the February 16, 2026 Council Meeting, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Buffaloe and a second by Council Member Peters.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC1-26 Board and Commission Applicants.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Gaines, Charlisa, Ward 6, Term to expire May 1, 2029

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Fetterly, Matt, Ward 2, Term to expire September 1, 2028

PARKING ADVISORY COMMISSION

Lowe, Shane, Ward 4, Term to expire February 1, 2029

PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD

Glover, Marcus, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2027
 Jefferies, Joseph, Ward 3, Term to expire November 30, 2027
 Kuhler, Matthew, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2027

TREE BOARD

McMains, Jacob, Ward 2, Term to expire January 31, 2029
 Miller, Max, Ward 5, Term to expire January 31, 2029

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC3-26 Jim Windsor - 96% of respondents to the 2025 City Utilities Survey said that reliable electric service was very important.

Jim Windsor, 200 Manor Drive, commented that this was the 10-year anniversary of pausing the needed transmission line across south Columbia, which had then been on budget and on time, noted the route had originally been approved in July of 2013, but had been paused ten years ago and had continued to be delayed due opposition by the former Mayor, even after hundreds of thousands of dollars had been spent on more studies and consultants, pointed out they were now down two routes, i.e. the Chapel Hill route and the Vawter School/Nifong route, explained the reasons the Vawter School/Nifong route was the better option, which included disruption, the level of MISO control, and costs, stated that as an electric utility customer, he and many others did not accept load shedding, which in reality would be rolling blackouts, as an option as a recent survey had indicated 96.2 percent of residential customers and 100 percent of commercial customers felt reliable electric service was important, and asked the Council to stop delaying and to expedite the construction of a transmission line along the Vawter School/Nifong route, without including any undergrounding, due to the amount of money already wasted with the delay.

SPC4-26 Sarah Read - Action needed to ensure reliable electric service.

Sarah Read rescheduled her request to speak to the following council meeting.

SPC5-26 Habimana Mugisha - Sharing a story of the impact Vidwest has had on my life and the community here in Columbia.

Habimana Mugisha explained his family had moved to the United States from the Democratic Republic of the Congo when he was about six years old for a safer and better life and had later moved from Baltimore, Maryland to Columbia, Missouri in 2015, noted he did not have purpose or direction after graduating high school in May of 2023 until he opened his photography business in June of 2024, commented that although he had the passion, he did not have a lot of support, stated everything changed when he found Vidwest as it gave him access to cameras, lighting, studio space, classes, and other creative artists who shared ideas and pushed each other to grow, pointed out Vidwest helped the community and young people find direction in positive ways, and asked the Council to continue supporting Vidwest so people like him would not lose access to opportunity.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH1-26 Proposed construction of renovations to portions of the utility customer service and treasury office areas located on the first floor of the City Hall Building.

The public hearing was read by the City Clerk.
 Public Works Director Shane Creech provided a staff report, and he and Finance Director Matthew Lue responded to Council questions and comments.
 Mayor Buffaloe opened the public hearing.
 There being no comment, Mayor Buffaloe closed the public hearing.

Mayor Buffaloe made a motion to approve the proposed remodel of approximately 2,350 square feet in the City Hall Daniel Boone Building lobby

located at 701 E. Broadway and authorize the city manager to proceed with the selection of a design-build contractor to design and construct such improvements. The motion was seconded by Council Member Foster and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

PR6-26 Repealing Resolution No. 101-14A that established revised procedures and guidelines for scheduled public comment at City Council meetings and adopting a new policy resolution on the same subject.

The policy resolution was read by the City Clerk.

City Clerk Sheela Amin provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions.

**Mayor Buffaloe made a motion to amend PR6-26 by changing “noon” to “5:00 p.m.” in item #2 of Section 2. The motion was seconded by Council Member Peters, and approved unanimously by voice vote. **

PR6-26, as amended, was read by the City Clerk, and the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PR7-26 Repealing Resolution No. 188-81 reaffirming rules for public hearings and comments before the City Council and adopting a new policy resolution on the same subject.

The policy resolution was read by the City Clerk.

City Clerk Sheela Amin provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions and comments.

Mayor Buffaloe made a motion to amend PR7-26 by adding “or address” to item #3 of Section 2 so the second sentence read that “persons addressing the presiding officer should first state their name and ward or address for the record.” The motion was seconded by Council Member Peters, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The Council asked questions and made comments.

Council Member Waterman made a motion to amend PR7-26 by adding “provided, however, only one (1) speaker per organization will be allowed five (5) minutes” to the end of the second sentence of item #4 in Section 2. The motion was seconded by Mayor Buffaloe, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PR7-26, as amended, was read by the City Clerk, and the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PR8-26 Establishing a policy for City Council member virtual participation at city council meetings.

The policy resolution was read by the City Clerk.

City Clerk Sheela Amin provided a staff report, and she, City Manager De'Carlton Seewood, and City Counselor Nancy Thompson responded to Council questions and comments.

Council Member Elwood made a motion to amend PR8-26 by changing “requests” to “notifications” in third sentence in item #8 of Section 1 so it read “all notifications for virtual attendance shall be made at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the meeting.” The motion was seconded by Mayor Buffaloe,

and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Buffaloe made a motion to amend PR8-26 by removing item #12c, which said “muting a member who is determined by the Mayor to be out of order” in Section 1 and renumbering item #12d to #12c. The motion was seconded by Council Member Foster, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PR8-26, as amended, was read by the City Clerk, and the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B2-26

Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to Janet Rogers to allow the construction of a detached accessory dwelling unit on property located at 105 S. Glenwood Avenue in an R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoning district; providing a severability clause (Case No.19-2026).

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Community Development Director Clint Smith provided a staff report, and he and City Counselor Nancy Thompson responded to Council questions and comments.

Scott Holan, 111 S. Glenwood Avenue, expressed concern in learning historic preservation was not a current primary focus and that future studies might be needed to better balance competing interests because significant and irreversible changes could take place in the meantime, and provided feedback in the spirit of process improvement and long-term planning, which included the belief that the staff report and applicant feedback had factually incomplete or broadly interpreted statements and that cited reports could reasonably support multiple conclusions, the need to improve communications with nearby neighbors as they had initially received a blank postcard that was later corrected with a postcard with limited information but had created a compressed review period due to the holidays, the fact the applicant rebuttal letter indicated neighbors were notified on October 2 when they had received a letter dated October 22 on November 9, and the concern with the scale of the accessory structure as its size was contingent upon an addition to the main dwelling and did not have a similar footprint of other existing legal accessory dwelling units in the area.

Kristen Veum, 111 S. Glenwood Avenue, indicated she resided in one of Columbia's Most Notable Historic Properties, acknowledged the desire to be agile and responsive to dynamic housing needs and a shifting economic landscape, recognized that simultaneously optimizing the social, economic, environmental, and historic preservation goals was a daunting task with tradeoffs on all sides, believed a dynamic approach to planning and zoning included the engagement of the Historic Preservation Commission on the front end before development pressures destroyed what was left of the City's finite historical resources, understood a historic neighborhood survey project had been initiated in 2005 but was currently on a hiatus, felt neighborhoods, such as North Central Columbia, West Broadway, East Campus, Benton Stephens, Grasslands, and the Old Southwest had a unique character that helped to boost the economy and make Columbia a vibrant and attractive place to live, suggested the City revive the historic survey efforts, and asked the Council to consider historic preservation and character in redevelopment plans sooner versus later because once that history was lost or eroded, they would not be able to get it back.

Adrienne Stolwyk, 212 Hirth Avenue, indicated she was the architect working with the Rogers family on this project, stated her respect for the concerns of the neighbors, explained the Rogers family wanted to invest in this neighborhood in a way that met the needs of a modern family in a society where housing was increasingly expensive, believed, architecturally, this fit well in the neighborhood as detached accessory structures were easier to accommodate in historic neighborhoods than newer neighborhoods, understood staff had recommended approval as had the Planning and Zoning Commission with some stipulations with which they were amenable, and felt a vote in favor of this would be a vote in support of infill and housing, which were both needed in Columbia.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, agreed the accessory dwelling unit ordinance did not have an owner-occupancy requirement when approved, stated she disagreed with the idea of a specific

covenant that was an exception to a rule to run with the land as it was bad policy, felt some were predisposed, whether realizing it or not, to feeling there was something wrong with rental property or being a renter, pointed out one's need for a good night's sleep or feeling safe did not change if that person paid rent or a mortgage, and suggested they consider the impacts of special conditions along with the way they thought about who was entitled to housing in good repair, as renters and owners should have the same benefits.

Brian Rogers, 2023 Parkridge Court, stated he and his family were looking forward to moving back into this neighborhood along with adding value to the property, and noted the opportunity to build an accessory dwelling unit would allow them to live as a multigenerational family in a way they would not otherwise be able.

Shane Lowe, 1660 Highridge Circle, noted many historic neighborhoods did not have a lot of density, making it difficult for young families to own those homes, felt accessory dwelling units provided the ability to add sustainable density in a way that was not invasive while preserving and maintaining the character of the neighborhood and allowed for multigenerational living to support one another, and urged the Council to approve this conditional use permit request.

The Council asked questions and made comments.

**B2-26 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN,
PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B4-26

Approving the PD Planned Development of "Ashford Place" located at the northern terminus of Sagemoor Drive and west of Hoylake Drive; approving a revised statement of intent; authorizing a development agreement; directing the City Clerk to record the development agreement (Case No. 231-2025).

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Community Development Director Clint Smith provided a staff report, and he, Public Works Director Shane Creech, and City Counselor Nancy Thompson responded to Council questions and comments.

Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering noted the 24 acre tract had been zoned PD in 2010 and that zoning had allowed for the proposed 3-unit building, stated this action would update the existing zoning with a PD plan, explained his client, Troy Miller, had purchased the west portion of Tract 5 in 2013, The Brooks Plat 1, which was on the east side of Tract 5, had been approved in 2014 and was developed in 2017, The Brooks Phase 2, which was south of Tract 5, had been annexed and zoned in 2017, The Brooks Plat 2 was approved in 2018, and the Brooks Plat 3 was approved in 2022, pointed out the subject property had been annexed and zoned long before The Brooks had been a part of the discussion for the area, indicated the utilities for the area were adequate, and provided schematics of the 3-unit buildings along with graphics showing the locations of the three phases of the proposed development.

Peggy Kirkpatrick, 713 Sagemoor Drive, explained she would be the first of five speakers representing the residents of Sagemoor Drive, which would be the sole point of ingress and egress to the Ashford Place development, understood safeguards for this street needed to be addressed before the development plan was approved, pointed out Ashford Place was a landlocked development with a single point of access through an existing neighborhood street with no foreseeable construction of El Chaparral Avenue, noted they would not be in attendance if the extension of El Chaparral Avenue existed because construction and other vehicles would have another way of moving south, stated their concerns were not about who lived in the homes, whether the homes were rented or owned, or with property values and crime, expressed their concerns were with the design and implications of the plan, which involved traffic, safety, parking, and a long-term precedence, and asked the Council to ensure decisions made tonight did not replicate or worsen already existing problems by pausing and requiring meaningful changes to the plan.

Austin Bryan, 901 Sagemoor Drive, commented that Ashford Place did not exist in a vacuum as it was one project within a broader pattern of development that relied on a limited roadway network, noted the traffic impact study being relied upon for this proposal had been completed nine years ago, in 2017, before construction of the first phase of The Brooks, included outdated

assumptions, such as an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent for the surrounding area, had not considered the Old Hawthorne and Vineyards developments, which had grown by nearly 90 percent, and did not account for cut-through traffic, which was a concern, especially on Hoylake Drive as it had been designed as a collector between Rolling Hills Road and East Broadway without adequate traffic calming and was a sore subject within the neighborhood, stated the Roseta Avenue Learning Center, which involved children, operated within the corridor without school zone accommodations, reduced speed limits, crosswalks, or traffic calming measures, pointed out the traffic impact study had indicated level F service in 2036 for El Chaparral and East Broadway near Casey's during peak hours and level E and F service for Roseta Avenue and Sagemoor Drive at East Broadway in the morning and evening, which he felt had already been reached today after conducting a traffic count of his own on October 29 and 30, explained The Brooks, Old Hawthorne, and Vineyards neighborhoods were still developing and proposed was an apartment complex on Tract 2 at Richland Road and Rolling Hills Road, expressed sympathy for the residents of the El Chaparral neighborhood as they had been there first, had poor sight lines, had long wait times, and had been impacted by decisions of the City while being unrepresented since they were not within the city limits, and asked the Council to acknowledge that Ashford Place was not an isolated proposal, but part of a pattern of growth pushing east without the necessary infrastructure.

Holly McCoy, 809 Sagemoor Drive, expressed concerns about safety on Sagemoor Drive as it had been built to neighborhood collector standards designed to carry high volumes at faster speeds but was expected to function like a residential street and its 19 driveways would turn every additional car into a potential conflict, pointed out the City Code prohibited subdivisions for single and two-family homes from taking driveway access onto collector streets unless formally approved and wondered why those driveways had been allowed, provided Hoylake Drive as an example of a roadway built to a higher standard, i.e., a neighborhood collector connecting Rolling Hills Road to East Broadway, but classified to a low standard street due to the lack of meaningful traffic calming and speeding, did not feel that mistake should be repeated on Sagemoor Drive, noted Sagemoor Drive had already required major repairs highlighting the stresses the street already endured, stated on-street parking narrowed the roadway, reduced sight lines, and increased risks for drivers, pedestrians, and children, and requested the installation of three 15 mile per hour rated speed bumps by the developer of Ashford Place prior to occupancy if the project was approved.

Pat Webber, 801 Sagemoor Drive, urged the Council to not allow this proposal to move forward without strong, enforceable conditions, particularly parking and buffering, explained the proposed plan relied on a single-bay garage along with a single parking spot in the driveway even though these were three bedroom units, which did not reflect how people actually lived, i.e., garages used for storage, owning more vehicles than parking spots, and the need to accommodate guests, noted overflow parking only had one place to go beyond the bounds of Ashford Place, i.e., Sagemoor Drive, pointed out the residents of The Brooks were subject to an HOA while those within Ashford Place would not be so there was a real concern with regard to spillover parking, felt having a higher intensity development behind R-1 homes with access only occurring via Sagemoor Drive, a residential street with 19 driveways, was unprecedented as those types of developments usually fronted on roadways meant to handle that type of traffic, commented that Ashford Place would funnel traffic inward onto a neighborhood street until El Chaparral allowed for access which was not expected for many years, and asked that the developer be required to include of two additional parking pads per unit, enforceable parking controls to prevent spillover into The Brooks, and buffering commensurate with level one requirements along the entire shared property to maintain the integrity of the two different neighborhoods.

Jen Bryan, Ward 6, commented that the legacy planned development standards before them tonight allowed zoning to be put in place without a defined development plan, leaving details to be decided nearly 15 years later, pointed out the City had moved away from this approach because it tended to create uncertainty and conflict, understood today's planned development designation required a plan upfront, stated the Council was being asked to reconcile ambiguous past zoning with present day housing goals, developer rights, and existing homeowner expectations, provided the issues on Hoylake Drive as an example of the difficulty of correcting missing protections once a development was approved, asked the Council to acknowledge that this was the first development plan submitted for this parcel and not a

continuation of an approved plan or minor clarification to a 15-year old statement of intent, wondered why this planned development was not held to today's standards, and requested that the installation of speed humps on Sagemoor Drive at the expense of the developer along with the pavement of incremental parking pads and the addition of level one buffering to be required as conditions if the proposed development was approved.

Gail Hauswirth, 5338 Harbor Town Drive, provided a handout, stated the proposed development would worsen longstanding problems related to Hoylake Drive, which was the primary street in their subdivision, explained the CATSO Major Roadway Plan had classified Hoylake Drive as a neighborhood collector, but a 2017 study assumed it would functionally replace a major collector that had previously been planned even though it had not been formally reclassified via a formal amendment process, understood Sagemoor Drive was classified as a city street by CATSO but had been built and treated as a neighborhood collector to facilitate the development of Ashford Place, pointed out street classification mattered because it affected safety, livability, parking, access, and cost responsibilities, the mismatches between classifications and function had real consequences, and it sacrificed transparency, noted Hoylake Drive connected a minor arterial and a major arterial while functioning as a cut-through route between them even though the UDC generally stated that a neighborhood collector should connect to only one arterial or one major collector and streets connected to arterials or collectors should be designed to avoid cut-through traffic, acknowledged the residents had been referred to the traffic calming program, but it heavily weighed schools, parks, and hospitals, which did not exist in the subdivision, commented that when approaching staff about it being reasonable to conclude Hoylake Drive exceeded volumes typically appropriate for a neighborhood collector due to the cut-through traffic, they had been told it was acceptable since it had been built to major collector standards, felt this was a problem as roadways should not be functionally upgraded without formally being reclassified, expressed the fact that safety concerns were real with speeds up to 57 miles per hour, and urged the Council to deny or defer the Ashford Place development until the Sagemoor Drive and Hoylake Drive designs were fixed.

Loretta Forsee, 2954 S. Olivet Road in Boone County, indicated she had been driving on Highway WW since the early 1970s, noted her son and grandson had been in an accident near the junkyard and bridge in 1998, leaving her son with a severe brain injury and her grandson with a mild brain injury, stated Highway WW could accommodate any more traffic as it was always busy, even during off-peak hours, pointed out she could not even get MoDOT to mow by South Olivet Church to allow her to pull out onto Highway WW safely and believed improvements would be even more difficult, and asked the Council to not allow anymore development until the roadway issues were addressed.

Jack Maher, 809 Brockton Drive, understood the density calculation of 3.2 units per acre was based on the entire 24 acre site, noted the density was actually approximately seven units per acre when calculated on the developable acreage, which was about 11 acres since the northern portion of the site was largely the floodway, the 500-year floodplain, and climax forest that had to remain post-development, believed the density associated with a planned development should be determined by conditions specifically applicable to the site, which included the character of the surrounding property, felt the proposed development was not compatible since The Brooks was entirely single-family residential and the proposed development had a density of about seven units per acre, reiterated that El Chaparral Avenue would not be extended for at least ten years, which resulted in traffic access and infrastructure issues, commented that the buffering between Ashford Place and The Brooks was insufficient due to the density, and asked the Council to send this proposal back for modifications that better balanced the needs for housing with the legitimate concerns of established neighbors and compliance with zoning codes.

Stephanie Bell with Ellinger & Associates provided a handout, indicated she was representing residents on Kingston Heath Drive, stated the 2017 traffic study was dangerously outdated as it was nearly nine years old and relied on older data when industry standards required data within 18 months and MoDOT required data no older than two years, noted the 2017 study also assumed 85 homes for the entire north tract when a more reasonable projection for the Ashford Place tract along with the two remaining tracts was 231 units, which was nearly three times what had been analyzed, believed this error invalidated the entire safety analysis along with the conclusions that the intersections would operate at acceptable levels, commented that

Table 5 on Page 27 did not include the worst case scenario, the October 23, 2025 letter only repeated information from the 2017 study, and the capacity analysis on Page 20 had not been updated, questioned the claim that the development was grandfathered under the old PUD rules because there had not been an approved development plan, felt the current UDC applied, which meant the proposed development violated the net developable acreage standard, the minimal landscaping requirement, the lot width standard, and maximum density standards, pointed out the 2010 development agreement was not being meaningfully honored as it required an updated traffic impact study when development plans were submitted for Tract 5 and did not allow for the City's traffic engineer to have the discretion to waive that requirement, wondered how the provisions for trail easements, two acres for emergency services, and ten acres for a public park included in the agreement would be accommodated with only two remaining tracts, and asked the Council to table this item.

Terry Haupt, 1224 Shore Acres Loop, commented that he believed the Ashford Place development was about developer greed and not about building affordable housing or helping the younger generation own real estate, calculated the number of units per acres at 8.5 versus 3.2, noted this area would not be easily accessible for the public as it was a quarter of a mile away from Highway WW, stated El Chaparral Avenue would not be developed for at least ten years, did not feel there had been enough foresight into the ten acre potential park that had been negotiated years ago, understood the need for additional housing but thought it should be properly planned, suggested lesser density, the construction of an access road, the extension of El Chaparral, and leaving trees between The Brooks and this development, and urged the Council to vote no on the current proposal.

Chris Beckett, 1130 Shore Acres Loop, believed the prior statements of intent were nullified since nothing had been done with El Chaparral Avenue, Rolling Hills Road had not been improved, there had not been residential development along Richland Road, and growth had been allowed along Highway WW, and stated communities were built by single-family homes.

Michael Bryant, 704 Brockton Drive, stated he and his wife had designed and built their retirement home in The Brooks, believed what they were trying to build as a neighborhood would be spoiled over the need to profit from rentals because those residents would not be joining the neighborhood as they would be adjacent and only moving through it, explained he turned left onto Sagemoor Drive coming home from work and there was nothing safe about it, did not feel they were currently protecting the people that lived in the neighborhood due to the hill and the everyday conditions, such as the sun being in one's eyes, and hoped that safety issue would be considered before putting more people in that situation.

Tim Crockett with Crockett Engineering, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, stated staff had repeatedly indicated that a piece of property zoned prior to the adoption of the UDC would be reviewed based on the regulations at the time that zoning was approved and not the new UDC calculations so the density was 3.2 units per acre, noted single-family density had a range of 1.5 to 4 units per acre, which was consistent with the proposed development, pointed out that with regard to buffering this was a single-family attached development and not R-MF, explained the City's traffic engineer had indicated the validity of the 2017 traffic impact study as its conditions, assumptions, and projections were still accurate and included the subject property with its maximum development potential, commented that the streets and intersections had been designed to handle traffic from the Ashford Place development per the 2017 traffic study that said the proposed roadways within The Brooks Phase 2 would adequately serve the proposed subdivision along with future development of the tract to the north, which was confirmed in the October 2025 communication, provided examples of other major roadways that were within subdivisions, indicated there would be two parking spaces per unit along with 68 additional on-street spaces and the potential to add other parking locations if needed, mentioned the point of a PD development was to allow for clustering the development in a usable space, and emphasized that roughly 70 percent of the site would include open space.

Caleb Colbert, an attorney representing the applicant with offices at 827 E. Broadway, stated this development had the support of staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission, who voted 7-1 to recommend approval after hearing the same types of comments they were hearing tonight, thought it was important to evaluate this request in terms of the housing needs of the community, understood the 2024 Housing Study found that the overall shortage of homes was contributing to the affordability deficit as well as a shortage of starter homes, single-family homes, and affordable rental units, top factors were community resistance, i.e.,

not wanting rental or dense developments nearby, along with regulations, and a need for 37,000 additional housing units by 2050, and wondered how they would reach that goal when there was opposition and resistance to this 77-unit proposal.

Dale Halley, 5250 Harbor Town Drive, stated he was a retired mining engineer who resided at the corner of Hoylake Drive, explained the mines he developed were equivalent to small cities and involved the building of the infrastructure first, i.e., power lines, water lines, fiber optic communications, and roads for the equipment and workers, understood subdivisions were built before the infrastructure in Columbia, which he felt was backwards, noted the elderly and kids had to cross the busy collector road to access their mailboxes or the school bus, emphasized he was not opposed to the subdivision, and asked the Council to take into account the safety concerns expressed by his neighbors because those issues would likely not be addressed for another 20 years.

John Shinn, 4408 Kingston Heath Drive, disagreed that this development was similar to other developments within Columbia as this would place high density into the interior of a low density area, believed the prior statement of intent and agreement had become invalid the moment Tract 5 was subdivided because the 120-130 acre tract was broken up into smaller tracts, including this 24-acre tract, did not feel the design exceptions were justified, asked for clarification as to whether the 240 units on Tract 2 would count towards the 300 units or not, and wondered how the 10-acre park and the trails, which were needed, would be accommodated with only two undeveloped tracts remaining.

Eric Thairu, a Sixth Ward resident, commented that he did not believe being a renter made a person less civically engaged as was shown by his presence at the meeting, stated he agreed with the safety concerns expressed by many of the speakers, felt those concerns should be addressed either before the project was approved or in lockstep with its approval so the issue was not infinitely kicked down the road continuing to be a concern for current and future residents of the area, believed every traffic death was preventable, and had no other concerns about the proposed project.

Jim Walls, Stayton Ferry Loop, asked the Council to look at the impacts of the other two tracts along with this tract as part of the pie due to the location of the Grindstone Creek Fork as more roads and bridges would likely need to build, likely pushing things out to 2045 or 2055 instead of just 2035.

Shane Lowe, 1660 Highridge Circle, suggested being consistent with zoning and honoring the understanding made to this point, expressed sympathy with those in the neighborhood concerned about safety as the number of people lost to automobiles each year was a cultural tragedy, did not feel the problems on Hoylake Drive or Highway WW were the fault of this developer, agreed the City needed to do a better job of moving traffic calming in a more dynamic way to help address issues such as those on Hoylake Drive, thought the City should negotiate with MoDOT to protect its citizens traveling on Highway WW, believed the road design within the proposed development was fairly responsible as it included curved roads, noted mixed density development was incredibly important as it fought the standard of economic segregation on which so much of this nation was built and allowed renters and owners to interact, and encouraged the recommendation to address more parking down the road if needed.

Dianne Buffington, 4824 Stayton Ferry Loop, referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and expressed respect for the one member who had voted no because she had made them feel seen, heard, and understood.

The Council asked questions and made comments.

B4-26 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: CARROLL, FOSTER, WATERMAN. VOTING NO: BUFFALOE, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, PETERS. Bill declared defeated.

B11-26

Authorizing a sponsorship agreement with the Missouri Department of Economic Development, Division of Tourism in support of 2026 Juneteenth events; authorizing the City Manager, or the Manager's designee, to enter into agreements for sponsorship of Juneteenth community events; amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$26,982.00.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Convention and Visitors Bureau Director Amy Schneider, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Administrator D'Andre Thompson, and Engagement Coordinator Shawna Johnson provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions and comments.

B11-26 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- B13-26 Amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$291,280.00; authorizing an agreement with the National Institute of Criminal Justice Reform for research, strategic planning, and technical assistance professional services.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Violence Prevention Administrator D'Markus Thomas-Brown provided a staff report, and he and City Manager De'Carlon Seewood responded to Council questions and comments.

B13-26 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- B16-26 Amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$65,000.00 for Risk Management office space.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

City Counselor Nancy Thompson provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions.

Maria Oropallo, a Fourth Ward resident, commented that she was an eleven year member of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC), nine of those as Chair, explained the key areas of risk management included financial, cyber, operational, and liability risks through the City's self-insurance program dealing with workman's compensation, property damage, general liability, etc., understood Risk Management had been a division of the Finance Department but had been moved to the Law Department in 2025 as part of the vote to approve the FY 2026 budget, and wondered about the reason for the move and why the FAAC had not been involved as risk management topics were discussed at FAAC meetings and the change felt like an indictment of the Finance Department.

The Council asked questions and made comments.

B16-26 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

The following bills were given second reading and, and the policy resolution and resolutions were read by the City Clerk.

- PR5-26 Repealing Policy Resolution No. 145-12 establishing revised policies relating to appointments to City boards and commissions and adopting a new policy resolution on the same subject.
- B1-26 Calling the municipal election to be held on Tuesday, April 7, 2026, to elect Council Members for Wards 1 and 5 for the City of Columbia.
- B3-26 Rezoning property located on the northeast corner of Old Highway 63 and Walnut Street (202 N. Old Highway 63) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-OF (Mixed-use Office) (Case No. 6-2026).

- B5-26 Amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$200,000.00 to provide for Public Works Department capital improvement projects.
- B6-26 Accepting a conveyance for sidewalk purposes; directing the City Clerk to record the conveyance.
- B7-26 Authorizing an Abatement Order on Consent with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.
- B8-26 Accepting conveyances for utility and sewer purposes; accepting a Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenant; directing the City Clerk to have the conveyances recorded.
- B9-26 Vacating portions of utility easements adjacent to properties located at 801 Fairway Drive and 2103 Country Club Drive associated with the Columbia Country Club waterline relocation project; accepting a grant of easement for utility purposes from Richard J. Rother and Kimi C. Rother; directing the City Clerk to have the ordinance and conveyance recorded.
- B10-26 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns and McDonnell Engineering Co., Inc. for design services associated with construction of a snow removal equipment building at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$436,500.00.
- B12-26 Authorizing an agreement with The Housing Authority of the City of Columbia for tenant-based rental subsidy assistance program services.
- B14-26 Amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$600,000.00; authorizing a contract with TSI Global Companies, LLC for services associated with the City Hall audiovisual modernization project.
- B15-26 Amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$1,000,000.00 for the purchase of an aerial ladder truck.
- R9-26 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Old Plank Road culvert structure project.
- R10-26 Authorizing a tourism development sponsorship agreement with the National Middle School Basketball Association LLC for the 2026 Missouri Middle School Basketball Championship event.
- R11-26 Authorizing a sidewalk renovation cost share program agreement with Wellington Villas Homes Association, Inc. for reconstruction of sidewalk adjacent to a common area along Canyon Ridge Drive.
- R12-26 Authorizing a community development block grant subrecipient agreement with Job Point for facility renovations.
- R13-26 Authorizing a special event operations agreement with Ragtag Film Society associated with the 2026 True/False Film Festival.
- R14-26 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns and McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. associated with improvements to the north parking lot at the Columbia Regional Airport.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and policy resolutions and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R15-26 Authorizing a special event operations agreement with Throwing Star Collective, Inc. associated with the Red Bull Chariot Race event.

The resolution was read by the City Clerk.

Convention and Visitors Director Amy Schneider and Convention and Visitors Assistant Director Julie Ausmus provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions.

Eugene Elkin, a Second Ward resident, wondered if Throwing Star was just the name because he would suggest not approving it if actual throwing stars were involved as those were dangerous.

R15-26 was read by the City Clerk, and the vote was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: BUFFALOE, CARROLL, ELWOOD, SAMPLE, FOSTER, WATERMAN, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

- B17-26 Amending Chapter 7 of the City Code as it relates to emergency management organization.
- B18-26 Vacating a drainage easement adjacent to Lots 194 and 195 within Forest Hills, Plat No. 3 located at 5724 Black Gum Court; accepting a grant of easement for utility and drainage purposes from New Standard Homes, LLC; directing the City Clerk to have the ordinance and conveyance recorded.
- B19-26 Authorizing construction of the Rice Road Private Common Collector Elimination Project (PCCE) #43 sanitary sewer improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract.
- B20-26 Authorizing expanded HIV testing program services and business associate agreements with Morgan County Health Center.
- B21-26 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness program services.
- B22-26 Authorizing a memorandum of agreement with the Missouri National Guard Adjutant General for the use of the Northeast Regional Park for a training event.
- B23-26 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for air service promotion; amending the FY 2026 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the amount of \$350,000.00.

X. REPORTS

- REP4-26 City Council Requested Report on Downtown Restroom Access.
- Parks and Recreation Director Gabe Huffington provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions and comments.
- REP5-26 City Council Requested Update on the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence 2014 Recommendations.
- This report was tabled to the February 16, 2026 Council Meeting during the adjustment and approval of the agenda.
- REP6-26 City Council Requested Summary of Communication Strategies for Public Works, Community Development, and City Utilities.
- This report was tabled to the February 16, 2026 Council Meeting during the adjustment and approval of the agenda.
- REP7-26 Updates regarding Volunteer Service to the City in Fiscal Year 2025 and Love Your Block.
- Housing and Neighborhood Services Manager Leigh Kottwitz provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions and comments.
- REP8-26 Monthly Finance Report.
- Finance Director Matthew Lue and Assistant Finance Director Jim McDonald provided a staff report, and responded to Council questions and comments.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, a Second Ward resident, suggested they reconsider the word “affordable” when it came to housing by utilizing low, medium, and high income instead, asked the City of enforce mobile home park improvements, such as internal roads since it could impact emergency services and vehicles, and pointed out rent costs were increasing significantly, which was bad news for Columbia.

John Shinn, 4408 Kingston Heath Drive, stated he planned to come before the Council in support of proposed high density apartments along Richland Road and S. Rolling Hills Road as that development would be located next to roads that could accommodate the intensity.

Shane Lowe, a Fourth Ward resident, believed tonight provided a good example of two different forms of development as one worked with existing infrastructure and did not create a major change for the community while the other, which would have accommodated more housing, had challenges, suggested they make the first process easier to allow for more housing, and asked that when they discussed the need to build infrastructure ahead of development, they not just focus on infrastructure that would add more cars to the community because that was not how they would get to the huge housing numbers needed.

The Council and staff discussed various topics to include attendance at the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) event this past weekend, thinking about the comment of Dr. Charles Steele at the SCLC event that “freedom was expensive” as it related to municipal decisions, such as the efforts of the City in terms of financial and structural commitments in serving the community, the need for more development and affordable housing, the desire for the full costs and impacts of development to be calculated at the onset of any proposal along with the potential of providing incentives if needed, pointing out that there were slightly more renters than homeowners in Columbia per census data from 2019-2023 and those renters were civically engaged, the first off-Monday work session involving more discussion on the proposed pedestrian safety ordinance, the unintended consequences of building policies and structures to meet the needs of one type of person, the concern for the very young ages of people engaging in violent activities, the need to determine why young people were engaging

in such violent activities, appreciation for the Columbia Police Department (CPD) in responding to these incidents and finding the perpetrators as it was emotional, dangerous, and time consuming work, being grateful that they had moved an item forward earlier tonight involving the Office of Violence Prevention, looking forward to discussing the transmission line project at the February 9 off-Monday work session, the need for a Comprehensive Plan in terms of development as the discussions tonight showed it would serve them well in their decision-making, appreciation for the Office of Neighborhood Services for providing volunteer opportunities for people to give back this past weekend, the great turnout at various Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. events, such as the NAACP event at the MLK Memorial at Battle Gardens and Second Missionary Baptist Church and the candlelight walk in the evening to St. Luke's Church, the comments of many that Columbia followed the teachings of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. by showing up for the community and those left behind, having no evidence or proof that ICE had been in Columbia despite social media posts, understanding federal law officials were not required to notify the Police Chief if they were to come, and the level of involvement by the CPD when it came to immigration and ICE as police departments were generally not involved in the enforcement of civil immigration violations.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned without objection at 11:57 p.m.