



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, January 5, 2023

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

City Council Chambers

Columbia City Hall

701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now call this meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Present.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Kimbell? We have eight; we have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good.

Present: 8 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier and Shannon Wilson

Excused: 1 - Robbin Kimbell

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing no staff.

MR. ZENNER: There are none.

MR. STANTON: Move to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton, seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Can I get a thumbs up approval on the agenda?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous. Thank you.

Move to approve

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

December 22, 2022 Regular Meeting

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the December 22nd, 2022 regular meeting minutes. Are there any adjustments or changes to the minutes?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Thumbs up approval on the minutes?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. LOE: Unanimous. Thank you. Very good. Staff, are we ready or are we having issues?

MR. ZENNER: I'm having issues, but I'm okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. We can get you help.

MR. ZENNER: Please. I am ready. I don't know where I put all my agendas, but that's all right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's all right.

Move to approve

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 08-2023

A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of Black Dog Consulting and Development, L.L.C. (owner), seeking approval of a rezoning from R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) with the intent to develop the site with cottage-style lots. The 3.3-acre site is located on the eastern frontage of Oakland Gravel Road, approximately ~500 feet north of Blue Ridge Road and is commonly addressed 3612 Oakland Gravel Road. **(This request was previously tabled at the December 8, 2022 public hearing).**

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to R-2.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Before we direct questions to staff, have any Commissioners had communication from the public or parties and, if so, would you please disclose it now so that we can all benefit from the same information. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Zenner, could you refresh me on the notification requirements for a BOA action?

MR. ZENNER: BOA requirements are similar to those for the Planning and Zoning Commission, 100 -- all property owners within 185 feet are notified, as well as all neighborhood associations or registered homeowners associations within 1,000 feet.

MR. MACMANN: To that end, is Ms. Donelson on that list, the person who generated this?

MR. ZENNER: It is my understanding that she was. I'd have to confirm that. We did post property, so with every rezoning request before this body, or public hearing request before this body, we have the larger public notice sign that is placed on the property. With our Board of Adjustment, we have a much smaller sign, so we rely more heavily for the Board of Adjustment on mail notification.

MR. MACMANN: As a request, whether or not Ms. Donelson is on the list --

MR. ZENNER: I would be happy --

MR. MACMANN: -- could you add her to the list?

MR. ZENNER: I will be more than happy to do so.

MR. MACMANN: And I'll save the other comment to the end. I'm sorry.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will move on to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. State your name and address for the record. Six minutes if you're with a group, three if you're an individual.

MR. CROCKETT: Good evening, Commissioners. Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, office at 1000 West Nifong. With me tonight is Adam Rau, who is the applicant tonight with Black Dog Properties. And, again, we're looking at 3.3 acres that's currently zoned R-1. We're asking for it to be zoned to R-2 for the cottage standard. Now, again, as Mr. Zenner indicated, we have to go to the Board of Adjustment to acquire those -- those standards, to be approved for those standards, so we have to -- it's kind of a chicken or egg, we've got to do one thing at a time. The first thing we have to do is come to this Commission and the Council to get our R-2 zoning. Then we need to go to the Board of Adjustment to get the cottage standard approval, and then if we obtain that, then we need to come back to this Commission and ultimately Council with a preliminary

plat for the property. So just to make sure we're -- we understand the process. We will be back if it -- if it proceeds and we get approvals as we go, we will be back before this Commission with the preliminary plat showing the layout and the street, the standard plat that you typically see. And there is some -- some -- again, it's zoned -- we have to go R-2. That does allow for duplexes. It's not my client's intent to do duplexes. He does not want to do duplexes on this site, he wants to do the single-family, you know, single-family units. If there's another way to do it, certainly that's the way we would go, however, this is the route that the UDC indicates. Again, you've seen the location map. You know where we're located. Again, you've seen the concept plan, you know. I'm not going to plagiarize. I'll just straight up say I stole this from the staff report because it's much better than the layout that I do. So you can see the -- the multiple zoning districts that are around the subject property, and we're looking at a density on our property about 5.5 units per acre. The duplexes across the street are about 7.7, up the street is 8.5 and 10. The duplexes further north are 4.5, and the PUD was, like, 6.5. So we're right in line on the lower side of the density of -- of the other multi-family in the area, but, again, we're looking for single family. And so what's the purpose, you know, why are we doing that. Well, we're -- we want to provide affordable small-lot infill cottage-style development. We want to develop in conjunction with the surrounding area and use a UDC to develop the tract to the best possible use. We are located within walking distance of Blue Ridge Elementary. Not too many times do we have new developments come forward that we're within walking distance. And not only elementary school, but also the middle school, which is about 950 feet away. We're also about a third of a mile to the MU Healthcare facility up on Smiley Lane. We're also about a third of a mile away from the future 30-mile loop that Parks and Recreation is planning around the city. It talked to Parks yesterday about that, and they have high hopes that that will progress in the near future, so I'm really excited about that, trying to get that loop completed, but they are -- have some -- they do have some plans for this area, and we'll be pretty close to it. Now we're also just about a quarter of a mile, just right down the street from Albert Oakland Park. I actually met Parks and Rec at that site for some improvements that they want to do, so Albert Oakland Park, you know, if you're not familiar with it, it's a 75-acre park has a lot of amenities basically across the street. Again here's our site right in the middle. What's yellow are the three elementary -- or, excuse me -- three schools, one elementary and two middle schools, Lang and Oakland, as well as Blue Ridge. We add in the health care, and then we add in the park facilities, the trail, and then the Oakland Albert -- Albert Oakland Park in green located there. Again, I think Mr. Zenner talked about it being an infill development. We don't need to talk about this too much. We're right down the

street from Fire Station 4. No more police is needed. Solid waste already serves the area, so, you know, we don't have to change routes or anything along those lines. Of course, adequate utilities for the area, as well. Columbia Imagined supports a plan like this for various reasons, and then, so, basically, in conclusion, we believe it's appropriate for the area. It's infill development. You know, it's going to meet all the City standards. It's going to be a little bit of a process. It's a little bit different than we've taken before in the past, but -- so we come to you, you know, respectfully requesting approval. City staff has approved it, and we think it's a good plan. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that this Commission may have.

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

MS. BURNS: Thank you. So a couple of questions, Mr. Crockett. So these would all be individually owned?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. It is our intent is to sell them. They'll have a smaller unit. Right now on the market, we have so many three-bedroom, four bedroom, you know, two and a half bath. You know, we would like to have something smaller here. I mean, we're -- we're seeing a change, if you will. People are asking for -- I mean, we're doing this in some other subdivisions and larger subdivisions, looking for a two-bedroom unit, maybe a two-bedroom, two bath, two-bedroom, one bath, a single car garage. We're kind of getting away from the larger homes and into the smaller. So the intent here is, absolutely, my client's intent is to sell these units for individual home ownership.

MS. BURNS: Oh, as far as a concept, do you have a price point on these units?

MR. CROCKETT: I would love to tell you. Right now, price points are, you know, probably low 200's, but that fluctuates monthly, weekly, daily based on construction material costs. Lumber is coming way down. Interest rates is coming up a little bit. So, you know, the idea there is to try to get in the low 200's right now.

MS. BURNS: Thank you. And then the last question is you didn't mention communication with neighborhoods or homeowners associations.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MS. BURNS: Could you share a little bit about that.

MR. CROCKETT: You know, my client can speak on this. He went door to door one Saturday in December. Went to all the adjacent property owners. He spoke to a couple of property owners, and if he didn't catch anybody there, he left them a note, left them a prewritten letter basically telling who he is, what his plans are, what he wants to do, and then gave his -- his cell phone number and said please reach out to me if you have any questions, concerns, love to talk to you about the project.

MS. BURNS: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Mr. Crockett, I would like to thank you and the individual who hired you there for doing this, because, as you know, and I hope you will learn, this fits our desires and we do hope to get those text changes so this is not such an arduous process because this is -- this is what we want to do. If this is built as advertised, or it can be built as advertised, this fits so many needs. I will bring up something and this is a note of caution. I'm all for this. This is great.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: We had another cottage-style development come up, but I'm not going to mention any names, and we got sold a bill of goods, and it was a pig in a poke, and they had all the right words, and they got what they wanted. That made us angry.

MR. CROCKETT: I understand that, and my client is here tonight to hear that. And so I think words are duly noted.

MR. MACMANN: Because this -- this is what we want for these lots.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. And to address the one letter that you did get, if I may, there was one letter that was submitted to -- to the Planning Department, and I believe the lady, I believe, she should be on the list. She lives right across the street, but her concern was mainly -- or concerns -- you can read the letter, you know what her concerns were, but she mentions apartments, and that's certainly not the case here. I -- obviously, we've addressed that, so, you know, we would like to reach out and assure her we're not doing apartments, we're doing single family.

MR. MACMANN: Yeah. A conversation with Ms. Donelson would be beneficial.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. MACMANN: And I do appreciate the tack that you all followed in the going door to door and stuff like that. That minimizes concerns and perhaps forestalls snowballing poor communication.

MR. CROCKETT: Right. Correct. And if you -- if you recall, this was tabled at the last meeting. There was a miscommunication, and the reason for that tabling was that we hadn't had that time to get that communication out. So instead of doing that communication, or ignoring it, we decided to table and do that and then come before this Commission.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Well, Mr. Crockett, I wanted a fight, but you didn't give me one. You asked -- you did it. You said everything we wanted to hear. I hope the owner is

genuine and authentic. If it is what you're selling us right now, this is the exact kind of project we want. So the only fight I have is if your owner isn't from the Show-Me State and shows us something else, but, yeah. Good job.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? I just had one question. Let's say this goes through tonight, we say yes. Great. Yeah. Board of Adjustment, they say no. What's your backup plan, or have you even thought that far ahead yet?

MR. CROCKETT: We haven't really thought that far. Well, I shouldn't say that. We have thought that far. We don't want to kind of put too much -- we don't want to try go down that rabbit hole too much because we're really hoping that we get the cottage standard. I think if we get denied, I think we have to go back and look at some kind of an R-1 development of some kind. It's not our intent to do R-2. We don't want to do duplexes. There's duplexes across the street. They're already filling a need. They are there, we don't want to put more duplexes in this area. We'd rather have single family. So I'm not saying that we don't have a different type of plan -- something, we don't know exactly what, but we're really hoping for the cottage standard. That's what we really want. And, you know, I really would -- I'm going to be a big supporter of getting the Code changed. Obviously, we like the Code, the UDC works well. There's a few things that need to be ironed out, and we're working through that, and that's normal for a new Code. Right? But the idea here is is the reason why I was nervous about doing the R-2 is because I come before you, I go to Council, I get R-2, and then we want to make sure that we have -- there's not the perception that we're doing duplexes. You know, then we turn around and say don't go to the Board of Adjustment, now that we've got R-2, we can do duplexes. That's not our intent, and we don't want to do that. So I believe having a change in the Code, we talked with the Planning Department about this numerous times, and they agree, is going to give a lot of relief to that especially with the neighbors when we try to tell them, yes, I want duplex zoning, but I'm not going to do duplexes, you know. So we're going to be the big supporters and work with staff to try to get that worked out.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think you'll have a lot of people on this side of the dais, as well, who would like to see that worked out.

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

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

MR. CROCKETT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next speaker on this case? Name and address?

MS. DOKKEN: Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street. And I'm just joining everyone else in

saying this seems like a really good idea and I hope it goes through. We definitely need appropriate infill development and more central density in the City, and more efficient use of resources. It sounds good.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any questions? Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak on this case? No? Oh, sorry. Yes?

MS. BURNS: I was hoping that the applicants could speak. I was interested in your communications with the neighbors that you spoke with.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I tried to let you come up without getting called out.

MR. RAU: I'm forced to. Adam Rau, 1312 Willowcreek Lane, and I'm the owner of the property.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Questions for this speaker? Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Thank you. Could you share the communications you had positive, negative questions. What was the response to the neighbors?

MR. RAU: I went around on -- I tried to think of the best time to not be a creepy guy knocking on people's doors. It gets dark at 4:30, you know. I went on Saturday, about 11:00 a.m., right during the World Cup final, so I did watch a little bit of that with a couple there at the end. Behind the door -- behind the property, they had lived there 50 years. Maybe the homeowner just had some general questions about, you know, what if I don't want it, you know, what were his wishes, so on and so forth. I said, you know, if it's not something you're interested in, you've got an opportunity to speak on it, go down there. I don't -- I don't think that they showed up to do that. I don't see them here tonight. So -- another neighbor who was directly adjacent behind it didn't want people looking in her back window. She felt that the property was elevated above hers, and she didn't like that idea. I shared with her, you know, there -- it's very deep lots, so the properties will be, you know, a little further forward. If we need to, we'll plant some trees in the back, but, you know, the goal is to make it an economical appealing property, and if we're just staring in other people's back windows, they can do that anywhere else. So, you know, my goal is not to make something that's not enjoyable for either the new homeowners or the existing neighbors.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I want to hear out of your mouth. What are your intentions with this property if you get R-2?

MR. RAU: Yes. My goal is cottage-style single-family homes. That's what we will do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? I did have a question. The property that -- or

the building that is currently on the property, it looks like it might be a 1950s, 1960s?

MR. RAU: It is available for rent if you would like to stay in there until this process is over.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But it's not -- it's not a heritage home or over 100 years old, or any of those?

MR. RAU: It is not. It's a -- craziest floor plan you've ever seen in your life, and it's a 19-something. 1951.

MS. GEUEA JONES: 1951.

MR. RAU: Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Last call? Thank you very much for being here tonight.

MR. RAU: Thank you for the opportunity.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you for coming forward. Anyone else? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: We'll move on to Commissioner comments on this case. Any Commissioner want to comment, or do we want to go into motions and --

MS. BURNS: I'll comment.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Burns?

MS. BURNS: Yeah. You know, I'm surprised because this is so heavily surrounded by R-1 that we haven't seen anyone coming to comment on this pro or con. Since there aren't people who are opposed to this, I -- I, with others, am very supportive of -- of what's attempted to be done here. I just -- I do have concerns about the heavily R-1 surrounded, existing R-1 lot being moved to R-2.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just a thing to reiterate again, we will -- we will eventually get to more of a by right with the cottage thing. I think that will alleviate some of these concerns. And as far as the neighbors, Mr. -- is Rau? Okay. Mr. Rau mentioned in a BOA, a replat, we have some buffering, and there will be some buffering to the -- and that will allow people to see that more clearly. I'm concerned about Ms. Donelson's response, because I -- you know, I don't know her, I just have what she's saying here. But this seems to fit and is a primo property. If you want to sell that to anyone, that would be a great deal. I think we should approve this and pay very close attention to it, and I'll refer back to the other project where we got sold a bill of goods, and I still have a bitter taste in my mouth about that. But I plan to -- I do plan to support this, and to follow it closely.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Yeah. I have very similar feelings to what has already been stated.

I think this is a great project. I do support the cottage-style development, and I hope that this moves through with Board of Adjustments, as well. In -- In particular, I look forward to the opportunity to see a cottage-style development go through with straight zoning, with R-2 zoning, as opposed to a PD plan, so I'm actually glad that that's a route that you're taking because I'd like to see that part of our Code work and get used. So thanks for using it, and I hope that it gets used well and that it's -- receives support from the community. I also appreciate the community outreach that you did, and that level of personal outreach is definitely appreciated by the community and by the Commissioners here. So best of luck.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: The proposed project on Northridge, the PD project, there was quite a few neighborhood comments on that proposal. And it wasn't necessarily in favor of the more - the smaller lots, but we still supported it because we saw it as an appropriate fit and an appropriate use. The fact that we're not receiving many neighborhood comments, and I appreciate Ms. Donelson's antipathy to having construction across the street, but unfortunately, that simply occurs from time to time, especially when you have an infant. But that strikes me that Oakland Gravel does have more of a mixed density along it and that the neighborhood is -- does see that this is a better fit along that with the duplexes across the street and the other densities up the street. So given we saw this as an appropriate density nearby, I do support this as a density at this location, as well.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further comment?

MR. MACMANN: If my fellow Commissioners have no other questions or concerns, I'd like to make a motion. In the matter of Case 08-2023, rezone from R-1 to R-2, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

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

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Wilson,

Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms.

Placier.

Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.

Thank you very much.

In the matter of Case 08-2023, rezone from R-1 to R-2, move to approve.

Yes: 8 - Burns, Loe, Stanton, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Placier and Wilson

Excused: 1 - Kimbell

Case # 54-2023

A request by the City of Columbia to revise Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) Sections 29-1.11(a) [Definitions], 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted Use Table], and 29-3.3 (qq) [Use-specific Standards] to incorporate new and revised definitions as well as revised use-specific standards to said sections that are reflective of changes to the regulation of marijuana as authorized by Article XIV of the State Constitution.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the regulatory revisions to Sections 29-1.11(a), 29-3.2, Table 3-1.1, and 29-3.3(qq) of the UDC so as to ensure conformance with the marijuana regulations contained within Article XIV of the State Constitution.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Do we need three separate votes?

MS. THOMPSON: I would advise three separate votes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Three separate votes. Roger that. Before we go to questions for staff, are there any Commissioners who received outside communication. If so, please disclose it so that we can all have the same information. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone here from the public who wishes to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commissioner comment on this case? For the benefit of the public and the record, we did spend a work session on this, and this has been thoroughly researched by the legal department, so the lack of discussion is not an indication of lack of work. Seeing no public or Commissioner comment, would anyone like to make a motion?

MR. MACMANN: I will. I need to make, as she said, three separate, and the first one is the 29-1.11(a); is that correct?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MR. MACMANN: The motion would be along the lines of move to amend as presented? Would that be sufficient?

MS. THOMPSON: That would be sufficient. I would also ask that for the approval of the first and recommendation that you subject it to minor technical corrections.

MR. MACMANN: Understood. In the matter of amending City Code to better fit the new Article XIV changes to the Missouri Constitution, I move to approve Section 29-1.11(a) [Definitions] with minor technical corrections. Is that sufficient, or do I need to add anything to that? I want to make sure our language is good.

MS. THOMPSON: That's sufficient for me.

MR. MACMANN: So moved.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier. Motion carries 8-0.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight votes to approve; the motion is carried.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to the next text change, is there any Commissioner comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Seeing no further comment, in the matter of amending definitions in 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1, I move to amend those as presented with minor technical corrections.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MR. MACMANN: Staff -- legal is nodding at me, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Mr. Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion. Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, roll call when you're ready.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval). Voting Yes: Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. And moving on to the last change, is there any comment on this change? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Seeing no further comments, in the matter of amending 29-3.1(qq), use specific standards.

MS. THOMPSON: Three point three.

MR. MACMANN: Three point three. Thank you very much. So I was reading it here.

29.3. I'll restart that. In the matter of 29-3.3(qq), use specific standards, amending the definitions to those presented with minor technical corrections, I'll move to approve.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commission Loe. Is there any discussion on this motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, may we have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms.

Wilson,

Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton, Ms. Burns, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms.

Placier. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. With that, that has finished the cases for the night.

Motion #1 - In the matter of amending City Code to better fit the new Article XIV changes to the Missouri Constitution, move to approve Section 29-1.11(a) [Definitions] with minor technical corrections. VOTING YES: Wilson, Loe, Stanton, Burns, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Placier. VOTING NO: None. Motion carries 8-0

Motion # 2 - In the matter of amending the UDC, Section 29-3.2, Table 29-3.1 [Permitted Use Table], move to amend as presented with minor technical corrections. VOTING YES: Wilson, Loe, Stanton, Burns, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Placier. VOTING NO: None. Motion carries 8-0

Motion # 3 - In the matter of Section 29-3.3(qq) [Use specific standards], amending the provisions to those presented with minor technical corrections, move to approve. VOTING YES: Wilson, Loe, Stanton, Burns, MacMann, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Placier. VOTING NO: None. Motion carries 8-0

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: I will now open the floor to public comment. If there is any general public comment that someone would like to make? Seeing no movement.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MR. ZENNER: The next meeting will be January 19th. We will have a work session at 5:30 p.m. We'll discuss with Ms. Thompson some potential training to split that work session with a follow-up from this evening's topic, if needed, after discussing matters with Mr. Smith so we can do some annual Commissioner training, so we start the new year off right. Since we do not have anything particular prepared yet for you, sure, we could probably bring another text change to start discussing, maybe cottage standards,

anyone? So we could possibly bring that forward, as well. Mr. Smith probably will lay an egg if I ask him to produce something, but nonetheless, you know, it's my role as his boss. We'll have something for you for the 5:30 meeting. You do have a regular 7:00 p.m. meeting. We do have some items that will be on that agenda -- just some. So we have the five that you see here before you. It is very possible that 49 and 50 may be delayed, given that they are uniquely tied together. They are the same property, as you can tell from the address. There was a comprehensive rezoning of this land. This is located at the southeast corner of the AC Grindstone Exit and U.S. 63 interchange, and this is property that is being affected by the relocation of the off ramp heading northbound on 63 immediately north of Lenoir. We're working through some issues as it relates to the preliminary plat at this point. Those may not be completely resolved by the 19th, so we may be down to three. And the first two were tabled at the December 22nd meeting, the one off of Balboa Lane that is a rezoning for R-MF to PD, and a PD plan for multi-family expansion on the subject tract. We have the 2005 East Brown Station Road. That is a rezoning request from PD to M-C for a portion of the overall acreage, and then a different parcel, but still part of the same ownership, M-C to I-G. This was originally a property that we thought we would be doing an M-C CUP request on. The applicant informed us that they wanted to continue to move forward with the northern half of the property that is located on Roger Wilson Boulevard going up towards the jail -- the county jail to remain the requested I-G, so that will come before you. And then we have a case off of 506 Garth Avenue. That is an ADU for an R-1 -- or R-1 ADU CUP, so that is one of those that we will have before you, as well. To familiarize yourself with the properties, these were our previously tabled cases on Balboa, as well as East Brown School Road. The M-C larger portion is what is sought to be split zoned in M-C and I-G, the northern portion of that, roughly five and a half acres to go to I-G. And then the tail portion of that property is presently zoned PD as part of the Pride Soccer Park PD plan. It is sought to be brought into the remaining M-C that would be there at the southeast intersection of Roger Wilson and Brown School Road. And then our properties that are remaining on the agenda, the rezoning and the preliminary plat for 3300 New Haven, which may be tabled. And then we have the location of the R-1 ADU CUP request on Garth. Those are the cases that we have coming forward for you for the 19th. We appreciate you coming back from the holidays and look forward to seeing you in two weeks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments?

MR. MACMANN: Before I make that final comment, if it's okay with my fellow

Commissioners, and we do actually have some time, if we got even 30 minutes, I would love to have something noticed so we could actually have -- at least begin a useful conversation on infill of something, whatever you want to call it, just so it's noticed so we can have that conversation if there's time. My fellow Commissioners feeling good about that?

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you're suggesting we add an agenda item called discussion on infill development?

MR. MACMANN: Something along those lines, because this is something that we -- we just went over five years with the UDC, and we've been waiting for this for a long time, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Would any members of the Commission object if we have time at our next work session to a general discussion? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: We've had some more focused discussions on this previously, so I'm wondering --

MR. MACMANN: I'm thinking about kicking the ball off again, that type of thing because it -- you know, but I'm open. I'm open. As long as we start the process, I really don't care where we start.

MS. LOE: Right. I was just wondering if it would be useful to bring some of that previous discussion back.

MR. MACMANN: Well, let's -- if I may.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: If we notice it is a general discussion on infill or something of that nature, anything that's presented and that we choose to discuss under those strictures, I think we'd be fine, as long as everyone is okay with that. Staff?

MR. ZENNER: I think that that's appropriate, and I realize what Ms. Loe is alluding to. We do have a spreadsheet of analysis as it relates to lot areas that has been previously discussed. It's probably been at least two years since the topic was brought up, so it would require probably going back quite a length of time in our archives. I think it may be more appropriate to begin the discussion again utilizing the research that was prepared that Mr. Smith and I have looked at, but we haven't looked at in a long time. I think the bigger issue that we have to deal with is there's two processes that are most likely going to need to be addressed. One deals with the more simplistic revision of -- and I maybe should be careful about saying simplistic -- the more direct and the more straightforward revision of the Code to deal with cottage standards and how that process can be streamlined. The second aspect of the discussion needs to deal with the creation potentially of different zoning definitions -- or different zoning classifications that

accommodate a different lot area minimum, as well as other dimensional changes that may need to be made to the Code to accommodate what we've previously discussed in community forums as missing middle housing and some of the other topics that are critical, I think, in order to address some of the affordability issues that we, as a community, are currently experiencing. So what I would probably want to do, as Mr. MacMann has suggested, is put this on the agenda as a much more general topic to which we then can refine moving forward in the research that was previously done and the ideas offered several years ago about lot area minimums and dealing with how that works, and then also being able to have as a spinoff of that the cottage-style standard discussion, as well, and take two paths going from a more general topic. So we will accommodate that. It must be on an agenda in order to have it discussed, so Mr. MacMann's point is very well taken. I believe we will probably have time. If I recall correctly, our last training session really only took maybe 30 or so minutes to go through, and out of an hour and 15-minute work session, we are not going to spend a lot of time as it relates on the drive-through topic, per se. So we will probably have an adequate amount of time to speak on this additional topic. And this is the type of discussion I like at the end of the meeting. You all can feed us some of the things that you would like to talk about, and we could figure out do we have time. Can we get it in, what research do we have to prepare in order to make it a meaningful discussion, so thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Loe? Oh, sorry.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you.

MS. LOE: I think -- I just mentioned that because I wanted newer Commissioners to know this isn't a new topic for us, and I think perhaps not -- I agree. It's been a while since we've looked at some of those files. But perhaps just listing some of the efforts or endeavors that we had started to look into to help start to generate a list of options could be a good starting place just for this group to look at and consider and also add to.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Just as a matter of curiosity, will the Board of Adjustment be involved in this change at all, or can we just ourselves change that aspect of the Code?

MS. GEUEA JONES: My understanding is they are in more of an enforcement side, so we change the Code and they deal with exceptions and waivers.

MR. ZENNER: In this particular instance, if what I'm understanding Ms. Placier asking, so the optional development standards as written in the current UDC are directly assigned to the Board of Adjustment. So I think to Ms. Geuea Jones' point, making amendments to the structure of the zoning code is really the purview of the Commission

and then Council. So the board is shedding a responsibility of theirs, so they probably wouldn't mind --

MS. PLACIER: Yes. It's seizing some of their power.

MR. ZENNER: I don't know necessarily if they see it that way. They wield enough of it as it relates to granting relief. Again, this comes to a practical matter of allowing truth in advertising when somebody comes before this body, and then ultimately Council, and assurances to the public. So I would think making the change is not going to be seen as something negative to the Board.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further public comment?

IX. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 19, 2023 @ 7 pm (tentative)

X. ADJOURNMENT

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Seeing nothing, I move to adjourn.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Loe. Hearing no objections, we are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 8:13 p.m.)

(Off the record.)