



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, July 18, 2024
5:30 PM

WORK SESSION

CONFERENCE RM
1A/1B
CITY HALL
701 E BROADWAY

I. CALL TO ORDER

- Present:** 7 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Shannon Wilson, Thomas Williams and Robert Walters
- Excused:** 2 - Peggy Placier and Carl Baysinger

II. INTRODUCTIONS

Chairman Geuea Jones recognized and welcomed the Commission's newest Commissioner, Bob Walters, to the group. She asked that each Commissioner and staff member introduce themselves and requested that Mr. Walters provide a little about his background.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously

Adopt agenda as submitted

- Yes:** 7 - Loe, Stanton, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Wilson, Williams and Walters
- Excused:** 2 - Placier and Baysinger

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 20, 2024 Work Session

Adopt minutes as presented

V. SPECIAL ITEMS

A. Central Columbia Urban Conservation Ordinance and Design Guidelines (Status Report)

Mr. Teddy introduced the topic and provided the full staff report. He began his presentation by requesting that the Commissioners offer feedback on the April meeting materials that were presented by the City's consultant H3 Design Group. He further noted that the full April public meeting materials were available on the City's engagement and public feedback portal Beheard.

Mr. Teddy indicating that the following the April public meeting there was a request made that the process be slowed down to permit the public to more fully understand the three conceptual scenarios presented during the meeting. Mr. Teddy indicated that there was some confusion expressed on what the consultant was seeking in the way of input. As a result of these requests, a "follow-up"

meeting would be held to go over the scenarios in greater detail.

Mr. Teddy provided an overview of the consultant's contracted activities noting that there were two components. First was to offer recommendations on the development of overlay standards for neighborhood preservation purposes within the study area. Second was to develop design guidelines that would provide opportunities to integrate new construction or redevelopment into the existing neighborhoods within the study areas. Mr. Teddy further noted that the consultant was working on 3D models based on the current UDC standards.

Mr. Teddy return to discussing what the objectives of the April public meeting were. He noted that the consultant was seeking input on how many overlays should be created. Mr. Teddy noted that the consultant had previously divided the study area into three geographic parts. One part being west of Providence Road north of W. Broadway, a second part being east of Providence north of E. Broadway, and the third part being east of College Avenue and south of E. Broadway. Within these three areas the consultants showed potentially 5 overlays being established. One overlay would contain neighborhoods west of Providence and north of W. Broadway, a second overly would generally contain the North Central neighborhoods between Providence and College north of E. Broadway, the third overlay would contain the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, and the fourth and/or fifth overlays would contain the East Campus neighborhood (east and west).

Mr. Teddy was asked to define the term "urban conservation" and explain how overlay zoning functioned. Mr. Teddy indicated that "urban conservation" generally was intended to mean preserving existing development patterns while allowing for new construction or redevelopment to occur. Examples were offered to help provide context on the term as well as to explain the concept of overlay zoning. There was general Commission discussion.

Mr. Teddy continued with his presentation noting the there was general consensus on the creation of an overlay for the area west of Providence north of W. Broadway, generally containing the neighborhoods located within the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Plan. However, he noted that there was not consensus on the other overlay areas presented. He then went on to discuss the three various development scenarios presented by the consultant at the April meeting for of the three larger planning areas.

Mr. Teddy commented on the significance of the requested input from the public during the April meeting and noted there was limited added context to assist those in attendance with what was truly being sought in the way of feedback. He offered several examples of the concerns that were expressed by those in attendance. He reiterated that given these concerns a "follow-up" meeting would be held; however, the public and the Commission were being asked to comment on the scenarios that were posted to Beheard. Mr. Teddy noted the consult is reviewing those comments as it continues to move forward with the project.

The Commission asked when their input was to be sought by the consultant. Mr. Teddy noted that the consultant's schedule included a presentation to the Commission once the regulatory framework was developed; however, this presentation was not to be seen as an authorization to begin revising the UDC. Council would need to specifically authorize the Commission to begin working on regulatory changes that may be recommended by the consultant's final work product that would be formally presented to City Council.

There was significant Commission discussion relating to the consultant's work. The Commission indicated that the 3D models being prepared needed to include the proposed "small lot" standards even though they were not adopted. Additionally, the Commission questioned the manner in which the consultant performed its analysis to arrive at the three generally planning areas, the potential 5 overlays, and the development scenarios.

Mr. Teddy explained that he did a driving tour of the study area with the consultants and that they had obtained significant GIS data resources from the city. Mr. Teddy noted that there was no single "special" group meeting at which the consultants collected feedback, but rather all feedback was obtained from the two public meetings that have been held. Mr. Teddy did note the consultants met with stakeholder groups for value decision; however, otherwise used market data and their professional experience to devise the proposed solutions presented during the April meeting.

The Commissioners noted that the consultant's work was missing physical and social implications that could inform how redevelopment would impact the West Ash area. It appeared to many Commissioners that neighborhood stabilization was only being provided within the Area 2 (east of Providence north of E. Broadway) and Area 3 (east of College south of E. Broadway). Commissioners noted that the consultants needed to protect those individuals without resources and that emphasis needed to be placed on those areas that were under-represented. It was suggested that the consultants obtain the list of contacts that Dr. Boston (the Boone County Housing Study consultant) had obtain to reach the under-represented and get them engaged into this project.

The Commissioners further requested that Mr. Teddy seek to obtain the public comments in their "raw" form from the consultants to ensure that what was being presented was actually what was being offered. The Commission further desired that the consultant's work provide greater "qualitative" research to support their recommendations, submit a housing stock analysis for review, discuss regulatory approaches with the Commission before finalizing them, and incorporate more GIS data into their findings.

Mr. Teddy thank the Commission for their attention and contributions. He noted that he would pass them along to the consultant.

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - August 8, 2024 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)

VII. ADJOURNMENT