



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, December 18, 2025  
5:30 PM

Work Session

Columbia City Hall  
Conference Rm 1A/1B  
701 E Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** 9 - Anthony Stanton, Sharon Geuea Jones, Shannon Wilson, Robert Walters, McKenzie Ortiz, David Brodsky, Les Gray, Kate Stockton and Cody Darr

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

**Approve the agenda as submitted**

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### **December 4, 2025 Work Session**

The December 4, 2025 work session minutes were approved with Commissioners Stanton abstaining.

**Approve minutes as presented**

##### **December 4, 2025 Regular Meeting**

The December 4, 2025 regular Planning Commission minutes were approved with Commissioners Stanton abstaining.

**Approve the minutes as presented**

#### V. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT & LEGAL COUNSEL UPDATES

Mr. Craig provided information on the final decision arrived at with respect to the Commissioner attendance and forfeiture provisions. He noted that beginning with the first PZC meeting in June 2026 (June 4) and moving forward the rolling 12-month "look-back" period will become effective. This conclusion means that beginning on June 4, 2026 any Commission who has accumulated 5 absences within the prior rolling 12 months shall "automatically" forfeit their Commissioner position. This conclusion was arrived at after reviewing the text of UDC as it relates to calculating absences.

Mr. Craig noted that if the Commission desired to discuss this matter in greater depth and/or propose revisions to the text it could be placed on a future Commission work session agenda. Commissioners acknowledged the information and did not indicate a desire to further discuss the matter at a future work session agenda.

Mr. Smith provided an update on 2 City Council agenda items. The first dealt with the review and outcome of the STR request on Eastham Drive. He noted that the City Council looked at the 300-foot separation between the licensed STR along Green Meadows and Eastham more critically than the Commission. Council did not view the fact that the two STRs were accessed from different streets as a reason to not apply the 300-foot separation standard. While this was an observed issue, ultimately the Council voted to deny the request based on the operational/open violation issues associated with the dwelling in a manner similar to that of the Commission.

The second item that Mr. Smith discussed was the rezoning action that was recommended for approval by the Commission at the intersection of Highway 63 and E. Broadway (i.e. The Broadway Apartments). Mr. Smith noted that the Council had questions regarding application of the provisions of Chapter 12A of the City Code (Stormwater) and development within the floodplain and floodway. Notwithstanding these concerns, the Council recommended to approve the request given the proposal would move the acreage out of the "Planned Development" into open R-MF zoning and that the new development proposed would be restricted based on the current Chapter 12A requirements that would be evaluated as part of a formal site plan submission.

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Small Lot Integration Text Amendments - Article 5 & Appendix A**

Mr. Zenner provided an overview of the changes made to the "flag/tier" lot provisions discussed at the prior meeting. He explained that the new text attempted to simplify the procedures and incorporated recommended revisions from the prior meeting. He further explained some of the dimensional limitations that would be imposed on existing lots if they were to be further divided to create new "flag/tier" lots. Mr. Zenner noted that not all existing lots (conforming or otherwise) may be able to be further subdivided without the potential of the existing home on the property being removed. Such situations would most frequently arise given the placement of the existing dwellings on narrow lots (less than 50-feet) given the need to accommodate the 20-foot "irrevocable access easement" and ensure the existing dwelling was not with the easement. Mr. Zenner reiterated that the provisions for "flag/tier" lot creation now clearly delineated the area dedicated for the "irrevocable access easement" could be included in a regulatory required setback.

Commissioners had general discussion on the proposed revisions. There was general support for what was proposed. Mr. Zenner noted that relief from the regulatory standards could be sought at the time of plat approval like any other "design adjustment" if the parcel was just short of being fully regulatorily compliant.

Having discussed the major change made to Article 5, Mr. Zenner moved through the remaining provisions pointing out where "no changes" were needed given the existing language of the Code and the changes proposed in the creation of "flag/tier" lots. He also pointed out where other minor modifications were made

within Sec. 29-5.2 dealing with “design adjustments” and a technical correction relating to an errant subsection reference.

Having completed all revisions to Article 5, Mr. Zenner moved onto discussing proposed changes to Appendix A. He noted that regulatory standards within the Appendix were applicable to both “public” street projects and “private” development projects on unplatted and replatted land. He further noted possible creating a section that addressed “small lot” development specifically would be a worthwhile investment of time to simplify where a developer desiring to create such subdivisions could seek guidance.

Mr. Zenner continued by stating that many of the street standards included several common issues that would need to be corrected. He noted that he was unable to get to all of these “common” corrections, but would have those addressed prior to having the comprehensive revisions on the code completed. For now, he explained that what was shown for the “residential” street standard would generally set the bar for what would be applicable for other street types given the other street types referenced back to the “residential” standard.

He pointed out that given the change in the interpretation of the minimum roadway width sufficient to accommodate on-street parking, a caveat needed to be created that would exempt existing constructed streets from the proposed revisions. Given this observation, where parking was shown within the standards it was proposed that a provision be added that exempted roadways constructed prior to a specific date (i.e. the effective date of the revised Appendix) such that existing on street parking would not be impacted. Commissioners agreed that this made sense.

Mr. Zenner then discussed proposed provisions that would be specifically applicable to “small lot” developments for 16 or more lots. He noted that the choice of the number 16 was to remain consistent with the other provisions created as a part of the UDC revisions with respect to this new style of development. If a developer was proposing fewer than the 16 lots they could request a “design adjustment” to permit the new right of way width. Mr. Zenner explained that the choice of a 36-foot right of way with 24-feet of paving would allow for sidewalks and a compliant roadway to be installed. He noted that reducing the right of way and paving may be possible to something less, but he’d have to follow up with the City’s Traffic Engineer and Fire Department personnel.

The Commission suggested that possibly allowing the use of “one-way” street networks within new “small lot” greenfield developments could be a means by which to reduced right of way width and paving standards. It was noted that the objective was to create alleys in new “greenfield” developments that would serve as the primary “service” corridor to new lots and primary roadway frontage was really only for secondary/emergency access. Mr. Zenner noted he had not considered that as a possible option would discuss it with the other staff members. He cautioned that before saying such an option was truly viable he wanted to ensure there was not an issue in service delivery.

Having discussed the last prepared amendment to the Appendix, Mr. Zenner noted

that he would continue to work on the remaining revisions and provide an update to the Commission at their January 8 work session. He noted that it was likely all amendments would be address by this meeting and the full “small lot” regulatory package would be ready to submit to consultants by the end of January for test.

### **B. Small Lot Integration Visualization & Regulatory Observations**

As a conclusion to the current work session, Mr. Zenner noted that Mr. Kunz had put together a “small lot” visualization that evaluated the proposed provisions discussed over the past year. The basis for the visualization was the Evergreen Cottage development off of Ballenger Lane in northeast Columbia which was the first approved “cottage development” through the Board of Adjustment process. With this brief introduction, Mr. Zenner turned the meeting over to Mr. Kunz.

Mr. Kunz provided an overview and description of the visualization process and several observations that staff had gained from working the proposed regulations into an existing “cottage” development. One observation identified was that typically corner lots would often not be capable of meeting the “small lot” standards given their need to be larger to accommodate setbacks. An additional observation was that potentially the FAR (Floor Area Ratio) and limitation on ground floor site coverage proposed within the regulations may be more restrictive than necessary to produce neighborhoods that have dwelling unit variations. Mr. Kunz went over specific lot area calculations to reinforce the observations and sought comments from the Commissioners with respect to these observations.

There was general Commission discussion which included comments relating to the potential need to eliminate or rethink how FAR and ground floor coverage could be considered. Commissioners noted that the current “cottage” design and the proposed standards were fairly aligned. It was further noted that the design professional likely needed to “sharpen their pencils” to make the current “cottage” design conform to the proposed standards. Concerns were expressed that making significant changes before having the design professionals tell staff and the Commission what was not workable may result in further project delays.

Commissioners were appreciative to see the proposed standards applied to a “real” development parcel and thanked staff for their efforts in producing the visualization. They commented that what was just presented provided clarity on what was within the proposed regulatory text. It was concluded that while several changes could be explored with addressing the FAR and ground floor area maximums it would be best to leave the standards as they are and let the design professional tell the staff and Commission what was not possible.

With that guidance, Mr. Kunz and Mr. Zenner thanked the Commission for their comments and attention. Mr. Zenner noted that the final textural revisions were hopefully going to be presented at the January 8, 2025 work session.

**VII. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 8, 2026 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.

**Move to adjourn**