

MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO
MARCH 7, 2024

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Ms. Sharon Geuea Jones
Ms. Valerie Carroll
Ms. Sara Loe
Mr. Anthony Stanton
Mr. Michael MacMann
Ms. Peggy Placier
Ms. Shannon Wilson
Mr. Zack Dunn

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Mr. Matt Ford

STAFF

Mr. Pat Zenner
Mr. Rusty Palmer
Mr. Kiaan Ahamed

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: The March 7th, 2024 Planning and Zoning Commission regular session will now come to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

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

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: Aye. Or here, sorry.

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 Ford? Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MS. CARROLL: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Present.

MS. CARROLL: We have eight; we have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, are there any changes or adjustments to the revised agenda?

MR. ZENNER: No, there are not, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to --

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Mr. Stanton. Thumbs up approval of the agenda? Well, you can approve this one.

MR. DUNN: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: You have to abstain on the next one. There we go.

(Unanimous vote for approval of minutes.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous approval. Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the February 22nd, 2024 regular meeting minutes. Are there any changes or adjustments?

MR. MACMANN: Move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

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

(Seven votes for approval of minutes; one abstention.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: We have seven with Commissioner Dunn abstaining.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case Number 31-2024

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of TKG Storage Mart Partners Portfolio, LLC (owners) seeking approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a self-service storage facility over 14-feet in height, located at 3412 I-70 Drive SE. (This request was tabled at the December 21,2023 and January 18, 2024 Planning Commission meetings to permit revisions to the request in regards to the Design Standards and Guidelines of Section 29-4.6(c) and the Use-specific Standards of Section 29-3.3(w) of the UDC.)

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Rusty Palmer of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested conditional use permit for the construction of a self-service storage facility greater than 14 feet in height on the property addressed 3412 I-70 Drive SE.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? If no one else has one, I just have a clarification. So the building material exception, is that also a matter for BOA, or does approval tonight approve that exception?

MR. PALMER: So that will be -- that is for your consideration to the extent that it would be a condition of your approval. So if what they're showing is -- is adequate to you, a straight up approval is probably okay, but if you're not satisfied with that and you see fit to add a condition of some further articulation or, you know, whatever you would see fit, that can be added as a condition of your approval.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But the 29-4.6(c) are BOA matters?

MR. PALMER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. PALMER: And the -- the -- I'm trying to think back. So that component is a part of the section that allows you the authority to kind of add those conditions, and so that's kind of where we're at now is --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: In the contextual -- it's the contextual based exception.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right.

MR. ZENNER: If you feel that it's not necessary, you have the authority to waive the -- the general compliance requirements for architectural standards.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Got it. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick. The building 100 by 55-ish?

MR. PALMER: I believe. There -- go all the way back. No, it's not.

MR. MACMANN: I'll ask Mr. Crockett when he comes up. I just didn't see it.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. I think -- I think it's around 100 square. Yeah.

MR. MACMANN: It's not jumping out at me. And one last question. What are lighting standards in this situation?]

MR. PALMER: Just whatever the standard for M-C is. I don't know off the top of my head, but it would be similar --

MR. MACMANN: Mr. Zenner --

MR. PALMER: -- to the rest of it.

MR. MACMANN: -- do you know what the standard for M-C is, how tall they can be?

MR. ZENNER: I believe the maximum light standard size is 28 feet. It would be 21 near adjoining residential.

MR. MACMANN: Residential.

MR. ZENNER: So this is going to be in a commercial setting similar to probably what will be --

MR. MACMANN: I was looking around -- it's all -- mostly M-OF around if I'm --

MR. ZENNER: The hotel being M-C and then the Moser's, which would be to the west will be the M-C. M-OF is to the south, so I think we're going to meet the standard requirements inward, downward, and would have the foot candle limitations off property.

MR. MACMANN: The only ones I would be concerned about are the ones, I guess, facing, like, towards the hotel. I wouldn't want that room. All right. Thank you, staff, very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We'll open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward. Name and address for the record. Three minutes if you're an individual, six minutes if you are here for a group, including the applicant.

MR. CROCKETT: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering, 1000 West Nifong. Mr. MacMann, to answer your question to start off, the building is about 100 by 110 is the rough size -- a footprint of the building just to start off with that. So I think Mr. Palmer did a very thorough and good staff report, so I'm going to just kind of quickly skim some of my slides here tonight. I think the overview, I think you did a job. You know, you're pretty familiar with what we're asking for tonight. Again, a conditional use for this specific use. One thing to note is the maximum building height in M-C is 45 feet. What we're asking for here, our building, it is a walk-out as Mr. -- Mr. Palmer indicated. On the high side or the higher side of the parking lot, it's only about 23 feet in height, and on the backside it's 33 feet, so we're not even coming close to that 44 -- or excuse me -- that 45-foot height. We're much less than that in an area that has quite a few taller buildings. We've got the three-story hotel, we've got a six- or seven-story hotel, and some other larger buildings out there, as well. So, you know, you kind of see the location here. Here's the zoning map. Obviously, we're not adjacent to any residential zoning, so we feel, you know, very -- you know, protected by that. Mr. Palmer indicated that we won't see the building from the adjacent right-of-way, and he had a schematic that kind of showed where the location of the building would be, but his schematic kind of showed that on the front side of the trees. There is a tree line between us and I-70 there. So here's our location. You can see that the building itself is going to be shielded, for the most part, by -- from the hotel. The hotel is going to screen us from adjacent right-of-ways. Yes, it is adjacent to the hotel itself. The larger grocer to the west is there and, of course, our existing facility further east. Scanning out just a little bit, you can see all the other commercial developments in the area, so we feel that it's in character with what's already out there. Again, you've seen these depictions. Again, it walks out from one side to the other, from 23 to 33 feet in height. Another depiction there. The green arrow points to where our building is going to be located, so you can see that it's behind the hotel, screened from view. Here's the -- on Keene Street. It's -- again, you can see it's screened. We've got trees that will give it some buffer, as well as the existing buildings. Use specific standards, I think Mr. Palmer went through all those. I'm happy to answer any questions with regards to those. I believe we are in conformance with those. This project has been tabled several

times. It started back in December, the first time it had come before this Commission in December; however, it was tabled for the purpose of going back and making revisions and working with City staff to come up with a plan that had those different building materials in the locations that might be visible from the public view, and so that was the reason for the tabling. We have been working with staff for some time now to get those standards -- get those revisions made so we can be in conformance with those standards. So again, you know, we believe it's consistent with the allowed uses with existing zoning. It's consistent with the specified use standards, promotes an increase in density around an already existing infrastructure, the infrastructure is there for it. It's compatible and it comes to you with support from City staff. So with that, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. I have a quick question. So you're putting tiny bits of brick on here, but the rest of it is still sheet metal?

MR. CROCKETT: Yes. That's basically the plan, yes, ma'am. Because it doesn't have any, really, view from any -- any adjacent areas. It's kind of secluded back in the back corner of the existing site. The metal is going to match the existing facility, the materials on the existing --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. I've seen the existing facility.

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MS. GEUEA JONES: And how does that put you in compliance?

MR. CROCKETT: When we -- talking with City staff, what is it's -- the intent is so that it is an aesthetic, pleasing building from the point of view from where you can see it from the -- from public rights-of-way. And so those locations and where it's visible from public rights-of-way, those are the locations in which on that back corner is where we have put the brick material.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But that's not what it says. It says the -- the exterior shall be constructed entirely of --

MR. CROCKETT: We understand that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. And you said you were -- you made changes to put in compliance with the USS -- you did not do that.

MR. CROCKETT: Yeah. We have made changes working with City staff to make changes to the proposal that's before you tonight. I may have misled you, and I apologize for that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That -- right. I just wanted to make it clear that you're not -- you're still asking for that exception.

MR. CROCKETT: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. I apologize if I'm -- if something is misunderstood, I apologize.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I'm sure what you meant was you were in compliance with what the staff asked you to do.

MR. CROCKETT: We worked together to come up with a plan that's -- yes, not compliance entirely with the regulation, and this is what's before you tonight. Yes, ma'am.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Thank you. Anybody else? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner MacMann.

MR. MACMANN: This is -- as this is a CUP, and if we agree that the exterior plan as presented is sufficient, I think it is in everyone's interest if we would include that in our motion. I mean, I've got the impression from you, Mr. Palmer, and if I got that wrong that we didn't need to, but I think we need to.

MR. PALMER: Yeah. That's up to you.

MR. MACMANN: All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I would agree with that. Any other Commissioner comments? I will say just as -- for me, if this were not three stories tall, I might be okay with allowing it to be 90 percent galvanized metal siding. As it is, I've seen how that stuff wears. I've seen how it looks on their existing facilities. I've seen it in other places. And even if it is behind a hotel, it, to me, goes against the use specific standards that we've created for this CUP, and I -- I don't think I can vote for that exception. I'm fine with the height, I'm just not fine with the exterior. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Pursuant of that line of reasoning, how would I bring that up? As an amendment? We discuss that separately and up and down, and then we've got to put it with the rest of it?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I don't think you even need to do that. We can up and down the whole thing. I could be the only person voting no, if I'm the only person --

MR. MACMANN: Well, I don't know what --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- if I'm the only person that feels that way.

MR. MACMANN: -- everyone else thinks, that's why.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Well, I don't, either. Commissioner Carroll, did I see your hand?

MS. CARROLL: No. I was having technical difficulties.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. No. Okay. Any other comment? Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: I will just say I think it is a little telling that, like, the hotel didn't come to testify in regards to the siding and everything else. You would think that they might have some strong opinions about the appearance of a storage facility right next to them. If they had genuine concerns, I would imagine they would be here.

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's fair. Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I would like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Go ahead.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 31-2024, 3412 I-70 Drive SE, conditional use permit, I move to approve the CUP permitted -- permitted as self-service storage facility over 14 feet in height.

MR. MACMANN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: A motion was made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner MacMann. Is there any further 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: Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Placier, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton. Voting No: Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Wilson, Motion carries 6-2.

MS. CARROLL: We have six to approve, and two no.

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

Case Number 91-2024

A request by A Civil Group (agent), on behalf of Cinnamon Hill, LLC (Owner), for approval of a PD Plan for Lot 108A of the Crosscreek Center C-P Plan to be known as "Fresh Karma PD Plan". The PD plan is proposing the construction of a two-story 5,200 square foot commercial building and a one-story 4,500 square foot comprehensive marijuana dispensary. Associated with this request are two revisions to the approved Statement of Intent(SOI) for Crosscreek Center. The first SOI revision seeks to add a "comprehensive marijuana facility" as a permitted use development-wide and remove a conflicting restricted use within the existing SOI. The second SOI revision seeks to increase allowed on-site signage for Lot 108A specifically. The two-acre subject site is located at the northeast corner of Stadium Boulevard and Highway 63N, and includes the address 1407 Cinnamon Hill Lane.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kiaan Ahamed of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends that the following recommended actions are to be taken:

(1) Approve the requested revisions to the 2008 Statement of Intent "permitted use" list by inclusion of "comprehensive marijuana dispensary facility" and deletion of "head shops and stores selling drug paraphernalia" as well as allowing one (1) additional freestanding monument sign on Lot 108A only.

(2) approve the proposed "Fresh Karma PD Plan" subject to technical corrections.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any of my fellow Commissioners have had any contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclosure so now. Seeing none. Questions for staff? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Quick question, you said 75 parking places?

MR. AHAMED: Seventy-five parking spaces along with eight bicycle spaces, so that would be 83 total.

MR. MACMANN: All right. For a 4,000 square foot building.

MR. ZENNER: And -- and the spec building to the north.

MR. AHAMED: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Fair enough, at the moment. I noticed there on the site plan a

pressurized sewer service -- sewer line is mentioned. Are they having to pump this stuff somewhere?

MR. ZENNER: It does drain to the -- if I am not incorrect -- to the southeast corner of the property, and then it does need to be pumped from the southeast to Cinnamon Hill, and likewise, there would be a similar scenario, if I am not incorrect, for the spec building that is being proposed.

MR. MACMANN: Next question. Do we have to pump it again after it comes off -- are we pumping this?

MR. ZENNER: No. It is the responsibility --

MR. MACMANN: That's the sufficient pumpage. I just -- you know, we get -- I'm loathed to get involved in pushing someone else's sewage for them -- well by paying for it, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: It is pumped from the southeast corner of the site to our gravity line that runs down Cinnamon Hill.

MR. MACMANN: All right. As long as we're not paying for it. Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. ZENNER: And if I may, if there are additional questions, two motions would be warranted here, the first motion being as it relates to the Statement of Intent revisions, the second motion being as it relates to the Fresh Karma PD Plan.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? I have a question. Did either the applicant or staff discuss the possibility of turning this into a straight zoning, because I believe M-C would allow them. Is it a lot problem or --

MR. ZENNER: Well, it -- so this is one of the last two lots that are available for development -- that are realistically available for development. And no, there was no conversation as it related to converting this to a straight zone given that the nature of this development has been in plan for everything. The existing site plan that was approved for this about a year ago and an amendment to the Statement of Intent at that point for the hotel, actually we're returning this to just a little bit larger than the 7,200 square foot building that was originally approved. So we're trying to get through this project. There was a very lengthy discussion with law as it related to how do we amend the Statement of Intent, because so much has occurred out here. And so the approach that we are looking at is to retain it as a planned district for the purposes of just being consistent for all of the other lots, and then to keep the revision to the Statement of Intent consistent with what we have done in the prior Statement of Intent revisions which is isolating the paragraphs within the SOI from 2008 and making the changes accordingly. And that is how we handled the increase in the development's overall square footage with the hotel, and it is how we have handled the introduction of hotels that were previously not clearly clarified as well. So we're trying to keep this one as consistent as we have previously as much as we know. We would all like to be able to be out of the business of planned district. This just seemed a little bit cleaner to keep it this way.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Good answer. I just had to ask.

MR. ZENNER: I appreciate it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public would like to come up, come on up. We'll open public hearing.

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. My name is Jay Gebhardt with A Civil Group. I have a PowerPoint to talk about the signs, if anyone has questions about that in more detail. But to answer your question, Sharon, a little differently than Pat, it was 16 years ago when I did the zoning. It was one of the most difficult projects I've ever worked on, and the neighbors were intensely involved at that time. And there was promises and agreements made through that planned district. So when I came back a year ago and was doing the hotel on this site, I did ask about going -- getting rid of it, and everyone felt like at the time there was -- is just too much baggage to discard with the M-C that had already been discussed and agreed to and that. And, Mike, as far the sewer, that's a private pump station that -- and we didn't design the sewer in Cinnamon Hill, but it's only four feet deep. There's 22 feet of fall across the site, so there's no sewer on Stadium at all down there, so we had to pump it back up -- either that or raise the site, you know, extremely to make it drain.

MR. MACMANN: If I may?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are you done?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. Yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Thank you. I just want to -- given the issue we've had with other neighborhoods and areas that have pumping stations in them and then we're paying for them, and people aren't happy with what we are paying for, I just needed to cover that base.

MR. GEBHARDT: Sure. No problem.

MR. MACMANN: Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Mr. Gebhardt, just a quick question about accessible route to the one-story building. I see that's there's an accessible route from the public sidewalk to the two-story building, but I wasn't -- I didn't see it marked or shown really. I couldn't find it for the one-story building.

MR. GEBHARDT: To the public -- to the public way, is what you're --

MS. LOE: To the public way; correct.

MR. GEBHARDT: You know, that's a good question, Sara. I -- I don't have the answer for that. I think when the construction plans are done, we'll have to address that fully for that. I don't know if that's an actual requirement of the PD plan.

MS. LOE: That's part of the reason, since we're approving a PD plan. Okay.

MR. GEBHARDT: But I will be held to that standard when I do the construction plans.

MS. LOE: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions? Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. You said or the staff report said that you were unable to reach the neighborhood associations. I was looking around and thinking what could that be. I guess those two apartment areas?

MR. GEBHARDT: No, Ms. Placier. So when this was done in 2008, the Shepherd Neighborhood Association on to the west of 63 was extremely involved. And then Timber Hill above us to the north was extremely involved. And part of that mitigation that I was talking about with that is that we're required to notify them. And so we -- when we did the hotel a year ago, we -- we reached out and we got no response the first time. The second time, one of them responded and said they didn't have any comments. And so this time around, we contacted the same group, and we didn't get anything, so -- but we did provide documentation to staff that we did, you know try, so --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: Can you talk to me a bit about the parking? How do you get to 83 spaces again? And --

MR. GEBHARDT: So the spec building to the north is a two-story building --

MS. CARROLL: Uh-huh.

MR. GEBHARDT: -- 5,200 square feet footprint, 10,400 square feet of building. And then the dispensary is 4,500 square feet. So when you do the math and the minimum requirements, you come up with the 76 required. We've done the 75, plus we're allowed to count the bikes toward it, so we've got one of those required spaces is a bike space, and then the others are extra, but they're bike spaces, not additional parking spaces.

MS. CARROLL: Okay. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Just real quick on this -- if you can answer this question, that's fine. I'll ask it loud and maybe staff will answer it. Cinnamon Hill and the other one, are those HOAs or neighborhood associations; do you know?

MR. GEBHARDT: Cinnamon Hill --

MR. MACMANN: That you contacted but --

MR. GEBHARDT: Oh. Timber Hill? They're neighborhood associations.

MR. MACMANN: They are neighborhood associations?

MR. GEBHARDT: Uh-huh.

MR. MACMANN: Okay. That answers the question for me, actually. Thank you very much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

MR. GEBHARDT: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other members of the public to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

MS. GEUEA HONES: Is there any Commissioner comment on the case? Seeing none.
Would someone like to make a motion on the SOI first. Correct? Yes, I'm getting a nod.

MR. MACMANN: That was my question.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner MacMann, go ahead.

MR. MACMANN: And the -- just to clarify, I'm going to run this by staff, if you don't mind, Madam Chair.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. MACMANN: Just to clarify, it would be a motion to approve the SOI revision first, then move on to the PD plan?

MR. ZENNER: That is correct, sir.

MR. MACMANN: All right. Thank you. In the matter of Karma Plan PD SOI revision, I move to approve.

MR. DUNN: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner MacMann; seconded by Commissioner Dunn. 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: Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a further motion in this case? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: In the matter of "Fresh Karma PD Plan," PD Plan approval, Case 91-2024, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The motion was made by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Dunn?

MR. DUNN: Do we need to make any special notations about his commitment to add that sidewalk?

MR. ZENNER: That is a construction plan requirement. They will have to provide accessible route.

MR. DUNN: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further discussion on the motion?

MS. CARROLL: Do we need subject to technical corrections on that one?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Can you say that into the mic?

MS. CARROLL: Do we need subject to technical corrections on that one?

MR. MACMANN: I will accept that amendment, just in case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton, do you accept the amendment on -- I get a thumbs up from Commissioner Stanton. The motion has been amended to include subject to technical corrections. Any further discussion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, whenever you ready, we could have a roll call.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Dunn, Mr. MacMann, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Placier, Ms. Wilson, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton.

Motion carries 8-0.

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Those recommendations will be forwarded to City Council.

Case Number 110-2024

A request by the City of Columbia to amend Sections 29-3.3(gg) [Use Specific Standards - Accessory Dwelling Units] and 29-4.1(a), Table 4.1-1 [Dimensional Standards for Residential Districts] of Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code). The amendments propose revisions to the regulation of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and the dimensional requirements applicable to single- and two-family structures within the R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) district.

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 proposed text change as presented.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Thank you for that presentation, Mr. Zenner. I -- I had a question, but it actually goes back to the work session report. In that report, it notes in the language for the proposed FAR language that the FAR is tied to the principal structure, meaning garage, storage building, and ADU would not count because, and in parentheses, it says ADUs are not proposed as being permitted in the medium and small lots. I just -- I highlighted that because what we're doing right now actually does permit ADUs in medium and small lots. Correct?

MR. ZENNER: That is a very -- that is a very observant connection, and so we will have to make sure that as we discuss that definition of FAR that we come back, we circle back around to that as it relates to our small lot standard.

MS. LOE: All right. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there anyone here from the public to speak on the ADU change? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there any Commissioner comment? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I just -- just a comment. I want to thank staff for the work they've done on

this. I know it hasn't been easy and I know it's taken a while, and I know that, in this case, you guys have kind of put a punching bag. So sometimes that's a deserved thing and sometimes it's not, and in this case, I don't think it was. I have no other comments at this time.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I just wanted to comment that I was pleased to see a citizen and resident of the central neighborhood bring this forward. We don't have that happen too often, that someone would bring forward an ordinance revision, and that's something that maybe we should encourage once in a while.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Yes. That -- To piggyback on my colleague's point, but she had a lot of help that -- behind. There was the Housing Coalition that worked. She's an architect. She has an ADU. I mean, you know, there was a lot of back -- back-end work, and, you know, I'm glad it came together in a concise clear way to us. But, yeah, we do need to maybe encourage more coalition-oriented discussion and opinion about what we do.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Carroll?

MS. CARROLL: I just wanted to say that I'm very excited to see these amendments come forward. In a lot of ways, they go farther than I thought was possible, and I'm excited to see that change. By the group that's here tonight, I take that to mean that there is quite a bit of support and the perception of ADUs has shifted in our community, and I hope that continues to be the case as it goes to Council. I also think that in a lot of ways it doesn't go quite as far as I was hoping, and I look forward to the next part of these amendments to see what else we think we can do with this type of housing.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: I'm going to make a motion. And before that, I request of staff and I'm saying this so Council can hear this, that we get some input in 12 to 24 months and see if we need a carrot to go along with these new opening things. In the matter of Case 110-2024, Accessory Dwelling Unit, UDC text change to 29-3.3(gg) and 29.4.1(a), and Table 4.I-1, I move to approve.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: An approval has been moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Carroll, when you're ready, may we have a roll call?

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

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

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

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any members of the public here to give general comments this evening? Seeing none.

VII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: So your next meeting will be on Thursday, the 21st of March. For some reason I'm thinking spring is somewhere here in the air, so that may be closer to the first day of spring maybe. We have a couple of cases that will follow our regular work session at 5:30 p.m., which we will be discussing our lot integration project and we'll be moving in to the next phase of that dealing with our subdivision-related amendments that we will have to be addressing, coming back with the gradation of our ground-floor area, as well as, I think, starting to talk a little bit about what we may want in use-specific standards. Once we have completed that discussion, we will show up here at 7:00 p.m. and you will have these two cases before you. We will have a replat -- or I shouldn't say a replat. This is a final plat of partially, if I'm not incorrect, platted property and unplatted property at 208 St. Joseph. This is to allow for the legalization of the lot to accommodate additional construction of a new dwelling unit on it in order to support a current housing agency that operates here in the City. So Rusty will be giving this report. I have -- in the back of my mind, I have very little information I recall on this right now, unlike usual, but this is a -- it is a -- it requires coming to you even though it's a final plat, because it has not been previously platted. And then the second case that we will have on the agenda is a revision -- a major revision and a PD rezoning of property that is duly frontaged. The principal frontage of the property and where the PD plan currently is applicable is 90 East Leslie Lane. That PD plan would be expanded to include one 107 East Texas Avenue, which is the portion of the property that would be rezoned to PD. And this is for Burrell Behavioral Health, and the 107 East Texas property is presently zoned M-OF, and they would like to have it merged into the PD plan in order to build an additional residential building for their client base in order to help deal with their growth. Maps associated with these two cases, again, there is our Ash Street -- corner of Ash and St. Joseph. The existing building that is there used to be a Boone County Family Resources property, if I recall correctly, which has been transferred to another non-profit, who is now wanting to consolidate the property to build on the very eastern edge of the highlighted area, which has frontage on Ash. That is currently a green space, and they're looking at being able to get a new residential building in on this property. And then, of course, our Burrell property there, spanning East Leslie Lane all the way down to Texas Avenue. So those are your two cases for the 21st meeting. We do have a meeting in April -- we have two meetings in April, and the agenda volume will start to pick up a little bit. Right now, we're just a little bit in a lull, but we have been still processing countless concept reviews, and as we generally find, about 75 percent of our concept reviews turn into real cases, so expect to continue to have somewhat of a stream of projects being presented to you here over the next several months. That's all we have to offer. Thank you very much for your contributions this evening and the direction. We will come back with some new and hopefully interesting information for you to start to

evaluate as we move forward in our next phase of lot integration.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

VIII. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments? Commissioner MacMann?

MR. MACMANN: Two things. Once again, I would like to thank all the members of the press and members of academia who were here earlier. Mr. Zenner, to answer your question, 10:06 p.m. on the 19th, it's a leap year.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MACMANN: That said, I move to adjourn.

MR. STANTON: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Adjournment has been moved by Commissioner MacMann and seconded by Commissioner Stanton. Without objection, we stand adjourned.

(Off the record.)

(The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.)