

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes**  
**April 10, 2025**  
**Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**Call to Order**

Commissioners Present –Loe, Ortiz, Placier, Stanton, Walters, Williams, and Wilson  
Commissioners Absent – Brodsky, Geuea Jones  
Staff Present –Craig, Kunz, Halligan, Orendorff, Palmer, Teddy, Zenner

**Introductions**

None

**Approval of Agenda**

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

**Approval of Minutes**

The March 20, 2025 work session minutes approved unanimously.

**New Business**

**A. Definition of “family” & Potential UDC Revisions - Discussion**

Mr. Zenner indicated that Mr. Teddy had prepared the work session topic and turned the meeting over to him to present the research and preliminary recommendations.

Mr. Teddy provided a background of why the topic was before the Commission by way of providing a statement that came directly from the recently completed “Housing Study for Columbia/Boone County” which gave specific recommendation to review and amend the definition of “family” such that barriers associated with housing availability could potentially be addressed. Mr. Teddy explained that the recommendations contained in the report were applicable to not only the City and County, but every municipality within Boone County. He also added that eliminating the current occupancy limits may potentially open up opportunities for “home sharing”.

Mr. Teddy provided an overview of the report that was provided as part of the work session packet starting with “historical” background and how the current the definition was linked to the current residential (R-1, R-2, and R-MF (formerly R-3) zoning districts. He noted that the current definition was a compromise between the City Council and effected/interested residents that did not want more unrelated persons within exclusively zoned single-family districts (i.e. the R-1 district).

Mr. Teddy then discussed his findings within the research he performed for other “peer” cities. He noted many communities still were attempting to define family by relationships, but several took a broader more “straight-forward” approached, but there was a great deal of variation. He further noted that the research used the term “family” and that this search parameter may have resulted in some skewing of the research results.

Mr. Teddy stated that the idea of a multiple unrelated person within a home could potentially be better captured in a definition that focused attention on the idea of the unrelated person’s functioning as a “single house-keeping unit”. Mr. Zenner added that the simplest approach to address the immediate challenge within the current definition, if Mr. Teddy proposed solution were to be implemented, would be to just change the allowance in the R-1 district to a maximum of 4 unrelated residents. Such a change would result in a single maximum permissible occupancy in all residential zoning districts.

He noted that staff would need to perform some GIS analysis to assess how significant the impact of this change would be specifically the “central city” neighborhoods. Mr. Zenner noted that intuitively he believed the impact could be very minimal given the majority of existing zoning in these areas was generally already R-2 and R-MF. A bigger concern he saw in making such a change would be potential parking implications.

There was general Commission discussion on these ideas. Concerns were expressed as to how would there be protections against possible abuse, what would be the substitutions for “person” limits, and possibly establishing a limit that would result in “displacement”. However, in general, Commissioners supported the

concept of using a “broader” definition that did not have all the permeations of who may be considered family as the current definition does.

With respect to the issues of abuse and substitutions of the “person” limits, it was discussed that if a change were implemented, abuse would be a “reactive” enforcement issue similar to the way this matter is addressed presently. Mr. Teddy noted that “over-occupancy” cases were fairly rare in the enforcement records maintained by Neighborhood Services on an annual basis. Mr. Zenner noted that there could be provisions added that dwelling “capacity” could be address in a manner similar to STR occupancy, based on the IPMC, with a maximum of 8 persons regardless of family relationship. Doing so would further align the short- and long-term rental processes. He further noted that adjusting the parking requirements for single- and two-family dwellings could be examined such that required parking would align more closely with what is presented required for multi-family dwellings which is based on “bedrooms” per dwelling.

There was further discussion on these possible approaches and how they may not recognize family size and cultural differences on what is or is not acceptable. Commissioners discussed the issue of dwelling unit capacity and the desire as inclusive as possible such that multi-generational and “non-traditional” family units could occupy a dwelling together. The Commission also recognized that there may be issues created, within certain locations, with parking if the definition were changed and that this should be thoroughly evaluated.

Mr. Teddy stated that the information provided was extremely helpful. He noted that some additional research would be performed expanding a literature review that sought out definitions not solely focused on the term “family” and GIS analysis would be performed. Mr. Zenner noted that given other work session topics that need to be discussed this topic would re-appear on the Commission’s work session agenda at their June 5 meeting.

## **Old Business**

### **A. UDC Text Amendment – Small Lot Use-Specific Standards**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and provided an overview his findings with respect to potential UDC revisions to Article 5 (Subdivisions) and Appendix A relating to the small lot integration text amendment. He noted that development of specific revisions would take some additional time and was hopeful more substantive discussion could be had at an upcoming work session.

Generally speaking, there were approximately 18 references within Art. 5 and Appendix A that would need to be reviewed to ensure, from a subdivision approach, that the new small lots could be created. Mr. Zenner noted that changes to Art. 5 would be fairly limited given much of the impacted regulations were only referenced in Art. 5 and actually defined/regulated by provisions within Appendix A. He noted that there were two exceptions to this. The first dealt with the topic of “Design Adjustments” and the second were dealing with sidewalks. Given recent discussions Mr. Zenner noted that he felt these topics were timely to consider; however, cautioned on tying them to functional revisions necessary to produce small lot efficiently given they could be more challenging to address in an agreeable amendment.

Given the limited amount of work session time, Mr. Zenner just provided an over of the standards subject to revision with some context as to why they needed to change. There was no specific Commission discussion on the identified 18 references. Commissioners understood a more detailed discussion was to occur at an upcoming work session.

## **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 7 pm.

## **Actions taken:**

Motion made to approve the agenda as submitted by Commissioner Loe and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz.  
Motion made to approve the March 20, 2025 work session minutes as presented by Commissioner Loe and seconded by Commissioner Stanton.