



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, May 22, 2025  
5:30 PM

Work Session

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

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** 9 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier, Shannon Wilson, Thomas Williams, Robert Walters, McKenzie Ortiz and David Brodsky

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

**Approved agenda as submitted**

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### **May 8, 2025 Work Session**

The May 8, 2025 work session minutes approved unanimously.

**Approved May 8 work session minutes as presented**

#### V. OLD BUSINESS

##### **A. Short-term Rentals - UDC Amendments Follow-up**

Mr. Zenner provide an overview of the changes made to the regulations following the last work session and noted that there had been discussion with Mr. Craig on the proposed inclusion of the parking standards within proposed Tier 1. Mr. Zenner explained that following this discussion it was concluded that the reduction in the amount of required parking for STRs should only appear in the "Permitted" use section of proposed Tier 1. This conclusion was arrived at after discussion the limitations of the Commission's authority on granting relief to standard zoning provisions. The Commission is only permitted to grant relief to standard zoning provisions when that relief is associated with a PD zoned property. All other relief from the standard provisions of the UDC are delegated to the Board of Adjustment.

Given this conclusion and based upon staff's understanding of the underlying desire to allow the maximum number of operators to participate in the STR market without being impacted by potential on-site/off-street parking requirements, new provisions were created that would restrict dwellings that could not provide sufficient parking to a maximum of 120-nights of annually usage as a permissible option without triggering a CUP provided none of the other CUP factors were triggered. There was general discussion on the proposed exception and concerns were expressed that there was not a limitation on the number of occupants that would be allowed in dwellings that could not met the parking standards. It was observed that is a dwelling could meet IPMC standards for maximum occupancy the revision would be granting a significant amount of relief.

Mr. Zenner noted that staff could examine a possible additional restriction in the exception that would establish a guest cap as well as the night restriction. He noted that most dwellings within the City have been required to provide no fewer than 2 parking spaces for decades regardless of zoning classification. If a restriction of 4 guests and 120-nights were established it would likely cover all possible scenarios and allow at least minimal use of a dwelling that could not or was not willing to provide the required 1space/2 guests standard minimum parking.

There was general Commission discussion on this proposed modification and it was agreed that the provision made sense; however, there also renewed discussion on the value of eliminating current Tier 1 and increasing the level of STR activity from the current 30-nights to 120-nights without any significant oversight. Several Commissioners commented on the necessity to revise the regulations to make them more efficient and reduce burdens upon the staff, Commission, and Council. Additionally, there was discussion that current Tier 1 was unused given there were no other changes in the administrative processes to make it more desirable or efficient than either of the other existing Tiers. Following this discussion, a vote was taken to direct staff to move forward with modifying the text and retaining the provisions to allow some form of parking relief

Mr. Zenner then proceeded to discuss the amendments to the STR definitions explaining why the changes were being made. He noted that an alternative definition for “long-term resident” was being offered to address the idea that authorized long-term tenants were permitted to obtain STR licenses. Given the term “principal residence” was being eliminated, Mr. Zenner explained that revising the definition of “long-term resident” as proposed appeared logical, since a “long-term resident” was referring to both an owner and long-term tenant occupying their “principal residence”. Without “principal residence” being retained, it seemed appropriate to just streamline the regulations and have “owners” and “authorized tenants” defined as individuals eligible to obtain STR licenses. The Commissioners acknowledged the rationale behind the definition adjustments; however, did not express a clear preference on retaining the current “long-term resident” definition or replacing it with the new “authorized tenant” definition. Commissioners indicated they would leave that up to staff to determine which definition was most appropriate for the final draft of the amendments.

Mr. Zenner then moved onto the last section of the changes that had not been previously discussed which dealt with the Permitted Use Table. There was significant discussion on why the Commission chose to have STRs shown as “conditional accessory”, “conditional”, and “permitted” uses within the table. Concern was expressed that the revisions to the table were essentially condoning the fulltime use of a dwelling as an STR by eliminating the “conditional accessory” designation. Mr. Zenner explained that once the use of a dwelling as an STR become its primary use by days it was no longer technically an accessory use to the dwelling; therefore, its designation as “conditional accessory” in the residential zoning categories was moot.

Commissioners asked Mr. Craig if there was a legal reason that STRs in the residential districts needed to remain classified as a “conditional accessory” use. Mr. Craig indicated he could not think of one at that moment and would have to do additional research. Mr. Zenner noted that given the proposed structure of the amendment and the new Tiers, an STR fell into two distinct categories “permitted” or “conditional”. He believed adding “accessory” to the use was simply semantics and had no bearing. Questions were asked about how several other uses within residential dwellings were categorized - specifically home occupations. Mr. Zenner noted that this use was coded as accessory as is an ADU.

Following additional limited discussion on the changes to the Permitted Use Table, the Commission agreed that staff should proceed forward in preparing the final text change for a public hearing on June 5. Mr. Zenner noted that the advertising had already be placed and run earlier in the week. He further noted that the changes discussed during the work session would be incorporated into the final public hearing draft of the amendment.

### **B. UDC Revision - Definition of "Family" Follow-up**

Mr. Teddy apprised the Commission of the additional research and supplemental definitions that had been identified with respect to how family is defined in other communities. He discussed the approaches that Madison, Wisconsin had conducted and talked about how a common theme in many definitions focused on the concept of "a single housekeeping unit".

Given the limited amount of time for Commissioner discussion, the focus was on concerns about not accommodating multi-generational families and possible abuses of any future definition. There was again discussion on how to craft a definition that was very empirical with its basis on already adopted and applied standards such as the IPMC. Staff pointed out several options within the definitions presented that could potentially address some the expressed concerns - specifically the use of the term "single housekeeping unit" and "upto".

If the new definition of family focused on the idea of a single housekeeping unit and stayed away from trying to define family relationship that could lead to a definition that would be inclusive enough to allow for multi-generational families of varying sizes. Incorporating the term "up to" would potentially allow for a caveat to be created for the multi-generational or different cultural groups to occupy the same home as well as place a known cap on occupy throughout the City generally.

Given meeting time was running short and the discussion on the topic was not fully completed it was agreed that this matter would appear on the next work session agenda.

## **VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - June 5, 2025 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)**

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.

**Move to adjourn**