



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, December 5, 2024

7:00 PM

REGULAR MEETING

Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will now call the Thursday, December 5, 2024 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order. Thank you all for your patience as we worked out our technical issues.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Williams -- Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, you may.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Present.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Geuea Jones?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Williams, here. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Brodsky? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: We have a quorum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

Present: 8 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Sharon Geuea Jones, Peggy Placier, Shannon Wilson, Thomas Williams, Robert Walters and McKenzie Ortiz

Excused: 1 - David Brodsky

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a motion to approve?

MS. PLACIER: So moved.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion to approve the agenda by Commissioner Placier.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Second by Commissioner Ortiz. Thumbs up approval on the agenda?

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Commissioner Walters? Thank you. That's okay. Unanimous. Thank you.

So moved.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Move to approve the minutes.

November 21, 2024 Regular Meeting

MS. GEUEA JONES: We all received a copy of the minutes of our November 21, 2024 regular meeting. Are there any changes or adjustments to the minutes? Seeing none. Is there a motion to approve?

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the minutes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MS. LOE: Second.

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

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Unanimous. Thank you all very much.

Move to approve the minutes.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS & SUBDIVISIONS**Case # 21-2025**

A request by Brush and Associates (agent), on behalf of Kenneth LaFond (owner), for approval of a 3-lot final minor subdivision to be known as "LaFond Subdivision" and a design adjustment from Sec. 29-5.1(d) [Sidewalks] along the subdivision's Brown Station Road and Green Ridge Road frontages. The subject 1.76-acre property is located at the northwest corner of Brown Station Road and Green Ridge Road and is addressed

2912 Green Ridge Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Kirtis Orendorff of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends the following actions:

1. Deny the requested design adjustment waiving sidewalk installation along Brown Station Road and Green Ridge Road.
2. Approve the requested 3-lot final plat to be known as "LaFond Subdivision" subject to:
 - a. Technical corrections
 - b. Submission of construction plans for required sidewalks (if design adjustment is denied)
 - c. Submission of a "performance contract"
 - d. Delayed Council consideration until technical corrections and construction plan approval, if necessary, have been obtained.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Just to double check with legal, we need two motions? One on design adjustment and then one on approval of the plat?

MR. CRAIG: That's correct. I think that's the preferable way to handle the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much.

MR. CRAIG: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Very good. 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? Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just quickly. If you could clarify for me the -- if it's plotted R-1 and you said there's a duplex that's existing, what's the implication of that for the --

MR. ORENDORFF: So --

MR. WILLIAMS: -- the lot that the duplex is on?

MR. ORENDORFF: So it would end up creating a nonconformity in that there would be a multi-family structure on a single-family lot. However, the existing condition is that there are two structures on a single R-1 lot. So while the resulting parcel would be nonconforming, we are lessening the nonconformity by putting at least one structure on one lot.

MR. ZENNER: And from the built environment, I mean, from a zoning perspective, it is a -- it was suggested that in order to correct the inconsistency and the land use type to the zoning, the possibly pursuing a zoning request to change the duplex parcel to R-2, which would be an appropriate zoning, be sought. However, in looking at the surrounding

land use conditions and zoning, it is a predominately R-1 zoned environment, and therefore if redevelopment of that duplex lot were to be proposed through voluntary removal of the duplex, it would be -- only allowed to be improved with a single-family structure, unless it were rezoned. So we -- by -- as Kirtis has pointed out, by creating a separate lot for the duplex, which is the existing -- is a nonconformity, in addition to having two dwelling -- principal dwelling units on the one lot, we are reducing it. But if you were to then pursue rezoning, you would make everything fully compliant if approved. However, if you don't, we are preserving also the opportunity to ensure zoning integrity within the neighborhood should that dwelling unit be removed. So it will function as a legal nonconformity. That legal nonconformity could be expanded provided it isn't encroaching into any other regulated environment. Typically, if the -- if the -- it could be expanded in a minor manner pursuant to our nonconforming requirements. Also pursuant to our nonconforming requirements, if the structure were to be destroyed by an act of God, it would be allowed to be reconstructed in its current configuration on the foundation that is on that property. That is also a provision that exists within our nonconforming provisions of the Code. So we get rid of two structures on one lot by the platting action. We really don't get rid of the fact that there's a duplex here on an R-1 lot, but that duplex has been there since probably the early '70s.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I had a couple of quick questions. Has there been any -- any history of incidents or accidents that have been reported up and down Green Ridge regarding, you know, pedestrian injuries and so forth with vehicles?

MR. ORENDORFF: Not that I'm aware of at this time. No.

MR. WALTERS: If -- second question is, you know, if the City ultimately in the future decided they have funds to -- wanted to build a sidewalk totally up and down Brown Station Road or Green Ridge, if that were to -- would occur, how would that -- how would any adjacent property owners -- would they be assessed any -- any valuating fine, any fees at that point as a result of that construction? If -- if the City decided, hey, we want to put a sidewalk down here and to benefit everybody, would the adjacent property owners be impacted from a monetary point of view?

MR. ORENDORFF: I believe --

MR. ZENNER: So the City does reserve the right to tax bill for the purposes of public sidewalk installation. The properties that would be benefitted from that, that is a process that is rarely been facilitated due to generally the lack of support. We presently have sidewalk projects that are being built as a part of capital investments that may be through

reconstruction of the other roadway. So if Green Ridge Road were reconstructed or Brown Station Road in this particular area, those costs for sidewalk construction associated with the road reconstruction would normally be rolled into one, and there would be no monetary impact. So it would depend on the type of action the City was taking. There is no capital project right now. There is no identified CIP project -- Capital Improvement Project to do sidewalk on either road right-of-way. Therefore, if that were to materialize at some point in the future as a priority, we would likely go through public information meetings, assess support, determine what acquisition of easements or any other rights-of-way may be needed. The subdivision regulations after their adoption -- readoption in 2017 specifically made clear that any property platted after the effective date of the ordinance is required to install sidewalks as a part of that subdivision action. There are very limited exceptions associated with that, and this particular parcel is located in an environment where none of the exceptions that are within the UDC would apply. So this is actually an outright sidewalk installation mandate, unless otherwise waived.

MR. WALTERS: And one last quick question. I did not visit the site. Do these -- either of these two streets have curbs on them?

MR. ZENNER: No.

MR. WALTERS: Okay. That's all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. Thank you very much. We will go to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If any members of the public are here, please come forward one at a time. Six minutes for the applicant in a group; three minutes for an individual. Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. SCHWEIKERT: Good evening. My name is Kevin Schweikert, Brush and Associates, here in Columbia. I'm here representing the property owner and the subdivider, Ken LaFond. Thank you all for your service and your time listening to me this evening. I want to briefly speak about the design adjustment request and give you a little more information possibly. Mr. LaFond purchased the property 17 years ago and has long wanted to divide the portion of ground on the northern side as a new buildable lot and also separate the existing duplex and existing house onto two separate lots for possible future sale of the two structures separately. The result of Mr. LaFond's desire, if approved, benefits the City in that it brings these two structures closer to conformity, as was discussed, to the City of Columbia standards by putting the residential structures, even though one is a duplex, on separate lots. Our reasons for asking for a design

adjustment for the sidewalk are as follows: Number one, construction of the sidewalk along the frontage of this proposed plat would be cost prohibitive due to the 580-foot length. There's a water line along Brown Station Road that will need to be worked around or possibly relocated to construct the sidewalk if, in fact, it's constructed in the normal area that it is. Pavement along Brown Station Road, there is the edge of pavement, the south edge or the east edge, whichever you call it, is at least 35 feet from the right-of-way line. The sidewalk would be built -- the proposed sidewalk would probably be built near the right-of-way line, which would be -- its edge would then be 30 feet from the pavement of the road. There's a three-foot high embankment there. There is a ditch along that drive, so traversing from the sidewalk as it ends back onto the road would be probably not beneficial for pedestrians and possibly dangerous in inclement weather. At -- at the end of the road, you could possibly use the neighbor's driveway to get back onto the pavement, so in my opinions, the walk along Brown Station Road would be rarely used because of the navigation to get there. Also along Green Ridge Road, it was mentioned there's a stream to cross, which is very expensive. The nature of this neighborhood lends itself to having a modest home built on the proposed undeveloped lot making construction of the sidewalk cost prohibitive. Number two, a continuation of the existing conditions of no sidewalk in this area does not constitute a negative outcome on the area. This is a long-established neighborhood that has been in existence since the late 1950s and early 1960s, sixty years or so. If the sidewalk is built, it will most certainly destroy the mature trees that line the area within a foot of the proposed sidewalk location on Green Ridge Road. In addition, the next existing sidewalk northerly of this proposed plan that would provide connectivity is along Blue Ridge Road, which is 1,600 feet away. At the other end of the plat, the walk would have to be extended 900 feet to achieve sidewalk connectivity. This neighborhood was developed over 60 years ago. The possibility of any additional sidewalk to be built because of new development in a long-standing developed area is very unlikely, so it is highly unlikely that this sidewalk will ever connect to another sidewalk. Number three is consistency. I wanted to bring your attention to another almost identical design adjustment request that was approved or granted, Case No. 138-2024, May of this year. The address is at 811 Broadway. It's at the intersection of Broadway and Greenwood Avenue. The neighborhood is also a long-standing developed neighborhood of 60 years or more. Upon requesting to do a two-lot subdivision, a sidewalk would have had to have been built along Greenwood Avenue for 200 feet along the frontage of the plat. Greenwood Avenue has no sidewalk at all, just like this present case we are discussing tonight. The next existing sidewalk to the north is at Ash Street, 1,000 feet away. Broadway does not have -- does have sidewalk along the road, so the

sidewalk would have had connectivity at the intersection. This 811 Broadway property had less hardship and more connectivity than our present case that we are addressing tonight, which is on Brown Station Road and Green Ridge Road. I think if a design adjustment that allowed for not building a sidewalk at 811 Broadway was approved in May, if consistency is desired, then the design adjustment request that we are asking for tonight should be approved. I believe if you were to ask the residents of this neighborhood the question do you think it reasonable to ask or mandate construction of a sidewalk along the frontage of this tract for the right to divide the two existing structures onto separate lots and the right to build one more residential home, I believe a large majority, after considering the above information I just provided would say no. So that's my statement. On behalf of Mr. LaFond, we respectfully ask that you approve the design adjustment request before you. Thank you again for your time and consideration of the matter.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Oh, wait just a minute, sir. Sorry. Questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else to come forward to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any Commissioner comments? Seeing none. We need a motion on the design adjustment.

MR. WALTERS: Is that first before the --

MS. GEUEA JONES: The design adjustment is before the platting action. And we make all -- all motions must be in the affirmative. So all motions are to approve.

MR. WALTERS: Well --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are you going to fight it out?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton, please go ahead.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 21-2025, LaFond Subdivision final plat, I move to approve the following: Three-lot final plat, LaFond Subdivision subject to technical corrections, submission --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do the design adjustment first. Just the design adjustment.

MR. STANTON: Doing the plat first.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Design adjustment first?

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. Do the design adjustment first, then plat, please. Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sorry.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Stanton, can you talk into the microphone as well, please?

MR. STANTON: And rewind here. Okay. As it relates to Case 21-2025, LaFond Subdivision design adjustment, I move to approve the design adjustment waiving sidewalk installation along Brown Station and Green Ridge Road.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton has moved to approve the design adjustment, Commissioner Loe has seconded it. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just on the basis of I think it's important that we provide some rationale given that City staff has recommended that we deny this, I don't think it would be prudent to -- to vote on it without having some -- some discussion. My view of it is that although I understand the purpose of the sidewalk provisions are within the subdivision requirements, that in this case, given the small size and the surrounding area, I don't think that the sidewalk is going to be overly beneficial and serve the purposes that was the intent of the sidewalk requirement in the subdivision. I also note that it really is only adding one additional property, and so, effectively, you are adding a sidewalk for one house. So that's -- that's my reason I intend to vote to approve.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. I was going to just briefly say this Commission, despite the example that the applicant brought forward, has a long history of denying sidewalk waivers. And often even when they are approved, it's on a split vote. I, personally, don't usually vote for sidewalk waivers unless there is a real geographic problem such as a cliff. I think those are about the only times that I have a history of voting yes on sidewalk waivers. I understand the concept of, you know, there's a sidewalk to nowhere. At the same time, there has to be a sidewalk started somewhere. And this is a corner property, so we're getting a sidewalk on two streetways. And so, to me, this is why we have the sidewalk ordinances in place. It is to encourage sidewalk development as people are redeveloping properties. This is an older neighborhood. The fact that this property is being subdivided and development is occurring is an indicator to me that that is likely to continue happening. So I -- I agree with the staff that there is no legitimate reason to give them a waiver here that is anything other than their desire to not expend the resources as they're redeveloping these properties. So I -- I will be a no vote, but we each have our own vote. Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: We do review the sidewalk cases on a case-by-case basis, so I don't feel we have a precedent per se. In this case I would consider that there are no vacant lots on Green Ridge aside from one which appears to be 90 percent in the floodplain and I'm not sure if it is developable. So I don't see -- there's extremely limited development on Green Ridge Road. Both Green Ridge and Brown Station Road are not improved with

gutters, and there is a -- or with curbs, and Brown Station drains to a drainage ditch, so bringing a sidewalk in is introducing a completely new form of drainage and infrastructure that just appears inconsistent. And given the lack of continued development in the neighborhood, I don't see it moving forward in that direction. So I will be supporting the denial -- or I'll be -- yeah, supporting the denial. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Hi. I just want to say that I am going to vote along with City staff's recommendation. As a person who does not drive, who is a frequent pedestrian, I think it's very important to start with sidewalks. You have to start somewhere. And as someone who is on the bicycle/pedestrian commission, we get people begging for sidewalks in their neighborhood very often that are very frustrated who have experienced first-hand what it's like living in the areas like these that have been developed that don't have sidewalks, and I want to avoid people in the future coming to bike/ped for sidewalks. We can do it now, so I'm going to vote along with City staff's recommendation. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Walters?

MR. WALTERS: I -- I plan to support this because I just think it's -- there is no real benefit to having it here. And I think the excuse that you've got to start somewhere isn't as applicable here as it would be if you were closer to an existing sidewalk network or you're amongst -- you're on vacant property that was most likely to be improved adjacent to you where those property owners would then also bear the burden of connecting that sidewalk. Right now it just seems like an unnecessary burden or unfair burden to the property owner to put up a considerable expense to something that will have no connectivity and no value to the general public.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Seeing none. I'll restate the motion. So the motion is to approve the sidewalk adjustment. A yes vote will allow them to not build a sidewalk; a no vote will mean that they do have to build the sidewalk. With that, Commissioner -- unless anybody has anything? Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Stanton,

Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Placier. Voting No: Ms.

Geuea Jones,

Ms. Ortiz. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WILLIAMS: It's six yeses and two nos. That motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next on this case we have the platting action. Is

there a motion on the platting action?

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 21-2025, LaFond Subdivision final plat, I move to approve the following three-lot final plat of LaFond Subdivision subject to technical corrections, submission of construction plans for sidewalks, if -- well, it's been denied -- I mean it's passed.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Right. So they don't need to be read.

MR. STANTON: Delayed City Council consideration until technical corrections and construction plan approve --

MR. CRAIG: I -- I believe with -- with the approval of the design adjustment, we don't -- those conditions don't need to be attached with the --

MR. ZENNER: Technical corrections would need to be, sir.

MR. STANTON: Yeah. So --

MR. CRAIG: Technical corrections would be, but --

MR. ZENNER: Technical corrections, and just as a course of process, the plat will not be forwarded to the City Council until technical corrections have been addressed and approved.

MR. CRAIG: Right.

MR. ZENNER: So the last two bullets are not needed.

MR. CRAIG: Not needed.

MR. ZENNER: The technical corrections are.

MR. CRAIG: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Do we want to restate it?

MR. CRAIG: Yes, please, Commissioner.

MR. STANTON: I move to approve the following three-lot final plat, LaFond Subdivision subject to technical corrections.

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you are ready.

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

MR. WILLIAMS: Eight yeses and zero nos.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Those recommendations will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case for the evening.

Motion to approve the sidewalk adjustment: Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Placier. Voting No: Ms. Geuea Jones, Ms. Ortiz. Motion carries 6-2.

Move to approve the following three-lot final plat, LaFond Subdivision subject to technical corrections. Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton, Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier. Motion carries 8-0.

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case # 25-2025

A request by Crockett Engineering (agent), on behalf of Club Car Wash Prathersville L.L.C. (owner), seeking approval to assign IG (Industrial) zoning as permanent City zoning to a 7.71-acre parcel of land district subject to annexation. The property is currently zoned Boone County M-LP (Planned General Industrial) and is located at 1591 East Prathersville Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. David Kunz of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the request to permanently zone the subject 7.71-acre site to IG (Industrial)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. 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? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward, state your name and address for the record. And six minutes for the applicant and three minutes for others. Go ahead.

MR. GREENE: Good evening, Andy Greene with Crockett Engineering. Our office is at 1000 West Nifong Boulevard, Building number 1, here in Columbia. I'm here tonight to talk about the assignment of permanent zoning of industrial for this property which is currently zoned light industrial planned in the County. It was originally zoned that, I believe, back in the 80s when the first two-story building on the right on the east side of the property was built. I don't know when Club Car Wash acquired it, but this is their headquarter site, and ultimately, they just need more space for office. The increase in office use increases the sewer. Per the sewer agreement, we really have to annex to add more office space here at the site. So as David put it, the IG seems appropriate for this area when you consider all the surrounding zonings and land uses. And I'd be happy to answer any questions.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will close public hearing and go to Commissioner comment.

Any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues don't have any questions, I'd like to entertain a motion.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 25-2025, 1591 East Prathersville Road, permanent zoning, I move to approve the permanent zoning request to the IG zoning district upon annexation.

MS. ORTIZ: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Approval moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, when you are ready.

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

MR. WILLIAMS: Eight to zero, the motion carries.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. Moving on to our next case for the evening.

Move to approve the permanent zoning request

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

Excused: 1 - Brodsky

Case # 26-2025

A request by John Hooker (owner) for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 208 Redwood Road to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 4 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and Sec. 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The 0.15-acre subject site is zoned R-2 (Two-family Dwelling), approximately 270-feet north of the intersection of Redwood Road and W. Ash Street, and is addressed 208 Redwood Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development

Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 208 Redwood Road to be operated as a short-term rental subject to:

1. 210 nights of annual usage
2. Maximum of 4 transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC)

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Before we go to questions for staff, if any members of the Commission have had contact with parties to this case outside of a public hearing, please disclose so now. Seeing none. Are there questions for staff? Seeing none. Oh, sorry. Commissioner Loe, go ahead.

MS. LOE: Thank you. I had a question about the north boundary. The report discusses the adjacency to the school, but then notes that there's mature vegetation surrounding the north boundary of the property. There's also a trail that appears to connect the school to the north end of Redwood Road. I was just curious. This didn't appear to show up in the report.

MR. HALLIGAN: That is correct. There is a trail as you can see in the aerial that would connect that.

MR. ZENNER: I believe that is part of the Again Park improvements as well. Most likely it would come off the end of Redwood providing access from the West Ash environment.

MS. LOE: Just I -- I see it -- there's a little more connection than how I interpreted the staff report as it was written. Thank you.

MR. HALLIGAN: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing -- oh, sorry. Commissioner Williams, go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just a question to staff. Did we approve recently a short-term rental CUP on West Boulevard?

MR. ZENNER: We actually approved two, sir. One just up the street, and if we go back a slide or two. So at the corner of West Ash on the southwest corner of West Ash and North West Boulevard, that is 121 North West Boulevard. That is what is referred to as the Hobbit House. That was approved at our -- approved two planning commission meetings ago, and actually received final approval this past Monday before City Council. And then about midpoint of West Boulevard Elementary at 316 North West Boulevard was another short-term rental that was approved as well. All -- those two, however, are outside of the 300-foot radius. As Ross has pointed out, there is one unregistered identified short-term rental within 300 feet of the subject site.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: If anyone from the public would like to come forward and speak on this case, please do so now. State your name and address for the record. Six minutes for the applicants and groups; and three minutes for --

MR. HOOKER: Hi. I'm John Hooker --

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- individuals.

MR. HOOKER: -- I live at 204 South Garth Avenue, and this is my property. I have owned this property for almost six years now, and it's been a rental property since the 1980s.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Could you -- I'm so sorry. Could you speak more closely to the microphone?

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. I've owned this property --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. HOOKER: -- for almost six years now. It has been a rental property since the 1980s. We recently converted this one to a short-term rental to allow us greater access to be able to take care and manage it. the only contiguous property to this short-term rental is a property that I own at 206 Red Wood Avenue. And then the other access is -- the access that you see there is the access to Again Street Park, itself, at the end of the road. So it's at the end of the dead-end street there. And if there's any other questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Are there any questions for this speaker?
Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Stuff hits the fan, who do I call and how fast is it going to get there?

MR. HOOKER: I live a mile and a half away, and my designated agent lives two miles away.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MR. HOOKER: And we're very careful about who we rent to. We have security cameras on the outside monitoring the front and the back of the house, see how many people come, go. We always ask everybody that we do a short-term rental for why they are in town and what their plans are and how many people are going to be there.

MR. STANTON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing -- well, I -- I have one. The property right next door to it --

MR. HOOKER: Uh-huh.

MS. GEUEA JONES: -- that one is also a long-term rental of yours?

MR. HOOKER: That's a long-term rental, yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. HOOKER: And I own that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah.

MR. HOOKER: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Wonderful. Thank you. Seeing no other questions. Thank you very much. Are there any other members of the public to come forward and speak on this case? Seeing none.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: We will close public hearing and go to Commissioner comments. Any Commissioner comments? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues do not have any other questions, I'd entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 26-2025, 208 Redwood SR -- short-term rental conditional use permit, I move to approve the request for the short-term rental CUP subject to the following: 210 nights of rental; maximum of 4 transient guests regardless of allowance -- of allowing permitted by the IPMC; and two driveway spaces be made available at all times while used as a SR -- STR.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is there a second?

MR. WALTERS: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Walters. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Loe?

MS. LOE: I feel as if this case hits on some points that we've discussed recently in work session, and I'm not sure we've fully resolved those. And given that we've -- there have been other STRs that have come forward in this neighborhood, I have to admit I'm uncomfortable approving another STR in that it is removing long-term residents from an area where we have a school and other community services located. So because of that conflict and because I feel this is unresolved, I actually am not going to support this. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Other discussion? I actually agree with you, Commissioner Loe. We are talking about an increasing concentration here of not just STRs, but STRs that are not the primary residence of the owners and license holder. So I -- I think this is the first time that we have had a case where there is an STR known to be within 300 feet, and it is in a small radius where we have two others that we have already approved. In addition, it is something that we know would otherwise be in long-term rental or could

possibly be in long-term rental and has been in the past. So I am not comfortable with this. We talked a lot as we were developing the ordinance about concentration, and, to me, this is an example of overconcentration in an area where we know we have housing need. So I -- I likewise will not be supporting this. Any further discussion?

Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I definitely respect my colleagues' positions. I think there is enough spacing between the Hobbit House and this. I do think and I'm glad that we're remaining conscious of the concentration. I see it differently. I think, yes, it's close to a school. Yes, it's close to a park. I just see other applications why that short-term rental will be good there. That's just my opinion, and I'm not -- I would probably agree with you more if one more in this area came up. I would be, like, okay. Yeah. But one more outside of what's already there maybe, but we're asking people to come out of the shadows and come to us and go through the process, and listen, and I'll say this to the public, listen -- get up here and get your stuff in and get approved because the more that are approved, the more factors start kicking in. And I don't want to penalize people for not being renegades and being illegally using their property. You know -- you know my big spiel about illegal use. I forgot my famous little phrase, but I got to get it back. But these people are playing the game and this is what we wanted. That is why we spent four years trying to figure it out. I think he has -- they have done what we asked. So, you know, the lesson is hurry up and get your stuff in before concentration becomes a factor to your STR. So I plan to support it.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Placier?

MS. PLACIER: Yeah. I agree with Commissioner Stanton in that it could be perceived as unfairly on discriminating against this particular applicant, even though otherwise, they comply and have been one of the relative early applicants. In reality, I wanted there to be a harder distance requirement, especially in this area, especially because the demand for affordable housing and long-term rentals. I didn't win that, and therefore, this one complies. And I don't think we are on good footing to deny in this instance. Now once this area becomes more saturated -- well, I don't even know how -- I don't even know how we're going to decide if it's saturated because we made the 300 feet a condition like we could be, you know, flexible and go with 200 or whatever. That bothers me a lot in this particular area, but I don't see a basis for denial in this case.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Wonderful points my dear colleague.

MS. PLACIER: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Wonderful points. And I think what the criteria is going to be is the

distance, the number in the area, and the key word here is conditional use. And it's coming before us for us to filter it through our eyes and our experience with this. And I feel no way saying no to another -- to another one that may be closer. I think we're getting to that point, and that's why it comes before us. You met the technical requirements, yes. One thing that we've expressed when we were putting this together is saturation in particular areas. And we have to weigh that with getting these people out from underneath the underground. And if we start zapping them too early, we're only like, what, 12 in. Right? We start zapping them too early, then people are going to go underground, and then we got to pull them out like potatoes. And we don't -- we don't have the resources for that right now. And, you know, I think as long as we continue to be consistent with our decisions, and we're -- we're voicing our opinion now. Hey, this area right here is becoming saturated. Get your stuff in. For everybody else that's still on the underground, get your application in because this is going to start making a difference in who gets a permit and who doesn't.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Wilson?

MS. WILSON: I am appreciative of all of the comments. I am especially appreciative of the applicant's note that he has vetted the individuals who lived there and will continue to do so. Thank you for sharing that, and thank you for your due diligence. And because of that, I plan to support.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: So I share the concern that Commissioner Loe and Geuea Jones have shared about the proximity to the school, and I also share some of the concerns about just the density, the concentration of -- in this area. At the same time, I think, you know, the 300 foot -- you mentioned, Commissioner Geuea Jones about the 300 -- I mean, another one in 300 feet. I don't -- since that's not a -- when it is registered, I don't feel that that should weigh against this applicant. We don't have anything currently in the CUP criteria that reflects specifically on schools, so I don't see, personally, a basis for restricting the applicant from getting a license on that -- on that basis at this time based on how the ordinances are currently written.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any further comments? I think I would feel a lot differently if any of the four that are in the area of the map right now were owner-occupied, whether they were owner-occupied with a 210 CUP or whether they were owner-occupied and never had to come before us. But they're not and that gives me pause. Any final comments before we vote? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: I think we're doing what we're supposed to do. We're setting the tone on how we're going to judge these from here on out. And what weighs on our hearts

are owner-occupied versus, for a lack of a better word, investment property, proximity to schools, a 300-foot radius per STR. These are things that we are looking at and I think we're being pretty consistent throughout our decision so far, and as long as we stay on that path, I think it leaves us room to make the decisions that we're making.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Last call. Seeing none. Commissioner Williams, may we have a roll call?

MR. CRAIG: If I may, do we have a motion on that?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yes.

MR. CRAIG: I'm sorry. I apologize.

MS. GEUEA JONES: We were in discussion.

MR. CRAIG: Pardon me.

MS. GEUEA JONES: It's okay.

MR. CRAIG: Pardon me.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr.

Stanton,

Mr. Williams, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier. Voting No: Ms.

Geuea Jones,

Ms. Loe. Motion carries 6-2.

MR. WILLIAMS: Six to two. The motion carries.

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

Move to approve the request for the short-term rental CUP subject to the following: 210 nights of rental; maximum of 4 transient guests regardless of allowance permitted by the IPMC; and two driveway spaces be made available at all times while used as a STR.

Yes: 6 - Stanton, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

No: 2 - Loe and Geuea Jones

Excused: 1 - Brodsky

Case # 28-2025

A request by Lauren Baxter (agent), on behalf of John and Lauren Baxter (owners), for approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow 700 W. Green Meadows Road to be used as a short-term rental for a maximum of 6 transient guests and up to 210-nights annually pursuant to Sec. 29-3.3(vv) and 29-6.4(m) of the Unified Development Code. The approximately 0.24-acre subject site is zoned R-1 (One-family Dwelling), is located south of the intersection of Crawford Street and W. Green Meadows Road, and is addressed as 700 W. Green Meadows Road.

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

Staff report was given by Mr. Ross Halligan of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the CUP to allow 700 West Green Meadows Road to be operated as a short-term rental subject to:

1. No less than one parking space within the attached 2-car garage be made available at all times the dwelling is used for STR purposes; and
2. Maximum of 210-nights of annual usage
3. Maximum occupancy not to exceed 6 transient guests regardless of potential occupancy allowed by most recently adopted edition of the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) or on-site/off-street parking.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. 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? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please come forward if you -- and, yes, we know it's the picture of the previous one. It's okay.

MR. ZENNER: We're going to go back --

MS. GEUEA JONES: It doesn't affect the vote.

MR. ZENNER: We'll go back to a correct slide.

MR. HALLIGAN: My apologies.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. It's okay. Any members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward, state your name and address for the record. Six minutes for applicants and groups; three minutes for individuals.

MR. BAXTER: Thanks for your time this evening. My name is John Baxter. My wife Lauren and I own the property for three years. We have no -- no comment prepared today, but we're available for any questions you guys may have.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: You heard my little speech before on the last STR.

MR. BAXTER: Sure.

MR. STANTON: So I have two questions.

MR. BAXTER: Yeah.

MR. STANTON: If stuff hits the fan, who do I call and how fast do they get there?

MR. BAXTER: Call us, my wife or I, and we're there pretty quick. We -- we live maybe a six-minute drive away.

MR. STANTON: Okay. Number two, you're in that kind of area where I've heard noise complaint issues and I'm just -- well, this is more of a statement than a question. You're one of the pioneers. If you screw this up, you greatly affect how we -- how other people use this opportunity, so you've got to be the pioneer and do good if you -- if you're approved. Do you understand what I am saying?

MR. BAXTER: Yes, sir.

MR. STANTON: And I say this to everybody, so these first ones, you guys are going to set the tone. You guys screw it up, it's open season. I mean --

MR. BAXTER: Like the previous man, we do -- we vet our guests the same way when they request to stay at our place. We ask them why they are here and they usually tell us -- they always tell us. And we have denied some based on why they say they'd be here. If it sounds like they may be more than others, we've -- we have a good relationship with our neighbors. We let them know our intentions right off the bat and gave them our contact information and always keep that communication and let them know if they ever have any issue at all, that we want to know because we do want to be good neighbors. We want to do things the right way. We don't want to be a nuisance of any kind. We've -- we've never received any type of noise complaint from anyone else, so when we saw that, that was kind of a punch in the gut to us because we do -- we truly do try to do things the right way and be good neighbors. That is a top priority for us.

MR. STANTON: Good to hear that. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you very much. Any other members of the public to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. BRATTON: Hello. My name is Colby. I'm here with my partner, Mia. We live immediately adjacent at 702 West Green Meadows Road, and we just wanted to provide support to this --

MR. CRAIG: I'm sorry to interrupt. We'll -- we'll need a full name.

MR. BRATTON: Colby Bratton.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. CRAIG: All right. Thank you.

MR. BRATTON: Thank you. And we just wanted to provide -- provide support for this. We'd also like to say that we originally were not aware that this has been an STR for the last two and half years or so, but we've not had any issues. We would like to get contact information before we leave, if possible, but we have no objections and we have not had any noise complaints coming from us. So most of the short-term tenants are wonderful. That's it. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Wait just one moment, please. Any questions? Commissioner -- sorry -- Wilson.

MS. WILSON: No questions. Thank you for coming forward.

MR. BRATTON: No problem.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public to speak on this case? Seeing none. We will close public comment and go to Commissioner comment.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments on this case? Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: Madam Chair, if my colleagues do not have any other questions, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 28-2025, 700 West Green Meadows Road, the STR conditional use permit, I move to approve the conditional use permit. Thank you. For 210 nights, maximum of six transient guests regardless of the allowance by the IPMC, conditional use of approval assured no less than one garage parking space be made available while the STR is in use.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any second?

MR. WALTERS: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Walters. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none. Mr. Williams, whenever you are ready.

Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Mr. Stanton,

Ms. Geuea Jones, Mr. Williams, Ms. Loe, Ms. Wilson, Mr. Walters, Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Placier. Motion carries 8-0.

MR. WILLIAMS: Eight to zero, the motion carries.

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

Move to approve the conditional use permit for 210 nights, maximum of six transient guests regardless of the allowance by the IPMC, conditional use of

approval assured no less than one garage parking space be made available while the STR is in use.

Yes: 8 - Loe, Stanton, Geuea Jones, Placier, Wilson, Williams, Walters and Ortiz

Excused: 1 - Brodsky

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Next, public comments. If any members of the public have a general comment they would like to make to the Commissioner, please step forward.

This is your opportunity. Seeing none.

VIII. STAFF COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Mr. Zenner, staff comments?

MR. ZENNER: Yes. You will notice that there seems to be a gap or maybe an error in the date here. It's not as we discussed in our work session. Your next meeting is January 9 of 2025. We are turning the calendar yet again. We do not have any cases for the 19th's meeting, so our work session topics that we had will be carried forward to the January 9th meeting, as well as some continued discussion on our small lot standards project that we have been working on. And then we do have a number of business items on our January 9th, 7:00 p.m. meeting, as those contain -- two of the three. We inadvertently indicated the Prathersville Road annexation request again as a repeat. We actually have a case that is off of Wilson Avenue that is in Benton Stephens. It is a replat of a property that is not formerly platted, and therefore, that will be coming to you and we will show you the graphic of that. We have a request for a PD zoning amendment to an undeveloped parcel down at the Bristol Lake Subdivision at the northwest corner of Bristol Lake Parkway and Gans Road. This was formerly identified as a multi-family development tract within the Bristol Lake Subdivision. It is being proposed to be developed with small cottage style single-family detached houses, and as such, requires a statement of intent revision, and that is what the rezoning action is for. The PD plan is a brand-new PD plan since the subdivision plat and PD plan just showed a vacant lot for this tract back in the mid-2000s when it was originally approved. And then the third item that is on the agenda is another short-term rental CUP request at 1003 Sunset Drive, which is off of West Boulevard, just to the west of Westwinds Drive. Your maps to put us into context. They are at the corner of Wilson and South William is the replat. In essence, what is happening here, you will notice that there's a home in the upper northeast corner of that property. The property line runs north-south on that property. The replatting action proposes to reorient the property line to be east-west, and then the purpose for the platting action is one, we have a sewer line extension that is required, as

well as the property requires Planning Commission review due to it not being a legal -- previously approved lot before the Commission. Your Bristol Lake Parkway parcel, this is the immediate entry corner into Bristol Lake Subdivision up across from Phillips Lake and the fishing pier location of the Phillips Lake Park, property that the City owns. And then on the far graphic, that is our CUP request for the short-term rental there up off of Sunset Drive. Those are your three items for the upcoming agenda. We are starting to clear our docket of projects from the prior year, though our volume of concept reviews which are normally a precursor of activity for the Planning and Zoning Commission, as well as other Council actions aren't slowing down significantly, so that is still a sign that people are wanting to come in and investigate development within the City of Columbia, and we hope we'll be seeing a continuous flow of activities. As we talked about within our work session towards the tail end of our meeting, we are six months now into adopted short-term regulation standards. Compliance is required by June 1st of 2025. As Mr. Stanton has encouraged the public that may watch in TV land that operates short-term rentals, get your paperwork in now. We do need to start seeing more applications in order to be able to effectuate processing them to ensure compliance, and we will as we monitor the application process also be cognizant of how we are ensuring that we are respecting the time of this Commission by not overloading you with requests and will continue to work towards streamlining the application review process before this body to continue to move them through at an appropriate pace. Again, at the close of another year of working with the Commission, and this is the beginning of my 16th year now with the City of Columbia, I don't know how many of these meetings I have sat in and sat before a body of this nature. It is with my heartfelt appreciation and best wishes that you all have a wonderful holiday season, and we look forward to seeing you all again at the beginning of the new year for another year of fun and frolicking as we move through the regulatory process in the City of Columbia. Thank you very much for your attention tonight.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you, Mr. Zenner. If I don't miss my guess, did we have two first presentations, like two of our staffers presented for the first time tonight?

MR. ZENNER: I believe -- I'm hesitating only because I know Kirtis's presentation this evening was the first, and I could have sworn I have had Ross present once before.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Ross presented before?

MS. ORTIZ: Ross has.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Oh, Ross has. Okay. Okay.

MR. ZENNER: So I think what you will start to see, and this is how I had mentioned during work session and so the public that watches in TV land again understands, as the

staff is becoming more familiar with our processes, I will still be behind the rudder guiding the ship, but will not be taking as a direct active role in presenting to you. I will be still conducting your work sessions for you with support from both David Kunz, one of our other planners, and Mr. Palmer. But you are going to start to see some faces and hear some presentations from the rest of the staff now. We're ready to let them loose and allow me to continue to look forward to how do we manage the process. So if you all do have -- with the schedule being released this evening, again, if you do have conflicts for the coming year, please let myself and Ms. Geuea Jones know so we can put those into the schedule. And for the public's benefit, the new schedule for 2025 will be published next week. So that will be available online on the Community Development Department's page under the Planning and Zoning Commission's link that is -- that can be found there.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Well, good job Kirtis and Ross, and I'm glad that we are going into the new year with a full staff or close to a full staff.

MR. ZENNER: Close to full staff.

IX. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any Commissioner comments for the evening?
Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I just want to echo that City's -- thank you to City Staff for your due diligence. Since, I mean, all year, all the time, but it was really nice to see people -- can I say my age too? It -- doing reports, I think that is really cool seeing young people like stepping into their power and, yeah, thank you all for what you do.

MR. ZENNER: I have -- I have used hair for grey -- I'll darken my hair for you so I look younger.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Commissioner Stanton, did you have something you wanted to say?

X. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 9, 2025 @ 7 pm (tentative)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

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

MS. LOE: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Adjournment moved by Commissioner Stanton; seconded by Commissioner Loe. Without objection, we are adjourned. .

(The meeting adjourned at 8:39 p.m.)

(Off the record.)