

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**NOVEMBER 19, 2020**

**Case Number 202-2020**

**A request by Crockett Engineering Consultants (agent), on behalf of George and Joan Pfeneger (owners), for approval to permanently zone 19.06 acres from County R-S (Single-Family Residential) to City R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) upon annexation. The subject site includes two parcels and is located on the west side of Lake of the Woods Road approximately 600 feet north of Geysler Boulevard, and is addressed 2801 North Lake of the Woods Road.**

MS. LOE: May we have a staff report, please.

Staff report was given by Mr. Clint Smith of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the requested R-1 permanent zoning pending annexation of the property.

MS. LOE: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Before we move on to questions for staff, I'd like to ask any Commissioner who has had any ex parte related to this case prior to this meeting to please share that with us so all Commissioners have the benefit of the same information on behalf of the case. Seeing none. Is there -- are there any questions for staff? Ms. Burns?

MS. BURNS: Curious -- I'm just curious about how it will be included in the Urban Service Area if it's -- if this is approved. Is it just redrawn then, and it includes it, or is there a request, or how does that work?

MR. SMITH: No. There's no formal request. It's really -- it's not -- it's not a very dynamic boundary. It's fairly static, it doesn't really change.

MS. BURNS: Okay.

MR. SMITH: And that's something we've been talking, I think, a little bit in context to the Comprehensive Plan, how to evaluate that and how we want to evaluate it going forward. And we've been -- we talked about this site specifically with sewer, actually, looking at some newer criteria for how we determine where that Urban Service Area is, and they determined this would be within a -- a boundary that would meet some of the new parameters that we're -- we may propose. And I don't want to get ahead of myself there, but --

MR. ZENNER: Well, and I think this was part of the discussion, so I would just elaborate on what Mr. Smith has touched on. This is part of a discussion that is within the status report update that we were unable to reach this evening during our work session. So the criteria really that our sewer utility has offered us to present within the status report is one that where sewer is immediately adjacent to a parcel, that City sewer, the boundary of that property, all things being considered equal, would be considered as lying within a revised boundary area. And the plan further -- or the status report further goes to suggest

that there may need to be a more dynamic process established moving forward for adjustments to the Urban Service Area either through more routine amendment or an automatic type of updating of the Urban Service boundary because as parcels are individually developed, obviously, sewer is going to have to be brought through this entire tract of land. The property then immediately to the north of it would then logically be considered inside the Urban Service Boundary because it could be served by City sewer without capital investment, which is the typical process. So that's -- and that would be more consistent, as well, with the idea of annexation being compact and contiguous, and would further facilitate those general objectives that we point out within the Comprehensive Plan itself. That's how growth is supposed to occur, not necessarily how it has in the past where we leap over a large section of City property or County property to go grab an individual parcel of property in the County and then possibly offer capital dollars to extend sewer. So the map that is within the status report, which we'll discuss at our December 10th meeting as a public input and comment session prior to forwarding to City Council has the proposed new boundary map and poses several questions that we will likely need to discuss as part of that public input hearing that we will have on the December 10th agenda.

MS. BURNS: Thank you.

MS. LOE: Additional questions? Mr. Smith?

MR. SMITH: I apologize. I did want to relay; I did have two conversations with nearby residents on this. I think one wound up in the report, resident to the south, and we'll -- it kind of goes into the preliminary plat, as well, and I'll talk about that a little bit, as well, but -- and then another conversation with a resident to the north. And most of those related a little more to the layout, so I'll save kind of the specifics for -- for the next case.

MS. LOE: We're in suspense. Any additional questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MS. LOE: If anyone has any public comments they would like to share on this case? We are going to hold fast. All right. We will close public comment.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MS. LOE: Commission discussion? Mr. Stanton?

MR. STANTON: If there is any -- if there's no comments from my colleagues, I would like to entertain a motion. As it relates to Case 202-2020, I recommend approval of R-1 permanent -- approval of R-1 permanent zoning.

MR. TOOHEY: Second.

MS. LOE: Second by Mr. Toohey. We have a motion on the floor. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing none. Ms. Carroll, may we have roll call, please.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Rushing, Mr. Toohey, Ms. Burns, Ms. Carroll, Ms. Loe, Mr. Stanton. Motion carries 6-0.**

MS. CARROLL: We have six votes to approve. The motion carries.

MS. LOE: Recommendation for R-1 permanent zoning will be forwarded to City Council. That brings us to our final case for the evening.