

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
January 21, 2021
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

I. Call to Order

Commissioners Present - Burns, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, and Toohey

Commissioners Absent – McMann

Staff Present – Bacon, Kelley, Palmer, Smith, Thompson, and Zenner.

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

January 7, 2021 work session minutes were adopted as presented unanimously.

V. New Business

Work Session Topics and 2021 PZC Work Program

Ms. Bacon introduced the topic and explained that today’s session would introduce UDC text amendments relating to the Retail use category’s provisions and the Permitted Use Table as a whole. She stated that work had also been done on text amendments for Accessory Commercial Kitchens, Artisan Industry, and Personal Services but those topic would be introduced at the following session if time allowed.

Ms. Bacon discussed the UDC inconsistency in that the Section 29-4.3 references *Retail, General, Small* and *Retail, General, Large* but Section 29-1.11 provides only a singular definition for *Retail, General* without clarifying text for small or large retail. Staff explained that the large retail provision was intended for big box developments. However, a lack of clarifying language created issues during site plan review. Mr. Zenner mentioned that this portion of the amendment was needed to convert departmental policy regarding a conflict into codified regulation. The existing definition referenced “no single use” and staff stated that this was intended to apply to mixed-use buildings which also needed clarification. The commission agreed to bring this item back with revisions to the intent of the mixed-use building matter.

Discussion moved to the topic of the Permitted Use Table in which Mr. Zenner elaborated on the history of Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) as a Planning and Zoning Commission item. Historically, CUPs had been a quasijudicial item acted upon by the Board of Adjustment. Switching this responsibility over to a process that relied upon a public hearing and City Council approval created the potential for politicization of requests that could otherwise be addressed through technical conditions such as use-specific standards. The Commission inquired as to

whether a use requiring a CUP could potentially disincentive development and Mr. Zenner replied that it could as developers may be hesitant to proceed with a proposal that could be politicized.

Mr. Zenner indicated that creating use-specific standards are the appropriate method by which to convert uses from “Conditional” to “Permitted” as it removes the review of vague conditions typically required of CUPS and puts in place specific conditions tailored for review of a specific use on a consistent basis. The Commission discussed the appropriate of uses requiring CUPs versus used permitted subject to use-specific standards. Mr. Teddy commented that CUPs are intended for uses that require site-specific critical review.

When reviewing the Permitted Use Table, Ms. Bacon pointed to uses, including libraries or lodge halls, which were conditional in some districts and permitted in others without use specific standards. She identified several of these as candidates for drafting use-specific standards. The Commission and staff discussed several uses, such as Halfway Houses and Residential Care Facilities, categorized under Group Living and whether or not such uses were similar enough as to condense into fewer defined uses. The general questions arising from discussion were whether these uses were inappropriately lumped together, the same thing, or correct as is.

Some Commissioners commented that there may be security concerns with some group living uses but not with others and that would be one factor in segregating uses. Others mentioned trip generation considerations that should require specific examination of each unique request. A Commissioner followed to say that many CUP requests are unique with variable factors that should be considered through the CUP process.

The Commission stated that we often regulate for the worst case scenario and that we can either deal with the problems on the front end or on the back end referring to regulation versus enforcement. There was discussion as to whether these uses were defined terms produced by another agency such as state or local regulations. Staff agreed to research these uses and consult with other divisions, such as housing, regarding these items.

Ms. Bacon noted some housekeeping items in regards to revising the Permitted Use Table. She indicated a revision fixing the mention of temporary uses; revising the text to omit C-2 as the district no longer exists; and changing the language of “Board” to “Commission” where appropriate as some weren’t changed with the adoption of the UDC.

Staff thanked the Commission for their discussion and reminded the Commission that the next work session would see introduction of draft text amendments.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:59 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the agenda as submitted. Made motion by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Rushing, to approve the January 7, 2021 work session minutes as presented.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
February 4, 2021
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

I. Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Burns, Carroll, Loe, McMann, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, and Toohey
Commissioners Absent – Geuea Jones
Staff Present – Smith (Bacon), Kelley, Palmer, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner.

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

January 21, 2021 work session minutes were adopted as presented unanimously.

V. New Business

Work Session Topics

Mr. Zenner discussed recent correspondence from Paul Land in which Mr. Land indicated that the M-BP (Business/Industrial Park) district is in need of a revision. Mr. Land's concerns centered on Light Industry and its current status as a conditional use in the district. Mr. Zenner indicated that there may be some disconnect between the UDC's definition of Light Industry and Mr. Land's definition. Mr. Zenner indicated that the intent of the conditional use was to reserve space in the business and industrial park for uses that were better suited to this district as opposed to the general IG (Industrial) district. Such uses might include high-tech industries or research & development labs.

Mr. Zenner mentioned that there are approximately less than five acres of M-BP and there has been minimal discussion or interest in the zoning district apart from Mr. Land's request. Staff is bringing this citizen request to the attention of the Commission now as work is already being done on similar text amendments to the UDC. Staff would need direction on whether or not to begin researching this topic and preparing revisions for the Commission's review.

Commissioners indicated that this request and potential revision could undermine the purpose behind the M-BP district which was a sentiment shared by some staff. Commissioners noted that Columbia has a poor reputation with the business community in the region and that Light Industry is the most common classification of manufacturing these days. There was a concern that letting go of the CUP process for this use takes away the ability to address environment impacts on a specific site. The Commission stated that the order in which amendments are researched, drafted, and discussed needs to be prioritized. Mr. Zenner concluded that he would reach out to Mr. Land and ask that he discuss his proposed amendments with other members of

the real estate industry and come make a presentation before the Commission relating to the necessity of the change.

Having concluded discussion on Mr. Land's proposal, Mr. Zenner noted that Ms. Smith would continue to guide the Commission in its review of the Permitted Use Table. Prior to beginning that discussion; however, Ms. Smith noted recent events in which the Columbia Imagined Status Report was accepted by City Council and that the Raising Cane's development would break ground in March.

Following her announcements, she began discussing the Urban Agriculture use within the Permitted Use Table noting that it is not necessarily a pressing issue nor does it entail a complex revision. Staff and the Commission discussed the use's permissibility in the R-MH district. Staff stated that R-MH developments require a site plan and are typically commonly owned which means that Urban Agriculture would not be a principal use in R-MH, but rather more likely a development amenity and could be considered permissible as an accessory use in the district.

Ms. Smith pointed to amendments that would be brought to the Commission at a later date. She pointed to the administrative need to clarify Personal Services as there is some ambiguity in the definition between some specific professions and businesses that fall under either the Office or Personal Services definitions. Staff mentioned Indoor Recreation would be brought forward in the future as there is a concern for large-scale developments that would be out of context in M-N districts adjacent to residential neighborhoods. There would also be future discussion relating to Drive-In Theaters and Outdoor Recreation as there appear to be inconsistencies.

Discussion moved to proposed amendments for uses involving use-specific standards. Mr. Kelley introduced a draft amendment for Accessory Commercial Kitchens that would potentially permit community-serving facilities, such as churches or schools, to lease out underutilized kitchen space to small-scale entrepreneurs. He noted that this amendment was assigned to the PZC via Council direction after a request by the Missouri Women's Business Center (MWBC) and Rock Bridge Christian Church in which the church desired to offer kitchen space to the MWBC for job training.

He noted that the proposed use-specific standards were intended to permit the use while preventing potential negative impacts relating to traffic and commercialization by tying the scale of the use to subject sites. Such proposed standards included limits set on the amount of kitchen space to be used, restrictions regarding on-site retail, and hours of operation. Mr. Kelley indicated that there have been discussions with the Health Department regarding their commercial kitchen reviews and that this draft amendment will be revised to be consistent with their policies.

He said that commercial kitchens as a primary use were permitted in the M-N zone and above, but that any accessory commercial kitchen presently in use in a residential zone could only presently be used for the church or school functions. He clarified that the proposed standards would not regulate church or school functions directly undertaken by the primary user for their mission. The annual pancake breakfast fundraiser held by a church was cited as an example of presently legal use of the kitchens that were entirely permitted now and would not be subject to the proposed use-specific standards. The proposed use standards, if desired, were intended to

apply to churches or schools that chose to rent out their commercial kitchens to outside users such as caterers or food trucks.

Ms. Smith said there was a desire to see if this was an acceptable expansion in the use of the existing kitchens for a commercial purpose and that the proposed standards were being offered to mitigate externalities of commercialization in residential zones. She discussed that staff had been in talks with one of the churches which desired the ability to lease out their kitchen, and had used information on their facility in their research.

There was Commission discussion relating to the economic concerns for churches and the need for job training and business incubators when the barrier to entry of business can be challenging. The current pandemic was cited as a reason for economic flexibility with protections to neighborhoods. Commissioners did not want to negatively impact existing uses or functions.

There was also discussion on how many users, how to effectively regulate commercial kitchens given the unlikelihood of actually conducting trip counts, and the impact of storage and service vehicles and time of day considerations. There was concern that the regulations need to be right-sized and make sense.

There was a desire for more information and research. The Commission asked that food truck operators and churches be queried for data on likely usage, needs, and business practices. There was discussion on how to use business license data to track existing, potential and future commercial kitchen users. There was a desire to consider existing users or existing kitchens which may exceed in size the proposed standards in phasing in any regulations. When and at what scale a conditional use permit versus permitted by right was discussed in terms of context, location and operation considerations.

Staff indicated they would undertake additional research and make the proposed language clearer in how percentages of kitchen used relative to the size of the facility may be calculated. The intent was to make sure a facility was not built with a huge commercial kitchen as the primary use and a church as the secondary user in a residential zone. Large and successful commercial operations were permitted in commercial zoning and so those operations could locate in commercial zoning. There was general discussion that this amendment/the development of use-specific standards should be pursued but with the discussed revisions and reflective of additional research.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:59 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Burns, to approve the agenda as submitted. Made motion by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Burns, to approve the January 21, 2021 work session minutes as presented.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
February 18, 2021
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

I. Call to Order

Commissioners Present - Burns, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Loe, McMann, Rushing, Stanton, and Toohey

Commissioners Absent – Russell

Staff Present – Smith, Teddy, Kelley, Thompson, and Zenner.

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

February 4, 2021 work session minutes were adopted as presented unanimously.

V. New Business

Unified Development Code Text Amendment Project - Zoning

Mr. Zenner provided a summary of where they were in terms of accomplishing this task. He said they would go over two additional topics at this meeting and then come back at the March 18th work session with a batch of revisions for a potential end of April public hearing. He said they anticipated reaching out to constituents on potential amendments for feedback and would need to advertise accordingly. He said they had learned in the last round of code revisions to right-size the batch of amendments so that they weren't overwhelming for the public and Council to get through and comment upon. He thought the conclusion of this meeting's topics would end-cap a digestible package of amendments, with future phases to come.

Mr. Zenner said at the March 4 work session meeting they would review the Commission's powers and responsibilities related to conditional use permits and planned development approvals and their enabling legislation in regards to attendance. He anticipated the Law Department would be involved in the discussion.

Mr. Kelley reviewed the artisan industry code amendments provided for review by the Commission. He went over the intent of the revisions. He said the use was incorporated into the UDC without use-specific standards, which was interesting given the use was permitted in the M-N zone, thus bringing some manufacturing and light industrial types of uses into the neighborhood level commercial district. He said the intent was to encourage the use but to right-size and right scale it in zones as applicable to the intent of each zone in which it is permitted. He said they had reviewed and provided for Commission review information from ReCast City which was a collaboration undertaken by the Business Loop CID and national experts

in their pursuit of promoting maker spaces within their district. The report had information on basing regulations on scale and tying them less to the types of tools that are used in the artisan industry. This is what staff was looking at with this amendment, loosening the definitions in terms of mechanism (human or otherwise) and tools and instead focusing on intensity and scale of operations. The intent was to balance restrictions.

Mr. Kelley also discussed state definitions of breweries and distilleries. The Commission discussed state-wide laws and the pros and cons of how state laws may be applied in local regulations. Mr. Keeley said they had used the information and additional research for guidance in terms of which zones a certain scale of artisan business may be appropriate. Research suggested that at over 15,000 square feet such operations would be better suited in the IG (Industrial) zone due to potential hazardous materials and the by-products of success such as larger amounts of shipping and receiving, etc.

There was discussion on regulations the Orr Street Studios in the North Arts Village Arts District had self-imposed upon their members in terms of activities and by-products that were seen to have negative impacts on those in a shared space. There was discussion on the types of restrictions imposed on glass-making, kilns, metalwork, sculpting and other activities. Safety plans and insurance considerations were also discussed by the Commission. Staff was to be provided with the specific use restrictions imposed on tenants of the Orr Street Studios for review and possible tailoring for inclusion within the final proposed amendment.

There was a need, Commissioners identified, to look at the light industry sections and definitions in terms of noxious and hazardous materials, and how hazardous materials are defined and used throughout the Code of Ordinances. It was described that small amounts of hazardous materials, such as in jewelry making, may be appropriate but that this type of consideration tied directly back to the discussion on limiting scale in certain zones. At some point there is a difference between a mass production of goods and artisan-level production.

Mr. Zenner discussed how the regulations, as common with zoning regulations, would likely be largely complaint-driven. There was discussion on how and where the line should be drawn in terms of activities and scale and the zones specific use types should go into. There was a slippery slope when mechanization is introduced. 3-D printing was discussed.

There was discussion that it would be complicated to capture all types of activities and tools in the definition so that they should be broad but also consider classes of activities. There may need to be a step 1 versus a step 2 or tier 1 tier 2 of types with corresponding regulations. There was further discussion that State definitions may be problematic or need to be considered critically.

Alcohol was defined as a hazardous material, yet the intent here wasn't to prohibit distilleries in the artisan industries use, just mitigate and balance risks. There also needed to be care not to regulate anything in the City's zoning ordinance that was addressed by State licensing requirements and focus more on the land use related considerations zoning is intended to regulate.

There was further discussion on zoning code tools, such as the conditional use permit process, to allow a variety of activities by right but if something more intensive was desired that it would

go through a CUP review process so that the review would permit opportunity to address and mitigate/condition potential issues. Related to this issue, the Commission suggested that staff look at information from the City of Colorado Springs and a joint NAFTA and DOT document that offers guidance on activities and accident likelihood and prevention activities.

Mr. Kelley described research from some cities that have two categories of artisan industries. He stated that his research identified the potential to create regulations applicable to businesses related to food and beverages which are more permissive and those related to manufacturing/sculpting/welding (etc.) which have more restrictive standards.

Mr. Zenner said they should also review the live/work use in the code to see how it relates/fits in/overlaps. He said people start breweries in their garages and that a lot of small-scale manufacturing is begun in small spaces.

Additional discussions on how scale was tied to volume, mass production and regulations were discussed, including local examples at Orr Street Studios and local artisans. Mr. Kelley responded to a question that the state laws had definitions for microbreweries but not micro distilleries.

There was additional discussion on the role of State regulations/licensing, the City's business licensing, and the use of the zoning ordinance. The intent was to protect the characteristics of each zone, and fit the uses within. There was additional discussion, with general consensus to lean more on scale than mechanism. There was discussion to reach out to stakeholders, especially the CIDs and businesses which may be regulated. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Kelley said this was part of the plan. They just needed to bring the topic to the Commission first and get general direction so that they could then engage stakeholders. Mr. Zenner said that was the intent of having a break in the schedule before coming back with the package of revisions, to have stakeholder input time.

There was additional discussion to look at building codes for live/work situations. Mr. Kelley said they had discussed artisan industry elements with the BSD staff and its relationship to the building code, but they identified the need to review live/work as well. There was discussion to start the regulations tighter then work with stakeholders on smaller aspects that could be expanded. For a two tier set of regulations, some Commissioners recommended dropping to 10,000 square feet as the max size without a CUP on more intensive activities. That would then encourage businesses seeking expansion due to success to either go to a district that allows more intensity, or to go through the City process and work out details with the neighbors. The guidance documents that had been discussed should also be used to identify triggers for hazardous materials in terms of quantities or qualities.

Mr. Kelley thanked the Commissioners for provided the input on the artisan industry amendment and noted he had a good understanding of where to begin with making revisions. He stated he looked forward to reviewing the documents discussed and would come back with a modified amendment for the March 18 meeting. Mr. Zenner stated that since there were no additional comments the meeting could now transition to Ms. Smith's presentation.

Ms. Smith reviewed revisions to the definitions of Office, Personal Services and Physical Fitness Centers. She said the revisions were proposed to provide additional clarity based upon some

business models that had come through on business license requests and general clean up needs in the definitions.

For example, there was a redundancy that the code said all office uses were permitted in the personal services definition, which was redundant because the office use was already permitted in any zone personal services were permitted whether it was explicitly called out or not. There was review and general discussion by the Commission of the proposed revisions. The distinction between those providing massages that were not licensed physical therapists, versus LPTs, was discussed. LPTs, as licensed medical providers, were proposed under the revision to go under medical office.

There was discussion on the potential to develop use-specific standards for personal services that may make them a permitted use (or remain a CUP if not fitting into the use-specific standards) in the M-OF (mixed use- office) zone. The Commission said they would review them as this may expand the affordable, incubator types of spaces that smaller personal service providers (barbers were cited as an example) could start out in, then move to larger commercially zoned spaces later if growth occurred. The use-specific standards would largely be scale-related for the same reasons/benefits as discussed in the artisan industry discussion previously held.

Ms. Smith said she appreciated the feedback and they would bring back draft use-specific standards for personal services when they brought back the entirety of the comprehensive revisions to this package of code amendments.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 7:40 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner Burns, seconded by Commissioner Geuea Jones, to approve the agenda as submitted. Made motion by Commissioner Burns, seconded by Commissioner Toohey, to approve the February 4, 2021 work session minutes as presented.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
March 18, 2021
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

I. Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Burns, Carroll, Geuea Jones, Loe, Russell, Stanton, and Toohey
Commissioners Absent – MacMann, Rushing
Staff Present – Kelley, Palmer, Smith, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner.

II. Introductions

III. Approval of Agenda

Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

IV. Approval of Minutes

March 4, 2021 work session minutes adopted as presented unanimously.

V. Old Business

Unified Development Code Text Amendment Project- Zoning

Ms. Smith described where they were in the development of the second phases of UDC text amendments. She described the work undertaken at previous work sessions. She said they were hoping to review revisions to the proposed text amendments for retail, artisan industry, accessory commercial kitchens, personal services, office and physical fitness center this evening, and then schedule, if the Commission felt appropriate and ready, a public hearing for the April 22 meeting. The public hearing would allow public feedback on the amendments.

Ms. Smith also described where they were in terms of public input. There had been correspondence and a meeting with the Business Loop CID (representatives were in attendance) regarding artisan industry, and they had provided a letter which was included in the meeting materials. There had been some discussion with churches but there would be a bigger push to those with commercial kitchens, and other stakeholders to the various amendments, as well as the general public once there was a draft the Commission was comfortable releasing for public comment. Staff outlined the additional outreach efforts they had identified for the stakeholder groups and the typical amendment process that would incorporate comments received as a result of the outreach.

Mr. Kelley discussed information he obtained from the business license office and Health Department which had oversight in terms of inspections and regulations relating to commercial kitchens. He said many tweaks to the codes had been made so that the code regulated zoning aspects and was reflective of the regulations and conditions of the licensure and inspection components which already occur. For instance, many of the Commission and staff concerns

about too many users overusing a commercial kitchen were already addressed by the Health Department and that there was not a need to try and have zoning regulations thereof.

Mr. Kelley summarized where they were with the Artisan Industry text amendment draft, and the conversations that had occurred with the Business Loop CID Executive Director Carrie Gartner and Susan Hart.

He said following the previous work session staff had taken the comments and worked to create two classes of the artisan industry use based upon the feedback. They had looked at the spectrum of uses from those that may be appropriate in impact for the neighborhood level versus uses that at larger scales are much heavier manufacturing or industry and tried to find categories that fit the scale considerations that had also been discussed as the lens by which to consider regulations rather than mechanism characteristics. There was general discussion on the class 1 and class 2 characteristics. There was additional discussion of how the re-use of buildings, especially in the M-DT zone, could impact or be considered in the regulations.

Mr. Kelley discussed the types of criteria a conditional use permit (CUP) process could include for situations/contexts/locations or users in certain zones. A CUP would be the procedural option if an artisan industry's scale or type went beyond what was permitted in the use-specific standards. Commissioners discussed operational and other business considerations that may make something work or not work in a given context and criteria. There was discussion on how to make the rules or expectations known both for permitted users and those interested in pursuing the CUP process.

There was discussion on the scale of use and users in the various classes. The class 1 users were less likely to go the direction of heavy industry as aggregate users. Some Commissioners were concerned that the impact of several class 2 users co-locating in aggregate could have negative impacts or just really an operational model that might be a better fit for an industrial park than what was expected in the commercial zones that permit artisan industries. There was discussion on size and scale considerations that might go outside this line if exceeded by an individual user or by several aggregate users. There was discussion on using some of the parallel language used in a few other code amendments on how a single versus multiple users under one roof could be considered. There was discussion about looking at 15,000 as the line for an individual artisan, and requiring a CUP if a single user was larger, and then a max of 30,000 in aggregate. How to allocate between class 1 and class 2 was discussed, with more concern on the class 2 users. 30,000 total in aggregate class 2 was discussed as an option to consider before a CUP, which could be several small users or up to two 15,000 sq. foot users.

There was a discussion on the live-work sections of the UDC and how to look at it for comparison in determining thresholds and also how additional discussion and work on the live-work sections of the code needed to occur. While related to this discussion, Mr. Kelley said there had been conversations with the Building and Site staff and that they would like to have a more full discussion in the future as code amendments continued. Ms. Loe offered insights into some of the disconnection points between the UDC adopted in 2017 and Building Codes adopted in 2018 in terms of the live/work definition. The definitions and the standards did not align. She also discussed the overlap and disconnect with the home occupation allowance in the code, which allowed 20% of a residential space to be used for the occupation and a CUP for up to 40% in all districts of the UDC, while the building code says more than 10% of a space being

used for work purposes become subject to the live/work interpretation. She asked they look into coordinating these percentages. She said there can be a concern with such differences, especially with the consideration of how many employees are allowed in a building. Mr. Kelley concurred and said they would look at this with more depth.

There was discussion on how entrepreneurs want to know the rules and will also explore the limits of the rules.

In additional discussion on class 2 artisan industry users, it was generally supported that more than 30,000 square feet of users collectively, and more than 15,000 square feet individually, would be the line between permitted and the CUP process. There was discussion on how to include this in the use-specific standards versus the permitted use table. There was discussion on permitting larger scales without a CUP in the M-BP and IG zones. There was direction to look at other similar but more intensive users permitted in these classes to gauge the line of use between artisan industry and manufacturing/production/industrial uses. There was direction to also gain insight from existing users in various zones, such as Dogmaster Distillery and Logboat Brewery and Broadway Brewery, to see how operations were operating presently in terms of business type allocation under a single roof, gross floor area, accessory use considerations, and neighborhood compatibility issues and opportunities. Understanding users and footprints was helpful to the discussion and right-sizing scale and intensity in each zone.

Mr. Kelley outlined the accessory commercial kitchen amendments. Ms. Smith reviewed the remaining code amendments related to retail, office, personal services, and physical fitness centers. Commissioners reviewed the proposed use-specific standards which would permit personal services in the Mixed Use - Office (M-OF) zone at a certain scale. After limited discussion on these text amendments, Commissioners indicated they would like staff to make amendments based upon the evening's discussion points, and prepare drafts for additional public input. They were also comfortable with staff scheduling the April 22 public hearing based upon the feedback being included in the next draft.

Mr. Zenner said staff would proceed accordingly. He noted that the Commission would be looking at some procedural items at the next work session. He also stated that staff would begin internal discussions on the next (third) round of text amendments and identify which needed to be considered by the Commission.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:58 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Burns, to approve the agenda as submitted. Made motion by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Toohey, to approve the March 4, 2021 work session minutes as presented.