



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, September 22, 2016  
5:30 PM

Work Session

Conference Room 1-B  
Columbia City Hall  
701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** 9 - Tootie Burns, Dan Harder, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Rusty Strodtman, Brian Toohey and Michael MacMann

#### II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Approved without revisions

#### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approved without revisions

#### IV. SPECIAL ITEMS

##### A. Election of Officers

Mr. Strodtman indicated that it was the time of the year to elect the new Commission officers for 2016-2017. He explained the background of why the second meeting in September was chosen for the election instead of in July. He also explained how the voting process would be handled noting that Mr. Zenner had ballots prepared and that each Commission would need to initial their ballot so it could be seen how they voted.

Nominations were taken from the Commissioner for its officers. Commissioner Strodtman was nominated as Chairman. There were no other nominations. Commissioner Loe was nominated as Vice-Chairman. There were no other nominations. Commissioner Burns was nominated as Secretary. There were no other nominations. The Commissioners completed their ballots and Mr. Moehlman computed the results. All nominated Commissioners were elected to their posts unanimously.

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

##### A. Building Permit Report

Mr. Zenner provided the August 2016 building permit reports to the Commissioners for information purposes. He explained the calendar year to date (CYTD) spreadsheets. Mr. Zenner noted that based on the recent permitting of the RISE apartment building and potentially the newest Brookside Building (5th and Elm) that building permit revenue was ahead of last year. He further noted that it is anticipated that revenue will decline in the coming year as it is not certain if there will be additional multi-family projects. Mr. Zenner noted that he was currently unaware of any projects being proposed.

Mr. Zenner indicated that if the Commission desired more detailed information regarding the permit reports he would be happy to ask a representative from the BSD Division to join our next meeting.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

### A. Unified Development Code Update

Mr. Zenner explained that staff was nearing the completion of the final public hearing draft of the UDC and would have it produced by September 26. He stated that it would not be produced in paper except for copies to be provided to the library. Commissioners questioned how they and the public would be able to access the document from the website and if it would be possible to provide the link to the documents directly in the notification e-mail. Mr. Zenner indicated that the link would be in the e-mail and that he would work with the Webmaster to determine if there was a way to get the notice of the draft on the "What's new" scroll at the top of the City's website.

Commission asked several questions regarding the status of the East Campus Overlay and how the comments and correspondence should be handled during the public hearing. Mr. Zenner explained that nothing had been received and that the provisions of the existing code had been added to the UDC to ensure that there was better integration. Several Commissioners questioned if the Overlay's needed to be in the UDC or not. Mr. Zenner said that technically they did not; however, their exclusion would potentially increase opportunities for errors and that such action was inconsistent with the intended purpose of the UDC which was to make information more accessible to the public and development community as it related to development matters. Mr. Zenner further noted that the changes proposed in the East Campus Overlay regardless of its inclusion in the UDC or not would need to be made. They were technical in nature and necessary for code continuity.

Commissioners noted that the correspondence they were receiving expressed concern regarding possible changes that would be slipped into the UDC without public review at the Council level. Mr. Zenner noted that such an action was possible on any ordinance and that was beyond the staff's or the Commission's control. To try to address some of the concerns that changes would go unnoticed Mr. Zenner indicated that he would put in a disclosure statement at the beginning of the East Campus Overlay text indicating that it was modified only for technical purposes. He said he had communicated this to those concerned about a possible "end run" and that was all he could do. It will be left to Council to decide if changes are submitted, after the public hearing, to either accept them or remand them changes back to the Commission for review and a recommendation.

Mr. Zenner continued to explain several significant changes that the staff recently completed within the code to address prior public and Commission comments. The first he explained dealt with the ability to distribute required climax forest protection areas on a site. There was general Commission discussion regarding the

new process. Mr. Zenner noted that the procedure was developed in light of several other related factors that were within the UDC, specifically the definition of what qualifies as climax forest that must be preserved on a site. The Commission did not seek to have the proposed provisions changed.

Related to the issue of climax forest preservation, Mr. Zenner noted that he talked with the City Arborist about the suggestion made by Commissioner Loe regarding logging. The Arborist agreed that the revision to the definition for logging to permit up to 3 existing trees, as defined, per acre to be removed without a logging or tree preservation plan was acceptable. The 3 trees per acre was a cumulative value so a 100 acre site could remove up to 30 trees without a logging or tree plan. This revision was accepted by the Commission.

A second significant issue that was discussed was the creation of standards relating to the permitting delay on annexed property (i.e. Temporary Abeyance). Mr. Zenner explained that a "look-back" period of 3 years was proposed and that the new provisions provided an option for reforestation verses an outright ban on obtaining a building permit for 5 years. He noted that the option for reforestation would require that the 25% of climax forest area needed to be re-established in a single or multiple, when permitted, common lot(s) subject to a planting species schedule included within the provisions. Mr. Zenner further noted that climax forest preserved outside of a regulated area (i.e. stream buffer) could be counted to off-set reforestation requirements, but climax forest within such areas could not be double-counted.

A final issue that was discussed dealt with the provisions of preliminary plat approval and its reduction from 7 to 3 years. Mr. Zenner noted that staff would be creating provisions indicating that one-third of an approved preliminary plat's lots must be recorded within the 3 years following such approval in order for the preliminary plat to remain valid. He noted that the issue of compliance with current engineering standards was already addressed.

## **VII. NEXT MEETING DATE - October 6, 2016 @ 5:30 pm**

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

### **Motion to adjourn at 6:55**

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.