



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, October 24, 2019
5:30 PM

Work Session

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Present: 6 - Sara Loe, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Rusty Strodtman, Brian Toohey and Michael MacMann

Excused: 3 - Tootie Burns, Joy Rushing and Valerie Carroll

II. INTRODUCTIONS

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion made by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Stanton to approve the agenda as modified to table discussion on member attendance and public comments until the following meeting.

Adopt agenda as amended

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 10, 2019 Work Session

Attachments: [Work Session Minutes](#)

Motion by Commissioner Russell, seconded by Commissioner Stanton to approve the October 10 work session minutes as submitted.

Adopted October 10 work session minutes without modification

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. September 2019 Building Permit Report

Attachments: [Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)

[September 2019 Permit Summary](#)

[2019 CYTD Permit Summary](#)

[3 year \(2018-2016\) CYTD Permit Summary](#)

Mr. Zenner provided a summary of the September Building Permit Report. Limited discussion was had.

B. PZC Member Attendance and Public Comments

This item was tabled until the November 7 Commission work session.

VI. OLD BUSINESS**A. Street Trees in the Public Right of Way - Follow up**

Attachments: [Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)
[Proposed Text Change Options](#)

Mr. Zenner provided a summary of the previous discussion regarding the desire to address technical and practical challenges with the location of street trees required by the UDC in terms of conflicts with utility placement in the public right of way. Mr. Zenner summarized the outcome of the October 10 work session. He said staff had provided the potential third option in text format with the staff memo. He outlined the three options the Commission had been reviewing. He said all added the term "tree lawn" to describe the tree lawn area. He also noted that each of the options including provisions for soil amendments for tree survival and included additional flexibility to allow the arborist to work with applicants in terms of tree species and tree placement give unique site conditions.

There was discussion about the application of provisions within Chapter 24 that address tree root conflicts with underground utilities (i.e. root barriers) and how these provisions could address the negative impacts to sidewalks and other infrastructure. There was also discussion regarding placement of trees on private property rather than in the ROW and how such locations would create challenges with maintenance. Mr. Zenner noted that the way the proposed ordinance revisions were prepared the maintenance of such trees would become the responsibility of the property owners; however, this added responsibility was off-set by the ability of those trees to be credited toward addressing other landscaping requirements. Commissioners discussed the costs such provisions would create and expressed concerns about non-owner impacts to trees on private property caused by deer, disease, etc. There was discussion of allowing some trees maintained by homeowners in the tree lawn to count for other landscape requirements under certain instances as a means of creating an incentive to want them to be located there.

Mr. Zenner explained that a major addition to the requirements, which was not addressed clearly during original discussion, dealt with a clarification on when the regulations would be effective. He noted that this clarification was necessary to address the issue of "one-lot infill" projects where it was generally not practical or realistic to expect street trees to be planted. Mr. Zenner compared this situation to that experienced with sidewalks that are required in areas where none exist. He said the clarification would make it clear when street trees were required and would reduce the need variance requests.

Mr. Zenner noted that the clarification offered in all three options made clear that street trees would be required along new constructed or redeveloped rights of way. He noted that this clarification was provided at the beginning of the provisions dealing with street trees. He further stated that the element of redevelopment was addressed at the end of the provisions. Mr. Zenner noted that under a redevelopment scenario the requirement of street trees was explicitly not

required for lots fronting on existing streets and would only be triggered if the street were undergoing full block length redevelopment.

Commissioner's discussed the proposed clarification and expressed a desire to further clarify what was intended by "full block" redevelopment. Following additional discussion, Commissioners agreed that the provisions dealing with redevelopment needed to be based upon a minimum of at least 50% of the linear block face on both sides of the street undergoing redevelopment as the threshold at which point street trees would be required. Commissioners agreed that when a conflict in underground utility placement prevented street trees from being installed on both sides of the street they would only be required to be on a single side where the underground utility was not located.

Having addressed the new provisions and reviewing the options with the Commission, Mr. Zenner sought to gain consensus on what provisions were desired to be retained in a final version of the proposed amendment. Commissioners agreed to all the new provisions proposed with the exception of requiring property owners to plant required street trees on private property when they could not be planted in the right of way. The Commission believed that this was too significant a burden and that private development covenants would ensure that trees would be planted within neighborhoods.

Having obtained consensus on the amendments to be retained, Mr. Zenner proceeded to ask Commissioners what their preference was regarding what size of right of way street trees should be required. There was significant debate related to this matter. Following discussion, a majority of the Commissioner voted to support requiring street trees along rights of way 50-feet or greater in size - generally Option #2 as modified by removal of requiring street trees on private property.

Mr. Zenner indicated that staff would prepare the final draft of the proposed amendment for a public hearing at the December 5 Planning Commission meeting. The proposed amendment would reflect the changes discussed at the work session and would continue to permit private utilities to be located within the public right of way as is current practice. Mr. Zenner thanked Commissioners for their participation.

B. 5-year Comprehensive Plan Update - Follow up/Re-engagement

Attachments: [Staff Report to Planning and Zoning Commission](#)
[Adopted City Plans post-Columbia Imagined adoption](#)
[Columbia Imagined & Climate Action Plan Crosswalk](#)

Due to the meeting time closing, the Columbia Imagined Update discussion was moved to the following work session meeting.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE - November 7, 2019 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:54 p.m.