City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, September 23, 2021 5:30 PM	Work Session	Conference Rms 1A&B Columbia City Hall 701 E. Broadway

I. CALL TO ORDER

Present: 7 - Sara Loe, Anthony Stanton, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll, Sharon Geuea Jones, Robbin Kimbell and Peggy Placier

Excused: 2 - Tootie Burns and Joy Rushing

II. INTRODUCTIONS

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Zenner asked that a new assignment from the City Council be discussed under new business. The Council asked the Commission to look at parking requirements per the UDC. Meeting Agenda adopted as amended unanimously.

Adopt agenda as amended

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 9, 2021 Work Session

September 9, 2021 work session minutes adopted as presented unanimously.

Adopt minutes as presented

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Commission 2021-2022 Officer Elections

Mr. Zenner provided the Commissioners with a consolidated ballot form to use for their votes. He said the ballots were retained per record requirements and provided instructions.

Ms. Geuea-Jones made a motion for Ms. Loe to retain the position of Chair. There was discussion and Ms. Loe asked that others consider their willingness to serve in the role at the next election and prepare for a transition next year. She said she was willing to serve for one more year. Ms. Kimbell seconded the motion.

Ms. Carroll made a motion for Ms. Geuea-Jones to serve as Vice-Chair. Ms. Kimbell seconded the motion.

Ms. Geuea-Jones made a motion for Ms. Carroll to serve as Secretary. Ms. Kimbell seconded the motion.

No additional motions were made for officer positions.

Mr. Zenner collected the ballots. The three motions for the three officer positions passed, with Ms. Loe as Chair, Ms. Geuea-Jones as Vice-Chair, and Ms. Carroll as Secretary.

B. UDC Parking Requirements (amended agenda item)

Mr. Zenner said the Council directed the Commissions to look at Chapter 4.3 and the Table 4.3-1: *Minimum Required Off-Street Parking (and Maximum Permitted Off Street Parking for Selected Uses)* and related sections of code for maximum parking and parking studies. He said the request came about following the results of a recent Board of Adjustment (BOA) case where the Board had denied a case desiring more parking that what is permitted by the code by more than 200% from the minimum required for the an auto service facility. Parking exceeding 200% of the code-prescribed minimum for a use must be approved via a variance, per the UDC. Zoning related variances such as parking are appealed to the BOA, procedurally. He said an email had been sent to the Council with the request to look at the procedures and parking requirements via the text amendment process. Procedurally, text amendments are reviewed at public hearing and recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission, with ultimate approval by the Council following a public hearing. This email also asked for the Council to direct the Commission to look at the parking requirements for schools, as “over-parking” variances for schools had also been the subject of recent BOA variance applications.

Mr. Zenner said the staff would come back with recommendations using national and local examples of parking demand. He said there were options to look at the use of parking studies and ranges of traffic generators of users permitted within a zoning category to help provide alternative data sources which may be used to determine required parking and over-parking thresholds. He said this research may be included in the next package of text amendments the staff was presently working on that the Commission had discussed at a high level at a recent work session.

Ms. Placier said there was an ad-hoc group looking at the impact of UDC elements on central city neighborhoods. She said this may relate to text amendment analysis and review. She said she was not sure there had been formal direction to this group by the Council at this point. Mr. MacMann said this may be a future directive.

There was general discussion on the environmental and other goals behind the calculation of minimum and maximum parking requirements, and goals of right-sizing versus flexibility when a change of use or site redevelopment occurs. There was a desire to narrowly draw the regulations so that reasons for additional parking have study and show-cause data to avoid speculative parking that has a negative impact without actual benefit to the community.

Mr. Zenner said this item would come back for discussion with additional suggestions as part of the on-going text amendment review process.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. M-BP and IG Permitted Use Table Revisions - Follow up

Mr. Zenner referenced the previous work session discussion on this topic. He said Paul Land had asked the Commission to review the M-BP and IG zones in terms of intent, permitted uses, and what Mr. Land saw as opportunities for revisions to attract business enterprise he though was desirable to the community. Mr. Zenner provided handouts that included the permitted use tables for the M-BP, IG and M-C zones and reviewed the uses which were permitted in more than one district, and those unique to each district. He also described the definitions and intent of each zone per the code, and the use-specific process that applied to some uses in some districts. He said use-specific standards were one tool to separate, by intensity or scale, which district may be more appropriate for one use over the other as they provided use parameters.

Mr. Zenner said Mr. Land came to the Commission in the spring because the definition of the M-BP district mentioned light industrial uses, but did not actually permit the use. He said there were options the Commission may look into. One option may be to add light industrial in the M-BP zone with use-specific standards.

There was discussion on the types of light industrial activities, and what the category meant today and may mean in the future. There was discussion on the differences between high tech uses, traditional industrial uses, and the business park model which may have co-related or co-locational uses. The concept of “clean” vs. “dirty” industry and indoors vs. outdoors activities was discussed. Mr. Zenner said the M-C and IG zones looked pretty similar in terms of permitted uses, and this gave him pause. He said that mechanical contractor uses also at times provided code issues in terms of which district they were appropriate based upon size, scale and activities.

The Commission reviewed the handouts and discussed potential mismatches between uses and zones and how they may look at the intent of each zone. The Commission asked for information on all property zoned M-BP and also maps that showed acreage and location of M-C and IG as part of the discussion. Mr. Zenner described the M-BP property was generally the MBS and Equipment Share headquarters campus that was recently zoned M-BP. The Commission indicated they would like to look at existing corridors, and noted the expanded uses under the present M-C was to put areas with established uses in zones as permitted uses when the UDC was adopted in 2017.

There was discussion on the marking aspects and truth in advertising related to the definitions of the different zone districts. The process of rezoning and regulatory uncertainties and how this impacted recruitment and incentives associated with economic development activities was discussed. This had been part of Mr. Land’s concerns with the existing zoning districts and definition and process. The Commission discussed the existing areas with industrial zoning and the perceived pros and cons with these properties. The Commission noted that avoiding speculation was desired, and the role of public input processes in their public

hearing process. While there may be business reasons for secrecy, details on size, scale, operation, management, site plans, etc. were elements which were part of the considerations for property rezoning requests and transparency for the public was part of the process as well.

The Commission was interested in looking at additional data on acreage and location and looking at these districts to move uses around and look at use-specific standards that may better address which zones which uses may best fall into. Looking at the intent and definition of each district may also be undertaken in future discussions. There may be opportunities to eliminate or collapse uses, and there may be expansions. The Commission was also interested in the impact of eliminating the M-BP district, but wanted to dive into the impacts on property with that zoning in terms of what would be an alternative.

Mr. Zenner said the staff would prepare maps and data as requested for a continued discussion on the matter at future work sessions.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE - October 7, 2021 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:59 pm

Motion to adjourn

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email CITY@CoMo.gov. 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.