

**EXCERPTS  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING  
COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER  
701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO  
May 07, 2026**

**CASE NUMBER 113-2026**

**A request by the City of Columbia to amend Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) with respect to the use-specific standards governing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as shown in Section 29-3.3(gg) of the City Code. The proposed amendments would permit ADUs in the R-1 zoning district without a conditional use permit, limit the number of registered rental dwellings on R-1 zoned parcels to a single dwelling unit, establish a single 5,000 square foot minimum lot area in all residential zoning districts as the minimum required for ADU construction, revise the corner side yard and rear yard setbacks for "detached" ADU construction, increase permissible structure height for ADUs when constructed as a "second" story upon another lawfully permitted accessory use, revise use-specific standard paragraph numbers given the addition/revision of the standards. The proposed amendments have been prepared in efforts to streamline existing regulations and encourage the production of ADUs within the City.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: May we please have a staff report? Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the revisions expanding opportunities for ADU construction without a CUP and be expanded into the MO-F and the M-N zoning districts reducing potential administrative error and making it a cleaner process for end users. This is an ordinance and therefore it's a living and breathing document. If we haven't calibrated it well enough at this point, it always can be amended in the future.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Are there any questions to staff on the text change? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Forgive me, but -- so this we get to do it all. We don't have to, like, make a recommendation to this counsel?

MR. ZENNER: You need to adopt -- you need to make a recommendation for counsel to adopt the changes.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Okay. So this will go to, like, Be Heard, like the process we did with (inaudible).

MR. ZENNER: No, it will not.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: This is not -- it doesn't need -- we go down and be heard.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. ZENNER: This now goes to the State, public hearing to adopt these regulations. If this Commission desires to make requests or recommendations for revisions, they will be incorporated in the staff report to City Council. We will not amend the regulation as it has been presented this evening.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Any other questions for staff? Seeing none. We will open the floor to public comment. Is there any public comment on the text changes to UDC standards?

MS. STOLWYK: I think there's a PDF that went through the document. It's -- I uploaded a document --

MS. GEUEA JONES: Isn't it the same thing we have in front of us from all the letters and --

MS. STOLWYK: It does have pictures.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please go ahead and continue.

MS. STOLWYK: Yeah. My name is Adrienne Stolwyk; I'm at 212 Hirth Avenue. I think what I would like to suggest -- I know it's presumptuous, but if you wished to make a recommendation to Council or vote as body on the four different edits that I'm proposing, my situation is -- I regret that this is not a more collaborative -- like, you don't have the opportunity to understand what it's like to design (inaudible) to people who are assessing different lots. So I'm trying within the channels that exist to -- to explain this, but if there's -- there could be more back and forth in some other world, and there isn't. So this is sort of the situation that I'm presented with and just trying to advocate for a more liberal ADU policy, and this is my last opportunity to do it. I think the ordinance, in general, is making great improvements. I would just suggest that you consider each of

those four amendments to see if there's an opportunity to make a little bit of a more liberal policy before it goes on to Council. That's my only request. Thanks.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Please wait. Any questions? I would just say that I think that there has been quite a significant amount of back and forth between this Commission and yourself. So I -- I understand that you don't like what we came up with and that you think we should have gone further, but I think that we have gotten a lot of communication from you, including letting you speak at our work session, which is unusual. So I do think this has been cooperative. I understand that you're disappointed in where we ended up, though.

MS. STOLWYK: In general, I think it's great. I just think there's a few more things you could do if you want.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: It's always easier to loosen it up than to pull it back. And I -- I have big reserves. Like, I mean, you heard me in the session. I don't want (inaudible) in my backyard. I don't want a villa in San Paulo, Brazil, either. But I do want work, so I think this is a good start, and we support the ADU.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Ms. STOLWYK? Seeing none. Thank you very much.

Next?

MR. GEBHARDT: Good evening. Jay Gebhardt with A Civil Group.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Jay, can you give your address so I can get you all that.

MR. GEBHARDT: Oh, sorry. 3401 Broadway Business Park, Suite 105.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you.

MR. GEBHARDT: A couple of things. One is there is in Adrian's correspondence, she has four things she has talked about. It would be interesting to see if you could separate those and vote on them separately, instead of take the whole baby and maybe think, because one of the -- one of the things, I think, is an easy change is the side yard on a corner lot. that is -- to go to 12 and a half to -- when we have an existing structures on the site, and it's part of a redevelopment situation, and this is where we get into this problem between Greenfield and redevelopment. But if it's a redevelopment project, and there's an existing structure on that there, I don't see the harm in -- in the matching that existing side yard setback. If it's five feet like Pat is saying, yeah. They can't park in front of the house, but they can park to the side of it. It's -- it's not exclusive of that. So I just think that was -- is a pretty simple thing. And a lot of times when we -- I have people looking for ADUs, it's to carve lots. They're the easy places to put it because they have another street access. So -- and it's easy to access that -- that ADU. So if you really, truly want to try to loosen up and make these more easily attainable, the 12 and a half, it doesn't sound like a lot, but, you know, we -- Pat and I had one going through Planning and Zoning, or Board of Adjustment. It was a 36-and-a-half-foot-wide lot. It was a 3,000 square foot lot, 3,600 square foot lot. You know, it was for CMCA. They were building an ADU on it. And what you're doing here is it would have made that more difficult. It would -- well, the three -- going -- limiting it to 3,000 would have made it where we had still to go to the Board of Adjustment, and the 12 and a half, I mean, you take 12 and a half plus six, that's 18 and a half, and then there's only 36 and a half feet wide, so it's not a very wide ADU by the time you left. Yeah, granted. That was one situation, but there's lots of little things like that in the existing inner city. So why do we -- why do we lump this in. Now if we're building a new cottage development and they're 3,000 square foot lots, just put a date on it. You know, anything built after a certain date, you can't have an ADU on a 3,000 square foot lot, if that's what you're trying to do. But don't -- don't prohibit it, in my book. And then the rear yard just seems like you're just going in the wrong direction. We -- we already have narrow lots that are not very deep, and trying to put an ADU on then. And, again, it's this idea that we don't have this in a Greenfield type situation or something. But keep in mind, and this is kind of getting off the rails a little bit, but -

MS. GEUEA JONES: Jay, your three minutes are up.

MR. GEBHARDT: All right.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Do you have a last thought?

MR. GEBHARDT: Yeah. If you could vote on them separately, I think that would be more informational to the Council. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Next speaker, please come forward.

MR. CLAYBROOK: My name is Scott Claybrook. I'm here personally, and also representing Arise Dwellings at 1111 Rangeline Street here in Columbia. I just mostly want to say thank you for this. I think this is really, really helpful. I've had that privilege of working on a number of ADUs personally, both in the affordability space and the aging in place space, trying to help folks age in place, have done attached and detached built within existing structures and new construction attached on the rear. And it went through the Board of Adjusters process and I have a personal home, trying to prepare a space for my mother-in-law who is aging and has been widowed in the last two years. And as a practitioner in the space, yeah. It -- the nuances are a lot -- there's a lot of details that come with these. And so getting to something this clear and continue to

push that envelope is extremely helpful to us, as we think about, again, affordability and just consistency and clarity. So I just -- I really want to celebrate the team that has worked on this. The only thing I would say maybe, and similar to Ms. Adrian, would be -- I do find it challenging a little bit to be able to know exactly how to have -- kind of, like, the nuance conversation. And when we get to these spaces, yeah. It just -- it just becomes a little more challenging to get down to the finer details. And so I even -- I was one of the ones who had e-mailed in and even in the hearing tonight, I think there's a clarity that, just as an example, six foot, our rear yard setback on a -- detached, I think, makes sense. With a two-story, it doesn't. And so those are the nuances that I think being able to navigate conversationally help a lot from people who are just doing it everyday. So, again, I think we're making great strides. I think the staff has done a phenomenal job and really appreciate the process.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: Hi. Thank you for coming. I was the one person in the audience at your Board of Adjustment hearing.

MR. CLAYBROOK: Thank you.

DR. GRAY: So I'm curious. You looked at these new regulations, yes?

MR. CLAYBROOK: Uh-huh.

DR. GRAY: Would that have prevented you from the hearing at Board of Adjustment?

MR. CLAYBROOK: Yes, I believe so. Yes.

DR. GRAY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anybody else? Are you aware that our work session agendas are published along with the drafts as we go through them of these things.

MR. CLAYBROOK: Of course. So falling along with that, there is no way to dialogue in that space traditionally to have a conversation just with -- with you guys, yeah.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Correct. Not in a face-to-face like this, but we do get everything e-mailed to Pat is that I'll -- either as part of the staff report or forwarded along to us throughout that process.

MR. CLAYBROOK: Totally understand that, and just communicate when I have a conversation with somebody and a real lot of things.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Sure.

MR. CLAYBROOK: It's just had to do that over e-mail back and forth, back and forth.

MS. GEUEA JONES: All right. Thank you.

MR. CLAYBROOK: Thank you so much.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else to speak on this case, please come forward.

MR. WILSON: Hello. I'm Lewis Wilson; I live at 404 West Broadway. Just as a point of fact, that's an R-1 neighborhood. I'm really -- I've followed this process because I come here to meet your work sessions, and I thank staff and all of you for the work you've done in considering this. I also appreciate the input by Adrian Stolwyk, and that makes me think that I'd like to either now or in the future consider as much flexibility as possible. I think ADUs provide a housing opportunity on -- at small scale that doesn't generate as much public response as when you try to put in 300 houses all at once. So it's a little less memblesque process, so to speak. The other thing is, I think that in terms of the housing development ADUs provide individual owners the opportunity to be a one-time mini-developer, rather than -- the system right now is we're waiting for gangs of rich people to come up with enough capital that want specific returns to create development, to create housing. It's a precarious situation if they can get better returns building data centers or God knows what. So I think that 80 years in a very obviously small way do provide an additional avenue for housing creation at local level. And with respect to, you know, concerns about historic neighborhoods, I don't live on a corner lot, I live one in from a corner lot, so I've got a house that's got an eight-foot backyard on one side and a garage that's about a foot off my lot. That has never really bothered me a lot. I know the people. We seem to work it out. So with respect to these ideas that things have to be super specially correct, every block has four corners, and they're all messed up the same way because they were built before time of any effective planning and zoning. That's all I have to say. I'll answer any questions if you've got any.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. Any questions for this speaker? Seeing none. Thank you for being here.

MR. WILSON: Thank you.

MS. GEUEA JONES: The next person to speak on this case, please come forward. Last call. Seeing none. We will close public comment.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner comment. I think that for clarity's sake in the record and so that City Council knows that these are all ideas that we have considered, I would like to say one thing, which is all of them are things that we discussed at length during work sessions. And it -- it may behoove us to find a

way to communicate that, and -- and be clear as we do major text changes, and how we are contemplating changes in a way that is streamlined for Council, and they are reviewing our recommendations. That said, in the absence of transcripts of all of our work sessions, I know it is after midnight. I would like to very briefly go through each of these four things and just ask if anyone is in favor of recommending Council make the change. Does that make sense to folks? I'm not asking for a long discussion on each one, I'm just saying I'm going to say, you know, 3,000 square feet, is anyone in favor of making that change. Does that make sense? I'm looking for nods or something. Okay. So moving through this as quickly as possible, and then I'll be looking forward to further comment. Is anyone in favor of reducing the 5,000 square feet to 3,000 square feet?

MR. DARR: I would be in favor of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Darr, you would be in favor of that?

MR. DARR: Yes.

MS. ORTIZ: I -- yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz would be in favor of that.

MR. BRODSKY: I would also be in favor of that.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Brodsky, Commissioner Walters. Okay. So everyone is in -- or not everyone, but several of us are in favor of reducing the minimum lot size where you could add maybe 5,000 to 3,000.

MR. ZENNER: All zoning districts; is that correct?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is this in all zoning districts, for those of you who are in favor of that?

MR. ZENNER: R-1 is a 5,000 square foot minimum.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. They say yes. All right. That is informative.

MR. DARR: It wouldn't preclude the -- I mean --

MS. GEUEA JONES: The other setback standards and such would apply.

MR. DARR: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: But, theoretically, that would mean that you have a 3,000 square foot lot in R-1 that are small lot standards -- theoretically.

MR. DARR: Yeah. Theoretically.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Yeah. Okay. Is anyone in favor of reducing the 15-foot setback from 15 down to 6? This is the thing that we discussed I don't know how long in work sessions, is the 6 versus 15.

MR. DARR: I would just say real quickly on this, I don't know that I'm in favor of changing this just because then we would have to go and change -- we've got to chase this down because we're -- the attached and detached are together. So now we have to separate from attached to detached, because there is no way anybody would in favor of an attached ADU six feet from a property line. So, you know, it's a cascading thing. So even though adjacent to R-1, I would be -- you know, 15 is what I would like to see, but, you know, R-MF or something, six foot seems like it would fine. But it's just getting too complicated, so at this point, I probably -- you know.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So, no.

MR. DARR: I would say no. Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Is anyone in favor of yes? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: This is what I was specifically planning on talking about. You know, I think we've got a lot of things here right, in the right direction. This is one where it was kind of taking two steps forward and took one step back with this one. My recollection was that it was -- in our conversations was closely associated with the fact that we were now around (inaudible). And I totally agree, six feet is -- is not enough of setback for a two-story, but for a one-story.

MS. GEUEA JONES: So you would be in favor of making the change as suggested in our correspondence?

MR. BRODSKY: Not exactly. I think we need to do a little bit more discussing. Like I said, the two-story --

MS. GEUEA JONES: So not as it was sent to us? Is anyone in favor of it as it was sent to us? No. Okay. The next piece is the principal dwelling around them to be even with the principal dwelling, but not less than six feet for -- these are side streets. This is a corner lot issue. Is anyone in favor of making this change?

MR. DARR: I would be in favor, I would think.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Darr would be in favor?

MR. DARR: Yes.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Brodsky would be in favor.

MS. ORTIZ: I would, also.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Ortiz would be in favor. Commissioner Walters? Yes.

Okay. Finally, the last one, a detached accessory dwelling unit and attached accessory dwelling units having different setbacks for rear yard and with the same 30 percent standard. Different setbacks for attached versus detached in the rear yard. Anyone in favor of that? It's this. This is the suggested amendment to the amendment.

MR. BRODSKY: Again, I wouldn't be as written, I would not in be favor just because I don't want --

MS. GEUEA JONES: And that's written, but in concept, you're okay.

MR. BRODSKY: Well, just -- it -- I would only be in favor of the six foot in R-2 or above. I wouldn't be in favor of six foot in an R-1 zone.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay.

MR. BRODSKY: So in the absence of making that nuance, I think I'm still in favor of just keeping the 15 feet uniform.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Anyone in favor of it as written?

MR. DARR: Not as written, but the same comments about the one-story versus two-story.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Okay. Having gotten all of that on the transcript for City Council to consider, I will open the floor to general Commissioner comment text change. Is there any comment, I would appreciate it? Commissioner Ortiz?

MS. ORTIZ: I -- I have some worry that we're going to have a repeat of the family situation. I was looking at what the county is doing for this. I'm just curious to see what Council thinks because we are being more restrictive than the county is. So I don't know. I'm sorry. It's late, but I am a little bit worried about this. That's all.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anyone else? Commissioner Brodsky?

MR. BRODSKY: Just two quick comments. One, this is only in the last two years, I think the second text amendment that we have done. And with STRs being the other one. And we always do these. And it's just a bummer to have these important conversations this late in the hour. And then my second comment, you know, I think, like I said, I think we've gone -- we're going in the right direction with these. It might not be perfect, but I think it's a large step in the right direction, and let's see it -- how it works out for the next few months. And as Mr. Zenner mentioned, if we need to adjust it again, we can do so?

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Stanton?

MR. STANTON: So I want to make a comment and then I would like to entertain a motion. Okay. This issue at ADU has had incredible access to us. If somebody is in trouble, wherever I'm at is you need to throw this up top and let City Council look at it and go from there. And then, like we said, the -- I want to -- I want to make a motion to -- if I -- if I say to approve the text changes, am I stepping on everything we just talked about just now?

MS. GEUEA JONES: No. Not at all.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: I think we've got a couple more comments, though.

MR. STANTON: Okay.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Commissioner Gray?

DR. GRAY: I understand the concern about Council can doing the main, so we're less restricted, but maybe not less restricted enough measures in comparisons to what the county is doing. But I didn't get increasingly frustrated that we are appointed to do this work alongside the staff, they presuming we have trust with this, as well. And then live in kind of fear about those decisions being following through on. So I do want to be clear. I appreciate, Madam Chair, that you allowed us to go through, because I do want to make sure that the people who have more competencies in this are heard, and I think that has happened, and we have had significant long-winded discussion about all of these things. And it may not be perfect, but, again, it can be revised. I think that I am -- I think we are producing the regulatory confusion and adding more clarity and more consistency across the different zonings introducing ADUs in other zoning areas that as buy-right use. There is one thing that I'm -- I have some concerns about, but that would not lead me to not support. This amendment is codifying the number of rental licenses into R-1. Additionally, I think, you know, the setbacks, we have had extensive discussion about those. I feel like giving -- a lot of that discussion was around what has appeared at Board of Adjustments, and the testimonies to make sure that this would be in effective move toward having less of those hearings take place. I am comfortable with moving forward with these changes, and the protections that are going to be in place.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Anything further Commissioner Comments? Seeing none. Commissioner Stanton, I believe we are ready.

MR. STANTON: As it relates to Case 113-2026, in the use-specific standards, UDC text

change, I move to approve the text change to Section 29-3.2, Table 29-31, and Section 29-3.3, subsection (gg) as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MS. GEUEA JONES: Motion made by Commissioner Stanton and seconded by Commissioner Gray. Is there any discussion on the motion? Commissioner Stockton.

MS. STOCKTON: A clarification. So the notes you made earlier will go to City Council and then we'll just vote on this --

MS. GEUEA JONES: That's right. Yes. Yeah. Providing context and a review of what the vote would have been if we tried to make all of the amendments without actually making any of the amendments. So that there is clarity and information. Anyone else? Seeing none. Commissioner Brodsky, we're ready.

**Roll Call Vote (Voting "yes" is to recommend approval.) Voting Yes: Ms. Stockton, Mr. Walters, Mr. Brodsky, Mr. Darr, Ms. Geuea Jones, Dr. Gray, Ms. Ortiz, Mr. Stanton. The motion carries 8-0.**

MS. GEUEA JONES: Thank you. That recommendation will be forwarded to City Council. That is our caseload for the evening.