

AGENDA REPORT
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
July 24, 2025

SUMMARY

A request by Courtney Pulley and Melissa Williams (owners), for approval to rezone 0.21 acres of property from the R-1 (One-family Dwelling) district to the R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) district to allow a two-family dwelling on the site. The subject site is located on the east edge of the western terminus of Stevendave Drive, and includes the address 4215 Stevendave Drive.

DISCUSSION

The owners are requesting approval to assign R-2 zoning to a 0.21-acre site located at 4215 Stevendave Drive to allow the existing structure on the site to be used as a two-family dwelling. The subject property is presently zoned R-1 and is adjacent to R-1 to the south, west, and east, and A zoning to the north. The parcels directly to the north and east are undeveloped.

Uses surrounding the site include a two-family dwelling directly to the west across Stevendave Drive, a vacant agriculturally zoned parcel of 33 acres to the north, and a vacant R-1 zoned lot of 1.7 acres to the east, owned by the applicants of this request. It is important to note the aforementioned R-1 lot is considered legal, but may not be developed without access being provided, which may be facilitated through extension of a public street or an irrevocable ingress/egress easement suitable to the city counselor or their designee.

The subject site was annexed into City limits in 1970 and was assigned R-2 zoning upon annexation. Based on aerial imagery, the site was developed sometime between 1968 and 1980. The subject lot is part of Alumni Heights Block 3. The Alumni Heights subdivision included four Blocks in total, all final platted by 1968. The creation of this subdivision and all four blocks occurred prior to annexation into City limits. Zoning was not established in the County until 1973, and some two-family structures that still exist to this day were constructed prior to annexation, hence the City's designation of R-2 upon annexation.

The rezoning request for this site from R-2 to R-1 occurred in 1977, affected all blocks within the Alumni Heights subdivision, and resulted in several nonconforming uses being created that persist to this day. The lots upon which the non-conformities exist may continue to be used as they are until their owners wish to redevelop the lot at which time conformity with the dimensional standards of the R-1 district would be required to be complied with. It is worth noting that reconstruction of the dwellings on the non-conforming lots would be permitted "as-is" following a natural disaster or act of God per the UDC. The City's 1983 Future Land Use Map, however, designated the subject lot and surrounding subdivision as a low-density residential district, meaning between 0 and 6 dwelling units per acre were seen as appropriate. Prior to Unified Development Code (UDC) adoption in 2017, the site was already rezoned into the R-1 district, then with the adoption of the UDC, this site continued to be zoned in the R-1 district.

The rationale provided for the rezoning from R-2 to R-1 in 1977 was largely to discourage two-family dwellings from being further developed or redeveloped on lots within the subdivision, as it was largely already build out by the time of the rezoning request. The staff report for the request in 1977 notes that single-family uses were the prevailing use within the subdivision, which continues to be true today. Staff noted there was no opposition to the rezoning request, but ultimately recommended denial of the rezoning request as the rezoning request did not provide "substantial public benefits, i.e., beyond an intent to promote a somewhat vague goal of 'overall neighborhood improvement'".

Outside of the Alumni Heights subdivision, R-2 zoning is ubiquitous, although underutilized. The Alumni Heights subdivision is an enclave of R-1 zoning surrounded by R-2 zoning, albeit many of the nearby

R-2 parcels remain unimproved. The attached map titled "Alumni Heights Dwellings" illustrates the mix of one- and two-family dwellings that currently exists within this neighborhood, and the number of nonconforming structures that now exist based on the rezoning request of 1977 within this subdivision.

The purpose of this request is to allow the use of a two-family dwelling on the site. The applicant has already sought a building permit to allow for this use and made improvements to the home to support it, but are not able to receive a certificate of occupancy until the rezoning request to R-2 is approved. The building plans were approved by Building and Site Development under the impression that it was an interior improvement and it was not understood that it was for a separate dwelling until the sub-contractor applied for a separate meter attachment permit to separate the electrical for the upper and lower level units. When seeking to obtain the separate permit, the owners were informed of their options for pursuing a conditional use permit (CUP) for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU), applying for rezoning, or restoring the dwelling back to a single-family residence given the work that was already completed.

While an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) conditional use permit (CUP) could also have been sought, the request would not meet the subordinate size requirement of the regulations; therefore, is not a truly viable option given the structure is split between two floors with equal square footage.

This rezoning, while different from surrounding zoning, does not permit inconsistent uses, as the site will remain residential. In regards to conformance with the comprehensive plan, the rezoning appears to be supported, as it results in greater infill density opportunities and does not require extension of utilities and City services while providing a new housing choice (Policy Three: Prioritize infill development, p.146). The site also lies within a tier 1 growth priority area for infill development and is believed to be a compatible land use for the surrounding area while introducing medium-density to established neighborhoods without disrupting neighborhood quality and character (p. 129-130).

The Boone County/City of Columbia Housing study, published in October of 2024, also appears to support a rezoning request of this nature. Gentle density in particular locations is noted as a housing need to close the perceived market supply gap between single-family homes and multifamily rental units, and integrating such density within existing neighborhoods rather than uniform development exclusively for two- or multi-family development (p. 166). It also promotes an increased variety of housing types to potentially serve the varied income levels of the community rather than requiring the entire structure be rented/owned as one unit (p. 167). Single family dwellings, per the study, represent nearly 30,000 units within the city, or over 50% of the entire housing stock, while two-family dwellings have a total count of approximately 4,100 units, or around 7% of the total housing stock (p. 53). This rezoning would help close the perceived supply gap within an existing neighborhood that currently has a mix of two- and one-family dwellings, and results in higher levels of utilization of an existing structure and lot that has no identified service issues if there were to be increased density.

While it certainly would have been preferable if this applicant sought a rezoning or CUP for an ADU prior to application for a building permit, staff does not believe that is grounds for recommendation of denial of this request. A certificate of occupancy may not be issued for a second dwelling until/unless this rezoning to R-2 is approved. The resulting two-family dwelling would not be uncharacteristic to the existing conditions of this neighborhood. While resulting in greater density than currently on the site, such a use would not yield unsafe outcomes for potential residents of the dwelling or unsafe outcomes for those in surrounding dwellings. The site has adequate square footage (9,800 square feet) to accommodate a two-family structure on the site and there is no proposed expansion of the existing structure to support the additional dwelling. There are four parking spaces on the site, two from a two-car garage and two on the existing driveway, outside of right-of-way, that may serve as a parking space for tenants to park in front of the garage. Therefore, staff believes this rezoning is supported by the

Comprehensive Plan, the Housing Study, and the surrounding land uses, despite the inconsistency of the zoning with the rest of the subdivision.

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the request to rezone the subject acreage to the R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling) district.

ATTACHMENTS

- Locator Maps
- Zoning Graphic
- Alumni Heights Dwellings Map
- 1977 Rezoning Ordinance
- 1970 Zoning Map

SITE CHARACTERISTICS

Area (acres)	0.21 acres
Topography	Sloping gradually down to east
Vegetation/Landscaping	Mostly cleared
Watershed/Drainage	Hinkson Creek
Existing structures	Single-family home, awaiting certificate of occupancy to use the top floor as a second dwelling, contingent upon approval of rezoning request.

HISTORY

Annexation date	1969
Zoning District	R-1 (One-Family Residential)
Land Use Plan designation	Residential District
Previous Subdivision/Legal Lot Status	Legal lot

UTILITIES & SERVICES

Sanitary Sewer	City of Columbia
Water	
Fire Protection	
Electric	Boone Electric

ACCESS

Stevendave Drive	
Location	Western edge of site
Major Roadway Plan	Local residential
CIP projects	N/A
Sidewalk	Not developed

PARKS & RECREATION

Neighborhood Parks	N/A
Trails Plan	N/A
Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan	N/A

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

All property owners within 185-feet and City-recognized neighborhood associations within 1,000 feet of the boundaries of the subject property were notified via property owner letter on July 7th of the pending action. An ad was placed in the Tribune on July 8th advertising the public hearing relating to the permanent zoning of the property.

Notified neighborhood association(s)	Meadowvale, Oakview Drive
Correspondence received	One question, no formal position supporting or against.

Report prepared by David Kunz

Report Approved by Patrick Zenner