

**EXCERPTS**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**COLUMBIA CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBER**  
**701 EAST BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MO**  
**March 19, 2026**

**Case Number 102-2026**

**The City of Columbia is proposing revisions to Chapter 29 of the City Code (Unified Development Code) that would revise the definition of “family” as shown in Sec. 29-1.11 [Definitions]. The proposed amendment would eliminate the difference in the number of unrelated adults permitted within dwellings in the R-1, R-2, and R-MF zoning districts in favor of a single maximum limitation of 4 unrelated adults, revise how a “family” is defined to allow non-traditional and multi-generational family formations to occupy a dwelling with no numerical limitation, and provides clarity that dwelling unit occupancy would be determined by using the adopted International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) standards such that "overcrowding" is appropriately addressed. The amendments are proposed as a means of addressing recommendations presented within the 2024 Boone County/City of Columbia Housing Study.**

MR. STANTON: May I have a staff report, Mr. Zenner?

Staff report was given by Mr. Pat Zenner of the Planning and Development Department. Staff recommends approval of the proposed revision to the definition of "family" as shown in attached Public Hearing Draft Definition of "Family."

MR. STANTON: Any questions for staff? Mr. Zenner, let's use Uncle Harry next time.

MR. ZENNER: My apologies, sir.

MR. STANTON: Yeah, you know. Just for --

MR. ZENNER: I should have taken the -- I should have taken the cue from you when we were doing Black History Month, but that was -- and that wasn't even Black History Month you referred to it as. You confused us all.

MR. STANTON: American History.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you. Because it is all history.

MR. STANTON: It's all history. All right. Any other questions of staff? Dr. Gray?

DR. GRAY: Not in line with that conversation at all. So you mentioned a potential change would be adult versus person?

MR. ZENNER: Back to that. So we're talking about here. I can't do that in this because I'm in the PowerPoint, but you are correct. So that would be up to four unrelated adults, because that's what we were driving at, is adults. Children can't rent homes, so, I mean, I -- you know, it's persons, adults. I would ask Mr. Craig to chime in if he feels that there's any concern if we were -- if they were to amend to adults instead. I think it means, you know --

MR. CRAIG: Well, yeah. Inability to contract. Or yeah. Yeah. So I don't know if those fears are

-- are, you know, reasonable, so, yeah.

MR. ZENNER: Would it make it any clearer, do you think --

MR. CRAIG: A person must be able to purchase property or to contract with a landlord, so by its nature, it's someone 18 or older, you know.

DR. GRAY: Yeah.

MR. CRAIG: Is that the question? Does that answer the question?

MR. ZENNER: I mean, an adult is considered 18. Correct?

MR. CRAIG: Yeah. Yeah. It's the age of capacity contract in most circumstances.

DR. GRAY: Great. My second question, you said there is some differentiation between what Boone County is recently doing, but the particularities of it are with, like, their college town for Columbia. But the spirit of it, the move toward -- well, like the spirit of the direction is the same, yes.

MR. ZENNER: It is to expand housing opportunity by -- and it's taking a different approach. So instead of the City's approach, which would include a cap based on our -- a cap across all of our residential districts, the County is not applying a cap on unrelated individuals or related, for that matter. They are going to go solely to a definition that is only drawing upon IPMC.

DR. GRAY: Thank you.

MR. STANTON: Have questions of staff? I would open up the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. STANTON: Anybody wish to speak on this issue, come up. Three minutes for individuals, six for organizations. Going once, going twice, three times. Close the public hearing.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. STANTON: Commission discussion. You guys are a lively bunch this evening. I would entertain a motion then, if we're not going to talk about it.

MR. WALTERS: I would be happy to make a motion.

MR. STANTON: Mr. Walters?

MR. WALTERS: Regarding Case Number 102-2026, the family definition revisions and UDC text change, I recommend approval of the text change to Section 29-1.1(A) as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. ZENNER: It should be 1.11(a). I apologize. Missed a one.

MR. WALTERS: Approve the text change to Section 29-1.1(a) as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. CRAIG: 1.11(a).

MR. WALTERS: All right. I'll try that again. Third time is the charm. All right. Approve the text change to Section 29-1.1(a) as presented.

DR. GRAY: One-one.

MR. ZENNER: One-one.

MR. WALTERS: Didn't I just say that?

MR. WALTERS: Don't look at that. Don't look at the screen, look at the paper.

MS. STOCKTON: Look at the paper.

MR. STANTON: Don't give up on it, Mr. Walters. Hang in there.

MR. WALTERS: It's getting late. I amend my prior mistake, and recommend approval of the text change to Section 29-1.11 as presented.

DR. GRAY: Second.

MR. STANTON: It's been moved and properly seconded. Mr. Secretary, let's take a vote, sir.

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

MR. BRODSKY: The motion carries.

MR. STANTON: The recommendation will be forwarded to City Council.