

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
October 23, 2025
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Ortiz, Stanton, Stockton, and Walters
Commissioners Absent – Wilson
Staff Present – Craig, Halligan, Kunz, Orendorff, Zenner

Introductions

None

Approval of Agenda

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously, as amended, following the addition of a discussion on “small lot” standards example tour to the beginning of the agenda.

Approval of Minutes

The October 9, 2025 work session minutes were approved.

New Business

A. Small Lot standards Development Tour

Mr. Zenner distributed a handout to the Commissioner that contained a series of development sites throughout Boone County that Commissioner Walters had put together that he believed may be beneficial for the Commissioners to visit to get a sense of how some of the use-specific standards relating to “small lot” integration appear in “real-life” scenarios. Mr. Zenner noted that Mr. Walters had also prepared an electronic Google map tour of the project sites and that he would send the link for the tour to all Commissioners following the work session.

Mr. Zenner turned the meeting over to Mr. Walters to explain each of the project sites and why he had chosen them. There was general Commission discussion regarding the tour’s developments and the specific elements that were possibly of interest at each. Commissioners were encouraged to personally visit the sites, but also reminded that if they chose to make a “field trip” out of the tour that they could not have more than 3 Commissioners together otherwise the gathering would be considered a meeting and possibly a violation of the open meeting requirements that the Commission is subject to. Commissioners and staff thanked Commissioner Walters for his efforts and noted they were aware of the caution on conducting a meeting without proper notice being given.

B. Accessory Dwelling Units – Requested UDC Revisions

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and explained its origins. He noted that Council was seeking Commission input and possible availability on when, if at all, they would be able to consider the proposed amendments that were contained request that was attached to this agenda item. Mr. Zenner noted that based on the Commission’s discussion at the work session on this matter, a report would sent back to the Council such that the request for evaluation would be considered “addressed”.

Mr. Zenner explained each of the requested revisions and their possible impacts within and between other UDC provisions. He noted that many of the proposed changes were not significantly complex or possibly controversial and that several had been previously discussed and generally supported. There was general Commission discussion that the amendments were worthwhile to consider; however, concern was expressed that deviating from completing the Commission’s current projects and amendments to take on ADU amendments would further delay completion of its current work. Commissioners noted that the current work on “small lots” and the definition of “family” would, once completed, would have a greater impact within the community than diverting its efforts to focus its attention on the ADU revisions.

Commissioners noted that prior to having staff begin research and preparation of text amendments addressing ADUs that they needed to complete the “small lot” integration text and distribute it to industry professionals for comment and finalize the public engagement process on the revised definition of “family”. Given these open projects were completed, Commissioners agreed that the amendments sought for ADUs could be taken up for discussion and public comment. Mr. Zenner noted that given the volume of STR requests and the processing

associated with them that staff's ability to work on the open projects has been significantly impacted. He noted that optimistically the open projects would be completed by early 2026 after which research and text preparation on the ADU amendments could begin. Commissioners further noted that they will need to ensure time for their review of the Complete Streets Policy revisions as well as the updating of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Zenner sought clarity from the Commission with respect to this discussion and the report that would be prepared for Council on it. The Commission confirmed that they **were** interested in considering the amendments presented; however, believe doing so **should only occur** following completion of the distribution of the "small lot" standards for industry comments and completion of the revisions to the definition of "family". Mr. Zenner thanked the commission for their clarification and noted a report would be prepared for the Council's consideration.

Old Business

A. Small Lots – Proposed UDC Revisions Art. 5 & Appendix A

Due to time constraints this matter was not discussed. Further discussion on this topic will occur at the November 20 work session.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve the agenda, as amended, submitted by Commissioner Brodsky and seconded by Commissioner Gray. The agenda was approved, as amended, unanimously. A motion made to approve the October 9, 2025 minutes by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Walters. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
January 22, 2026
Conference Room 1A/1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Stanton, Stockton, Walters
Commissioners Absent – Ortiz and Wilson
Staff Present – Craig, Kunz, Orendorff, Smith, Zenner

Introductions

None

Approval of Agenda

Agenda adopted as presented.

Approval of Minutes

The January 8, 2026 work session minutes were approved unanimously with Commission Brodsky abstaining.

Community Development & Legal Counsel Updates

Mr. Smith provided an update on the City Council discussion and ultimate approval of the ADU request off of Glenwood Avenue. He noted that the Council was supportive of what was presented and the analysis performed notwithstanding the concerns expressed by the public. He also that there were questions related to the ability to have two rental units on the property and the condition regarding ADU/garage construction which were addressed in his presentation.

Mr. Smith also provided an overview of the discussion and vote with the Ashford Place proposal which was unsuccessful in obtaining approval. The final vote was 3-4. He noted the denial focused on Council concerns about access to the proposed development acreage and that there was a desire to have other public infrastructure (i.e. El Chaparral) brought into the site to address this concern. Mr. Smith noted that the analysis provided within the staff report and that considered by the Commission was sufficient, but felt that it may be necessary to take a look at growth patterns throughout the community and consider how to plan for it better moving forward.

New Business

A. UDC Revisions - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Mr. Zenner noted that this topic was being brought forward based upon prior discussion and a request from Councilperson Carroll that the Commission consider further adjustments to the ADU regulations such that production of this type of housing could potentially be increased. Chairman Geuea Jones noted that it was her recollection that this matter was not intended to be brought back to the Commission until the small lot integration project was completed.

Mr. Zenner noted that the final preparations on this amendment were underway and would be concluded by the end of January. As such, presenting this matter tonight was not impacting the completion of the small lot project. He further noted the definition of “family” is out for public review. Given these projects are wrapping up Mr. Zenner noted that staff needed to begin discussion on new topics. Chairman Geuea Jones thanked Mr. Zenner for his explanation on why the topic was being discussed and asked him to proceed.

Mr. Zenner referred to the distributed documents relating to this matter. He noted that side-margin notes were added to the document to help explain why the changes as proposed were being made. He noted the first most significant change was a proposal to remove the CUP requirement from ADU permitting in the R-1 district. He noted that to protect against two (2) rental units being allowed in the R-1 district a new provision was added to the use-specific standards for ADUs that would codify the current CUP condition that the Commission recommends with R-1 requests. He noted that there was no need to address this within the R-2 or R-MF district because these districts already allowed two rental certificates on compliant property meeting the other ADU requirements.

A question was asked regarding the background to the R-1 condition and why it was applied. Mr. Zenner noted that the condition was to protect against “back-door” density being added to a historically single-family detached zoning classification. Homes/lots within the R-1, while capable of being rented, were not generally intended to be used for multiple detached single-family dwellings that could both be rented. Mr. Zenner further explained that ADU usage in the R-1 was envisioned at the time of ADU regulation adoption in 2015 to allow for aging in place or multi-generational living arrangements, not as a means of creating an incentive to increase housing units for rental purposes. Mr. Zenner was thanked for his explanation and asked to proceed with the other proposed changes.

An additional question was asked about the needed add language clarifying the restriction on only one structure being a rental unit when the ADU became used as a short-term rental. Mr. Zenner noted that this was not really needed given the process for licensing general rental units and STRs were managed by the Neighborhood Services Division. As a part of the licensure process, a verification of the rental status of the entire property would need to be checked to determine if more than one dwelling would be licensed. If it was determined that such an application would result in both properties in the R-1 district having rental licenses one would be denied. Mr. Zenner was thanked for his explanation and asked to proceed with the other proposed changes.

Mr. Zenner continued by explaining that ADUs could be sought on lots not less than 5000 sq. ft. in the R-1 district and not less than 3000 sq. ft. in the R-2 and R-MF district. It was questioned if this difference in lot area between the districts should be considered for amendment in preparation for the adoption of the “small lot” integration standards to avoid possible conflicts and to simplify the regulations. Mr. Zenner explained that the change in lot areas between the R-1 and the R-2 and R-MF districts was made at the same time the UDC was amended to address the lot consolidation concerns within the R-2 and R-MF district approximately 2 years earlier. Mr. Zenner further stated presently “cottage lots” did not allow an ADU to be constructed upon them.

The Commission had general discussion on this topic. It was concluded following discussion that the 3000 sq. ft. lot area within the R-2 and R-MF districts should be pre-emptively modified in preparation for the adoption of the small lot standards. In arriving at this conclusion there was discussion that a lot less than 5000 sq. ft. may just be too small to accommodate an ADU and that such a change would be more in keeping with the current restrictions applied to “cottage lot” developments. Mr. Zenner added a side margin note to this effect and noted the final version of the proposed regulatory changes will include this requested modification.

Mr. Zenner then explained that there was a request to consider allowing an “integrated” ADU to be able to encroach into a required regulatory setback. Mr. Zenner explained the difference between “integrated” and “detached” ADU construction. He noted that the request to allow such an encroachment by-right could not be supported by staff given it would essentially constitute a “special exception” for a single type of housing. He further noted that while there has been one Board of Adjustment processed variance to resolve this issue, he was unaware the impact this restriction may be causing generally. The Board’s role is to evaluate unique circumstances like that and render relief based on those circumstances. To amend the code simply for a single type of housing was not viewed as fair generally to other uses or prudent from a land use regulation perspective.

Mr. Zenner then discussed then need for the proposed amendment related to the applicable corner side yard. He noted that what was being proposed a reduction, but not the entire reduction desired in the amendment consideration email. He explained that prior to 2017 the corner side yard for all lots was ½ the required front yard and that the revision to the UDC in 2017 has resulted in issues since its implementation. The choice of a 15-foot corner side yard was chosen to have an even number within the redline, but if desired it could be changed to 12.5-feet which would match the pre-2017 standards. The real concern was that an ADU not be built any closer to the corner side property line than the principal dwelling when it was more than 15-feet off the corner side property line such that alignment of the home and ADU were matched. Furthermore, it was essential that possible public safety issues as well as possible utility, sidewalk, or minimal right of way expansion needs were met. Any less a corner side was not seen as being in the best interest of the public.

Being respectful of time constraints and the additional work session topic that Mr. Kunz was present to discuss, Mr. Zenner indicated that the remainder of the amendments proposed to the ADU regulations would be discussed at the February 5 work session.

B. UDC Revisions – “Data Centers” (Definition & Allowed Location)

Mr. Kunz provided an overview of the proposed regulatory changes that were going to be discussed and why. He projected a PowerPoint presentation that was also distributed to the Commission such that could follow along. Mr. Kunz noted that the objective with this UDC revision was ensure that “data centers” were a defined use in the UDC and that they were denoted as only being permissible following issuance of a CUP in the IG (Industrial) zoning district. He noted that was being proposed this even was the first of a two-step process. Step two would include researching and developing use-specific conditional use requirements specifically tailored to the topic and Columbia. The urgency with defining “data centers” and allocating them as a CUP in the IG districts was to ensure future IG requests were not unnecessary denied given fear that “data center” could be built without any regulatory review.

Mr. Kunz went through various definitions from other communities nationally. He explained how he “deconstructed” each definition to determine what parts were common to each other. Based on the evaluated definitions and the “deconstruction” of them to find the common elements, Mr. Kunz explain that was how he got to the proposed definition that he felt would be appropriate for the City of Columbia at this time.

He noted that special care needed to be given to ensuring that a “data center” as an accessory use such as the University or a hospital were not required to obtain a CUP. He noted that several of the definitions reviewed included this exclusion language and that based on the various levels of “data centers” those operated as an accessory use were likely not the one’s of greatest concern. The Commissioner discussed the proposed definition seeking clarification on how certain classes would be covered moving forward.

After discussion and assurance that the drafting of the use-specific standards would address many of the concerns expressed, the Commission indicated staff should proceed to a public hearing on the amendments. Mr. Zenner noted that it was likely this topic would appear on the February 19 Planning Commission agenda provided advertising deadlines could be achieved as a public hearing matter. Mr. Zenner further noted that given the proposed amendments straight-forwardness distribution to interested parties prior to the public hearing would not occur. Commissioners acknowledge the approach and directed staff to proceed.

Mr. Zenner thank the Commission for their contributions on the evening’s topics.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve agenda by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Darr, approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the January 8, 2026, work session minutes as submitted by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Stockton, approved unanimously with Commission Brodsky abstaining.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
February 5, 2026
Conference Room 1A/1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Ortiz, Stanton, Stockton, Walters, Wilson
Commissioners Absent – None
Staff Present – Craig, Halligan, Zenner

Introductions

None

Approval of Agenda

Agenda adopted as presented.

Approval of Minutes

The January 22, 2026 work session minutes were approved unanimously with Commissioners Ortiz and Wilson abstaining.

Community Development & Legal Counsel Updates

Mr. Craig addressed the Commission with respect to the request for a definition of what constituted “adequate” infrastructure. Mr. Craig noted that he was unable to identify any specific criteria; however, made reference to a recent WebEx session that he was participating within that dealt with “data centers”. He noted that takeaways from the session appeared to support that if regulations were to be developed with respect to the land use, that special considerations should be given to noise generation from such facilities, their architectural appearance, and required parking associated with such facilities. Mr. Craig stated he was surprised that such facilities actually generated the level of noise that they did and that many codes referenced in the WebEx did not require parking since such facilities were generally uninhabited. He also commented on a theme that came up within the WebEx session about how “secretive” many data center applications were.

There was general Commission discussion on the observations that Mr. Craig shared and a summary of the prior work session discussion regarding the data center amendments was given for the benefit of Commissioner’s Ortiz and Wilson. Following this recap, there was concern expressed that additional evaluation of “cold storage” versus 100% active use data centers needed to be better understood. Comments were offered that “cold storage” was being replaced by storage “in the Cloud” and that having an exception for “data centers” operated as an accessory use to a hospital or University was not necessary given the records retained by such entities was also moving to be stored “in the Cloud”.

Old Business

A. UDC Revisions - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Mr. Zenner summarized discussion from the prior work session for the benefit of Commissioners who were not present and noted that supplemental commentary on the proposed revisions was submitted that would be discussed as time permitted and if the Commission desired to do so. Mr. Zenner walked through each of the proposed amendments that were discussed during the January 22 work session and provide context as to why the changes were being recommended.

Upon reaching the provision addressing the minimum lot area required of an R-1, R-2, and R-MF lot to accommodate ADU construction, Mr. Zenner recapped what staff understanding the Commission consensus was relating to this provision based on the January 22 discussion. He noted that it was his understanding that the majority of the Commission was in favor of returning the minimum required lot area to permit ADU construction to 5,000 sq. ft. in all zoning districts. Mr. Zenner explained in great detail why the current regulations were revised to reflect the current minimum lot area thresholds. Following this explanation, there was general Commission discussion. Following discussion, it was agreed by the Commission majority, that returning the minimum lot area to 5,000 sq. ft. in all zoning districts was still desired.

Mr. Zenner noted that returning to the former minimum lot area would still permit an existing legal or legally, substandard lot in the R-1 district no less than 5,000 sq. ft. to be improved with an ADU without CUP review, if the other proposed changes were approved. He also noted that current regulatory language prohibits “cottage lots” to be improved with an ADU. He further noted, given the underlying intent of why the “small lot” integration amendment was being pursued that returning to the greater minimum lot area to allow a lot to accommodate two dwellings was justifiable. The concerns expressed by the Commission were shared by staff and returning the minimum lot area to the original 5,000 sq. ft. would potentially avoid creating unintended consequences with limited impacts in ADU production.

Mr. Zenner then proceeded to discuss changes to the required corner side yard setback and noted that the Board of Adjustment would be considering a variance on this matter at its upcoming February 10 meeting. He noted that this particular provision was not just an issue with ADUs, but was one impacting general redevelopment of corner lots throughout the city. He noted that this impact was to be addressed first with ADU and then more holistically for all residential development by a broader “Dimensional Standards” table adjustment.

Mr. Zenner explained that the choice of the 15-foot setback was an arbitrary number intended to ensure ease of administration; however, historically (pre-UDC) the corner side yard was 12.5-feet (one-half the required front yard). Given this historical application Mr. Zenner indicated he was not “married” to 15-feet and would entertain revising it to the former 12.5-feet for any lot platted prior to 2017 subject to the current exception shown with in the revised language requiring that an ADU did not get constructed any closer corner side yard than the principal dwelling on the lot when it exceeded 12.5-feet. There was Commission discussion on the matter after which there was general consensus that 12.5-feet should be the minimum subject to the current exception.

There was additional discussion on the setback requirement noted within this regulatory provision that permitted an ADU to be located within 6-feet of a side or rear property line. Commissioners expressed concern that this provision was inappropriate and not well thought out at the time of ADU regulation adoption given the impact it created in an area understood by most as being unable to construct a residential dwelling within. Mr. Zenner explained the rationale for why the provision was generally created and noted that a provision to address the impacts of concern was offered within the regulatory changes which also received feedback from Mrs. Stolwyk and Mr. Claybrook.

There was general Commission discussion, that if a detached ADU were to be permitted in the rear yard that an enhanced setback should be required. Commissioners offered specific recommendations on what those setbacks should be, but there was no consensus reached. There was also discussion of a recommendation of how to mitigate the “privacy” issue that was underlying the ADU placement concerns which was part of the supplemental recommended ordinance amendments submitted by Mrs. Stolwyk and Mr. Claybrook.

Given work session time constraints completion of the discussion on the setback provisions was not able to be completed. Mr. Zenner noted that this matter would be further discussed at the February 19 work session, at which time, he hoped all matters would be resolved and a final path forward on the amendments could be identified. He also noted that given the public comment period on the definition of “family” would be closing on February 20 he would provide a summary of the comments received, to date, as part of the work session agenda.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve agenda by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Wilson, approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the January 22, 2026, work session minutes as submitted by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Walters, approved unanimously with Commissioner Ortiz and Wilson abstaining.

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
February 19, 2026
Conference Room 1A/1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Ortiz, Stanton, Stockton, Wilson
Commissioners Absent – Walters
Staff Present – Craig, Kunz, Halligan, Zenner

Introductions

None

Approval of Agenda

Agenda adopted as presented.

Approval of Minutes

The February 5, 2026 work session minutes were approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Public Comment “Summary” – Definition of Family UDC Revision

Mr. Zenner distributed the comments received to date on the revision to the definition and provided a summary of them. He noted that there was general support for the change. Mr. Zenner stated that the comments reflected several common themes which were a displeasure to defining “family” at all and that the revisions did not go far enough. There were several comments indicating a preference to return to the 1935 definition of “family” which basically drew no distinction between dwelling unit occupants other than they were not transient guests and contained no caps on the number of individuals that could occupy a dwelling. Several comments noted that the new definition should focus on an “occupancy” limitation. Commissioner Geuea Jones indicated that she had transmitted her Facebook group comments to staff for incorporation into the comment pool, but what was received on Beheard was consistent with what she was aware of on her Facebook feed.

After providing an overview of the comments, Mr. Zenner asked for Commission discussion and direction on the proposed amendment as it had been publicly shared and if changes were desired. He noted that it was not staff’s desire to adjust the recommended definition to revert to the 1935 version given it would not be respectful of the current established definition and would likely fail to take into account the unique conditions of housing occupancy given impacts that the student population has on the community. Mr. Zenner noted that removing the distinction between the R-1 and R-2/R-MF districts and retaining the current maximum number of **un-related** adults in a dwelling was likely the most modest step forward to resolve certain issues that would be capable of sustaining broad community support.

There was discussion on what Boone County was proposing within their code with respect to this matter. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Smith noted that the County was considering a more simplistic change to just define an occupant load with respect to housing and that the County does not have a rental registration program. Furthermore, concentration of people in neighborhoods is not as pressing a matter in the County as it is in the city given the vast differences in development and housing topologies.

Mr. Zenner also noted that the suggestion of addressing occupant loading in a dwelling was being addressed in the new definition. He noted that this was handled directly by incorporation specific reference to the International Property Maintenance Code (IPMC) standards with respect to occupant loads. He explained that owner-occupied housing is not assigned an occupant load at the time of being issued a certificate of occupancy, but rental housing would be at the time of licensing. If a complaint were received with respect to an owner-occupied dwelling being over-occupancy by a “family” the complaint would need to be investigated by Neighborhood Services staff.

After additional Commission discussion on this matter, the majority of the Commission agreed that they were satisfied with the proposed new definition structure. Having made this decision, Mr. Zenner noted that the public comment period on the amendment would close on February 20. He noted that given the Commission's consensus to not further modify the definition, he would prepare the text amendment for a public hearing before the Commission for either the March 19 or first meeting in April. The date of the hearing will be driven by ensuring that 15 days of public advertising could be achieved.

Commissioners indicated either date was acceptable. Mr. Zenner thank the Commission for their discussion.

OLD BUSINESS

A. UDC Revisions - Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)

Mr. Zenner summarized the discussion and proposed changes made to the regulations given ideas and recommendation shared in the prior work session. He noted that the version of the regulations distributed with the work session agenda proposed the removal of an ADU being permitted on a lot as small as 3,000 sq. ft. based on his understanding that the majority of the Commission was in favor of the change given the possible impact that would be created.

There was considerable discussion on this matter; however, once discussion ended the Commission agreed that an ADU on a 3000-5000 sq. ft. lot was not appropriate. Several Commissioners noted the predominance of lots this size were a rarity and that removing this provision would have minimal impact to the effectiveness of the standards. It was noted that eliminating the CUP in the R-1 district was likely a much greater driver of future ADU production. Mr. Zenner reminded the Commission that if warranted the regulations could be further amended if removing the small lot allowance was actual an impact in the production of ADUs following greater documentation that applications were being denied because the lot size was removed. Until there is better evidence that permits are being denied it was agreed that the concerns of having too much housing on a lot not capable of supporting it were justification to have the standard revert to the previous minimum lot area of not less than 5000 sq. ft.

There was also discussion with respect to the proposed increase in setbacks in the rear yard and side yard as well as proposed accessory structure height being greater than the primary dwelling. With respect to the building height, Mr. Zenner explained the rational for why a detached ADU should be allowed to be greater than the primary dwelling up to a maximum of 24-feet in height. He noted that this recommendation was made to accommodate 2-story accessory structure where the ADU was on a second floor of that building. The added height would ensure two fully functional floors of development and would still be 12-feet lower than the maximum height allowed in all residential zoning districts (i.e. 35-feet).

Mr. Zenner noted that the proposed revisions were recommending addressing the concerns of the additional accessory building height by additional rear and side yard setbacks. Furthermore, Mr. Zenner noted that this height exception would only apply to two story accessory structures that included an ADU. This meant that traditional accessory structures such as detached garages would still be regulated by the provision that they could not be taller than the primary dwelling on the property. Finally, Mr. Zenner noted that given other related UDC standards applicable to accessory structures such as the restriction that the total square footage of accessory uses on a lot cannot exceed the total ground floor area of the principal dwelling the concern that such structures would overwhelm the site were seem as being mitigated.

After discussion about how the increased side and rear setbacks would be applied, Commissioners agreed that this revision was acceptable. Mr. Zenner noted that he and the Division Manager for Building and Site Development needed to discuss the proposed text to ensure it was clear about how this new modification would be applied.

Mr. Zenner also explained that based on a recommendation to reduce adjacent property impacts by ADUs in rear yards he was recommending that setbacks be increased. Additionally, he noted that given concerns about ensuring compliance with landscape screening he had removed what previously appeared in the proposed revisions in lieu of governing window placement on ADU sides adjacent to R-1 or R-2 zoned lots. He noted that a 15-ft rear yard was proposed based on prior discussion during the March 5 work session and that a 10-ft side yard was recommended which would be consistent with the R-MF setback. He also explained the concept of how window placement would be managed when an ADU was adjacent to an R-1 or R-2 lot.

There was significant discussion about these proposed changes. Generally, Commissioners favored an enhanced rear yard setback and concluded that 15-feet was a reasonable distance. Whereas there less consensus on an enhanced side yard setback with some Commissioners expressing a preference for maintaining the current 6-ft setback. There was also significant discussion on the idea of restricting window placement as shown within the proposed revisions with the majority of the Commission not supportive of the recommendation.

Following additional discussion, a vote was taken on taken on the three recommendations. The majority of the Commission voted in favor of the setback revisions and the majority recommended denial of the window placement provisions. Mr. Zenner noted that he would modify the proposed changes as directed.

Having arrived at the end of the allotted meeting time, Mr. Zenner thank the Commission for their comments and noted that there may be additional discussion of this matter at the upcoming work session.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve agenda by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Wilson, approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the February 5, 2026, work session minutes as submitted by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz, approved unanimously.

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
April 23, 2026
Conference Room 1A/1B - 1st Floor City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Stanton, Stockton, Walters

Commissioners Absent – Ortiz

Staff Present – Craig, Smith, Zenner

INTRODUCTIONS

None

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda adopted as presented.

LEGAL COUNSEL AND DIRECTOR UPDATES

Mr. Smith provided an update on the City Council's actions from Monday night's Council meeting – specifically the voting on the PD plan for the Vantage Development south of Richland Road and east-west of Rolling Hills Road. He noted the item remained on the Council's consent agenda and was approved notwithstanding prior public comments and concerns. There was no report offered from Mr. Craig regarding legal matters.

NEW BUSINESS

A. UDC Text Change – Accessory Dwelling Units (Follow-up)

Mr. Zenner provided an overview of the "Final" draft of the regulations and explained that they have been fully vetted the impacted staff within the Community Development Department. He noted following this review their were several observations made with respect to certain provisions and some minor adjustments to the text last seen by the Commissioner were made to ensure clarity from an administration aspect. Mr. Zenner recapped all the proposed provisions for the Commission specifically calling out the changes in the required setbacks and ADU height would be handled.

There was general Commission discussion on the changes in the setbacks. Commissioners commented on the rear yard setback and only thought was going to apply to R-1 zoned property. Mr. Zenner explained that the revisions prepared had it equally applied to all zoning districts for efficiency in staff administration. Having variable standards in different zones was not what was previously understood was desired; however, if the Commission wanted to make a recommendation that it be amended as part its recommendation on the revised regulation stating why that would be more appropriate that would be acceptable, but staff believed the current standards were most appropriate and addressed the greatest level of concerns expressed about a "living" unit being within an area historically not associated with "habitable" space.

A second Commission comment was offered with respect that an ADU should be allowed to either be located at the same distance that an existing principal dwelling was setback from a corner-side yard if it was less than 12.5-feet from the side street and not have to be setback to the location of the principal dwelling's location if that dwelling was greater than 12.5-feet. Mr. Zenner explained that staff did not desire to have newly constructed structures closer than was the former corner-side yard setback was, the principal purpose of the proposed revision, and that setting back equal to the face of the principal dwelling when greater than 12.5-feet, but less than the current required 25-feet, was not uncommon. Mr. Zenner noted that if the Commission desired to recommend for Council's consideration a different standard with their recommendation on the regulations that would be appropriate. The revisions as written were supported by staff, believed appropriate, and offered relief that was not presently within the regulations. Mr. Zenner noted that the recommended revisions could have unintended consequences.

Finally, with respect to the rear yard setback, Mr. Zenner noted that the way the setback would be applied a "attached" ADU would be permitted to encroach into the standard 25-foot setback **without** up to 10-feet a Board of Adjustment variance. There was discussion on this provision and some concern with possible abuse. Mr. Zenner noted that this observation was also noted by the staff in Building and Site Development; however, there was no evidence to support that it was pervasive or would truly create an issue. Mr. Zenner noted that if the real concern was having a dwelling closer than 15-feet to a property line shared with another residential structure was it really that efficient to require an "attached" ADU to seek a variance. Staff did not see it was and that's why the standard was incorporated as written. The standard only applies to dwelling with an "attached" ADU and was seen as a mean to make the construction of such dwellings less burdensome. The majority of ADU permits issued have been for "detached" ADUs and it is very unclear if this standard would result in shift in construction

demands for “attached” ones. If abuse with this provision were to be identified, Mr. Zenner noted the regulations could be revised at a later time.

With respect to changes in allowed ADU height, Mr. Zenner explained how this new text would be administered. He noted that an “attached” ADU was already permitted to be constructed to the maximum height within the residential district (35-feet) and under the proposed provision a “detached” ADU would either have to meet the height of the primary dwelling on the property or **if constructed** as a second story upon another lawfully permitted accessory use be allowed a maximum height of 24-feet – no greater than another other accessory structure allowed in all zoning districts. To address setbacks of a detached accessory structure (inclusive of a second-story ADU) Mr. Zenner noted that the setback referenced in the ADU regulations would be applied not the general setback cited elsewhere within the UDC. The ADU setback are more restrictive than general setbacks for accessory structures and are seen as being consistent with Commission concerns about ADUs being located with a yard area that should not be encroached upon by a “habitable” dwelling.

Having discussed the most significant revisions, Mr. Zenner noted that the public hearing on the proposed text changes was scheduled for May 7. Commissioner Geuea Jones asked Commissioner if they had concern with this date or additional changes desired to be made. Commissioners did not request further revisions and noted that May 7 was acceptable for the hearing.

B. Unified Development Code (UDC) Text Amendment – Home Occupations

Mr. Craig noted that Law Department staff was still considering the most appropriate means by which to address the current local disconnect with the adopted State regulation governing this topic. He provided a brief overview of what was discussed at the last meeting and indicated that when the Law Department was prepared to move forward with the necessary legal compliance changes this matter would be brought back to the Commission for consideration. He reiterated that the changes being proposed were necessary to ensure legal conformance between the City’s regulation of “home-based” business and those adopted by the State. As such, the proposed changes were really not open for discussion; however, if further regulation of business not otherwise covered under the State statutes was desired those could be discussed as a separate work session matter.

C. UDC Text Changes – Corner-side yard & driveway setbacks and M-C building height

Mr. Zenner gave an overview of the topic. He noted that the purpose of discussing these matters was so staff could map out upcoming UDC regulatory changes it felt were needed to address/resolve reoccurring issues in the development process as well as establish work that could fill-in gaps between existing regulatory topics such as “small” lot integration and “data center” use-specific and CUP-specific standards. He noted that these topics would be brought before the Commission during the “off” work session where other “higher” priority text changes were not being discussed.

Mr. Zenner proceeded to explain the purposes of the changes to the corner-side yard and driveway setback revisions. The corner-side yard change would revert the existing setback of 25-feet to the pre-UDC (March 20, 2017) setback of 12.5-feet and apply to all lots considered “legal” by the code. There were comments offered by Commissioners as well as guests in the work session that some provision needed to be considered to allow for the revision to extend to non-legal lots as well. Mr. Zenner noted the request would be reviewed.

With respect to the proposed driveway setback provision and its revision, Mr. Zenner noted that this would be proposed to be fully eliminated for pre-UDC (March 20, 2017) lots. Recommendations were made that this amendment also look at the resolving potential issues impacting “attached” single family dwellings as well as be expanded to eliminate its applicability to any lot created after the UDC was adopted. Mr. Zenner noted staff would look into addressing these recommendations.

Finally, Mr. Zenner discussed the proposed text change relating to increase height of “hotels/motels” specifically within the M-C zoning district from the limitation of 45-feet to a proposed maximum of 60-feet. He noted that after several Board of Adjustment actions with respect to hotel height and several denials this request was believed necessary to ensure that the City can have an efficient and effective means to promote new, contemporary hotel construction. He noted that the amendment would be focused on Interstate 70 interchange locations and lands within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the interchange. He further noted that staff would examine possible hotel site locations along the US 63 corridor using the same methodology.

Mr. Zenner also explained that as part of this particular amendment is was likely that new use-specific standards would be developed to address possible height impacts on the surrounding built environment and that it would be possible that changes in the M-N zoning district would be recommended as well. He explained how the current height restrictions between M-OF, M-N, and M-C worked or in some cases may not.

Commissioners asked that staff what the purpose of the height restrictions were generally. Mr. Zenner explained that such restrictions are generally related to “life-safety” matters as well as quality of life. Mr. Smith noted it also

has to deal with community character. Commissioners requested that staff consult with the Fire Department to determine if a height maximum was really needed or if the building codes could just be allowed to govern in the commercial districts. Mr. Zenner noted that he would reach out to Fire as well as discuss the changes with internal staff in the Building and Site Development Division.

Having completed all agenda items, Mr. Zenner thanked the Commission for their time and recommendations. He noted that staff would continue to move forward with its existing regulatory changes and augment the work session discussions with these topics.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

ACTIONS TAKEN:

Made motion to approve agenda by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Brodsky, approved unanimously. Made motion to approve April 9 work session by Commissioner Gray and seconded by Commissioner Brodsky, approved unanimously with Commissioners Geuea Jones and Stockton abstaining.