



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Thursday, September 10, 2020  
5:30 PM

Work Session

Conference Rms 1A-1B  
Columbia City Hall  
701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

**Present:** 9 - Tootie Burns, Sara Loe, Joy Rushing, Lee Russell, Anthony Stanton, Brian Toohey, Michael MacMann, Valerie Carroll and Sharon Geuea Jones

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

#### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Meeting Agenda adopted as presented unanimously.

##### **Motion to approve minutes as presented**

**Yes:** 9 - Burns, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Toohey, MacMann, Carroll and Geuea Jones

#### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### **August 20, 2020 Work Session**

August 20, 2020 work session minutes were adopted as presented with Ms. Loe abstaining.

##### **Motion to approve minutes as submitted**

#### V. NEW BUSINESS

##### **A. UDC Text Amendment Project, Phase 1**

Mr. Smith introduced the topic. He gave an overview of how they anticipated proceeding over this and the next work session meeting in terms of identified updates, clean up, and revisions to the UDC. He said it was not unexpected to be at the point of identifying revisions to make the code more user friendly for the staff, applicants, and public at this juncture, 3.5 years since adoption of the new code.

He said this first phase was designed to be generally simpler and less controversial to handle lower hanging, yet important, issues and to get in the rhythm of text amendments. The proposed amendments were focused on improving clarity and on areas where there was confusion, conflict between the intent and the delivery of the text, and areas where there were numerous requests for relieve (e.g. structures over a lot line).

Mr. Smith pulled up a PowerPoint Presentation and went through the proposed text amendments line by line with the Commission. He began with explaining how arterial streets were listed in the definitions section. The proposed amendment was agreed upon as a means to have all "street-types" listed together within the

definition section.

Mr. Smith moved to the second proposed revision which dealt with the addition of a definition for banks and financial institutions. He explained that this amendment was proposed to address confusion that this use was classified within the definition of office. There was significant discussion on the addition of this definition based upon Commissioners concern such that such a definition would include the land use of payday/title loan businesses which are generally predatory in nature. Mr. Smith explained that such land uses were already considered captured by the call-out of "banks and financial institutions" within the definition of "office" and the proposal to create a separate definition was to callout the use for clarity and convenience of UDC users. He noted there was no intent to expand land uses already generally considered included within the current code.

There was general consensus to have banks and financial institutions as a stand-alone from the "office" definition and to permit then in the same zones as "offices". Some commissioners cited examples during the previous code development hearing that banks did want to be listed as a separate use from all other office uses. There was discussion of how bank drive thrus were a conditional use in the M-N but permitted in the M-C zones and how modern banking facilities were evolving with the computer tellers being installed.

The Commission further discussed the need to call our payday/title loan businesses individually from other financial institutions so that at a later date either use specific standards or possibly conditional use permit requirements could be prepared. Staff indicated that could be done; however, noted that to ensure no non-conformities were created the use would be listed in the Permitted Use Table of the UDC in the same locations where banks and financial institutions are permitted today. Staff further noted its preference for creating use-specific standards over the conditional use permit process due to potential subjectivity or politicization when the intent is to regulate land uses.

Staff noted the need for Council to direct the Commission to engage in the creation of such standards which could mirror those currently being considered by the Legislature if desired at some point in the future. As for the current activity, there was consensus to come back with a definition for payday/title loan business now only.

There was discussion of how to handle the definition for clear cutting versus logging and what each meant. There was discussion of whether to leave the definition in or take out and the ramifications of each option. There were split Commissioner votes on the matter. It was agreed that staff would confer with Building and Site staff on the issues and bring back additional information at the next work session to resume the discussion.

There was discussion regarding the definition of "wall sign" and if painted wall signs should fall under that definition given such signs are expressly prohibited on buildings elsewhere within the sign regulations of the UDC. Several Commissioners

desired to revisit the prohibition, especially in the downtown, given there are some existing iconic wall signs, some new ones were desired, and it was often a challenging task to differentiate between a painted mural and a painted sign. It was agreed that the sign ordinance revisions would need a separate, deeper dive; however, for now the definition could instead reference the provisions of Chapter 29-4.8 and what is regulated to allow for the definition to match any future revisions to the sign code itself.

Given the work session time was running short, Mr. Smith discussed how they this process would move forward. He indicated that staff would provide their recommendation and the Commission would be asked to vote each change “up” or “down”. If voted “down”, Commissioners would be able to offer alternative text to vote on so that Council could see the will of the Commission versus the staff recommended action. The Commission proposed ways to make alternative recommendations or revised text that took into account public input and Commission priorities and while trying to balance the challenge of avoiding discussions outside of the public hearing, but also understanding the challenge of presenting alternative text on the spot. Ideas were proposed and additional discussion would be held.

Ms. Geuea Jones would also provide to Mr. Zenner, for distribution to the Commission, information on State regulations and proposals relating to payday lenders. Some Commissioners also noted that while known issues with payday loan businesses exist, that many living in poverty are also unbanked and sometimes check cashing and other financial institutions do serve some neighborhood needs.

There was consensus to bring this topic back at the next work session and continue the discussion.

## **VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - September 24, 2020 @ 5:30 pm (tentative)**

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned approximately 7:02 pm

**Motion to adjourn**