



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Planning and Zoning Commission

Thursday, November 5, 2020
5:30 PM

Work Session

Conference Room 1-B
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.

Adopt agenda as presented

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 22, 2020 Work Session

October 22, 2020 work session minutes were adopted as presented unanimously.

Approve October 22, 2020 minutes as presented

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2021 Submission Calendar & Filing Deadlines

Mr. Zenner asked the Commissioners to review the proposed calendar of deadlines and meeting dates. He explained that the staff was now sending out advanced notification postcards to property owners adjacent to a planning case in lieu of in-person public information meetings to follow health guidelines, and the calendar reflected this. He said they would post on the website on Monday of the following week for the public and applicants.

B. Comprehensive Plan Update - Survey Results

Mr. Kelley reviewed the survey data which had been received to date via a PowerPoint presentation. He described there were concerns by the staff that the demographics of those taking the survey were not a great match for the demographics of the community in metrics such as where participants lived, age, race, homeownership status and others. He also described that while there was consensus on some aspects of the survey questions, there were polarized results as well. The Commission had significant discussion on how to better engage a more representative and diverse group of citizens. There was review of the demographics of participants and responses to various questions.

Mr. Kelley and Ms. Bacon also summarized what they had heard from one-on-one and small group meetings with stakeholders. They had met with nearly 100 persons

in this manner. They described the groups attended and the number of online surveys taken (general and subject matter) and the types of feedback. The community indicated a desire to ensure more diversity in planning, and there were frustrations that “squeaky wheel” groups sometimes monopolize the content of plans because they come out more than others. This was on both sides of transportation elements of the Plan, e.g. non-motorized transportation proponents were concerned there wasn’t enough implementation for trails, rail, sidewalks, transit, etc. while other groups thought these elements were overly prioritized over road, bridge and other existing infrastructure needs.

Stakeholders had emphasized the City needs innovative public engagement processes to collect meaningful and sustained input from diverse and representative members of the community. Stakeholders had recommended that communications needed to be right-sized and accessible in the ways that citizens want to be engaged, and not just a one-off here and there. Frequent, one question surveys, and other types of communication were described.

Ms. Bacon and Mr. Kelley explained that they heard from many groups that relationships forged during the original Comp Plan efforts and during the development of the Status Report need to be maintained, supported, and strengthened. Groups such as the DLC and Sierra Club encouraged follow up with them through the process and beyond. Engagement and education are a two-way street in a transparent and inclusive process. Follow up and follow through is equally important. Staff also heard that affordable housing and evolving technologies (social media, micro transportation, etc.) need to be featured more predominantly in the Plan. There were also discussions about the relationship between planning and public health in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. There were concerns expressed by citizens that planning and government were not fair and equal in how all citizens were treated, especially in tough economic times.

Mr. Kelley showed the priorities chart they’d used capturing the 2013 priorities compared to how the plan elements were re-prioritized by the public in the public surveys in 2020. He said about half of the top prioritized plan elements had gone up or down in terms of the public’s prioritization. There was discussion on how there were different development pressures being experienced by neighborhoods in the intervening years, and how this may have changed priorities to some extent. There was discussion on areas that diverged in terms of public priorities-- issues that were seen as very important by some but not very important by others, and the factors which may be behind this.

C. Comprehensive Plan Update - Status Report

There was additional discussion on how to further engage the community and policy level discussions which were garnered by the survey results, both in what was heard in the actual results and by the clearly lacking level of participation despite good intentions and best efforts by the staff and Commission. This needed to be pointed out in the Status Report as a disclaimer and there had to be meaningful efforts and strategies to do better now and especially for the full plan update. Significant resources and drawing on our lessons learned and the best practices from other places would be a part of the process. There were noted

limitations due to a busy time of year with the election and the ongoing stresses and struggles and inability to meet in traditional ways due to COVID-19.

There was discussion on how to move forward, with a call to keep the surveys open for another two weeks with efforts by the Commissioners to spread the word to additional groups. There was also discussions on how to make the plan itself easier to digest and more mobile/web-friendly. Ms. Bacon said she'd conducted research and there were many options available to pursue in the future. She presented a draft executive summary that they could provide with the Status Report to have a big picture version that was shorter and more digestible. The Commission said this was worth creating for readers that did not have the time for a deep dive.

D. Climate and Environment Commission Correspondence

There was discussion on the letter provided on the Status Report from the Climate and Environment Commission. Commissioners discussed the content of the letter, and desired to spend additional time discussing with the CEC the opportunities and concerns they saw in the relationship between the two boards and the CAAP and the Comp Plan. They would follow up with the CEC as a next step, likely early in the next year.

Mr. Zenner said there would be an updated version of the status report to review at the November 19 work session meeting which would reflect the public input received at that point, understanding that as additional survey data came in it would be revised to reflect it. The surveys would remain open until then.

VI. NEXT MEETING DATE - November 19, 2020 @ 5:30 pm

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:58 pm

Move to adjourn