



## Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Agenda

January 8, 2025, 6:00 pm  
Council Chambers, City Hall, 201 S. Franklin St.

Online viewing location:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/KirksvilleCity>

---

Call Meeting to Order

Roll Call

Order of the Agenda:

Staff Report of additions or changes  
Motion (and Second) to approve the order of the agenda  
Vote – Ayes / Nays / Abstain

Minutes:

Minutes of the regular meeting on October 09, 2024  
Motion (and Second) to approve minutes  
Chair asks for corrections  
Vote – Ayes / Nays / Abstain

Old Business:

None

New Business:

### **1. Election of Chair**

- a. Nominations
- b. Discussion
- c. Vote – Roll Call
- d. Newly-elected Chair Now Leads the Meeting

### **2. Election of Vice Chair**

- a. Nominations
- b. Discussion
- c. Vote – Roll Call

Staff Comments:

None

Citizen Participation

(Time Limit of Five Minutes) Citizen participation is for suggestions and comments on items affecting the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City, but are not on the agenda. Action by the Commission other than acknowledgment is not expected at the same meeting. Citizens may address the Commission on topics which are part of the regular agenda when these items are discussed by the Commission. Citizens must add their signature to the Citizen Participation Sign-In Sheet and announce their name before they begin speaking. The Commission does like to follow up with citizens and request citizens willing to leave a form of contact.

Adjournment

Notice of Nondiscrimination:

All persons within the City of Kirksville are free and equal and shall be entitled to the following equal use and enjoyment within the city at any place of public accommodation without discrimination or segregation on account of age, ancestry, color, disability, gender, gender identity, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation or on any other basis that would be in violation of any applicable federal, state, or local law.

Notice of Disability Accommodations:

Any person with a disability desiring reasonable accommodation to attend this meeting may contact the City Clerk at 660.627.1225 to make such arrangements.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF October 9, 2024

PRESENT:

Dan Martin, Chair  
Jeremy Hopkins, Vice Chair  
Betty McLane-Iles  
William Robb

Patricia Sexton  
Bruce Thompson  
Kabir Bansal, Council Representative  
Sara Knipe, City Planner  
Ashley Young, Community & Economic Development Director

ABSENT:

Jason Chrisman  
Chuck Heckert

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Martin called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission in the City Council Chambers to order at 6:00 p.m.

**ORDER OF THE AGENDA**

Chair Martin asked if there were any changes to the agenda. Mrs. Knipe stated there were none. Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles made a motion to approve the agenda. Dr. Sexton seconded the motion. The agenda was approved with the following vote: Aye: Bansal, Hopkins, McLane-Iles, Robb, Sexton, Thompson, Martin. Nay: None. Abstain: none. Absent: Chrisman, Heckert.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Martin asked for a motion to approve the minutes of September 11, 2024. Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion. Chair Martin asked if there were any corrections to the minutes. With no corrections, the minutes were approved as published with the following vote: Aye: Bansal, Hopkins, McLane-Iles, Robb, Sexton, Thompson, Martin. Nay: None. Abstain: none. Absent: Chrisman, Heckert.

**OLD BUSINESS**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Variance** – *A request for a variance from Sec. 44-334. – Detached accessory buildings. (a) and (b) at 1216/1218 W. Missouri Street.* Mr. Hopkins made a motion to recommend the City Council approve a variance from Sec. 44-334. – Detached accessory buildings. (a) and (b) at 1216/1218 W. Missouri Street. Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles seconded the motion.

Mrs. Knipe stated the petitioner intended to build a home. She mentioned that normally an accessory building would not be permitted without a permanent structure already in place. She stated the petitioners were asking for an exception that would allow for the storage of equipment to maintain the front lawn for the neighborhood and to stay in compliance. Mrs. Knipe said they were working on building plans. She stated the city staff supported the variance request.

Mr. Hopkins asked for clarification that once the house was built, if it was within three feet, the building could be in the front yard. Mrs. Knipe said that by looking at the map, it depended on how they addressed the building of the home. She mentioned that once the lot combination was completed, it would depend on the topography and what could be done. She explained that depending on those variables, it could possibly be moved further back. Mr. Thompson stated the petitioner planned to build their house on top of the hill with a steep driveway. He said they had been mowing the front lot of the property, falling within the red

line on the map. Mrs. Knipe stated due to physical reasons, the petitioner wished to keep the lawn equipment at the bottom of the hill.

Mrs. Knipe stated that once the lot combination was complete, the property would have an “L” appearance. Mr. Robb asked if the shed met the proper setbacks or if it would need to be moved. Mrs. Knipe confirmed the shed met the proper setbacks. Mr. Robb stated the only caveat he would add would be that the variance would only be for the current location of the shed and not for any future location, should it be moved. Mr. Robb asked if it was not routine for a construction management shed to be placed for storing construction materials. Mrs. Knipe stated there was a permit process for beginning construction. Chair Martin asked if only a shed could be placed on a property for maintenance. Mrs. Knipe responded you could not under the current code. Mr. Hopkins stated the concern was that there was no intent to place a home on the current lot. Mrs. Knipe responded that the individual lot would be combined to form a single large lot. Chair Martin pointed out that once the home was built, the intent would be to paint the shed green and plant a row of Juniper Trees to provide a privacy screen.

Commission members discussed the different processes between a homeowner installing a storage shed versus building contractors installing a temporary storage shed for housing materials, which is a part of the building and construction permit process.

Chair Martin asked if the owner had a building permit. City staff responded the owner did not. Commission members discussed the type of shed that had been built along with the possibility of moving the shed.

Mr. Hopkins mentioned a discussion held with Mr. Young prior to the meeting. In that discussion, he asked if the variance was assigned to the property or the occupant, which he was informed was assigned to the property, which would not present an issue for future property owners. He stated at some point you would be mowing uphill, along with landscaping, on the property, making the location of the shed irrelevant even though he understood it would be taxing for the individual. He stated the property owner chose to buy the lot even though it was topographically challenging. He pointed out that with the surrounding homes, it appeared to be a valuable area. He stated that with buying the land, hiring contractors, and building the home, there should be other solutions for mowing, such as a riding mower or hiring someone to mow. He also mentioned solutions such as naturally seeded short grass or moss for a non-mowing solution that would meet the current code. Mr. Hopkins stated that he found the petitioners’ ideas for the property interesting, but believed there were enough solutions to the problem that a variance was not required. He stated that if the concern was that a storage shed should not be located in the front yard, then the code in general should be addressed. Mrs. Knipe responded that the owners intended to have low-maintenance landscaping and the area being mowed currently would be the only area where grass would be located. Dr. Sexton responded the petitioner installed the shed without knowing it could not be placed in its current location, meaning a variance needed to be approved, or the owner would need to remove the shed. Chair Martin asked if an option could be added to set a timeframe for the completion of the lot combination and building of the home. Mrs. Knipe stated the motion could be amended to include a timeframe for completion. Chair Martin asked about the reason for staff supporting the variance. Mrs. Knipe responded they wanted the grass to be maintained, and this offered a reasonable solution to allow the owner to do the maintenance. She also stated they were aware this would be a multiphase process. She explained that if this were already one lot, this would be a different conversation.

Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles asked when the owner purchased the property. Mrs. Knipe responded she did not have that information. Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles pointed out that the property owner’s diagnosis could have been received after the property purchase. Chair Martin asked if it was known if the property was deeded to the petitioner. Mrs. Knipe said to their knowledge the petitioner was the property owner. Chair Martin asked if there was further discussion. Mr. Robb stated he wanted to see the owner do what he said he would do, such as paint the shed and plant the trees. Mrs. Knipe stated a temporary variance could be a reasonable request. Mr. Young shared that the motion could be amended to include a timeframe. Mr. Hopkins stated

a timeframe of six months to paint the shed and plant the trees could be a reasonable request. Dr. Sexton mentioned the variance was to allow the shed to be on the property no matter what color or surrounding foliage. Mr. Thompson said the shed was the size that three men and a boy could easily move, and it was not permanently attached to the ground that he could tell. Mr. Hopkins stated that fact made it less of an issue to move.

With no further input, the motion as stated was approved with the following vote: Aye: Bansal, McLane-Iles, Robb, Sexton, Thompson, Martin. Nay: Hopkins. Abstain: none. Absent: Chrisman, Heckert.

**2. Variance** – *A request for a variance from Sec. 44-104. – Maintenance of parking facilities and design specifications. (c) at 2026 N. Baltimore Street.* Dr. Sexton made a motion to recommend the City Council approve a variance from Sec. 44-104. – Maintenance of parking facilities and design specifications. (c) at 2026 N. Baltimore Street. Mr. Hopkins seconded the motion.

Mrs. Knipe stated MA Bank was asking for a variance regarding the surface code. She stated they have a lease for two years and they would be required to return the property to its original state. She stated any poured concrete or asphalt would have to be removed, so they wished to use gravel. Mrs. Knipe stated the benefit of using gravel would be less stormwater runoff. She also mentioned they were moving towards taking a better look at planning and falling more into smart planning, meaning it would not be necessary to pour concrete and then rip it out within two years. She stated city staff recommended approval of the request.

Mr. Robb asked for an explanation of a Temporary Bank. Mrs. Knipe stated the petitioner was looking at several property locations to build a permanent bank building. Mr. Thompson responded he had been in the banking business for 40 years. When opening a branch in a new community, they would rent or buy a small mobile home designed specifically with an interior layout allowing it to function as a bank. This building would be used while they build a customer base and work on building their permanent facility. He stated once that was complete, they would remove the temporary bank. Mr. Robb stated the building would not need a permanent foundation. Mrs. Knipe stated that was correct and would save a lot of unnecessary construction. Mr. Thompson pointed out parking for customers was already there. Mr. Bansal pointed out MA Bank was a well-established bank in Macon and would be a great addition for the community. Prof. Dr. McLane-Iles asked if they had found a permanent location. Mrs. Knipe stated they were still looking at several locations. Chair Martin asked if the position of the trailer was known and if it would line up with the other building; possibly north and east of the current concrete stub. Mrs. Knipe indicated that was her understanding.

Mr. Robb mentioned that the reasons to use gravel, which would be better for the environment and help with percolation, were wonderful and asked about adding that to the permanent code. Mrs. Knipe stated it depended on the situation. She explained that gravel could cause other issues, such as accessibility. Mr. Robb referenced an article he read about the use of gravel at the National Mall and how well it was working. Mrs. Knipe stated depending on the area and use, that could be part of the smart planning approach used in the future. Chair Martin acknowledged there was a concern over the use of too much concrete regarding water runoff.

With no further input, the motion was approved with the following vote: Aye: Hopkins, McLane-Iles, Robb, Sexton, Thompson, Bansal, Martin. Nay: none. Abstain: none. Absent: Chrisman, Heckert.

#### **CITIZEN / STAFF / COMMISSION INPUT**

Mr. Robb asked about the sale of the Reiger Amory. Mr. Young responded it was owned by the school district and they had decided to sell the property.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business, Dr. Sexton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bansal seconded the motion. Chair Martin declared the meeting adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

Teresa Dorris  
Recording Secretary