

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
April 9, 2015
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Lee, Loe, Puri, Reichlin, Stanton, Strodtman
Commission Members Absent: Russell, Tillotson
Staff: MacIntyre, Moehlman, Smith, Teddy, Zenner

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **Development Code Update – Use specific and dimensional standards**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and indicated prior to beginning the discussion he wanted to give the Commission advanced notice on what would be discussed at the upcoming Module 3 public meeting scheduled for Wednesday April 15 at 6:30 pm. He noted that Module 3 would be covering the administration and enforcement provisions of the new development code and that there would be several changes discussed at the upcoming meeting.

Mr. Zenner stated that within the new code it is proposed that conditional uses be handled by the Planning Commission and Council – no longer by the Board of Adjustment. He indicated that this change is a significant departure from current practice and is relevant to this evening's discussion since staff does not believe every conditional use currently identified in the land use tables needs to go through both the Commission and Council. As such, there may be new use specific or performance measures developed for certain current conditional uses such as neighborhood pool/amenity centers.

Mr. Zenner further explained proposed changes to how planned developments would be processed and considered for amendments, procedural changes for subdivisions, and how alternative dimensional standards in the R-2, M-N, and M-C districts would be implemented. He noted that the purpose for bringing these topics to the attention of the Commission was to ensure they were informed about what was likely to be discussed at the upcoming meeting. Mr. Zenner noted that following the Module 3 meeting the Commission and staff would discuss these issues at greater length.

Having given the preview of possible discussion topics at the Module 3 meeting, Mr. Zenner provide an overview of what was desired for this work session. He indicated that staff really was more interested in the Commission's thoughts on the use specific standards and that staff was not going to point out where it found possible conflicts. Mr. Zenner stated that many of the standards shown were repeats from the current code just recast in a new framework. He further stated that the consultants have made very few changes and that really is what staff was seeking to gain insight on from the Commission. Mr. Zenner referenced the questions in the staff memo as the guide for the work session discussion.

Chairman Puri opened the floor to the Commissioners to respond to the questions and express their thoughts on what was proposed by the consultants. There was general discussion and the consensus was that it would be helpful to have a real or fictional project to apply the standards against. The Commissioners acknowledged that they found it very difficult to digest the information on a topic by topic basis because the zoning code is not often looked at as book to read, but rather a document to go and solve a problem with.

There was also concern expressed that the standards, especially those in the M-DT, were far too complex for the lay-citizen to understand. Commissioners generally felt it would be best if the code could be simplified and that staff should work with the consultants on tweaking the use specific standards. There was general agreement that if the current use standards were effective changes may not really be necessary, but that decision should be left to the staff since they would be the ones working with those standards most in their day-to-day activities.

Have completed discussion on the use specific standards Mr. Zenner introduced the second topic to be discussed – the dimensional standard tables and graphics. Mr. Zenner noted that the table were generally a repeat of the existing dimensional standards found within the code today; however, recast to reflect the new zoning districts and in some instances new standards to accommodate alternative development styles.

There was general Commission discussion on the format of the tables and graphics. Generally Commissioner's felt the graphics were helpful in illustrating the dimensional requirements. There was concern expressed however as it related to several of the setback and lot area requirements proposed for the RMH and the "Cottage" style housing uses. The lot area for new mobile home lots was commented on as potentially being unrealistic given the current size of standard mobile homes. Additionally, the lot area as well as setbacks proposed for "cottage" style housing could have unintended consequences in already developed neighborhood settings – specifically the front yard setback being less than standard R-2 housing.

Mr. Zenner explained that what was being proposed was just that – a proposal. The staff in its review identified several potential "pinch" points as well and would need to address those with the consultant prior to finalizing the integrated draft. The idea of having a single outlying lot of "cottage" development in the middle of a fully developed neighborhood, while as drafted could occur, was not believed to be likely. This belief was based in the fact that concerns have been expressed about how the alternative development standards for "cottages" could be authorized.

Mr. Zenner indicated that depending on how the issue of authorizing the alternative "cottage" style standards was resolved the likely development of single lots with cottage-style housing would be limited if permitted at all. The idea of a cottage-style development was envisioned on much more holistic scale where several lots meeting certain criteria existed and the concept made sense. While not written that way at the present time this was part of the concern expressed about how the alternative standard would be made available which was still being evaluated. Mr. Zenner noted that this issue would be resolved prior to the integrated draft being completed.

Mr. Zenner indicated that the Commission's comments on these two sections of the code were helpful and would allow staff to have additional discussion with the consultants. He encouraged the Commissioner's to attend the upcoming Module 3 meeting and noted that if anyone desired to have time with the consultants to contact Tim Teddy to arrange for that.

- **2016 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) review**

Mr. Zenner reminded the Commission that they would be receiving presentations from the Public Works and Parks and Recreation Departments on the 2016 CIP at the next work session. These presentations would focus on the ballot related items for the August and November elections. The choice to utilize the projects proposed for inclusion on the ballots was to make best use of already prepared presentations. Mr. Zenner noted that the Finance Department has requested Commission comments on the CIP no later than May 11 to ensure that they are included in the Council's budget retreat packet. Final discussion of CIP comments would occur at the May 7 Commission meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

- Work Program Status – status update

No reports given

ACTION(S) TAKEN: March 19, 2015, minutes were approval. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:55 p.m.