

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
April 6, 2023
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Carroll, Geuea Jones, Kimbell, Loe, MacMann, Stanton and Placier
Commissioners Absent – Burns, Wilson
Staff Present – Palmer, Teddy, Thompson, and Zenner

Introductions

Approval of Agenda

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously

Approval of Minutes

No meeting held on March 23, 2023

Old Business

A. UDC Text Amendment – RC (Residential Cottage) District

Mr. Zenner gave an overview of the proposed R-C District by beginning with the definitions and working through the proposed changes. He noted that since the item's presentation at the March 9 meeting several changes to the ordinance amendment had been made. He noted that the definition of "cottage" dwelling may need to remove reference to a maximum square footage given the desired outcome was to allow for "small-lot, small-footprint" homes to be constructed not only in the proposed RC district but also in the R-2 and R-MF district on substandard lots.

Mr. Zenner continued to describe the changes that would be necessary to the district descriptions in Article 2 noting the revision to the R-2 district and the removal of the reference to the Board of Adjustment's role within the approval process for cottage-style development. He then discussed the necessary changes to the "summary" table of dimensional standards that would be required with the proposed amendment indicating that a new description and summary table for just the R-C district would be created.

There was Commission discussion relating the proposed changes to the table and a question was asked to clarify that what was being proposed was necessary as it was originally understood that staff was just going to prepare an amendment to create the R-C district. Mr. Zenner noted that what was being discussed incorporated not only the change to make a new R-C district, but also preparing the R-2 and R-MF districts to allow small-lot, small-footprint development possible. He noted that the combined effort was to potentially address the current issue associated with "substandard" lots with less than 60-feet of frontage and creation of a pathway to avoid future lot consolidations that were perceived as eroding neighborhood character.

Commissioners discussed this approach to the amendment and were generally supportive of the efforts; however, recommended that in presenting this matter to Council that the idea of the R-C district be presented first with the revisions to the R-2 and R-MF districts being a secondary activity least the whole amendment process be misunderstood. Mr. Zenner acknowledged the observation and indicated such a tactic could be utilized as the item proceeded through the regulatory process.

As Mr. Zenner continued to explain the dimensional standard table revisions to the R-2 district there was discussion relating to the required front yard setback. Mr. Zenner noted that following the March 9 meeting he had reviewed the setbacks and concluded that it was more appropriate to retain a 25-foot setback in the R-2 when cottage-style development would be permitted and not accessed from an alley. This revision would require an additional 5-feet be provided; however, would ensure consistency with all other zoning classifications and provide additional depth when a vehicle was parked in the front yard versus the minimum 20-feet that is typically necessary. He further

noted that a reduction to a 10-foot front yard would be possible if the lot utilized alley access as it means of ingress/egress.

There was significant discussion on the impact that this revision would create. As part of the discussion, the issue of “median” front yard setback was brought up. Mr. Zenner indicated that based on the way the amendments were prepared the conflict being discussed was not contemplated. He noted that in instances where a cottage-style home would be proposed in the midst of a developed block that the provisions of median setback would over-rule that of the dimensional standards table. He further noted that Article 4 contained the “actual” dimensional standards applicable to each zoning district and that what was being shown in Article 2 was just an excerpt of those standards without any footnotes.

Mr. Zenner noted that, if desired, a specific “exception” in the median front yard setback provisions to exclude R-C from its rules could be drafted. There was additional Commission discussion relating to this suggestion which concluded with the majority of Commissioners not in favor of it. It was further noted that the reduced front yard setback would ostensibly only really be of value in new “greenfield” construction where it may be possible to have alley construction supporting the cottage-style development and not necessarily in “infill” development. As such, it was agreed that returning the front yard setback to the original 20-feet with a footnote being added to the dimensional standards table in Article 4 noting required compliance with the “median” setback would be acceptable.

Having reached the end of the allotted work session time, the Chair asked Mr. Zenner what the next steps were. Mr. Zenner indicated that he’d like the Commission to review the remainder of the amendment with specific attention being given to the possible “use-specific standards” and the Permitted Use Table revisions. He noted that same materials presented at tonight’s work session would appear on the April 20 work session agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:55 pm

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Motion made by Commissioner MacMann, seconded by Commissioner Loe, to approve the agenda as proposed.