

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
June 5, 2025
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1st Floor City Hall

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Ortiz, Placier, Stanton, Stockton, Walters, and Wilson

Commissioners Absent – None

Staff Present –Craig, Kunz, Halligan, Palmer, Orendorff, Teddy, Zenner

Introductions

The Chair recognized the newest appointed Planning Commission members and requested that each member of the Commission and staff introduce themselves.

Approval of Agenda

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

The May 22, 2025 work session minutes approved unanimously with Commissions Darr, Gray, and Stockton abstaining.

Old Business

A. UDC Revision – Definition of “Family” Follow-up

Mr. Zenner provide an overview of the proposed text change noting that the definition of “family” supplied within the work session packet was a combination of definitions that were previously presented by Mr. Teddy. Mr. Zenner noted that the three variations were offered to address the widest possible spectrum of tenancy configurations that were discussed during the May 22 work session.

He further noted that the actual impact of making the proposed changes had not been fully evaluated with respect possible parking issues that may arise within the city’s more densely populated areas given the opportunity to have a maximum of 8 unrelated persons within a qualifying structure. Furthermore, Mr. Zenner noted that discussion with the Neighborhood Services staff had not yet occurred with respect to their thoughts on the proposed revision or how the new IMPC inspection procedures to verify occupancy limitations would be implemented. Mr. Zenner noted that these matters had not occurred given he believed a “framework” for the new definition needed to be agreed upon rather than talking around the topic over multiple meetings.

There was general Commission discussion on the proposed revised language. Commissioners were supportive of the 3 variations presented and felt that they would address the majority of situations that were discussed during the May 22 meeting. It was noted that the term “up to” in subparts (b) and (c) were appropriate and ensured that no one would automatically be granted occupancy that would be greater than a dwelling’s bedroom capacity as stated by the IPMC and that maximum occupancy was not greater than what was being permitted by the STR regulations.

There was discussion on how the increase in occupancy would impact on-site/off-street parking. Mr. Zenner noted that this concern may not be as pressing in the R-1 zoning district given most homes constructed generally have sufficient parking to meeting the minimum 2 parking spaces within a garage, on a driveway, or a combination of garage and driveway. In some instances, Mr. Zenner noted, that dwellings within the R-1 district actually had double the required minimum parking.

Mr. Zenner noted staff has concerns with how the increase in occupancy could impact parking within the R-2 and R-MF district especially with single- and two-family structure that have sufficient bedroom floor area to support higher occupancy. These types of dwellings are only required 2 off-street/on-site parking spaces regardless of their occupant load today. He noted that in a duplex today, occupied by four un-related individuals

that drive there may be 2 more vehicles present than available parking spaces. In these types of situations parking spills over into the public streets possibly causing issues. To address this, he noted that staff was recommending a revision to the parking standards for single- and two-family dwelling such that 0.75 spaces/occupant be provided when such dwellings were used as a “long-term” rental. There was Commission discussion on this matter with several Commissioners agreeing that the revision was appropriate. Mr. Zenner noted that dwellings authorized to have the maximum occupancy of 8 individuals would require 6 total spaces. If such dwellings could not comply with the revised parking standards, the issued rental certificate would only permit occupancy based on available parking which Mr. Zenner noted was very consistent with how STR occupancy was being addressed.

As part of discussing of the text change Commissioners expressed the desire to define “housekeeping unit” to ensure what was meant by this term. Mr. Zenner noted that he could look into finding or proposing a definition for this term; however, expressed concern that doing so may create additional confusion. There was consensus on the need for the definition such that possible manipulation of what constituted a “family” by the proposed variations would be limited if not negated.

There was also Commissioner discussion about the need to ensure that sufficient public outreach to impacted stakeholders was undertaken prior to bring the matter before the Commission for the required public hearing. Mr. Zenner noted that staff could use several of its existing distribution lists to provide notice to the Apartment Association, registered Neighborhood and Homeowner Associations, and the listserv used by the PZC agenda notifications in addition to traditional newspaper notice. Concern was expressed that these traditional methods of engagement may not be sufficient and it was suggested that use of the City’s social media and potentially the BeHeard public engagement portal be used. There was general agreement that use of BeHeard may not be most the useful due to access issues for all residents.

Mr. Zenner noted that staff could coordinate with the City’s Public Communications Office to get the word out about the proposed text change. He noted that an update on public comments could be provided at the July 10 work session and based on comments received it would be possible to schedule a public hear on the final text change in August. Commissioners were receptive to this idea.

Mr. Zenner noted that he completed what was desired on this topic and would work toward obtaining public comments. The Chair asked if there was additional direction for staff. Hearing none, the Chair asked staff to proceed forward and report back at the July 10 work session.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve the agenda as submitted by Commissioner Wilson and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. The agenda was approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the May 22, 2025 minutes as submitted by Commissioner Wilson and seconded by Commissioner Ortiz. The minutes were approved unanimously with Commissioners Darr, Gray, and Stockton abstaining.