

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes**  
**June 20, 2024**  
**Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**Call to Order**

Commissioners Present – Carroll, Ford, , Loe, Placier, Stanton, Williams, Wilson  
Commissioners Absent – Baysinger, Geuea Jones  
Staff Present –Craig, Kunz, Teddy, Zenner

**Introductions**

**Approval of Agenda**

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously

**Approval of Minutes**

The June 6, 2024 work session minutes were approved, as amended. Commissioner Williams noted that text on the bottom of page 1 where there was discussion of the reduced paving in the required front yard for lots less than 5000 sq. ft. needed to be changed to include the 30% option and indicate that paving limitations defaulted to which every was the greater of 200 sq. ft. or 30% of the required front yard.

**New Business**

**A. Zoning District Acreage Patterns**

Mr. Zenner provided handouts to the Commissioners relating to a prior request for the memo that Mr. Teddy had prepared for the Council’s consideration regarding “Inclusionary Zoning”. He noted that the Council did not provide direction to the staff to proceed with additional research relating to the matter. Mr. Zenner further noted that based on the comments made at the prior Commission meeting unlike what was present in the New Jersey, the city’s zoning code was fairly inclusive in its housing options within its current zoning classifications.

The current small lot project was undertaken to create “options” for attainable housing construction and that the issues associated with increasing the homeownership rates of historically disadvantaged members of the community involved other entities such as financial institutions and developers willing to engage. Mr. Zenner noted that zoning provisions are not intended to correct lending practices or the willingness of a developer to build less expensive housing. The purpose for zoning provisions is to create ways in which costs can be reduced with the understanding that there is not a guarantee that attainable housing will be constructed for everyone.

There was significant discussion with respect to this topic; however, there was no direct recommendation from the Commission as to what should be done with the contents of the memo. Several Commissioners express frustration that not enough was being done to address homeownership rates and if not now when would such action be taken.

Following this discussion, the principal topic of the agenda item was taken up. Mr. Zenner provided an overview of the data. He noted that the data was scattered given the department does not have an established policy by which to pull zoning district acreages year to year. He noted that given the interest it would be appropriate to establish January 2<sup>nd</sup> moving forward as the annual date for which future data collections would occur. Mr. Zenner also noted that as has been discussed previously, the R-1 zoning district is the most common (approx. 80%) of the residentially zoned land mass within the city. He noted that this is important if the small lot text change were implemented since these locations would be potentially most impacted by the use of small lots (3000 – 4999 sq. ft.) and medium lots (5000-6999sq. ft.).

There was Commission discussion about the data table provided. Commissioners noted that the imbalanced of date ranges for the data were not well suited for analysis. However, Commissioner as noted that they could see

that growth overtime was generally with the R-1 district. Commissioners asked if it was possible to determine what the lot sizes were within the properties that rezoned to residential, specifically the R-1 given it was the largest zoned acreage.

Mr. Zenner noted that this data was not available and would potentially require looking at the platting actions. He noted it may be possible to extract average lot sizes from parcel data that the city obtains from the Boone County Assessor's records. It was noted that having this information would potentially assist in understanding where not only the small lot integration project would have its greatest opportunity but it may also identify where other lot area changes (i.e. maximums) should be considered to promote more attainable construction and better usage of vacant land.

There was additional discussion that work that Mr. Kunz had prepared when looking at lot sizes within specific regions of the community may also provide guidance for addressing the Commission inquiry. Mr. Zenner noted that he would have to work with Mr. Kunz on this task as well as the department's GIS tech. As information became available it would be provided to the Commission.

## **Old Business**

### **A. UDC Text Amendment – Small Lots**

Mr. Zenner introduced the agenda topic. He noted that the clarity sought was necessary given prior Commission discussion with respect to creating regulatory requirements that would discourage use of the new small lots versus promoting their use. Mr. Zenner noted that as the current code is structured, zoning incompatibility is addressed through several different factors principally buffering/screening and neighborhood protections. The clarity desired is to understanding the Commission's intent of creating "cohesion" between and within small lot developments. Mr. Zenner noted what he was looking for was guidance on if the Commission wanted staff to prepare standards that may "isolated" small lot development from adjoining residential uses thereby increase development costs.

There was Commission discussion on this topic. Commissioners preferred to have standards that would draw upon the current regulatory provisions within the UDC – most specifically the neighborhood protection standards. Mr. Zenner explained that the neighborhood protection standards were not presently applicable to single or two-family development and to provide similar protections to adjoining single and two-family construction would require a minor adjustment to those provisions. Mr. Zenner further noted that discussion about creating "diversity" is related and that the architectural provisions offered would establish minimum design guidance associated with the development of small lots. He further noted, that the additional provisions relating to "variety" in the housing styles and topologies were being developed and would address lot size variations as well as potential include percentage-based housing topologies for newly created small lot development.

Commissioners noted their support for staff pursuing development of "cohesion" standards using a modified version of the neighborhood protection standards. There was concern that applying additional standards to this style of development would impact its use and may ultimately increase development costs. Mr. Zenner noted that given the Commission would not be discussion this topic of "small lots" on its July 18 work session agenda it was hopeful that staff could make progress on the development of the remaining use-specific standards. Mr. Zenner thanked the Commission for its input.

## **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

## **Actions taken:**

Motion made to approve the agenda as submitted by Commissioner Ford and seconded by Commissioner Placier. Motion made to approve, as amended, the June 6, 2024 work session minutes as presented by Commissioner Placier and seconded by Commissioner Wilson with Commissioners Baysinger and Williams abstaining