

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes  
September 4, 2025  
Conference Room 1A & 1B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**Call to Order**

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

Commissioners Absent – Brodsky

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

**Introductions**

None

**Approval of Agenda**

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

**Approval of Minutes**

The August 21, 2025 work session minutes were approved unanimously with Commission Geuea Jones abstaining.

**New Business**

**A. Planning Commission Correspondence – Short-term Rental Amendments (follow up)**

Chairperson Geuea Jones introduced the topic and provided some background with respect to what she understood the issues to be with the letter from the prior work session minutes. There was general Commission discussion on the updated correspondence. Mr. Zenner provided some added context with respect to the changes that were made to address Commissioner concerns.

Chairperson Geuea Jones asked if the Commissioners were satisfied with letter and its changes. Commissioners indicated that the changes adequately addressed the concerns and better represented the circumstances/actions surrounding the final vote. A single comment was made regarding a minor edit which involved keeping the “voice” of the correspondence active throughout. Based on this comment, Mr. Zenner made one revision to the letter during the work session. He noted given the Commission was satisfied with the correspondence that he would submit it to the Council with all the other public comments relating to the text change.

Chairperson Geuea Jones noted that this correspondence was a “one-off” precipitated by the public discussion surrounding the topic and was prepared as a means of explaining more directly why the changes were being sought. She noted that preparing such correspondence would not be a regular occurrence whenever public opposition or controversial decisions were made by the Commissioners. She thanked the Commissioners for their contributions to the correspondence.

**Old Business**

**A. Small Lots – Art. 5 [Subdivisions] Revisions Discussion**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and picked up from where the Commission had left off at its last meeting on the matter (August 7). He began by discussing the need to address the issue of “lot frontage” and “lot access” given new small lots, especially those in “infill” situations, may not always have either. In such situations new small lots could be a second tier of lots that would need to be accessed and fronted to something other than a public street. Mr. Zenner noted that currently the regulations did authorize the option of allowing a “shared” ingress/egress to be a substitute for public street access; however, want to make clear in these sections that such an access would be acceptable and know if there needed to be some type of additional limitation added to avoid unanticipated consequences by placing a driveway/access on a property line.

Mr. Zenner further explained that while previously discussed standards already addressed this topic with respect to single structure development on a new or existing lot, there had not been conversation on how this matter would be addressed when “redevelopment” of a deep lots occurred. Making sure adequate consideration of how to ensure legally compliant “stacked” small lot could be created was really the underlying intent of address this matter within the referenced sections.

There was general Commission discussion on this matter. Concerns were expressed that allowing a driveway to serve as access to multiple lots that otherwise did not have roadway frontage could create issues for an adjacent lot that was not seeking to redevelop with additional small lots. Commissioners felt the provisions needed to be amended to allow a “shared” access to fulfill the requirement of lot “frontage” and “access” in redevelopment/infill scenarios, but also noted that in a “greenfield” situation there is no need to allow for such modifications. The logic expressed for this variation was given the “greenfield” subdivision would be brand new and could meet general “frontage” and “access” standards as described in the code.

Given this conclusion, the Commissioners requested that staff prepare amendments that would allow for a “shared” access to serve as “frontage” and “access” to new redevelopment/infill small lots subject to the access/driveway placement being off-set from the adjacent property line by 5-feet as is the current UDC standard. Mr. Zenner noted he understood what the Commissioners were looking for and would draft language accordingly.

Mr. Zenner then proceeded to discuss a matter that was not unique to the small lot integration project, but rather to all subdivision actions. The matter had to deal with the process/considerations associated with the approval and/or denial of design adjustments following the criteria described in Sec. 29-5.2(b)(9) of the UDC. He noted that this topic has previously caused confusion for certain Commissioners and felt that addressing this matter as a part of the small lot project was timely given it is possible that a higher number of design adjustments may be triggered. Commissioners generally agreed that discussion and addressing the confusion would be worthwhile.

Mr. Zenner drew the Commissioner’s attention to one specific passage within the design adjustment criteria which appeared to some Commissioners as requiring **all** criteria listed in the section be **met** prior to recommending approval of a requested design adjustment. Mr. Zenner provided general context on what the purpose of the section was about and how staff approached its evaluation of design adjustments. He noted that a design adjustment was envisioned as a means of allowing modifications to the standards within the UDC when the alternative being proposed was either “equal to” or “better than” the regular requirement based on the unique characteristics of the proposed development. He further noted that the language of the section when applied to the Planning Commission’s review appeared more permissive than that of the Council’s action which clearly stated “the Council **shall** consider” the criteria in rendering a decision on the design adjustment.

There was Commissioner discussion the issue at hand. Chairperson Geuea Jones provided some examples of where this issue arose already and asked for legal clarity on the matter. Mr. Craig provided a response and indicated that it would be best to have harmony between the Commissioners responsibilities with the review criteria and those of the Council’s. Based on this reply, the Commission agreed that the confusion with the significant of the criteria could be simply addressed requiring both the Commission and Council be required to **consider** the criteria in their respective decision-making processes. Mr. Zenner stated he understood what the Commissioners sought as the correction. He would rework the language to state the “Planning Commission and Council **shall consider**” the criteria in deciding the outcome of a design adjustment request.

Mr. Zenner noted that the remaining provisions within Sec. 29-5.2 of the UDC were not needing revision given the standards described were “procedural” and that all future subdivision actions for small lot developments would need to follow the existing process. Having address the revisions to Art. 5 [Subdivisions] of the UDC, Mr. Zenner continued on to revisions within Appendix A.

Mr. Zenner noted that Appendix A included the provisions addressing roadway design and minimum right of way widths. He further reminded that the Commissioners that there is on-going consultant review of the street standards and that the completion of that project could impact what would be discussed now as a part of the small lot project. Notwithstanding this current work, Mr. Zenner indicated that within Appendix A there are already several existing street standards that need to be considered for revisions given the level of activity surrounding proposed “cottage lot” developments and that the Commission’s consideration of these changes would be timely.

Mr. Zenner began by noted that within all of the street standards of Appendix A there was a general “disconnect” between the minimum fire code width of streets and that stated. This disconnect was likely given the Appendix A standards were created prior to the current adopted Fire Code which development is now subject to, but there had never been a comprehensive revision to the UDC precipitating a need for changes until now.

Given this disconnect, Mr. Zenner noted that he would communicate with the Fire Department to gain clarification on the minimum right of way, travel lane width, and on-street parking restrictions that would be applicable to new small lot developments. Understanding these limitations would likely be very informative in formulating possible exceptions to the standard requirements described within the street details.

Mr. Zenner further noted that one of the primary objectives in looking at alternatives to the standards presently communicated in Appendix A was to reduce overall development costs, but not impact public service/safety delivery options. He also noted that possible revisions would be more applicable to “greenfield” developments than “infill” projects.

Commissioners generally agreed that tailored revisions would be needed. There was some concern expressed on this would be clearly communicated. Mr. Zenner noted that creating specific “exception” language would be one approach or creating a separate regulatory section specific to small lot development would be another; however, he had not given it much consideration at this time.

Mr. Zenner noted that he would continue his presentation on the revisions to Appendix A at the next work session and may potentially begin presenting revision text for the Commission to consider relating to modification previously discussed. He thanked the Commission for their contributions and the work session discussion.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

### **Actions taken:**

A motion made to approve the agenda as submitted by Commissioner Ortiz and seconded by Commissioner Wilson. The agenda was approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the August 21, 2025 minutes as submitted by Commissioner Wilson and seconded by Commissioner Gray. The minutes were approved unanimously with Commissioner Geuea Jones abstaining.