

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
November 20, 2025
Conference Room 1A/1B - 1st Floor City Hall**

Call to Order

Commissioners Present – Brodsky, Darr, Geuea Jones, Gray, Ortiz, Stanton, Stockton, Walters,
Commissioners Absent – Wilson
Staff Present – Craig, Kunz, Halligan, Orendorff, Smith, Zenner

Introductions

None

Approval of Agenda

Meeting agenda adopted unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

The November 6, 2025 work session minutes were approved with Commissioners Gray and Stockton abstaining.

Special Items

A. Small Lot Integration Text Amendments – Article 5 and Appendix A

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic, provide a synopsis of what progress he had made in preparing the text changes as well as explained that Mr. Kunz was working on the graphic visualization that the Commission sought to see how all the regulations worked together. He noted that he hoped to have the majority of the text amendments completed by the December 4 work session. Mr. Zenner further noted given there was no “regular” business to be conducted on December 18, there would be an extended work session to allow Mr. Knuz time to present the visualizations of the proposed amendment provisions and wrap up “loose-ends” on the text changes. Given this schedule could be met, the proposed fully text change would be presented to the local design community in January 2026 for testing. Optimistically, Mr. Zenner commented that the proposed text changes would be presented to the Commission for a public hearing in April 2026.

With this introduction Mr. Zenner ran through approximately half of the specific text changes within Article 5 and Appendix A that were identified as part of the Commission’s earlier discussion. Mr. Zenner noted that provisions were added to clarify that reductions in minimum lot size (area and width) and preservation bonuses would not apply to small lots. He also noted that given the M-OF and M-N districts had been included in the proposed text revisions given single-family detached housing was allowed within these districts.

There was discussion on this addition and if it were actually necessary given there were no general dimensional (i.e. lot standards) for this type of development within the zoning districts. It was noted that the majority of the residential development occurring within these districts was actually multi-family not single- or two-family development. Mr. Zenner acknowledged that this was a correct statement; however, noted that if a property owner were to consider using property so entitled to develop small lots without undergoing a rezoning action it would be necessary to ensure that such development could not benefit from the existing reductions, in essence “double-dipping”. There was additional discussion on the topic which concluded that given the limited nature of single-family development in the districts leaving the exception as written was appropriate.

Mr. Zenner then discussed the proposed text changes address the issue of when sidewalk installation would be triggered with creation of small lots. He noted that to address this matter a new subsection needed to be created that essentially created a “carve-out” for installation on longer infill properties where an irrevocable access easement would be created to access lots not fronting an existing public street. Mr. Zenner noted the proposed amendment language essentially required property being subdivided to create additional small lots to install sidewalk along the primary street frontage, but be exempt from having to install sidewalk along the irrevocable access easement.

There was general Commission discussion on the proposed text. It was noted that there really was no reason to include the first full sentence of subsection (iii) which was describing the lot sizes that would be exempt. Rather the Commissioners believed the new subsection was complete by simply expressing that sidewalk construction on irrevocable access easement would not be required provided they were less than 250-feet in length. Mr. Zenner explained the origins of the 250-foot distance which consists with the maximum length of a “residential” street not required to install sidewalks. It was further discussed that if a proposed irrevocable access easement were longer or there was a desire to not install sidewalk at all along the primary street frontage, an applicant would need to seek a “design adjustment” just like they would today with standard lot development.

Mr. Zenner then proceeded to discuss text amendments that would allow the Commission and Council the ability authorize the creation of “flag/stem” lots on previously unplatted (subsection “a”) and platted (subsection “b”) property. It was noted an oversight was made in the preparation of these text changes that failed to identify the distinction between the two subsections with respect to what review body (i.e. Commission or Council) would have principal authority in authorizing the creation of the “flag/stem” lot. “Flag/stem” lots described in subsection “a” were primarily reviewed by the Commission and then Council. Whereas, “flag/stem” lots described in subsection “b” were the sole purview of the Council. Given this oversight, the proposed provisions within subsection “b” (specifically i, ii, and iii) needed to be added to subsection “a”. Furthermore, it was agreed that using the same limitations on lot width shown in subsection “a” should not be repeated in subsection “b” given existing lots that may be substandard and sought for further subdivision using a stem may have more than 59-feet of roadway frontage.

Mr. Zenner noted that the purpose of creating the new provisions relating to “flag/stem” lots would generally only be applicable to “infill” development scenarios given the “flag/stem” created would also need to be encumbered by an irrevocable access easement. In new “greenfield” development “stacking” lots and using “flags/stems” as an access alternative would be discouraged and the use of alleys in such development would be encouraged instead.

Having completed the discussion of all prepared text changes and receiving supportable feedback, Mr. Zenner noted that he would condition to work to complete the remaining amendments. He noted that the Commission’s discussion on this topic would continue at the December 4 and 18 meetings.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.

Actions taken:

A motion made to approve the agenda, as submitted by Commissioner Darr and seconded by Commissioner Walters. The agenda was approved unanimously. A motion made to approve the November 6, 2025 minutes by Commissioner Walters and seconded by Commissioner Darr. The minutes were approved unanimously with Commissioners Gray and Stockton abstaining.