

Planning and Zoning Commission Special Work Session Minutes
July 27, 2016
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Burns, Harder, Loe, MacMann, Rushing, Russell, Strodtman, Toohey
Members Absent: Stanton
Staff: Moehlman, Teddy, Zenner
Guests: Farnen

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None.

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- UDO Comment and Issue Spreadsheet

Mr. Zenner opened the meeting by picking up where the Commission had left off at its July 13 special session (top of page 6 of the spreadsheet) and indicated that he was working on completing the integration of comments from the July 7 and 21 meetings. He noted the additional comments should be available before the August 4 work session and he would distribute a spreadsheet addendum to add to the existing spreadsheet packet they were working with. He further noted that the spreadsheet posted online was different from the one he distributed at the July 13 meeting. The spreadsheet online was not sorted by “Y” or “N” items whereas the Commission’s version was.

Mr. Zenner presented the comments and there was general Commission discussion. A request was made to provide clarification regarding the application of screening between residential and commercial uses when the residential use was located on commercially zoned land. Mr. Zenner explained that in such situations the residential lot would not be required to screen from the commercial use, but the commercial use, if built after the residential use, screening would be required. He further stated that if the residential use came after the commercial use was built there would be no retroactive screening placement on the commercially used property. Commissioners were concerned that was not clearly stated in the regulations and desired that clarification be added. Mr. Zenner noted that such clarification would be included in the final public hearing draft.

Mr. Zenner continued presenting concerns and issues and came to the comments relating to design standards, “four-sided” architecture, and building articulation. Mr. Zenner explained that the UDO included specific provisions for multi-family buildings as well as all other types of building construction with a list of excepted uses. Commissioners expressed concerns about how the multi-family design provisions applicable to multi-family buildings in the R-MF district were at a disadvantage to single and two-family buildings of similar size.

There was lengthy Commission discussion on this topic. Following discussion there was consensus that the term “four-sided” architecture should be revised to state “all-sided” architecture and that additional provisions regarding landscaping and building material treatment be added to the UDO. Specifically, the landscaping standards were recommended to be changed to require that buffer materials between multi-family R-MF and single and two-family R-MF be increased to require the 80% opacity of such screening be achieved at the time of planting. In regards to the “all sided” architectural treatment it was concluded that the non-street side of a multi-family building be required to meet the same architectural treatment as the street sides whenever the building was greater than 24-feet (i.e. generally a three-story building) in height. The architectural treatment would be for the entire non-street side and be in addition to the required property edge buffering.

The Commissioners agreed that the landscaping would help to soften the impact of a two-story multi-family building against a single-story home or duplex and that such treatment was most economical. Whereas, the additional standards relating to architectural treatment and landscape buffering made sense when multi-family buildings greater than the typical single or two-family dwelling (maximum of two-stories) were adjacent to each other. The added cost of the architectural treatment would generally be distributed across a larger number of units and therefore could be better absorbed into the construction costs.

Upon reaching consensus on how to address the issues of building architecture and buffering the Commission made a motion to adjourn the work session and pick up discussion at the August 4 work session. Mr. Zenner noted that there would be no regular hearing items on the August 4 regular meeting agenda and asked the Commissioners if they would like to have an extended work session till 8 pm. Commissioners agreed that this would be appropriate.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: Minutes from the July 13, 2016 special work session were approved. No votes or motions were made. Meeting adjourned approximately 8:15 p.m.