

**Planning and Zoning Commission Special Work Session Minutes**  
**August 31, 2016**  
**Conference Room 1-B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:** None.

**TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:**

- UDO Comment and Issue Spreadsheet

Mr. Zenner opened the meeting and indicated that the Commission would pick up with question 65. He provided explanation of the different tree preservation areas and noted staff would develop a definition for Tree Preservation Easement. He noted that the placement of trees on their own lot would assist in better clarifying what was to remain on a site and what could be removed.

Discussion regarding question 66 resulted in the Commission requesting that staff draw a more clear distinction between commercial and residential logging operations. Mr. Zenner indicated that a logging operation was generally considered a commercial activity and that timbering for residential construction on an individual lot would not be. He agreed a clarification in the definition to draw the difference would be helpful.

There was significant discussion regarding the changes in the “planned” district process. Concerns were expressed that the requirement to submit a full development plan along with a zoning application for property to be rezoned to PD was excessive. Staff attempted to explain why the standards were written the way they were. Commissioners were not convinced that the new procedure would not have adverse negative impacts. Mr. Zenner suggested that one option to a full-blown development plan would be to permit more of a “conceptual/bubble plan” that would serve as a guide for future site improvements. Commissioners were receptive to the idea; however, still not convinced. After further discussion, the Commission did not make a recommendation to change the way the PD provisions were written.

Mr. Zenner then moved to questions 71-73, 78-79, and 81 all of which dealt with the HP Overlay requirements and the HPC’s role in the designation of property. Mr. Zenner explained that the HPC did have the authority to nominate property for Most Notable Status without owner consent; however, such action was rare. He further explained that Most Notable Status did not subject the property to any of the HP Overlay requirements. Mr. Zenner explained that the only property subject to certificates of appropriateness were those designated as Landmarks or contributing property within an HP Overlay District. Designation of a Landmark structure and the creation of an HP Overlay are the responsibility of the Planning Commission and Council – the HPC does not have direct authority to confer such designations.

Commissioners inquired about the potential of HPC proposing changes to the regulations within the UDO. Mr. Zenner indicated that he was aware of discussion to request changes to the requirements; however, did not have a firm date on when such changes would be presented. Mr. Teddy indicated that the Commission could consider a late submission of any comments from the HPC like comments from any other source. Commissioners felt it inappropriate that they should be asked to consider proposed changes this late in the

process. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Teddy explained that this is difficult to control and depending on the significance of the changes it could delay a vote on the UDO to allow for adequate review. Alternatively, the Commission could recommend the UDO move onto Council noting that the proposed changes, if any, were not supported due to lack of time to review. After additional discussion the Commission agreed to leave the text as it was written understanding that aggrieved members of the public would have opportunity to express their dissatisfaction with being potentially brought into an HP Overlay or being designated as a Landmark without their consent at both the Commission and Council public hearing levels.

The Commission requested that question 75 be addressed by adding Tree or Landscaping services to the MC and M-BP districts provided there was no outside storage of materials. The rationale for allowed the use in these districts was that to have vehicles or equipment in these locations was not inconsistent with the other uses already allowed. Restricting the storage of materials was seen as a health and safety issue.

Mr. Zenner explained the rationale behind question 76 and why zero-lot line housing was an appropriate alternative to conventional detached single-family in the R-2 and R-MF zoning districts. There was limited discussion following Mr. Zenner's explanation and the Commissioners were comfortable to continue to allow the zero-lot line housing to remain in the UDO as proposed.

The issue of four-sided architecture in questions 77 and 83 were noted as having been previously addressed. The issue of median setbacks (question 86) was resolved by noting that the proposed Clarion standard would be applied city wide and if the UC-O districts wanted to amend their overlay standards to keep the full block measurement technique in place in just their Overlay area that was appropriate.

There was also discussion on the proposed revisions to create more relief for small lots along the Business Loop. Mr. Zenner noted that relief already existed in the way of no required parking for buildings or sites less than 10,000 sq. ft. and that the BOA process could be used if compliance with the standard provisions following a catastrophic loss were to occur. He further noted that there were relief provision within the landscaping standards that would allow the Director to modify landscaping and screening. Mr. Zenner concluded by noting that caution should be exercised in creating provisions to accommodate issues on the Business Loop as they would be applicable to all other MC property city-wide. The Commission had general discussion and concluded that the means of relief in the code could accommodate the case-by-case situations on the Business Loop and additional changes were not generally needed.

Having reached the end of the questions/issues within the August 18 spreadsheet, Mr. Zenner indicated that the Commission would proceed forward with the remaining "N" answered questions at its next meeting on September 7. He noted the agenda for that meeting would be distributed on Friday.

**ACTION(S) TAKEN:** No votes or motions were made during the meeting. Meeting adjourned approximately 8:30 p.m.