

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
August 18, 2016
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Burns, Harder, Loe, MacMann Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Strodman, Toohey
Members Absent: None
Staff: Moehlman, Teddy, Zenner
Guests: Farnen

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None.

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- Building Permit Report

Mr. Zenner provided the July 2016 building permit reports to the Commissioners for information purposes. He explained the calendar year to date (CYTD) spreadsheets. Mr. Zenner noted that based on current trends it is possible that building permit revenue will be ahead of last year due to the submission of the RISE apartment building project as well as several other smaller multi-family projects.

Mr. Zenner indicated that if the Commission desired more detailed information regarding the permit reports he would be happy to ask a representative from the BSD Division to join our next meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

- UDO Comment and Issue Spreadsheet

Mr. Zenner indicated that he had updated the Comment and Issue Spreadsheet with information through the July 21 meeting and apologized for not having it to distribute to the Commission this evening. He indicated that he would provide the supplemental sheets to the members at the August 24 meeting. Mr. Zenner also commented on the smaller format spreadsheet layout that was provided to the Commissioners with the agenda. He noted that the purpose of the smaller spreadsheet was to focus the work session discussion on the topics noted to be of greatest interest. He stated the comments were the same as those on the 11 x 17 spread sheet and if Commissioners wanted to use the large copy they could, but would have to flip pages more often.

Mr. Zenner began the work session by completing the “Y” answered comments/issues that started with Comment 149. There were no recommended changes to any of the “Y” answers. Mr. Zenner noted that the most current supplement had several additional “Y” answered comments, but the Commission and staff would circle back to those after completing the comments identified as most pressing and the special discussion on the M-DT comments.

Having wrapped up “Y” answered comment discussion, Mr. Zenner proceeded to begin review of the prioritized “N” answered comments beginning with Comment 54. There was discussion about the process and purpose for adding the removed M-1 use back into the IG district for the purposes of code adoption. Mr. Zenner indicated that it was staff’s desire to avoid the appearance of a “taking” as part of the UDO adoption process, but added that a comprehensive clean-up of improperly zoned areas based on current use was needed in certain areas of town. Commissioner’s inquired about the proposed post-UDO rezoning process and if it would result in “patchwork” of zoning designations. Mr. Zenner responded no. The zoning would be done more on an area basis than parcel-by-parcel. He further noted that it was likely property owners who would be zoned initially IG

as part of the district conversion process would benefit from being comprehensively rezoned to MC or MN since certain uses currently allow in M-1 would not be permitted in IG.

Following the extended discussion on Comment 54 Mr. Zenner moved to Comment 56 and was asked to revise the zoning district designation (should have been M-BP) to which the comment was referring and to proceed forward with adding “car washes” as a permitted use in the district. Comment 60 was explained as having been previously addressed and Mr. Zenner provided an explanation of the proposed solution. Ms. Burns expressed concern that the proposed solution still did not address an untreated side of a building “visible” from a public right of way.

There was discussion on Comment 61 dealing with “tiny houses” and Mr. Zenner noted that the elimination of the limitation on development of lots less than 60-feet wide or on lots smaller than 5000 sq.ft. may by default permit “tiny house” development on remnant lots currently considered unbuildable. The Commission agreed no change to the code was necessary at this time given the additional research required for creating appropriate standards – they felt such an activity should occur as a post-UDO adoption task.

Comments 62 and 63 were the last that the Commission reviewed during its work session. There was significant discussion regarding “civic structures” and their proposed exemption from the M-DT requirements. Mr. Moehlman explained the legal basis that permits governmental agencies from being held accountable to specific regulatory requirements. Commissioners indicated that it would be appropriate to have some reference in the code that says governmental buildings would follow the M-DT standards. Mr. Zenner and Mr. Teddy noted that public construction already has a review process and that any citizen can call out an inconsistency with meeting the standards during the public hearing process.

Mr. Teddy further suggested that he’d like the opportunity to discuss the matter at the August 24 meeting in the context of the other M-DT comments. It was also suggested that one way of addressing the issue of exemption was to remove “public” buildings from the map and revise the definition of “civic” structure.

Having reached the end of the work session’s allotted time, Mr. Zenner noted that the Commission would focus on the M-DT comments/issues at the upcoming August 24 meeting and pick up with comment/issue item 65 on August 30 if the M-DT discussion was complete. Mr. Zenner further noted that a small version of the M-DT only comments/issues would be distributed as an attachment to the August 24 agenda that would be sent out on Friday.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: Minutes from the August 4, 2016, meeting were approved. No other votes or motions were made. Meeting adjourned approximately 6:55 p.m.