



## Advisory Group Meeting Summary

July 23, 2008

---

### ***Members Present:***

Dick Ainsworth	Jim McDonald
Gary Bakke	Giovanna McLaughlin
Brent Campbell	Heather McMilin
Dave Chrismon	Kathryn Sheperd
Lee Clemmensen	Judy Smith
Lori Davidson	Paul Sopko
Dennis Druffel	Brian Walter
David V. Gray	Nick Kaufman
Jan Hoem	Ken Jenkins

***Others present in the audience:*** 15 citizens

**Note:** These notes supplement the presentation given during the Advisory Group Meeting on July 23, 2008. They are not meant to duplicate the presentation and they are not verbatim.

### ***Welcome and Overview of tonight's meeting:***

- ◆ Introduction by Mayor Engen
- ◆ Timeline indicating the place we are at within the current phase of this project
- ◆ Focus on “Advisory Group Review draft of Module 1 – District Framework”, document dated 7/11/08.
  - Approach and overview
  - Advisory Group members to highlight pros and cons of the draft proposal
  - Public comment
- ◆ Next steps

### ***Approach and overview:***

Kirk began by explaining that this meeting was to be an overview of the first module concepts, and that an evaluation would be done later to see whether 3 or 4 modules will be required for the entire process.

He recognized there is a new look to the ordinance and commented that Duncan Associates are still open to improvements to all elements. Among the changes there have been improvements in use classifications and district consolidations. Included in

the power point presentation was a slide showing how the district consolidations came about. (By looking at the standards and uses)

Some key points include:

- The list of permitted uses is generalized in most zones, steering away from the existing exhaustive list of numerous ways to describe the same use.
- Additional descriptions of residential building types are added. Future modules will provide additional development standards.
- The new cluster development option picks up on existing code ability to cluster for existing RLD-4, RLD-2, RLD-1, LSR, SSR and Open and Resource zones. Projects using this tool still have to go through subdivision review and require a minimum 30% open space.
- The new conservation development option encourages clustering in large lot zones (existing RLD-4, RLD-2, RLD-1, LSR, and SSR) with a minimum land area to qualify. Sixty percent of the project's area must be set aside as open space and an approximate 20% density bonus is possible.
- Some business and commercial districts were consolidated. An intensity designator is proposed in order to address varying standards.

After the power point presentation Kirk went around the circle of Advisory Committee members and asked for topics of concern from each member. These topics will be addressed and discussed at a future meeting.

### ***Topics of interest from Advisory Group members:***

#### **Items for further discussion**

##### **Lot line houses in R5.4 and residential building types.**

The zero lot line development is unclear, will cause problems, and some felt it should be eliminated from the ordinance completely.

Concern that lot line development may cause crowding in single family areas perhaps it could be a conditional use.

##### **Residential height (especially in R5.4)**

Concern and questions regarding the height in zone R5.4 – changing from 30 feet in the R-1 and 40 feet in the A to a proposed 35 feet.

The 35 foot height limit will be destructive in single family zoned areas when used with lot line houses. Suggest reducing the height to 30 feet and removing lot line house option.

##### **Controls on single-purpose residential buildings in business and commercial districts (vs. mixed use)**

More discussion is needed on making single-purpose residential uses in commercial areas Conditional Use.

##### **Split zoning**

Not allowing split zoning is desirable, but allowing overlays to split a parcel is also desirable (CLB).

Concern regarding partial zoning of lots.

##### **Affect of regulations on housing cost/affordability.**

Explore more tools for affordable housing. Would like to see incentives for workforce housing.

More dialogue is required for affordable housing.

Concern about mixed use – ground floor commercial, but it has to be in the right place. There may be an affect on affordable house.

Mixed uses may require the residential above to subsidize the commercial below.

##### **Cluster & Conservation development option (regulations & testing)**

Clarify small lot development and ability to cluster.

Cluster for larger lots, not seeing it go far enough.

Needs more consideration for the smaller lots.  
Consider effect of/on adjoining zoning districts and parcels.  
Define Neighborhood Conservation District better, how does it relate to the proposed historic Preservation Ordinance?  
The lot size calculation in the Conservation and Cluster needs to be clarified and explained.

### Uses (where specific types allowed and how interpretations are made)

Clarify the definitions of 2 unit townhouse, 2 unit house, and multi unit.  
Consolidation of districts may be able to go further.  
Renaming some of the districts R1 is confusing with the current R-1.  
Bed and breakfast in residential neighborhoods need clear and concise standards.  
Casinos are not mentioned as use in commercial or business districts.  
Liquor stores – look at use and location closer, concerned if established as a permitted use.

### Need for lot coverage regulations

Consider massing limitations.  
Consider maximum building coverage for commercial and residential.

### Transition and adjacency issues

Concern about transition areas between zoning districts.  
Will standards be guides for development or requirements, how will this happen when transitioning between zoning districts?

### Agriculture

How does the chicken ordinance fit in and crop versus animal agricultural?

### Fences [Not part of the module]

Fence regulations should be removed to a fence chapter.

### Hillside Standards [Not part of the module]

Hillside standards should be treated as an overlay.  
Want to see hillside standards for variations of hillside. Small (area) changes in slope should not have to kick in 25% is a buildable slope.

### Overlays [Not part of the module]

Concern regarding treatment of CLB's if not required as an overlay.  
Concern regarding gas stations not requiring an overlay (CG).

### Misc. topics

- Would like to see a chart for each district showing the differences between old regs and proposed regs.
- More and clear graphics for standards.
- Simplified approach on lot size and density which brings them closer but not completely solved.
- The interpretation paragraph needs to be clarified with regard to the amount of authority given to planning staff.
- Be sure architectural styles are not precluded by these regulations.
- What will happen to the anti-scraping ordinance with the adoption of these regulations?
- Electronic signs need to be regulated, hours of motion etc.
- Disappointment to see drastic reductions in minimum lot size for the R1 district.
- Where do neighborhood plans go, how do we get them to have weight? Clarify for the existing and future neighborhood plans.

## **Positive Elements**

- Preservation of Industrial areas.
- Combinations of zoning.
- Reorganization of document.
- Building type flexibility.
- Lot line type structures yield more usable yard space.
- Legibility and consolidation of districts.
- Format.
- Good increase in density while respecting neighborhood livability.

## ***Public Comments and Other Questions and Comments:***

- If the new R5.4 (R-I, A) district will allow a second unit on 5400 square feet it would be a drastic change and we would oppose it.
- No integration with current science and design arts. What is the basis for proposed guiding numbers?
- The regulations lack public health and welfare caveats.
- Concerns over increases into on “over crowded valley”.
- Staff should reference NEPA & others to avoid catastrophics.
- Likes the 35 foot height limit, many older existing homes are already 35 feet or more.
- Questions on feasibility of conservation option with 20% bonus and 60% open space.
- Agriculture goals should be different than Open Space.
- Mixed use may create some concerns now but would likely work into the future.
- Get rid of lot line houses.
- Recommend 30 foot height limit in new R1.
- Would like to see the comparison charts of each district.
- Density – minimum lot size. Increasing densities leads to mistrust.

Kirk gave an example of how creating more lots in a specified zoning district can be accomplished without increasing the density of the same area.

A 9,000 square foot lot in the R-XII zoning district would be allowed to have one structure (5,400 sq ft/ structure) and a maximum of three units (2,700 sq ft/unit). This could be built out as one triplex or one single family home (each structure requiring 5,400 sq ft). If the minimum lot size is reduced to 3,000 sq ft then each of the triplex units could be built on a separate lot (3 units X 3,000 sq ft = 9,000 sq ft) allowing for the possibility of individual ownership as well.

The consultants will create a side by side comparison of the existing zoning districts and proposed districts.

## ***Next Steps:***

The next meeting of the Advisory Group will be from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 14th in the City Council Chambers. It will focus on the topics of concern raised by the Advisory Group.