

TITLE 21 COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

8-30-07

The Committee came to order at 9:30 a.m. Present were all three committee members as well as staff and members of the public.

The Committee began its discussion with the “awning” issue associated with a pending ordinance. The staff will prepare a definition of architectural feature for purposes of encroaching into the right of way.

The committee then began its work on Chapter 4.

Ms. Selkregg asked about the location of “open space” and “landscaping” in Title 21. Staff reported that this is found in chapter 7.

The Committee then discussed the zoning districts in general and the desire to avoid an area wide re-zoning. Mr. Coffey’s general comment was that we are creating new districts where they may not be necessary and as to the level of detail. His concept was that much of the detail found in the new districts be left to various district plans. The Committee then discussed these two concepts.

Then the Committee then discussed the residential zoning districts.

The Committee then discussed the new R-2F district which is intended to deal with areas in transition. The discussion centered on the prescriptive nature of the language versus the use of Special Limitations (SLs) in a re-zone process. Neither system is perfect, but staff believes that using a prescriptive method with the limitations found in the proposed code will bridge the gap between R2A and R2M. Further, there is nothing in this section which prohibits the use of SLs if and when zoning changes to this zone are applied for by property owners.

The Committee then discussed the R-4 Multifamily Residential District 2. This District includes FARs and limited commercial and the R-4A Multifamily Residential Mixed Use District. The discussion centered on the extent of commercial uses, FARs, DUAs and the bonus system.

Also discussed were the prescriptive provisions which deal with blank walls. These provisions which work in some circumstances and not in others. A better way to do this might be to require the site plan reviewer or the conditional use permit issuer to consider these issues at the time that the review takes place. It was agreed by the committee to add this type of language.

The Committee then discussed the R-5 zone which permits mobile homes. This is the only district outside of mobile home parks where mobile homes are permitted. Mobile home is defined as a manufactured home built after 1976. There are issues with mobile homes and manufactured homes.

Next, R-6 zoning was discussed. The size of the lot is 1 acre and the calculation currently required to use $\frac{1}{2}$ of the abutting right of way. This simplifies the zoning. Mr. Coffey asked about lots becoming non-conforming. The solution is a provision that deals with these lots not becoming non-conforming.

R-7 was next discussed. This is a 20,000 square foot lot.

R-8 which is 4 acres in size calculated without consideration of the abutting right of way. Mr. Coffey asked about the similarity between R-8, R-9 and R-10. They all deal with larger lots and low density development along with the absence of public services (sewer & water) and may have "topographical or other natural conditions" or "steep slopes". Again, we want to avoid re-zoning lots of property. This discussion also encompassed the R-9 and R-10 zones and the steep slopes issues of the R-10 zone. The average slope table reflects current practices of the platting board.

The Committee concluded its work at 11:30.