

TITLE 21 COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

9-6-07

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 a review of the minutes of the last meeting. Tom Nelson noted that mobile homes were defined before 1976 and manufactured homes are different. The Committee then discussed the differences between “trailers” and “mobile homes” and “manufactured homes” and how this issue could be addressed. Ms Ossiander wants more options for these types of housing. Ms Selkregg wants affordable housing versus “trailers”, “mobile homes” and “manufactured homes”. For her, the housing strategy should be to make “manufactured homes” affordable.

The Committee then began work on the Commercial and Mixed-Use Districts.

Mr. Coffey asked about the purpose statement on page 13 lines 18 and 19 compared to page 14, lines 13 and 14. The first is directed at the development of strip retail/commercial all along the road. The second deal with individual development. Ms. Ossiander directed her comments to the second part of Mr. Coffey’s question. The staff advised that the second provision was intended to limit the number of curb cuts.

The Committee then discussed the 25 foot depth requirement on page 14, line 19.

Ms. Selkregg then asked about the size of the district which is 4 acres maximum found on page 15, line 1. This maximum size is qualified by the provisions of the FARS and the Major site plan review provisions.

Staff anticipates that there will be re-zoning applications for these new zones. Also, the staff anticipates that the district plans may result in some of these types of re-zones.

The Committee then discussed the B-3 district. Staff anticipates restricting this district to the major arterials. It is anticipated by staff that property owners will re-zone to the other districts because of the permitted uses in the newer districts.

Mr. Coffey asked about the timing of the DT-1, DT-2 and DT-3 districts which await the adoption of the new Downtown Comprehensive Plan and

the work of a consultant. It is anticipated that the requirements of these zones will be presented after the 1st of the year (2008).

The Committee then discussed the RO zone. Ms. Selkregg expressed concerns about “loop holes” which allow for “bad development”. Mr. Coffey stated that the conditions of the zone and the design standards found elsewhere address those concerns. Ms. Ossiander asked about the 25% limitation on retail. Currently, retail is not allowed in the RO district. This will permit it, but limit it.

Ms. Ossiander then asked question about hostels and “visitor accommodations”. Ms. Selkregg is opposed to “visitor accommodations”.

Mr. Coffey then asked about “net density” on page 16, line 7. After discussion it was agreed that we will have ONE measure of density.

Ms. Selkregg then asked about how we can insure that the RO district will be use appropriately. Mr. Coffey responded that any re-zone requires an ordinance, PZC review and Assembly approval.

The Committee then reviewed the General Purpose/Intent of the Mixed Use District.

Mr. Coffey asked about the number of Mixed Use Districts being proposed. He questioned the need for so many and also stated that simple economics (land cost) will prohibit residential development. Ms. Selkregg responded by saying the we could require residential development as part of a re-zone. Staff stated that “coercion” is not part of this code, but “permission” is part of the code.

The Committee had a process discussion centered on the question of whether or not the committee is reasonably content with the outline of the districts as presented and dealing with the details or whether we want to look at the major structural changes. The staff’s idea is that the Committee is to get informed, but that “global” changes should be considered/discussed only after we have the benefit of public comments and PZC review and comments.

The Committee then discussed the NMU district, its size of the area and the size of the buildings.

Mr. Coffey wants to delete subsection 3. a. because it is, in his judgment, incomprehensible and therefore unclear. Ms. Selkregg wants to “do a better job” in developing the criteria. She does not believe that this criteria works.

Mr. Coffey asked what “community scale” on page 18, line 19 means. There was no clear definition. He also asked about the definitions of “community activity center” and “commercially-designated transit-supportive development corridor” on page 18, lines 32 through 34. No good answer was forthcoming.

The Committee then asked about the size of the CMU and the RMU districts. There is no limit on the size of these districts. Unlike the NMU district there is less concern for the residential area which the NMU is intended to serve.

The MT-1 and the MT-2 for Midtown is reserved. We are not going to have this provisions until the Midtown District Plan is adopted. There were provisions in the previous draft, but none in the current provision.

The Committee then reviewed the Mixed Use District Development Standards. Ms. Ossiander asked about the FAR requirements. Mr. Coffey about the affordable housing standards. Ms. Selkregg asked about the term “indistinguishable” as applied to affordable housing.