

TITLE 21 COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

9-27-07

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 started with Industrial Districts on Chapter 5 of the public hearing draft.

Ms Ossiander asked about the definition of schools which does not include pre-schools. The staff pointed out that pre-schools are included in the definition of "child care centers". Page 20 and 21 lines 24 and 1 respectively.

Mr. Coffey then reminded staff of the new ordinance proposed re: restaurant and eating place liquor licenses. This may change this proposed language.

Mr. Coffey then asked questions about the adult ordinance which is confusing relative to "unaccompanied minors" versus "no minors allowed". The staff will look at this because of the confusion resulting from the provision on line 11, page 20 and lines 19-20 on page 20.

Mr. Coffey then asked about the party wall agreement and the requirement of "uniformity and common appearance". There was a discussion about this provision.

Mr. Coffey then asked about the set back requirements on the common property line. There was a discussion about this provision around current exemptions based on square footage.

Ms. Ossiander asked about the use of the term "one household" on page 22, line 36. The staff noted that this term was modified by the term "designed"

Ms. Ossiander commented that she intended to include more than the R-5 district. She will address this on large lots. Page 23, line 23.

Mr. Coffey asked about the prohibition of "variances" for a four page section of code. Why is this necessary? The committee discussed this issue which staff advises is in current code.

Ms. Ossiander asked about the "permanent foundation" prohibition in lines 5-7 on page 24. This was different than the flood plain

requirements. After discussion it was agreed that we would add the words “except as otherwise provided....”.

Mr. Coffey asked about the lot size on lines 3-4 and lines 12-18 on page 24. Currently, lots are 3,000 square feet so this is an increase of at least 500 square feet. This increases the costs of this housing. Ms. Selkregg supports larger lots than these. Ms. Ossiander supports the current lot size as does Mr. Coffey.

Ms. Ossiander asked about road surfacing (page 24, lines 40-41) and Mr. Coffey asked about set backs (page 24, lines 20-26) which are the current standards.

The committee then discussed roads, road width, street frontage, etc on pages 24 and 25.

The committee discussed the “L4” landscaping requirement on all 4 sides of a park regardless of what it abuts. “L4” is 30 feet in width which the committee believes is too much and needs to be revised.

Ms. Ossiander then discussed the provisions on page 26 re: “additions” aka “accessory buildings”. There will be discussions on this section.

Ms. Ossiander then asked about the number of exits. It is inartfully written (staff concurs), it will be clarified to state that you cannot eliminate an exit when you build an addition.

The committee then discussed the convenience establishments provisions on page 27, lines 1-15. Staff reported that all parks have a site plan and if there is no convenience establishment in the park, the site plan would have to be modified. For new parks, the establishment would be part of the new site plan.

The committee then discussed the flood hazard overlay district (page 27-28).

The committee then turned to the “Group Living” provisions on pages 28 through 30.

The Assisted living facility provisions mirror existing code. (Page 28)

The Correction Community Residential Center (Page 28 and 29) is subject to a proposed new ordinance. The issues are a cap on occupancy and the distance between these centers.

The habitative care facility replaces quasi institutional facilities without changing the substance of the code. This type of facility provides housing and treatment.

Roominghouses were discussed in more detail. The # of guestrooms was discussed. The committee was advised that the fire code holds that more rooms is a hotel. Mr. Coffey suggested that we add language limiting the number of guest rooms but subject to fire code compliance, more guest rooms would be permitted as is current practice in town.

The committee then discussed transitional living facilities which are intended to be temporary in nature. The discussion centered on the idea of "special needs" as language which could be incorporated. The staff will consider this addition.

We stopped discussion on chapter 5 at this juncture. We will attempt to get to page 54 next time.

Ms. Selkreg then handed out a comparison chart on dimension zoning. She suggested that we (the staff or the committee) prepare this type of comparison. This has been done to some degree by staff and was handed out by Erika.

Mr. Coffey stated that the last time we did this, through public hearings at PNZ and the Assembly with the Issue/Response methods which permits analysis of the real issues. The public was informed and did have an opportunity to be heard multiple times.