

Item G - ORD19-249 Public hearing and recommendation of an ordinance amending Chapter 144, Zoning, Section 144-3.4 Zoning districts and regulations for property zoned subsequent to June 22, 1987-, and Section 4.2, Land Use Matrix, with the creation of an additional single family residential zoning district; 3.4-2 R-1A-5.5, Single Family Residential District. (Case Manager: Jean Drew)

Commissioner Meyers asked if the commission is handling both Item G and Item H together.

Mrs. Drew stated she will be presenting on both items, but each will require individual action.

Mrs. Drew presented Item G and Item H; Item G, R-1A-5.5 Single Family Residential District will require a 5,500 square foot lot minimum, 50-foot lot width, 110-foot minimum depth, and a front setback of 25 feet; Item H, R-1A-4 Small Lot Single Family District will require a 4,000 square foot lot minimum, 45-foot standard lot width, 40-foot width option with rear alley access, no minimum depth, and a front setback of 15 feet with a reduced setback option for alleys.

Chair Edwards asked for clarification on the 20-foot garage setback and 25-foot front setback.

Mrs. Drew stated that the garage structure can be setback only 20 feet while the primary structure must be setback 25 feet.

Chair Edwards noted that in the R-1A-4 zoning corner lots must maintain a 50-foot lot size.

Mrs. Drew clarified this was so there could be a commonality between lots and setbacks.

Chair Edwards asked for clarification on the width requirements of the alley street.

Mrs. Drew stated she believed the measurement was 22 feet.

Chair Edwards stated he is wary of new requirements increasing the cost of development which offsets the aim of smaller lots to reduce the price of development.

Chair Edwards asked if the utility providers will enforce any easement requirements outside of the bounds of the reduced required setbacks.

Mrs. Drew specified NBU had stated it can vary depending on the circumstances of the lot, but broadly they would have the ability to place utility easements within the reduced required setbacks as specified in each ordinance, and the alleyway provided in R-1A-4 zoning would provide an opportunity to place this easement within the alleyway rather than on the lot.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Meyers stated affordability needed to be expressed in a variation of housing types and not just variations on single-family zoning.

Mrs. Drew stated one of the goals of the new zoning ordinances was to provide a starting point for an affordable single-family home zoning district and then provide more variation from there.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Sonier asked if our code allows for quadrplexes or triplexes.

Mrs. Drew stated any development with three living units, or more is considered multi-family.

Mrs. Snell stated we have two multi-family districts, R-3 and R-3L, for low and higher densities.

Chair Edwards stated once the fire department added the restriction of sprinklering any development considered multifamily rather than just allowing for a demising wall, developers were drastically less likely to build tri or quadraplexes due to increased cost. Chair Edwards stated increased requirements will increase costs, so it is important to be reasonably mindful about zoning requirements in order to increase affordability aside from the cost of land.

Commissioner Meyers stated he has no objection to the zoning ordinances but hopes this is the beginning of code changes that will result in more affordability within the city.

Mrs. Snell stated the alleyways would be required to have 25 feet of right-of-way and 22 feet of pavement.

Mrs. Snell stated a standard city street requires 30 feet of pavement.

Discussion followed.

Chair Edwards opened the item to public discussion.

Burt Wellman, 162 W Mill St., stated he is an Engineer and that the requirement of an alley might be expensive for a developer and having some sort of alternative to building an alleyway would be beneficial and asked if the zoning change would affect the ZHA zoning criteria.

Commissioner Sonier left the dais at 7:53pm.

Chair Edwards asked Mr. Wellman is providing extra parking or widening a main street as an alternative to providing an alleyway would take the burden off of developers as well.

Mr. Wellman stated this would be another option.

Chair Edwards asked if there would be any objections from developers about utilizing shared driveways to side loaded garages as an alternative.

Mr Wellman stated the driveway may need to be made very large or have a shared access easement for the two properties. Mr. Wellman stated drainage might be a concern in this case.

Discussion followed.

Commissioner Meyers stated due to the smaller lot size a larger driveway would increase impermeability significantly.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Commissioner Laskowski, seconded by Commissioner Mathis, to close the public hearing. Motion carried (6-0-0).

Discussion followed.

Commission Sonier returned to the dais at 7:59pm.

Chair Edwards asked for clarification if the two items will be voted on separately despite being discussed together.

Mr. Onion clarified they will require separate motions; after making a motion on Item G, Item H will need to be read, a quick public hearing held, then a motion can be made for Item H.

Chair Edwards restated the description for Item G, ORD19-249 and asked if there was a motion.

Motion by Commissioner Laskowski, seconded by Commissioner Sonier to recommend approval to City Council regarding the proposed amendments to Chapter 144, Zoning, Section 144-3.4 Zoning districts and regulations for property zoned subsequent to June 22, 1987-, and Section 4.2, Land Use Matrix, with the creation of an additional single family residential zoning district; 3.4-2 R-1A-5.5, Single Family Residential District. Motion carried (7-0-0).

Item H - ORD20-011 Public hearing and recommendation to City Council regarding proposed amendments to Chapter 144, Zoning, Section 3.4 Zoning Districts and Regulations for Property Zoned After 1987, and Section 4.2, Land Use Matrix, with the creation of an additional residential district, R-1A-4, Small Lot Single Family District. (Case Manager: Jean Drew)

Chair Edwards asked if anyone wished to speak in favor.

No one spoke.

Chair Edwards asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition.

No one spoke.

Motion by Commissioner Laskowski, seconded by Commissioner Mathis, to close the public hearing. Motion carried (6-0-0).

Commissioner Laskowski invited Mrs. Drew to speak before a motion is made.

Mrs. Drew stated an alternative to the alleyway requirement for 40-foot lots may be considered as the 40-foot lots seem to be a desirable option for developers.

Chair Edwards stated the frontage is often the largest cost portion of the lot.

Commissioner Laskowski asked if the changes to require a 110-foot depth as an alternative to the alleyway requirement should be included in the motion.

Mrs. Drew clarified Commissioner Laskowski's statement and restated this would be just another option to achieve the reduced 40-foot lot width without an alleyway.

Motion by Commissioner Laskowski, seconded by Commissioner Sonier to recommend approval to City Council regarding the proposed amendments to Chapter 144, Zoning, Section 3.4 Zoning Districts and Regulations for Property Zoned After 1987, and Section 4.2, Land Use Matrix, with the creation of an additional residential district, R1-A-4, Small Lot Single Family District [with an recommendation to allow an option for a 40' wide & 110' deep lot minimum, and a longer driveway to accommodate off-street parking as an alternative to the alleyway option]. Motion carried (7-0-0).