

Land Development Committee Minutes
November 20, 2013

Attendees: Ed Hattenbach (Committee Member), Natalie Wolf (Committee Member), Scot Lahrmer, Bill Doering, Peg Conway, Kevin Frank, Wes Brown and Tom Muething (Committee Chair)

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. The minutes from the meeting of October 24, 2013 were reviewed and approved.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the proposed amendment to the zoning code relating to panhandle lots in light of the public meeting regarding this proposal which was held on November 11, 2013. Each member of the Committee commented on the proposal and it was agreed that certain changes to the proposal should be recommended to Council. The proposed changes were as follows:

1. The fourth "Whereas" clause in the proposed ordinance should be deleted. This clause stated that panhandle lots are generally not favored by Amberley Village. The Committee felt that this was an overly broad statement because panhandle lots can be very suitable in the right circumstances.
2. The phrase "Panhandle lots are not generally encouraged or accepted as a form of land development" at the beginning of Section 1B in the proposed ordinance should be deleted for the same reason as noted in 1 above.
3. The requirement to include the legal description of the subject property included in Section 1B(2) of the proposed ordinance should be deleted. It was felt that this information was not needed to complete the review.
4. There was discussion concerning the phrase in the proposed ordinance- "Multiple panhandle lots stacked one behind the other are not permitted". The Committee felt that this should be deleted because stacked lots is an ambiguous term. The other provisions of the proposed ordinance should be sufficient to make a determination whether the proposed panhandle lot(s) is acceptable.
5. There was also discussion concerning the requirement that the panhandle lot needed to be at least 150% of the minimum zoning requirement of the district. There was agreement that this requirement was overly prescriptive and that the other requirements of the proposed ordinance should permit a determination whether a panhandle lot is acceptable. However, there was agreement that the strip of land providing access to the panhandle lot should be excluded from the acreage of all lots in determining whether the minimum acreage requirement of the district is met.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Tom Muething