

Minutes
Land Development Standards Committee
October 14, 2009

Members Present: Joe Taylor, Patrick Bradshaw, David Blevins, Patrick McDowell, Ron Leatherwood, Ken Wilson, Daniel Hyatt, Steve Kaufman

Members Absent: Mike Erwin

Staff present: Paul Benson, Fred Baker, Lee Galloway, Alison Melnikova

The meeting came to order at 7:40 am. Mr. Benson announced that the business for the day would be review of the Action Items from the Diagnosis Report beginning where the Committee left off on the September 30th meeting with Section 3.10 Parking.

Committee comments by section:

Parking

3.10.1 Add flexibility to permit sites to exceed the maximum parking standards with pervious systems. There was considerable discussion of this issue with the consensus of the Committee being that maximum parking standards may be unnecessary since parking lot buffer and landscaping requirements, stormwater management standards, and requirements for side and rear parking may be enough disincentive for overly large parking areas.

Reduce the size and complexity of the current parking table and coordinate it more directly with use or building type provisions. The Committee agreed that the current parking table is too complex and generally liked the simplified example from Wendell. Staff note: it is difficult to base parking on employee counts as recognized in the Diagnosis Report and would concur with eliminating all such standards.

3.10.2 Incorporate bicycle parking standards for all multi-family and non-residential development. The Committee recognized the need for bicycle parking, but would like to see a minimum threshold either in number of residential units or square footage of commercial buildings so that single racks didn't have to be installed for every minor project. The Committee also suggested that there may be uses for which bicycle parking is unnecessary and such uses should be exempted. Mini-warehousing was the only such use cited.

3.10.3 Revise the connectivity standards to require that adjacent parking areas be interconnected where topography permits. The larger issue of requiring parking

lot connections generated a lot of discussion. In general, the Committee was concerned that parking lot connections should be done in a way to discourage parking lots from becoming thoroughfares or short cuts to avoid traffic signals. Where parallel public access roads are needed some Committee members felt that the public sector should acquire right-of-way and build streets. The concept of providing connections between a few neighboring businesses caused less concern. Some members expressed concern that requiring private property to be used for public thoroughfares is inappropriate citing maintenance costs, disruption of the business, and issues of providing access for competing businesses. The specific issue of permitting flexibility for these connections was not considered a problem, but a necessity. In some cases topography will prevent connections and this should be anticipated in the ordinance.

Neighborhood Infill

3.11.1 Remove current minimum lot size standards in each district and rely solely on density setback, lot frontage, and massing standards for compatibility. The Committee agreed with Mr. Benson's proposal to maintain similar minimum lot sizes to those that currently exist, but to group similar districts into uniform standards, and to bring maximum densities to two times the minimum lot sizes, as presented in the memo to the consultant. The Committee was interested in using other standards to insure compatibility but some concern was expressed that this section not get too complex.

3.11.2 Add language to require that front and side yard setbacks for infill lots must be consistent (within a certain defined threshold) with adjacent properties. This issue was not specifically discussed, but the consultant's draft language was presented for Committee consideration.

3.11.3 Evaluate the usefulness of the current impervious surface standard. Mr. Baker informed the Committee that these standards are not required by stormwater management regulations. The Committee agreed with the concept that required landscaping and open space would provide for sufficient green space and that these standards could be eliminated.

With time for the meeting drawing to an end, Mr. Benson suggested that the Committee consider weekly meetings as there are still some major issues on the Action Items list to be discussed, and that the consultant has begun submitting draft sections of the ordinance to be reviewed. Committee members agreed to meet on a weekly basis as needed with the next meeting to be held on Wednesday October 21 at the usual time and place. Notebooks with the draft ordinance were distributed to Committee members.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 am.

Paul Benson, Planning Director