

Minutes
Land Development Standards Committee
November 4, 2009

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

Members Absent: Patrick Bradshaw

Staff present: Fred Baker, Paul Benson, 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 October 28 with Section 3.15.1 Site/Infrastructure Standards

Committee comments by section:

Site/Infrastructure Standards

3.15.1 Allow a payment-in-lieu of construction option for sidewalks in very low density developments.

Some concern was expressed with current requirements creating sidewalks to nowhere, the additional cost imposed by sidewalks on development, and whether the provision of right-of-way by developers for future sidewalk construction should be adequate to meet this requirement. However, the majority of the Committee supported current standards. The consensus of the Committee was that a payment-in-lieu of sidewalk construction option should be provided in the ordinance for use in steep terrain on low traffic streets and in cases where connecting sidewalks would be a distant possibility. Funds collected could be used to implement priority sidewalk projects identified by the pedestrian plan.

3.15.2 Consider implementing a more comprehensive tree protection standard that is keyed to the context/zoning district.

After considerable discussion the Committee agreed that the ordinance should incorporate some tree protection standards, especially in steep slope areas. Interest was also expressed in riparian area tree preservation. The Committee recognized that the amount of grading generally required for site development in our terrain would make existing tree preservation difficult. This requirement should be tied to the Site Resource Assessment.

3.15.3 Add requirement for neighborhood open space or payments-in-lieu of open space dedication in each new subdivision.

The Committee recognized that open space requirements are probably not as important here given that the Town is surrounded by large tracts of public open space suitable for outdoor recreation. However, the consensus of the Committee is that there should be open space requirements for larger residential developments. Open space requirements should not always require development with active recreational facilities. Passive facilities such as benches, overlooks, and pathways should be able to satisfy such requirements. Smaller developments should be exempted. If such areas are to be opened to the general public some Committee members felt that the Town should accept responsibility for maintenance. Town staff suggested that the Town may be willing to maintain open space recreational areas where such areas are readily available to the residents of new and existing development.

Streets and Connectivity

3.16.1 Require at least two connections for each new neighborhood. More may be necessary for larger neighborhoods.

There was considerable discussion of this requirement. Generally the Committee is supportive of this requirement as long as exceptions are built into the ordinance for situations where topography prevents more than one entrance without extensive grading – which are not unusual in mountain topography. Establish a maximum block length of 500 to 800' (depending on the density of development and /or the zoning district) and pedestrian/bicycle connection through blocks longer than 800', between neighborhoods, and across streams. The Committee felt that ped/bike connections across streams to other properties would not be feasible to require, but was generally supportive of such requirements within residential developments. Topography should be taken into account on block length requirements as the establishment of a grid system is difficult in mountain topography.

3.16.1 Require stubs to adjacent property.

This requirement received a lot of discussion. The Committee was generally supportive of the staff's current practice to require connections to other properties where such connections make sense topographically. Some concern was expressed that these connections be done in a way to not interfere with prime developable land on adjacent properties. Staff suggested that there was no need to require developers to construct roads on these stubs, since the provision of right-of-way would be sufficient to permit the developers of adjacent properties to make future connection. The Committee agreed that there should be specific standards concerning where such connections are required.

3.16.3 Discuss the merits of private streets and gates vs. public streets.

The Committee recognized that gated communities tend to divide the town, but that many people prefer this environment, especially since many home in this area are used as seasonal residences. It was the consensus of the Committee that gates should be permitted except on roads that formed important transportation network connections to adjacent properties outside of the development.

3.16.4 Revise and clarify sidewalk and planting strip requirements.

Staff pointed out that there are some inconsistencies in the existing development that need to be clarified. There was no other discussion of this issue.

3.16.5 Create a bicycle plan that designates key routes and require their installation through the development process on a pro-rata basis.

Staff pointed out that there is State funding available for bicycle planning and that the Town would apply in the near future.

3.16.6 Include standards for upgrading non-conforming street frontages with new development. During the sidewalk discussion staff informed the Committee that currently the Town requires the dedication of additional right-of-way to meet Town standards when property was developed. No other frontage improvements were discussed.

Create a map that classifies each street according to Street Function and Classification. This issue was not discussed due to the shortage of time, but it is really an issue of staff resources (time) to undertake this classification.

Signs

3.17 Revise sign standards to reflect consistent regulation by district and standardize the provisions in a simple table.

Permit a master development sign and reduce the maximum usage of the wall face for signage to 10%.

As time was out for the meeting, and the consultant has already provided the Committee with the draft sign ordinance, this discussion was deferred until the Committee reviews that section of the draft ordinance.

Mr. Benson informed the Committee that this concluded the Committee's review of the Action Items from the Diagnosis Report. Beginning with the next meeting the Committee will begin review of the draft ordinance. The consultant, Craig Lewis, will be present at the next meeting to begin the review of the draft ordinance and talk to the Committee about the next steps in the review process.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 am.

Paul Benson, Planning Director