

Minutes
Land Development Standards Committee
December 2, 2009

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

Members Absent: Patrick Bradshaw, Daniel Hyatt

Staff present: Paul Benson

The meeting came to order at 7:45 am. Mr. Benson stated that the business for the day is review of Chapter 9, Parking and Driveways.

Mr. Leatherwood wanted to make an observation about Chapter 2 before the review of Chapter 9. He felt that the following language in the intent statement for the Eagles Nest Rural District: "future developments shall be sensitive to views from the valley" should not be limited to the Eagles Nest district and that all districts whether in valleys or hillsides should have as a goal to be sensitive to views into those districts. After discussion the Committee felt that this statement should be deleted since the issue to which the statement applies is the visibility of the hillside areas of the Eagles Nest district from the rest of the town which is effectively addressed by the hillside protection standards.

Mr. Benson began review of Chapter 9 by reviewing the memo he sent to the Committee and the consultant.

Mr. Blevins asked why parking for religious institutions is different for residential districts. Committee members expressed some concern that other civic/institutional uses have no minimum parking requirements, particularly in residential districts.

Mr. Kaufman expressed concern with the minimum standard of 1 parking space per 600 square feet for commercial and office/service uses, and cited problems in his neighborhood about offices using all available on-street parking to the exclusion of residents of the neighborhood.

The Committee agreed that Exemption and Adjustments B. and C. which exempt commercial uses of less than 2500 square feet from on-site automobile parking, and which permit the counting of adjacent on-street parking spaces toward the

minimum required parking respectively, should be deleted. The primary problem being with single-family dwellings converted into nonresidential uses having inadequate off-street parking.

The Committee further felt that 1 space per 600 square feet may be an inadequate minimum standard and that the ratio should be increased to 1:500 or even 1:400.

As for bicycle parking, the Committee is supportive of current standards, but had some concern that the requirement for a bike rack design that provided support at two points may be too restrictive, since it would not allow conventional bicycle racks. There was also some concern that the advisory language of 9.5.2 G. should be removed, according to the general principle of deleting advisory language. In addition, it would be difficult in many cases to locate parking between the building entrance and the closest parking space.

Finally, the Committee felt that the requirement for some bike parking at each entrance for a building with multiple entrances would be too problematic, as called for in 9.5.2 H, preferring instead to permit a single bicycle parking area.

For next week discussion is to begin with Permitted Parking Locations, Section 9.3.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Paul Benson, Planning Director