



September 24, 2019 Meeting Notes

Attendance:

- 7 taskforce members in attendance, 6 staff members, and 4 city council representatives
- 3 citizens

Taskforce Questions and Discussion:

- DSD Administrator Cat Hernandez opened the meeting and recapped the previous meeting and proposed code language to review related to height and setback to address components of massing.
- Height: Consensus was reached that the proposed amendment should move forward for a recommendation, upon addressing Ashley Farrimond's comments/questions regarding the proposed code language to address the new height restrictions.
 1. What happens after the 50 feet? Can MF-33 zoning automatically go from 35 feet to 45 feet? Or, after 50 feet do you use the stairstep approach?
 - The Taskforce agreed that reference to the stairstep approach should be included in the language through a reference to the code and illustration in Article 5
 2. Need to address what the height limit is if the abutting property has a single or 2 story structure.
 - The Taskforce agreed that simplifying Note 11 that restricts the height to the maximum allowed height for the abutting zoning district so that there is no confusion that a vacant lot would be subject to a more restrictive height of the already constructed abutting structure.
 3. What if you abut a church on one side and single family on the other?
 - Only the side abutting the single family use is restricted to the height limitation within the first 50 feet.
- Front Setback: : Consensus was reached that the proposed amendment should move forward for a recommendation, upon addressing Ashley Farrimond's comment/question regarding the proposed code language to address the minimum setback requirement
 1. To clarify, this is not the actual setback of the house, but the setback required by a SF zoning district? I thought the intent was to have a single-family type required setback? My concern is that this reads that the setback has to be at least the same as the existing house, which could be really far.
 - The Taskforce agreed that simplifying Note 12 that requires a setback similar to the minimum required for the abutting zoning district so that there is no confusion that a vacant lot would be subject to a more restrictive setback of the already constructed abutting structure.
- Front Entry/Transparency requirement:
 - The Taskforce focused on lots that are one third of an acre or less. There were some concerns brought up related to higher density multifamily complexes. An example of a lower density development on Wyoming was mentioned by a citizen in attendance. It was agreed upon that front entry requirements should apply to properties developed with 4 or less units, and only require the front entry be oriented to the street for the primary structure that abuts the street. After a comment from the citizens attending, the taskforce agreed to add a



requirement for a front walkway from the door, as code already requires this, to ensure the street orientation that is desired.

- The Taskforce agreed that there were several items that were discussed that are more appropriate for the 2020 UDC Amendment process and asked that a summary of these be presented as part of the work they did during this review. Staff is preparing a summary and will report these during the code amendment process. The summary will be provided to the Taskforce members so that they can continue to discuss independently for future submittal for the 2020 UDC amendment process.

Public Comment:

- Cosima Colvin: require a front walkway to ensure that street orientation is achieved.
- Sydell Brooks (D1): Glad that the taskforce focused on the items and came up with code language that addressed these issues
- Alan Neff: Prefers developments to have front entries along the street rather than facing internally connected courtyards. Concerns with RM-4 zoning in Denver Heights that is exploited by developers to create developments that maximize density and negatively impact the neighborhood by removing the orientation to the street. Would like to see rezoning take place of Denver Heights after the plan is approved to a more conventional residential zoning district since the neighborhood is mostly developed with single family homes.

Next Steps:

- Staff to finalize the proposed code language with the City Attorney's Office and forward to the Taskforce for final review.
- Staff to schedule a community meeting for mid October and develop survey questions for SA SpeakUp.
- Dependent on the feedback received will dictate if the taskforce needs to reconvene again.
- The follow is the tentative schedule for the code amendment process. Taskforce members were asked to attend to show support for the proposed amendments:
 - Late October/Early November: Planning Commission Technical Advisory Committee
 - November: Zoning Commission Briefing and Consideration
 - December/January: City Council SubCommittee and City Council Consideration