

## **R4C/R2A Advisory Committee Meeting**

October 26, 2010, 6 pm

Lower Level Conference Room, Washtenaw County Building, 200 N. Main

Present: Jean Carlberg, Wendy Carman, Chuck Carver, Nancy Leff, Ethel Potts, Ellen Rambo, Ilene Tyler, Julie Weatherbee

Absent: Anya Dale, Michelle Derr, Tony Derezinski, Carl Luckenbach,

Staff: Matt Kowalski, Wendy Rampson

### Project Update

MK – Reviewed project schedule. Community meeting in November for general public to give feedback.

EP – May take more than one meeting to discuss recommendations.

MK – Reviewed notes from meetings, focus groups, staff, master plan, Council charge to identify objectives.

JW – Draft recommendations as whole?

MK – Yes, package to City Council.

### R2A Recommendations

EP – Similar problems in R2A – overoccupancy, cars.

WC – Clarify. What's under R2A?

MK – Changes to NC code.

WC – When present, can put in section under R2A?

MK – Yes. Can make clear.

WC – Can discuss now?

MK – Why does have to do with lot size? If damaged, can't be rebuilt. Issue for everyone with non-conforming lot.

EP – Planning principle used to be to phase out NC. Don't see reason for that to continue.

MK – If remove lot area, does that address?

WC – If not fault of owner, support. But not if voluntary.

JC – Rationale for not allowing replacement of NC? Bad wiring, plumbing. Still fits within neighborhood. Neighborhood would benefit.

JW – Would feel uncomfortable. Fine line between old and need to replace.

WC – Question about whether they would need to build in conforming way.

IT – If want to voluntarily tear down, other NC issues come into play and may be too restrictive.

JC – If lot size and building fit, and can rebuild if fire, why does it only have to be in case of flood, fire, calamity.

WC – Responding to request.

MK – That was original concern.

JW – Not sure that we agree that like NC. Agree that fair to replace.

WC – Can come forward to ZBA, lot of record.

JC – Small lots with inadequate housing. Additional bullet would allow them to rebuild.

NL – If buy currently NC property, once own it, if voluntarily remove, have to build something that conforms with current zoning.

CC – “Similar style” – how is determination going to be made?

MK – Building permit stage – GIS, photos. Reviewed under zoning.

JW – Can improve certain features?

MK – No. Could go to ZBA.

ER – Similar to existing language?

MK – No.

WC – Wording may still need to be wordsmithed.

MK – Looking for agreement on general concept.

MK – Anything else on R2A? NO.

### Downzoning

MK – Priority rezoning outlined in Master Plan. Other areas either protected by historic districts or area has changed since original recommendations.

EP – Need to think about this more. Look at maps more carefully.

WC – What is area that didn't include?

JW – Why did stop at West Hoover?

MK – Will look at in more detail.

IT – Areas in Spring Street?

MK – Downzoned already?

JC – Downzoned to R2A or R1?

ER – Most are rentals.

MK – Not included – area of Prospect and Wells. Can look in more detail.

JW – These specified 18 years ago. Is this still situation?

MK – That's why eliminated Prospect/Wells. The two listed are the biggest chunks that would apply.

EP – Distinction between student rental and family rental? Even four students act like a SF.

MK – No.

MK – Can prepare snippet of map.

ER – Put Prospect/Wells back on to explore.

### Overlay Districts

MK – Agree as whole, specifics determined later. R4C not uniform district. Not as comprehensive as form-based codes, but customizable.

EP – Lots of possibilities. Can include characteristics that are special to that area. Enforceability is concern if not attached to zoning.

MK – Overlay districts in place in downtown. Different standards for districts. Enforceable.

JW – How does this come about? Often in response, which is too late. What would trigger?

MK – Similar to process of rezoning. Can be initiated in several ways: by citizens, Council initiation, staff initiation.

JW – Can find things specific to neighborhood.

IT – Issue of combination of lots. Is that part of an overlay? Blanket.

MK – Don't want to outright prohibit, but can do through overlay. More of structure of building rather than lot lines. Ex, might be okay in some areas.

WC – If comes about because of developer, who reviews.

MK – Council determines.

WC – Public did not like what happened in downtown.

JW – Who would be notified? Concern if could be instigated by anyone.

WC – Can official protest petition be presented inside of overlay?

WR - Could amend master plan to outline what should/could be included in overlay.

MK – Just interested in knowing if support concepts.

CC – Need specifics to know if support it?

IT – Bullets help explain.

CC – What are situations where can prohibit lot combinations?

EP – Case by case study? Analyze neighborhood, make different rules depending on expectations. If don't have any vacant land.

WC – How hard would be to identify areas that think that would be appropriate for overlay zones.

MK – Okay, but don't have time for details, but concepts.

WC – Think system could work, but if don't tighten up, would allow something completely different to happen. Ex. Scale – some neighborhoods okay for densifying, but don't want to have used to densify everything.

NL – Overlay overlays existing density. Underlying zoning remains as basis for density. If take R4C, overlay has to be better defined.

WC – If don't use overlay, leave things the way they are...

CC – Later recommendations for reduced lot sizes, overlay is restriction. Taking away from one area and replacing in another.

IT – Only specific language is lot combination.

EP – Might give firmness and flex.

WR – Example from downtown – massing.

ER – Do you see some of overlay zones to deter PUD zoning?

MK – Yes.

ER – Could limit number of land divisions?

MK – Massing of building is key. Maximum lot size.

MK – Heard that want detail about areas where can be enacted.

JW – Could be useful tool. Take 3-4 years to implement?

MK – Will take time.

JC – Way to describe so talk about process – reflect what's good about neighborhood (preserve), identify neighborhoods where changes are beneficial. Fine tune in neighborhoods, and identify where can be changes. Collaborative. Feel more comfortable? Where can put density?

EP – Form of building.

JC – Need to get specific areas.

JW – Useful tool. Similar approach to downzoning.

IT – Should identify priority area(s). Ex – Geddes and South University (Area No. 5) – encourage density without lot combinations.

JC – Could be area where lot combinations are very appropriate.

MK – Clarify areas, add detail to possible.

#### Minimum Lot Size/Width

MK – 6,000 sf is average lot size, excluding large parcels. Brings in 385, but majority remain non-conforming. R1D is 5,000 sf min. If revise density calculations, if you lower much more, could increase density quite a bit. If reduce to 4,000 sf, reduces by 900 parcel. Interconnected with density.

WC – Talked about at another meeting. Concerned that if you go below, can't provide what you need on-site, such as parking, outside space. If don't provide, goes out on street.

MK – Also land divisions factor in.

IT – Over 1000 lots are still NC.

CC – By downsizing to 6000, may take away impetus to combine lots.

IT – Lots with building already on them have parking on them.

JC – Main difficulty is that it does not remove many NC. Helpful if could give drawing of 5,000 sf lot to show where parking could go.

NL – If have driveway and garage, not much left for yard.

EP – Worked when families. Failure now because not enough parking.

MK – What is purpose of making all conforming? What's the goal there?

CC – Allowing someone with SF home to replace with MF.

WC – Intention was to conform, and if didn't, maybe shouldn't be R4C.

JW – Base on what there now, or what should be there.

IT – Decision made years ago.

WR – Didn't happen because constrained by NC status.

IT – No lot size – what happens? How combine apartments.

MK – Not sure eliminating min lot size would help that.

EP – How many people can land hold?

MK – Revisit after discuss density.

### Density

MK – Incentivizing 6 BR unit now, trying to move to smaller units. Trying not to take away too much currently allowed, but more flexibility for smaller units.

WC – Lot of trouble understanding examples. What is new?

MK – Proposed density, along with minimum lot size.

WC – Maximum occupancy under housing code, with parking. Decided need spreadsheet.

WC – Two BRs per unit, how many?

MK – Could be six,

NL – No one going to rent it, though.

MK – Any way write, will be way to exploit.

JW – In her neighborhood, 2 BR apartments and 6 BR, but not 6 in 2 BR. Like this, since now 0-6 bedrooms the same. This would be fair – studio is different than 6 units. Lot of need for nice 2 BR, but building 6 BR because it's cheaper to build.

WC – Comparing parking.

MK – Trying to balance parking with open space. Don't want parking everything.

EP – Not enough incentive.

ER – Wouldn't go below 1.5 spaces/unit.

EP – Researched parking in other cities. Much better. One spot per bedroom.

CC – CPC's position on on-site parking?

JC – Make other arrangements – not the space. UM has bus system.

CC – CPC not opposed?

JC – Just in downtown.

MK – Parking calculations. If 10,000 sf, up to 1.5, puts out of synch with 6 BR units at 2

WC – Parking per bedroom?

JW – Hard one. 24 unit 2 BR apartment with sea of parking – lot combination. Addresses differences between studio and 6 BR. Hate to see lots combined to provide parking. Would happen if make parking requirement too high.

MK – Parking per bedroom.

WR – Enforcement becomes problem.

JW – Sewer disconnects – how do they come up with?

MK – Based on use, flow.

JC – Overlay can specify where parking in backyard is okay?

MK – Parking per bedroom?

EP – Explore.

IT – Bedroom number tied to lot size or floor area.

ER – Need some visuals.

EP – Predate open space requirement. Paved back yards date back 20 years.

IT – Hard to understand implications.

JW – 6 BR can't be used except by particular type of renter. 2-3 BR allow more flexibility. Lot better than what have.

MK – Heard about need for flexibility. This allows – good or bad – more flexibility.

WC – Going to build 2BR

EP – Why should 2 BR apartment have less required for SF home?

JC – Unintended consequence of being prohibitive of added.

ER left

EP – Required open space, landscaping.

MK – Over 1200 sf becomes parking lot, which requires screening, CLUB.

MK – Can come up with other scenarios

MK – Density?

IT – Have a hard time visualizing so don't end up with 6 BR units, maximized density. Don't want to restrict in such a way.

MK – Looking for examples?

WC – Don't know if support because don't know what it means. Would like to work out examples, so can come to conclusion.

CC – No minimum lot size – reaction?

JC – Could relate to number of bedrooms.

IT – If eliminate, would reduce lot size non-conformity.

WC – Open space and parking.

IT – Seems like gesture to people feeling like legal.

EP – How it an advantage to be conforming.

MK – Biggest concern that can't be rebuilt – now proposed. Eliminate concern?

IT – Lot combination other layer that needs to be addressed. Deal with as overlay? Would like to be specific. Overlay?

MK – Blanks to fill in. What do think about another meeting before community meeting?

JW – Or community meeting communicating that not resolved.

MK – Set up another meeting before community meeting.

### Public Comment

Leslie Morris – Lived in R4C for 17 years. Parking requirement – like to base on unit size. Those creating smaller units will be creating parking problem. Suggestion: Make ½ space/unit. Same effect, but wouldn't produce parking

crunch in neighborhood. Re; downzoning – protest from property owners since owners could only rent to 4 unrelated, or convert to duplex.

Farhmar Farranci – Taking about 2-3 BR. In student area, inquiries are for 6 people +. No one will take on project that doomed for failure. Zaragon provided 6 BR in penthouse. Parking main issue for commuter, not for residents. Enough for residents. Students do not want to share rooms.

Ray Detter – Intelligent discussion. Community meeting – illustrated materials so people have understanding.

Jen Langenberg – Re: 6 BR houses, farthest from possibility. Big groups coming together. Not speaking to larger landlords. In areas on outskirts, like West Davis, some of new buildings are beautiful. Sad to restrict to same envelope.

JW – Many different areas – part of problem.

Ended 8 pm.