

PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

April 25, 2016

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Groat at 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Deborah Groat, Mark Reams. Alan Seymour

OTHERS PRESENT: City Planner Chad Flowers

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes for the meeting on February 22, 2016 were approved.

AGENDA:

Comments from Citizens:

Discuss Amendment to the TOC Zoning District Update: Mrs. Groat asked Mr. Flowers if he found what the density for R-5 is. City Planner Chad Flowers said R5 and R2 density allows up to eight units per acre. Mr. Reams confirmed that they were both eight units. Mr. Flowers confirmed eight units per acre for both. He said it gets broken down to the number of units per density. Low density is approximately six units per building, high density is twelve units per building. Mrs. Groat asked if we had heard from Redwood an official request to change the zoning.

Mrs. Groat said when she went to the meeting Redwood held they wanted to go to R-5 residential from Agricultural Residential (which would allow R1-R2). The people of Milford View were upset because they did not want more apartment complex behind their homes. Another thing to consider is Redwood would have all three entrances to the property cut off, and have only emergency vehicular traffic.

Mrs. Groat asked if Mr. Flowers if he spoke to Mr. Aslaner about attaching the conditional use. Mr. Flowers said staff did a little more research on how other communities handled assisted living in a commercial area. He said no section is the same, and there is no perfect code section. He said other communities are steering the projects toward the PUD. He said when we do a PUD we can do the restrictions and limitations.

Mr. Seymour said he does not believe there should never be anytime where any provisions in a PUD should exceeds the requirements of any of our conventional zoning districts. He gave an example where Mr. Reams mentioned R-5, requires only 8 units, it should never go beyond 8 units. Mr. Flowers said the nature of a PUD is geared towards those types of changes.

Mr. Flowers said we were originally making the request to add assisted living as a conditional use for TOC. Mrs. Groat asked are we still there now? Mr. Flowers answered no. Mrs. Groat asked where we are. Mr. Flowers said they did the research and looked at how other communities treat assisted living facilities. He said we have a need for assisted living facilities

but we only currently allow them in HMD districts. He said the potential builders when they contact the City want near the hospital or areas where there is a medical office, but you also have operators that do want to be in the Commercial district. He said during a council meeting, Mrs. Richardson suggested that we add assisted living as a conditional use for TOC. Mr. Flowers attended the meeting on February 22, 2016 and he was asked to go back and do a little more research on how other communities handle/treat assisted living facilities in the commercial setting. He said they almost all gear towards the PUD. The staff and administration discussed it, we feel pretty strongly that PUD is the direction that we should go when it is in a commercial setting.

Mr. Reams asked how the apartments behind Ace hardware were built because they were zoned HMD but are just apartments. Mr. Flowers said there is a condition in HMD that allows multi-family use. Mr. Seymour said he would like to exchange in the conditional use the multi-family use with assisted living use.

Mrs. Groat stated if she is hearing it correctly they would like to take multi-family living out of HMD, which would mean we would have never had those white apartments behind Ace. Mr. Flowers said we can apply changes to definitions in the City's definitions code. Mrs. Groat asked Mr. Flowers how he felt about taking out multi-family from HMD as a conditional use. Mrs. Groat asked that AD= Health Services in the SID. Mr. Flowers said the question would be does the City want to look at removing the conditional use of multi-family in HMD. Mr. Flowers said the staff is looking at code amendments, and they can look at this. Mrs. Groat asked Mr. Flowers how he felt about this change. Mr. Flowers agreed that the conditional use in HMD is something that we should look at removing it. Mr. Flowers said if he finds he needs assistance on reviewing this change, he will come back to the Public Affairs committee.

Mr. Flower said both scenarios have to be approved through Planning Commission and Council. Mr. Flower said the spot PUD depends on where the area is located, he said you do not want to handcuff yourself, especially when you have control of the final zoning or PUD going to Council.

Mrs. Groat asked Mr. Seymour if he has enough confidence in the system (Planning Commission/ Board of Zoning Appeals/Council) that things could be worked out well the way it is happening now or are you looking ahead with nervousness in the future. Mr. Seymour answered yes, even though we have zoning theoretically on the best use of the land rather than the project that is put in front of us. Which is how it is supposed to be done but it does not happen that way. Mrs. Groat stated that it is always going to be contingent on the people bringing the project. Mr. Seymour said that is wrong it has to be the use of the land.

Mr. Reams said in a PUD the developer is giving up a lot to the City. However, the City has a lot of say over what happens. He added it is also a longer process. Mr. Reams said if we use the PUD more we would have more say on what the project looks like and what the end result is going to be.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10p.m.