

## Residential Infill Task Force Meeting

5/20/14, 8 AM  
9<sup>th</sup> floor conference room

Staff in attendance: Skinner, Kerski, Whitworth, Wood, Rickoff, Schmidt, Waters, Cooper, Leftwich, Williamson, Link, Coler, Stroud, Fletcher

Council: Ryberg-Doyle

Task Force: Johnson, Ruth, Cole, Benedict, Bainbridge, Felton, Jones, Crigler, Brasington, McKetty, Mitchell

Ryberg-Doyle opened the meeting just after 8 AM

Presentation by Buddy Skinner, Building Codes Administrator, regarding City's Noise Ordinance

- Complaint driven, ability to administer stop-work orders
- Noise limits (max. decibels daytime/nighttime) - Citywide: 60/55 CBD: 80/75
- Daytime limits are from 7am – 10pm

Dwayne Cooper, City Engineer, explained enforcement procedures

- Project One: coordinated with contractors, residents and businesses regarding blocking streets, heat, and other issues
- Typically talk with contractors to address issues
- Vast majority of complaints are for commercial sites (handful in the last year)

Comments: How can the City address issues of noise? Adjust daytime hours?

- Other issues tend to overshadow noise
- Typically early morning complaints such as nail guns on roofs at 7 am
- When approached, neighbors can usually understand the benefits of early construction work (avoiding heat, minimizing overall length of project)
- Unique set of circumstances should be the basis for stop-work orders in these situations

Michael Kerski, Planning & Development Manager, presented the Residential Infill draft ordinance

Planning Commission's informal review (May 8) and public comments: generally positive; disappointment that mass and scale have not been addressed

Discussion:

- 2.5-inch caliper tree preferred
- Bainbridge: we are already seeing results in the development of infill subdivisions without any changes to the ordinance; in each neighborhood there will be different issues that we haven't been able to address; do not need to hyper-focus on specific issues that we are seeing today; general standards agreed upon now can be refined over time; let staff write the ordinance
- What kind of grading plan is needed for residential projects?

Cooper explained the purpose of showing grading information:

- Developer will be responsible for determining the maximum impervious coverage per lot to be recorded on the plat, especially if lots are sold to different builders, which would also apply to future improvement;
- Identifying a building pad on a grading plan does not need to be specific to the final building footprint; however, the final footprint would need to conform to the area and elevation of the original pad

- This would leave less room for property speculation; trend for under-developed real estate is to “strike while the iron is hot”
  - Kerski explained the City’s updated subdivision process (inter-departmental review); with mostly challenging sites left within the city, every project struggles with cost and infrastructure
- Suggestion for consistency between 19-6.9.2 and 6.9.5: 25% and 40% building footprint
- 19-6.9.7: should exclude street trees or not?
  - Bryan Wood, Zoning Administrator: could exclude building square footage in lot calcs for trees
- Public comment: There was some education gap between citizens and Commissioners/staff; infill regulations will impact affordable housing throughout the City
- Matt Johnson, Planning Commissioner, asked staff to address to massing and scale issues to the Planning Commission to explain why there are no specific standards (develop public confidence that various issues were discussed)
- Kerski invited task force members to come and speak at PC hearing; can move the Infill text amendment to top of PC agenda
- Front porches were also not standardized by the committee; City hesitates to regulate porches but indicates that they are preferred; varies by neighborhood
- include purpose/intent statements for each standard
- ADD maximum height should be lowered to 35 feet; reasons for building higher should be worthy of a variance
- Reconsider ribbon driveway requirement, may not match the neighborhood and won’t always be popular; allow this to be an option to meet the 60% impervious requirement
  - Purpose of ribbon driveways was debated: aesthetic or stormwater control tool; can driveways be required to be pitched to put water in yards; some people want a functional driveway and have larger lots;
  - 19-6.9.4: strike G, modify F; keep suggestion for ribbon driveways out of ordinance: FAQ pamphlet or similar