

MEETING NOTES

Zoning Update-Technical Committee Meeting
Metropolitan Planning Commission
Surrency Meeting Room
February 20, 2008
3:00-5:00 PM

I. Review January Minutes

The notes from the January 16, 2008 meeting were approved.

II. Technical Committee Membership

In an effort to boost attendance at Technical Committee meetings, staff will be inviting new people to join the committee in the coming months.

III. Component III (Zoning Districts and Uses)

A. PowerPoint Presentation on Component 3

Charlotte Moore gave a brief presentation to introduce Component 3 of the Unified Zoning Ordinance. In this component, we will be creating new zoning districts. This effort will include a new master use table, use definitions, and use standards. It will also include special districts, such as those associated with Planned Unit Developments, as well as Overlay Districts for historic neighborhoods and other areas with special restrictions.

B. Master Principal Use List (handout)

The committee reviewed the first draft of the master use list and offered the following comments and suggestions:

- Performance standards need to be integrated with the use table to help mitigate the negative impacts that more intense uses can have on surrounding properties.
- When working on the use list, we need to be mindful of the gray areas that exist for uses like package alcohol sales. This use occurs not only at liquor stores, but also convenience stores and grocery stores.
- When working on development standards for water-oriented uses, keep in mind that traffic impacts will vary greatly depending upon the activity (casino cruise vs. a conventional sightseeing cruise).
- Catch-all categories, such as "all other service uses" are potentially dangerous because new, high-impact uses may emerge in the future that were not anticipated by the ordinance.
- We need to develop a strategy for addressing drive-thru windows, which can greatly increase the impact that a business has on surrounding properties.

- Bars, nightclubs, and taverns are currently grouped together as a single use, but may need to be separated due to the additional impact that live entertainment and dancing can have on surrounding properties.

C. Residential Group-Type Homes (handout)

The committee reviewed draft materials on residential uses that fall under the heading of "group living" and offered comments and suggestions:

- Consider revising the definition of "family" to include domestic partnerships.
- The proposed definition of "household" is confusing and needs to be reworded.
- Consider imposing a minimum spacing requirement for some group homes so as to avoid concentration of such homes.
- Requiring the owners of boarding houses to live on site seems overly restrictive. They should be allowed to have an on-site manager instead.
- Some of the standards for single room occupancy units (SROs) would be unenforceable under the current regulatory system. We may need to establish a special licensing process for SROs to improve enforcement.
- Remove the 500 ft separation requirement for fraternities and sororities. Concentrating these uses may be best because it helps to limit the number of residents that are negatively affected by the noise that is commonly associated with these uses.
- Dormitories cannot be defined as being owned by a college or university because of the recent trend of privatized dorms. Boundary Village (SCAD) is an example of a privately-owned dormitory.
- The line between group care homes and adult day care can sometimes blur. Definitions for these uses need to make it clear that a group care home is a full time residence while an adult day care facility is not.
- We need to be conscientious about how we treat mixed use districts as part of the UZO process. A common use standard for more intensive uses is to restrict them from locating adjacent to a residential district. How would such a standard be treated when the adjacent district is a mixed use district?

Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 16, at 3:00 PM.