OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 10, 2020
7:00 p.m.

Call to Order

Those members present: William Snavely, Shana Rosenberg, Carla Blackmar, Jason Bracken, Steve Dana, Corey Watt, Richard Keebler
Those members excused: None
Staff members present: Sam Perry, and Zachary Moore, Ben Mazer
Staff members excused: Chris Conard

Approval of Agenda

Mr. Dana made motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Watt seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Approval of the Minutes of September 8, 2020

Ms. Rosenberg made motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Dana seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Public Comments Related to Items Not on the Agenda

There was none.

Reports from Commissions, Boards, Committees & Staff

Ms. Rosenberg provided a Housing Advisory Commission update. The HAC have been reflecting upon their 2020 and 2021 goals and will be able to report next month.

Mr. Bracken reported that the Environmental Commission have been discussing a cooperative solar plan, benefits of clearing off landfill gas, tracking climate footprint.

Mr. Dana reported on the Coalition of Healthy Communities Leadership Team goals to eradicate health inequities to citizens of Oxford. They are seeking to embrace the University in this attempt.

Mr. Watt reported on HAPC and their discussion of small cell phone poles. Mr. Watt reported that smaller models have come before City staff and are working with HAPC design efforts. Mr. Watt reviewed a recent Skydeck modification to a proposal at Brick Street. Mr. Watt reported on a recent difficult decision for the demolition and construction at 101 W Church. Mr. Watt reported that it was a very complex decision and analysis, permitting a demolition and construction for a new structure. The voting was close; however, well thought out discussion took place.

Ms. Blackmar reported on the Oxford Parking Transportation Board, which recently met. Ms. Blackmar referred to a recent parking study by the Oxford Police Department regarding strategies for parking meters. Which meter technology makes the most sense is being reviewed. Mr. Snavely inquired if there was any discussion regarding parking garage strategy, in terms of getting people to use it. Discussion followed.

Mr. Snavely asked that an Executive Session prior to the next Planning Commission meeting take place to discuss role assignments. Only fifteen minutes is needed.

<u>New Business</u>
<u>Staff Presentation on potential Zoning Code Text Amendments:</u>
<u>Parking Code Update</u>
<u>District & Supplemental Provisions Update</u>

Mr. Moore presented a preview of draft text amendments under two categories: 1) Parking and Site Access Text amendments and 2) District and Supplemental Provisions Text amendments.

Mr. Moore stated these amendments came about after a lot of cleanup, housekeeping, and inconsistencies found by staff. The first opportunity for a formal vote by the Commission will be at the December meeting.

Mr. Moore presented the proposed text amendments by topic, and fielded questions in-between.

The first presentation was on the **Parking Code Update.**

Mr. Moore presented the **Applicability** topic. Mr. Dana inquired about how the percentage of 25% or less threshold for expansion was derived from. Mr. Moore explained this threshold is often found in other Zoning Codes, and is the same percentage threshold for expanding non-conforming uses, so there is some precedent already in the Code.

Mr. Moore presented the **Pre-Existing Gravel Parking** topic. Ms. Blackmar inquired if there was an advantage of gravel versus concrete. Mr. Perry reported that over time the type of gravel used in driveways essentially turns to pavement and isn't permeable.

Mr. Moore presented the **Dimensional Standards** topic. There were no objections from the Commission.

Mr. Moore presented the **Required Parking Spaces** topic, which included reducing the number of required parking spaces for three-family dwellings down from 2.5 per unit to 2 per unit. There were no objections from the Commission.

Mr. Moore presented the **Residential Regulations** topic. Mr. Keebler stated he didn't think it was a good idea telling people how to get out of the regulations and suggested moving the statement in regards to the City Engineer determination at the bottom of the section, and doing the same for the Non-Residential Regulations.

Mr. Moore presented the **Non-Residential Regulations** topic. Mr. Moore acknowledged Mr. Keebler's prior comment to amend this section in a similar manner.

Mr. Moore presented the **Sidewalks/Walkways** topic, which includes provisions to require public sidewalks to be constructed and/or repaired whenever there is a new project. Mr. Moore noted that the City Engineer was in favor of the language as presented. Ms. Blackmar and Mr. Watt asked for clarification.

Mr. Moore presented the **Parking Plan Review** and **Conditional Use Chapter Modifications** topics, which go hand in hand with one another. Parking Plan Review would be similarly structured to the Landscape Plan Review process adopted earlier this year, allowing for a more discretionary review process by the Planning Commission specifically for parking code compliance. Mr. Keebler stated he felt language under Parking Plan review was confusing and could cause some problems. Mr. Moore said they could take a second look at the language. Mr. Moore also discussed an odd section in the Conditional Use Chapter entitled Transition Parking Lots, proposing its removal and replacement with a section requiring a Conditional Use for new off-street parking areas in the UP and RO districts.

Ms. Blackmar inquired as to whether the bicycle parking requirements are currently being implemented. Mr. Moore replied that they were. Discussion followed regarding signage.

Mr. Snavely inquired Mr. Mazer if the Board of Zoning Appeals was required by state laws? Mr. Mazer's impression of this is that most cities have a Board of Zoning Appeals, and believed it is a part of the administrative zoning review process. Mr. Mazer’s understanding is that it is a state law and an additional protection for the property owner. Mr. Snavely asked Mr. Mazer to look into the question further. Discussion followed.

Mr. Watt inquired about adjusting the ratio for having 1 bike parking spot every 10 vehicle parking spots, in light of potentially having less vehicle parking spaces. He was concerned projects would end up with less bicycle spots. Discussion followed.

Mr. Moore began the next presentation on the **District and Supplemental Provisions Update**.

Mr. Moore presented the **Porches, Stoops, and Decks** topic. Mr. Moore stated the goal was to make all sections of the code consistent in regards to porches, stoops and decks. Mr. Snavely inquired about what went into determining decks exceeding 50 square feet, which were only allowed in the rear yard. Discussion followed. It was suggested that staff craft definitions for porches, stoops, and decks and then dimensions could be figured out after. Mr. Watt suggested pictures could be used as visual examples.

Mr. Moore presented the **Fences & Walls** topic. Mr. Watt asked whether there was any rationale behind the 2-foot setback requirement having to do with utilities.

Mr. Moore presented the **Restriction on Principal Buildings’** topic. Mr. Moore noted there was a potential loophole when it comes to principal building restrictions. Mr. Snavely expressed concern about the R-3 and R-4 being allowed to have more than one principal building per lot. Discussion followed. Mr. Moore stated he would look into the matter further.

Mr. Moore presented the **Front Yard Setback & Vacated ROW** topic. Mr. Moore expressed this was cleanup to help clarify where to measure the setback.

Mr. Moore presented the **Patios** topic.

Mr. Moore presented the **Residential Building Additions** topic. Mr. Dana was very pleased with this addition in the language. The Planning Commission was in agreement with the idea, but advised to be careful how we do it in regards to enclosing of additions. Mr. Perry spoke and stated that staff was trying to put back the language to how it was in 2017. Staff will do more work on it. Discussion followed.

Mr. Moore presented the **Minimum Lot Frontage** topic. Mr. Moore stated there was a need to establish lot frontage standards across all zoning districts. We already have a definition of lot frontage. The changes would address flag lots as well. Discussion regarding cul-de-sac exemption took place. The Commission discussed separate panhandle or flag lots’ language. Double stacking of lots was discussed.
Mr. Moore presented the **Mile Square Design Standards** topic. Mr. Moore noted that the changes proposed were duplicated across all three district sections (R-1MS, R-2MS, R-3MS). Mr. Keebler inquired about the siding standards. Mr. Moore stated that vinyl siding is currently only discouraged, it is not outright prohibited. Mr. Watt offered that the HAPC was working on design guidelines for exterior

materials. Mr. Perry expressed there would be enforcement issues if vinyl was prohibited, due to some situations requiring a permit and others not.

Mr. Moore presented **Other Code Cleanup**.

Mr. Snavely thanked Mr. Moore for his presentation and looked forward to seeing the results of the discussion at the next meeting.

Administrative Approvals

PC-2020-11, Final Subdivision, Lake Forest Drive Dedication and Easement Plat, 4-Leaf Development, LLC

PC-2020-12, Lot Consolidation, Parcels H4100-143-000-003 and H4100-143-000-007, US 27 & Southpointe Parkway, Veer Investment LLC

Adjournment

Mr. Mazer asked to circle back to Mr. Watt, Mr. Perry, and Mr. Mazer's meeting to discuss abstention voting. Mr. Mazer stated it was permissible under Robert's Rules. An individual does not have to explain while casting or why. Mr. Mazer stated from a policy standpoint, we encourage members to vote either yes or no. Mr. Snavely asked about recusals versus abstentions. Mr. Mazer stated recusals are appropriate when there is a conflict of interest. Abstentions are appropriate in certain situations, such as when a member was absent for the previous meeting and a vote is being taken to approve that meeting’s minutes. Members are allowed to abstain when they feel it is appropriate.

Mr. Dana made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bracken seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.