



MEMBERS OF LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

CHARLES DEESE, DISTRICT 3, CHAIRMAN
JAMES BARNETT, DISTRICT 4, VICE-CHAIRMAN
TAMECCA NEELY, DISTRICT 2
, DISTRICT 5
SHEILA HINSON, DISTRICT 6
ALAN PATTERSON, DISTRICT 1
BEN LEVINE, DISTRICT 7
CLERK: JENNIFER BRYAN

MINUTES
Lancaster County Planning Commission
June 2, 2022 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Deese called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL: Quorum is present (Six Commissioners)

Commissioners Present:

Tamecca Neely	Ben Levine	James Barnett
Sheila Hinson	Charles Keith Deese	Alan Patterson

Absent: none

No appointment has yet been made to fill District 5 seat.

Staff Present:

Rox Burhans	Clerk: Jennifer Bryan
Ashley Davis	
Matthew Blaszyk	County Attorney John DuBose

Rox Burhans introduced new staff member, Matthew Blaszyk.

Also Present: Dennis Marstall, County Administrator

The following press were notified of the meeting by email in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act: The Lancaster News, Kershaw News Era, The Rock Hill Herald, The Fort Mill Times, Cable News 2, Channel 9, and the local Government Channel. The agenda was also posted in the lobby of the County Administration Building for the required length of time, and was published on the County website.

2. APPROVE AGENDA

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve the Agenda.
Motion to Approve by **James Barnett**; 2nd by **Sheila Hinson**
Called vote: 6:0. Motion approved unanimously.

3. CITIZEN'S COMMENTS [see Sign-In sheet attached]

Chairman Deese opened the floor to comments from the public. None signed in; floor is closed to Citizen's comments.

4. APPROVE MINUTES

a. March 15, 2022 Regular Minutes

Item forwarded to this agenda: insufficient votes for quorum at 4/7/22, 4/19/22, 5/5/2022, and 5/17/2022 meetings. Commissioners Levine and Hinson were absent from the meeting of March 15, 2022. Commissioner Neely was absent from the meeting of 4/19/2022. Commissioner Alan Patterson was absent from the meeting of 5/5/ 2022. Commissioners Barnett and Levine were absent from the meeting of 5/17/2022.

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve March 15, 2022 Regular Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by **James Barnett**; 2nd by **Alan Patterson**.

Commissioners Levine and Hinson abstained.

Called vote: 4:0. **Motion approved.**

b. May 5, 2022 Regular Minutes

Item forwarded to this agenda: insufficient votes for quorum at 5/17/2022 meeting. Commissioner Patterson was absent from the meeting of 5/5/2022. Commissioners Barnett and Levine were absent from the meeting of 5/17/2022.

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve May 17, 2022 Regular Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **Sheila Hinson**. Commissioner Patterson abstained.

Called vote: 5:0. **Motion approved.**

c. May 17, 2022 Regular Minutes

Chairman Deese called for a motion to approve May 17, 2022 Regular Minutes as written. Motion to Approve by **Alan Patterson**; 2nd by **Tamecca Neely**.

Commissioners Barnett and Levine abstained.

Called vote: 4:0. **Motion approved.**

5. PUBLIC ITEMS

a. RZ-2022-0672 Purser

Application by Nathaniel B. Purser to rezone 1-acre parcel at 7984 Taxahaw Road (TM# 0093-00-004.04) from Rural Business (RUB) to Agricultural Residential (AR) zoning district, for the purpose of converting a former commercial building into a residence.

Staff Presentation: Ashley Davis, Senior Planner, noted that applicant had indicated to staff that he would attend, but was not present; and that two members of the public had called in to say they would attend, and their names were placed on the sign-in sheet by the Clerk at their request, but were also not present.

A. Davis presented the application consistent with the staff report.

Notes:

1. A question had been raised as to whether the property was ever a gas station, and whether there are gas tanks on the property; staff reviewed SC DHEC/federal registry of underground storage tanks, and looked at aerial photographs dating back to the 1980s, no gas tanks were identified or registered.
 2. Code Violation for unpermitted work was reported and inspected after the agenda and staff report were published. Because the violation involves renovation work to convert the existing structure to a residence, staff recommendation is unchanged.
- A. Davis provided information that the individuals who asked to speak live near the subject parcel, that Mr. Faile is a former owner of the property when it was a convenience store, and that they had expressed objection to the rezoning and to the unpermitted work.

Staff Recommendations: Approval as consistent with surrounding zoning and usages.

Questions to staff:

- **Chairman Deese** noted that the property is zoned RUB because it is located at a rural crossroads, and that is the proper location for RUB. This rezoning could potentially allow a mobile home on the site, which he does not want to see. It may never be a store again, but it should be a business. **Davis** noted that since the parcel is only one acre, the current structure would have to be removed before a mobile home could be installed.
- **B. Levine** commented that it seemed apparent that the owner began renovating, discovered the zoning issue, and therefore applied for rezoning so as not to be out of compliance.
- **Chairman Deese** stated that he believed someone had been living there; there is a mobile home behind it hidden from view, but he does not want to see a mobile home right at the intersection of Hwy 501.
- **S. Hinson** commented that this is the country, neither a residence nor a mobile home would be inconsistent with the surrounding zoning, usage or appearance in that part of the County, which is very rural.
- **B. Levine** asked for clarification about the mobile home; A. Davis responded that there is no mobile home currently on the property, there is one on an adjacent property.
- **Chairman Deese** commented that there used to be a mobile home next to the store and there was utility hookup for a mobile home still in place.
- **Patterson** noted that the other 3 corners of the intersection are all Agricultural/ Residential, no other businesses, consistent with this request.

Comment from applicant(s): [not present]

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets)

Chairman Deese opened the Public Hearing and called for comments.

Two members of the public had called in to say they would attend, and their names were placed on the sign-in sheet by the Clerk at their request. Stacy Faile and Donald Faile were called upon by the Chair; they were not present when called.

Davis also noted that the item would go to a Public Hearing before Council, all parties would have a further opportunity to comment in a public forum.

[See additional discussion before adjournment below.]

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item RZ-2022-0672. Motion to approve by **Alan Patterson**; 2nd by **Sheila Hinson**.

Discussion:

- **J. Barnett** asked if there were staff conditions attached to the motion. Attorney DuBose noted that the staff comments were findings of fact, not conditions.
- **B. Levine** commented that as a matter of personal policy, he does not support a request if the applicant does not attend.

Called vote: A. Patterson: For B. Levine: Against T. Neely: For
 S. Hinson: For J. Barnett: Against C. Deese: Against

Vote: 3:3. **Motion fails for lack of majority.**

The item will go to County Council for consideration.

b. UDO-TA-2021-2980 Interim Ordinance

Application by Lancaster County to amend the Unified Development Ordinance (all Chapters except Chapter 8), to modify the Cluster Subdivision Overlay District; to reclassify the five Mixed-Use Districts as legacy districts; and to implement new Flexible Districts.

Staff Presentation: Rox Burhans, Development Services Director, presented the application consistent with the staff report. Draft text of Interim Ordinance is attached to meeting agenda in Staff Report. [See also attached handout, “**Staff Comments on UDO Interim Ordinance (5-11-22 Draft)**” and attached copies of **Interim Ordinance slide presentation** – 10 slides]

Ordinance would establish new Flexible Districts, creating a project-based process as opposed to the district-based approval process. Existing Mixed-Use districts would receive “legacy” status, to divert further projects to Flexible Districts.

Among other considerations, attention was given to 3 possible options for addressing problematic aspects of Cluster Subdivision Overlay District [“**CSO**”]: [See slide “Cluster Subdivision Options”]

- Option 1: Maintaining the CSO provisions as is;
- Option 2: Deleting the CSO provisions;
- Option 3: Allowing CSO use only for properties already zoned MDR at time of enactment [i.e. no rezonings of large parcels for the purpose of using CSO]

Staff Recommendation: Approval, subject to attached Staff Comments, and with Option 3 regarding disposition of CSO.

Questions/Discussion with staff:

ALAN PATTERSON:

- Once a developer goes through process, are they bound to the plan that is submitted and approved? **Burhans:** Yes, they are bound to the terms and conditions and design approval. There are provisions for necessary modifications, but within limits and procedural checks and balances.
- For Mixed Use flex district, will the 25-acre minimum threshold still apply? **Burhans:** The flex site-specific process would allow parcels with less than 25 acres highland to use the new development process. Residential minimum is 45 dwelling units; commercial minimum is 5 acres; mixed-use would be a combination of the two.
- What would the impact of the MDR change for Cluster Subdivision Overlay, a large or moderate impact? **Burhans:** It depends on the option ultimately chosen by Council. The impact would be noticeable if eliminated completely; allowing it to be used for properties/projects already zoned MDR would alleviate the sting for developers already committed.
- The provision allowing Committee of the Whole [“COW”] “preview” seems to bypass the established process and seems unnecessary. **Burhans:** The intent is to allow developers to have some feedback as to whether they have a viable project before committing hundreds of thousands of dollars to a project that Council does not want; open to other solutions to this problem.

BEN LEVINE:

- Will the proposed changes allow development agreements to reduce impact fees collected? **Attorney DuBose:** All new development is subject to the instituted impact fees for a designated area. If a project provides unique features that affect what the impact fees are intended to address, e.g. building a school or a fire station – then the Impact Fee statute allows certain offsets. The County via a Development Agreement could essentially credit the value of that feature to offset impact fees; but the asset/feature would have to be directly tied to the impact fee in question. In and of itself, a development agreement is not going to absolve a developer from payment of impact fees.
- Does the proposed change for MDR/CSO change the density allowable? **Burhans:** Existing CSO has same density limit as MDR, but with different provision for lot sizes. Chapter 3 changes make some room for increased density, but lot size requirements create a practical limit in single-family detached development.
- The option of allowing CSO for acreage already zoned MDR would essentially mean that CSO is still allowed everywhere in Indian Land. Is it possible to allow it elsewhere in the County, but prohibit CSO in Indian Land? **Burhans:** Geographical limitation was considered as an option for dealing with CSO but was deemed not practical. There is very little MDR not already entitled by other projects in Indian Land that could be combined for CSO projects. **A. Davis:** Only two small areas in Indian Land that could qualify, everything else is south of Route 5, near city of Lancaster. **Burhans:** Fortunately, the County kept LDR and AR as base zoning in Indian Land, which limits the impact of this change.

- Are sidewalks an element off-limits to flexibility? **Burhans:** the proposed Interim does not change the existing requirements.
- A developer opting to use CSO if it is retained would not have to provide amenities as they would under the new flex process? **Burhans:** Under CSO, a developer can count almost all impaired land as open space, which preserves wetlands but leaves no room for amenities. The new ordinance retains the same acreage requirement for open space (25%) but would only allow floodplain to account for up to 50% of open space, and instituting requirements for amenities.
- Approves of staff comment item that reduces the threshold number of units linked to required amenities (from 500 units to 250).

TAMECCA NEELY:

- How does the developer establish the “default” base district for their project? **Burhans:** Developer will meet with staff, describe their project, and select an existing zoning district that most closely meets their needs. This functions as the default standards for the “flex” option.
- Asks for clarification regarding the open space and amenities requirements in the proposed Interim. **Burhans:** The Interim provisions are trying to plug gaps in the existing ordinance. Current ordinance does not require developments to provide amenities; meanwhile local public amenities such as neighborhood parks are becoming increasingly rare due to maintenance costs. The proposed ordinance establishes minimum standards for amenities and open space provided by subdivision developers while allowing some leeway for selected elements.
- Likes the provision of the COW “preview,” but would like to see a way to provide the same information to the public. **Burhans:** That should be achievable, although mass mailings would probably not be practical.
- Going forward, how will this ordinance tie in with the new Comprehensive Plan being developed? **Burhans:** The sunset of the Interim Ordinance will come about as the new Comprehensive Plan and UDO come online. The Comprehensive Plan that is adopted will govern this Interim if there is a gap until the new UDO is in place.
- Some of the language seemed a little vague, she would like to see qualifiers such as “generally,” “should,” etc. tightened up so as not to leave so much grey area.

SHEILA HINSON:

- The proposed Interim seems to make the process clearer and easier to use. **Burhans:** The intent is to make it easier for developers to deliver a better product and resolve challenges more easily. It will be a lot of additional work for the staff to administer, but it will bring us to a standard that is becoming more the norm.
- Asks that the staff keep in mind the different needs of the more rural parts of the County. **Burhans:** the proposed plan keeps the existing options in place, acknowledging that development needs vary.

JAMES BARNETT:

This gives the rural areas the tools needed to plan for the future, rather than amending the UDO at every meeting. He appreciates what the staff has put into it. With the high cost of materials, it makes sense to give the developers feedback before they invest time and money in a project the County doesn't want.

CHARLES DEESE:

Regarding CSO, it needs some work, but he'd like to see it stay in place. In most areas it can be used effectively with Development Agreements. DAs are a handy tool if used correctly, impact fees can only be used for the specific area and purpose for which they're collected. Overall the proposed ordinance is well done, aside from the minor comments that will be worked out before it goes to Council.

Public Hearing: (See attachments: Sign-in Sheets) none signed in.

Chairman Deese closed Public hearing and called for a motion on item UDO-TA-2021-2980 Interim Ordinance.

Motion to approve Interim Ordinance, with **option 2** [deletion of Cluster Subdivision Overlay District, referencing slide presentation] and Adoption of Staff Comments [referencing attached handout] by **Ben Levine**; 2nd by **Sheila Hinson**.

Discussion:

A. Patterson thanked staff and Mr. DuBose for their work in drafting the Ordinance, and educating Commissioners on the matter, so that he can make an informed decision. Would like to see caution in the Council "preview" to assure that it is not perceived by developers or the public as a "pre-approval."

B. Levine stated that he would be in favor of retaining the CSO if it was modified to include the open area and amenity requirements, but cannot support retaining it in its current form.

Chairman Deese clarified that Mr. Levine's motion included elimination of the CSO as it exists [Option 2 referencing presentation slides].

J. Barnett commented that he would be more supportive of Option 3 regarding the CSO, modification rather than deletion.

Called vote: A. Patterson: For B. Levine: For T. Neely: Against
 S. Hinson: For J. Barnett: Against C. Deese: Against

Vote: 3:3. **Motion fails for lack of majority.**

Chairman Deese asked counsel if he should call for another motion. Attorney DuBose stated that a motion to reconsider can be made by the parties carrying the vote, which in these circumstances [tied vote] would fall to those voting against.

Chairman Deese stated the item will go to County Council for consideration.

[NOTE: the matter was revisited after New Business below]

6. NEW BUSINESS

In July, we will return to the established practice of a Workshop on the first Thursday of the month, and one regular meeting on the third Tuesday.

- a. Overview of Next Month's Agenda: June 21, 2022
RZ/DA- 2021-2803 Two Capital Partners a/k/a Tadlock; RZ -2022-0812
Sharp; RZ-2022-0978 LC Detention Center
- b. Other

James Barnett asked if the Chair should recognize citizens who had arrived late in the meeting and may wish to comment in Public Hearing. **Chairman Deese** addressed the latecomers and stated they will have an opportunity to address Council in Public Hearing; **A. Davis** commented that the motion to approve had failed for lack of majority and would go to Council with a recommendation for denial. She offered to update them on status of code violations after the meeting.

Rox Burhans asked for clarification regarding the Interim Ordinance, whether the Commission's intention was to send it to Council without consideration or vote on other options. **Attorney DuBose** confirmed that the prevailing side, in this case those who voted against, had the option of making a motion to reconsider the item. **Burhans** commented that there seemed to be broad consensus by the Commission for the Interim Ordinance as a whole, with differing opinions on the matter of Cluster Subdivision Overlay. **B. Levine** asked if any Commissioner that had opposed the first motion could put forward another motion in support of another option for CSO to reopen the discussion. **Attorney DuBose** confirmed this statement, and noted that the prevailing votes against were by Barnett, Deese and Neely; any of them could propose a motion to reconsider, incorporating a motion for approval with different terms.

T. Neely asked if the matters of the Interim Ordinance as a whole could be voted separately from the matter of the CSO options. **Attorney DuBose** confirmed that the issue could be split.

Chairman Deese commented that the matter could have been split before or during the first motion, why separate them now? **Dubose** responded that he could only confirm that separation is an option, but he offered no opinion as to whether the Commissioners should so move.

Burhans offered that it was clear that one option was not acceptable, leaving open discussion about the other two options; perhaps the Commission could come to some consensus; he noted that staff recommendation was for Option 3. **Dubose** commented that staff recommendation would, as a matter of course, be noted in the report to Council, and that the minutes would reflect Mr. Levine's comment that he would support retention of the CSO if it were amended to remedy the flaws in its existing form.

J. Barnett asked if the discussion of the other two options was open; **DuBose** stated that there was no motion currently on the floor.

Chairman Deese called for a motion, if there was no motion to reconsider then he would hear a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Neely moved to reconsider the matter of UDO-TA-2021-2980, presenting a **Motion to Approve the Interim Ordinance with option 3** [Allowing CSO use only for properties already zoned MDR at time of enactment] Amended to include adoption of Staff Comments [referencing handout].
2nd by **J. Barnett**.

Discussion:

- **B. Levine** restated his concerns about the flaws inherent in the existing CSO provisions, and asked that if there was not support for deleting it, that staff and Commission consider Text Amendments to address the problems. **R. Burhans** commented that the new UDO would address CSO issues; **Levine** noted that he would prefer that amendments be looked at sooner rather than wait for the new UDO.
- **A. Patterson** commented that it was apparent from the discussion that common ground could be reached.
- **T. Neely** concurred with Deese's earlier comment that CSO could work if properly planned.

Called vote: A. Patterson: For B. Levine: Against T. Neely: For
 S. Hinson: For J. Barnett: For C. Deese: For

Vote: 5:1. **Motion is approved.**

Item is referred to County Council for consideration.

7. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn by **Sheila Hinson**; 2nd by **James Barnett**. Motion approved by unanimous consent. Meeting adjourned at 6:44 PM.



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 3: CITIZEN'S COMMENTS

General Comments or comments on matters not on tonight's agenda.



Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Thursday, June 2 2022

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before Council will be required to do so in a civil manner. Council will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Council Members, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. Council's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.
2.
3.
4.



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5 a. RZ-2022-0672 Purser

Application by Nathaniel B. Purser to rezone 1-acre parcel at 7984 Taxahaw Road (TM# 0093-00-004.04) from Rural Business (RUB) to Agricultural Residential (AR) zoning district, for the purpose of converting a former commercial building into a residence.

Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Thursday, June 2 2022

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before Council will be required to do so in a civil manner. Council will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Council Members, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. Council's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.	STACY FAILE 7980 TAXAHAW RD KERSHAW SC	not in meeting 
2.	DONALD T. FAILE 7859 TAXAHAW RD KERSHAW SC	not in meeting 
3.		



PLANNING COMMISSION Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Item 5 b. UDO-TA-2021-2980 Interim Ordinance

Application by Lancaster County to amend the Unified Development Ordinance (all Chapters except Chapter 8), to modify the Cluster Subdivision Overlay District; to reclassify the five Mixed-Use Districts as legacy districts; and to implement new Flexible Districts.



Council Chambers
101 N. Main Street, Lancaster South Carolina
Thursday, June 2 2022

Citizens are allowed 3 minutes per person to speak. Everyone speaking before Council will be required to do so in a civil manner. Council will not tolerate personal attacks on individual Council Members, County Staff or any person or group. Racial slurs will not be permitted. Council's number one priority is to conduct business for the citizens of this county.

PLEASE PRINT

1.
2.
3.
4.

Staff Comments on UDO Interim Ordinance (5-11-22 Draft)

1. Section 2.5.3 (Page 13): At what stage in project will use table be updated to reflect Flexible Districts? Section 3.4.1 (Page 16): Need to update this section to reflect not permitting residential uses in Flexible Non-Residential District.
2. Table 3.4.1-1(Page 17): Exclude multifamily from Flexible Residential District. We continue to want to have townhomes and 2 to 4 family dwellings permitted. Traditional apartments/Multifamily should be in Flexible Mixed Use only.
3. Table 3.5.1 (Pages 20 and 21):
 - a. Delete reference in section D referencing gross density acreage backs out Primary Conservation area
 - b. Updated densities for town home uses to 8 du/acre and 12- du/acre for multifamily.
 - c. Remove multifamily from Flexible Residential District
 - d. Delete residential uses and densities from industrial districts.
 - e. Provide disclaimer note that density Increases must be approved by County Council
4. Section 3.3.3 (Pages 21 and 22): Need to create language distinguishing appropriate amenity features for commercial and MXU projects versus residential.
5. 3.7.3 (Page 22): Reduce amenity center threshold to 250-homes per feedback from Stakeholder Committee member.
6. Section 3.8 (Page 23)
 - a. Where does the 1 overflow stall for every 5 units/homes come from? Consider 1 per 10 for single family detached.
 - b. Clarify 40-ft front setback is only for SF Detached Homes
 - c. Establish 20-ft gap between lot categories
 - d. Evaluate 51% Lot mix. Create a 20-ft spacing gap between lot categories. Would like to have this be eligible for flexibility to address unique projects that may warrant an individual mix (age restricted, etc.)
 - e. Define 50-ft buffer plant material
7. Section 3.9.9C (Page 32): Insert "order of control" language for various plan and ordinance elements.
8. Section 3.9.10 (Page 32): Update modification language to reflect Council approval for moderate modifications.
9. Section 3.9.5.A (Page 27): Revise side setback to 7.5-ft versus 10
10. Section 3.9.5D (Page 30): Insert "brick or stone" as examples of masonry materials.
11. Page 42: No request for a new Flexible District in same category
12. Section 9.2.10 (Page 49): Delete "Stormwater Permit"

5. Public Items

b.) TA-2021-2980 UDO Interim Ordinance

Proposed amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10) to create three new zoning districts, convert existing Mixed Use Districts to legacy status, and modify the Cluster Subdivision Overlay District.

Overview

Interim Ordinance: 3-Key Items

1. Establishes Three New Flexible Zoning Districts
 - A. Flexible Residential, Flexible Non-Residential, & Flexible Mixed-Use
 - i. Project-based rezoning approval versus district based (similar to MX or PDDs)
 - ii. Allow rezoning applicants to request flexibility from certain ordinance requirements
 - iii. Creates supplementary standards if applicant chooses to rezone to a Flexible District
 - iv. Gives developer opportunity to exceed ordinance requirements
2. Converts Five Existing Mixed Use Districts to Legacy Districts
 - A. MXU Districts used to accommodate town homes, most apts., and mixed-use development
 - B. Interim Ordinance will replace this function
3. Proposes Changes to Cluster Subdivision Ordinance (options provided in report)

Why Have an Interim Ordinance?

- October 2021 County: Initiated UDO Rewrite with White and Smith
 - Major issues with 2016 UDO
 - Two year process to complete
- Flooded with Major Development Inquiries in Both Panhandle and Greater Lancaster Area
 - Desirable community
 - Moratoriums
- County Concerned about Processing Major Projects with Flawed Ordinance

Prior Interim Ordinance Discussions

- Planning Commission Interim Ordinance Discussions
 - April/May 2022: One-on-One Discussions
 - May 16, 2022 Detailed Overview
 - Various informal discussions
- Council Discussions on Interim Ordinance Discussions
 - September 15, 2021
 - November 10, 2021
 - December 15, 2021
 - February 16, 2022
 - April 13, 2022



Administrative Items

- Applicability
 - 45-Homes/Units For Residential (TIA threshold)
 - 5-Acres for Non-Residential
 - Combination of above for Mixed-Use
- Application Content (similar to MX or PDD)
 - Master Plan
 - Terms/Conditions Document
 - Traffic Study
 - Building Elevations
 - Other Items (as needed)
- Process
 - Follows general rezoning process*
 - Neighborhood meetings
 - COW project introduction



Interim Ordinance Standards

Created New or Modifications to Existing Standards

1. Fill missing gaps in current UDO
2. Improve under-performing existing standards
 - a. Open Space and amenity requirements
 - b. Lot mix
 - c. Overflow Parking/Setbacks
3. Kept those that worked well



Cluster Subdivision Options

Three Options For Cluster Subdivision Overlay District

1. Retain as is until full UDO rewritten
 - ✓ Will entitle development that is inconsistent with goals
 - ✓ Dilutes purpose of Interim Ordinance
2. Delete From Ordinance
 - ✓ May not be fair to existing owners zoned MDR
 - ✓ Would eliminate expansion of developments completely
3. Retain for properties already zoned MDR
 - ✓ Equitable
 - ✓ Manages expansion of developments



Wrap Up

- Greater certainty with project approach versus district approach
 - Common tool used with peer communities
- Creates Options to Resolve Project Challenges
 - Help with compatibility issues
- Will Not Solve all UDO Issues, But will Address

Many With Larger Projects



Staff Comments

Three Categories

1. Housekeeping Items
2. Modification to Ordinance Standards or Flexibility Allowances
3. Administrative Procedural Items

Overall Fairly Minor Comments



Recommendation

Staff recommends **approval** subject to:

1. Updates by consultant addressing comments
2. Retaining CSO District for properties zoned MDR as of date of this TA application

