

**Mt. Pleasant Planning Commission
Minutes of Work Session
June 4, 2015**

I. Review of packet materials/goals for work session

Goal of work session is to work out enough of the details to draft a recommendation to move forward to the City Commission.

Packet Materials:

- Map of the M-2 area
- M-2 Redevelopment Summary
- Notes from Joint Meeting with City Commission (2/26/15)
- Notes from PC Work Session (4/9/15)
- M-2 Redevelopment Procedures
- Rowe Report

II. Facts & Figures

Kain provided the following facts/figures:

- 183 parcels located in the M-2 student area; 153 are locally owned.
- 3 1/2 % of the parcels city wide
- 1,478 licensed occupants
- 36 occupants over base permitted at 1:900 square feet land area.
- 50 over previously licensed totals
- Average \$89,000 increased taxable value per property.
- Neighborhood could theoretically accommodate 1696 occupants based on the 1:900 land area
- Parking is more restrictive - not aware of anyone who has had a reduction in required parking

Driessnack commented that there has been over \$2,000,000 added in taxable value through this process.

III. Review of M-2 review process

a. Joint meeting with City Commission

Kain reviewed the key points of discussion at the joint meeting.

b. Planning Commission Work Session

Kain reviewed the key points of discussion at the work session.

c. Walking tour and open house

Discussion ensued on information gathered at these sessions:

General Impressions:

- A lot of misconceptions out there regarding zoning and the redevelopment process.
- Many residents thought the area was going to be rezoned and that the M-2 district was expanding into adjacent R districts.
- Citizens expressed their feelings that the developers are given additional occupants which they feel is the cause of the problems - they don't understand why the behavior is not controlled.

It was noted that any action taken in the M-2 district will not change underlying issues in the adjoining R districts, such as the proliferation of rental licenses.

IV. Regulatory Toolbox

Discussion ensued on a variety of regulatory techniques that could be used to codify a process similar to the existing process that accounts for feedback from both citizens and the City Commission. There was consensus that the current redevelopment process produces structures that are aesthetically pleasing and compatible with existing homes in the area. Discussion focused on what area should constitute a transitional area to the R district and what would differ in those developments from others in the M-2 district.

V. Direction to Staff

General areas of agreement:

- A transition area within the M-2 district should include properties adjacent to or across an alley or local street from a property in an R zoning district. Existing buffer requirements such as walls/fences should remain, and additional restrictions such as per unit occupancy limits should be implemented.
- The neighborhood look and feel created by prior M-2 redevelopments (detached structures rather than large buildings or row homes) should continue to be encouraged without modification.
- The input of the Zoning Board of Appeals and the additional opportunity for public input is valued and desired to be continued.
- Parking lots are incompatible with the neighborhood look and feel desired; strategies to reduce their input such as the limited use of stacked parking should be included in the new recommendation.
- The ability to combine platted lots for redevelopment should be limited to no more than two lots per project to maintain the look and feel of the existing neighborhood. Dimensional requirements should be adjusted to reduce the incidence of non-conformity of existing platted lots.
- Incentives for redevelopment based upon occupancy should continue. The land area criteria for redevelopment should be eliminated as well as the per unit land area

requirement for the M-2 district. Occupancies should be based upon the existing 1:300 building area requirement, which is limited by setbacks and height limits in addition to the limits parking requirements place on building occupancies. There should be per unit occupancy limitations for redevelopments in the transitional area to address compatibility.

Closing remarks:

Commissioners were asked by staff to consider if there should be a cap on unit occupancy outside of the transition area? If so, at what point would they have to split? Commissioners were asked to provide feedback to staff on this item within the next two weeks. A draft ordinance will be available for discussion in July and consideration to set a public hearing for August.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.