

TEXT AMENDMENT

Ordinance Fact Sheet

Case No. CD-CPC-2021-00214

Brief Title

Amending Chapter 88, the Zoning and Development Code, through revisions, clarifications, and other administrative changes throughout the chapter in accordance with the Zoning & Development Code periodic review and special purpose amendments process. (CD-CPC-2021-00214)

Details

Location: City wide

Reason for Legislation: To amend Chapter 88, through revisions, clarifications, and other administrative changes throughout the chapter in accordance with the Zoning & Development Code periodic review.

PLAN REVIEW

1. LOT AND BUILDING STANDARDS

- Provide new lot and building standards for lots platted or annexed prior to January 1, 1954
- Allow for contextually appropriate development for new and existing homes

2. MINOR SUBDIVISION AMENDMENTS

- Clarifying Language
- Establish naming conventions for minor subdivision types
- Allow for the re-establishment of previously platted lot lines
- Allow for up to 15 lots to be subdivided through the minor subdivision process

SUMMARY OF CHANGES FOLLOWING CITY PLAN COMMISSION:

- The applicant made revisions to grammar and clarity to the text, as well as edited the supporting images.

CITY PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION:

Approval subject to the following condition

1. The City Planning and Development Director shall review the projects built under the proposed infill residential development standards within the next 7 months and present findings to the Council in June of 2023 to assess whether there is a need for changes.

220997

Ordinance Number

Positions/Recommendations

Sponsors

Jeffrey Williams, AICP, Director Department of City Planning & Development

Programs, Departments or Groups Affected

City wide

Applicants / Proponents

Applicant

City Department

City Planning & Development

Other

Opponents

Groups or Individuals

KCNAC

Basis of Opposition

Conditions:

1. Separate minor subdivision amendments into a separate ordinance to clarify this amendment will apply to all residential lots and is not limited to the 1954 definition of the Infill Lot & Building standards.

a. Restate Type 3 to include compliance with the public engagement requirements of 88-505-12.

2. Look back must also include a presentation to the KCNAC board and at a general meeting of the KCNAC.

a. Case references in study period must include not only filing status of applicant but

whether the subject property was occupied or resold at the completion of the permitted work

3. Evaluate height calculation methodology to establish where height measurement is based.

a. Clarify example images to improve readability

--	--

	<p>4. Restate garage door width restriction to allow tuck-under garages with minimal sidewalk impacts; coordinate language with item #3 to avoid conflict and consider referencing building width and not ground-level façade</p> <p>5. Remove detached garage restriction; the ADU ordinance allows detached accessory dwelling units on all residential lots, which either creates a conflict or renders this restriction irrelevant</p> <p>6. Define impervious cover by % of perviousness, not material, i.e. pavers and concrete are available in both pervious and impervious versions, technology is constantly changing</p> <p>7. Clarify 88-420-04-P to apply to a single lot (i.e. multi-family building) or remove. There is no consensus around removing parking requirements on detached dwelling unit (single-family) lots/building projects.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement pilot applications by neighborhood, block, or specific application type <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Design implementation to prioritize empty lots and protect existing housing stock b. Partner with applicant(s) and neighborhood organizations c. Analyze outcomes and incorporate findings to refine code language 2. Waive fees for owner/occupied applications with claw-backs 3. Review ADU language to coordinate housing strategy priorities and eliminate conflicts.
Staff Recommendation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For <input type="checkbox"/> Against Reason Against
Board or Commission Recommendation	<p>City Plan Commission 6-0 10-04-2022 By Allender, Baker, Crowl, Enders, Hill and Rojas</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For <input type="checkbox"/> Against <input type="checkbox"/> No Action Taken</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For, with revisions or conditions (see details column for conditions)</p>

Council Committee Actions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do Pass
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do Pass (as amended)
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Committee Sub.
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Without Recommendation
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hold
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not pass

Fact Sheet Prepared By: Najma Muhammad
Planner
Date: November 7, 2022

Reviewed By: Joseph Rexwinkle
Division Manager
Date:

Initial Application
Filed: November 17, 2021
City Plan Commission October 04, 2022
Action: Approval with Conditions
Revised Plans Filed: N/A
On Schedule: N/A
Off-Schedule Reason: N/A

Reference Numbers:
Case No. CD-BZA-2021-00214