



Land Use and Zoning Meeting #2 Notes

July 20, 2015
1:30 pm to 3:30 pm
City of Grand Rapids Parking Services
50 Ottawa Avenue, NW

WORKGROUP MEMBERS PRESENT: Sarah Abel, Pamela Benjamin, Janay Brower, Lamont Cole (Co-Chair), Tanya Gonzalez, Margo Johnson, Jim Jones, Ruth Kelly, Tom Koetsier, Julie Niemchick, Joy Pryor, Kristin Rahn-Tiemeyer, Brad Rosely, Jim Talen, Lee Nelson Weber (Co-Chair), and Stephen Wooden

STAFF PRESENT: Erin Banchoff, Landon Bartley, Connie Bohatch, Johanna Schulte, Suzanne Schulz, and Kristin Turkelson

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:

Lamont Cole led the group through introductions.

The group reviewed the notes from the July 6, 2015 meeting.

Stephen Wooden clarified the occupancy policy in East Lansing is based on the number of units in a low-density zone.

Technical problems accessing the site were discussed. A Google Drive site was created in addition to the SharePoint site. Contact Johanna Schulte (jschulte@grcity.us) with any problems.

GOAL FORMATION:

Kristin Turkelson and Landon Bartley reviewed the Master Plan goals. Workgroup members voted on the top three goals they felt were most applicable to the workgroup. The goals are listed below in the order of votes received. Next to each goal is the number it appears in the Master Plan.

Votes	Goal	Number in Plan
12	Promote broad range of housing choices (aging in place and accessibility)	3
9	Encourage racial, ethnic, and income diversity	4
8	Locate new high density housing to capitalize on transit	7
4	Provide quality rental housing	6
4	Encourage walkability with connected streets and mixed uses	10
3	Provide choice of neighborhood types	2
2	Recognize importance of schools in communities	14
2	Maximize public investment in development projects	9
1	Support home ownership	5
1	Collaboration for decision making	8
1	Make streets a neighborhood asset	11
1	Provide safe neighborhoods	12
0	Document and market amenities	1
0	Enhance neighborhood recreational opportunities	13

The importance of the relationship between neighborhoods and business districts was discussed.

Mr. Bartley asked the group whether the Master Plan goals covered the goals of the workgroup or whether anything needed to be added. The group discussed aging-in-place and accessibility and added it to Goal 3.

Margo Johnson asked the group to consider the conflicts between higher density and parking.

The group reviewed the top goals identified and applied them as group to applicable land use and zoning tools in terms of longevity and feasibility.

Goal 3. Promote broad range of housing choices (aging in place and accessibility):

Tools: Accessible housing, accessory dwelling units, co-housing and co-op Housing, community land trust, height limits and bonuses, inclusionary zoning, occupancy limits, tiny houses/micro units, land banking and demolition

Goal 4. Encourage racial, ethnic, income, and age diversity:

Tools: Accessible housing, accessory dwelling units, coop housing co housing, demolition policy, height limits and bonuses, inclusionary zoning, land banking, occupancy limits, tiny houses micro units

Goal 7. Locate new high density housing to capitalize on transit:

Tools: Accessible housing, co-housing, demolition policy, height limits and bonuses, inclusionary zoning, occupancy limits, tiny houses

The group discussed tension between goals two and seven. Suzanne Schulz explained some of the tools (height limits and bonuses) are easier to grapple with because they are assumed to apply primarily to business districts but other tools (accessory dwelling units, occupancy limits) apply primarily to neighborhoods where the tension plays out more.

The group discussed goal two as being an important issue.

Staff will continue the exercise and bring it back for review.

ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS DISCUSSION:

Kristin Turkelson introduced a table detailing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs). Ms. Turkelson explained ways the policy could be changed or modified. Ms. Johnson asked if the fee could be changed. Ms. Turkelson explained the fee only covers about 40% of the administrative costs of the process. Brad Rosely proposed the fees and longer timeline be waived if a unit fit certain requirements (affordable, accessible, etc.). Lee Nelson Weber asked whether the process was a barrier and how many people were looking to create these units. Ms. Turkelson responded that the City gets a lot of calls but has not had an application in three years or longer. She suggested people are continuing to create illegal ADUs for family members. Mr. Bartley explained that Code Compliance does not generally see these cases because they are in single-family, owner-occupied homes.

Lee Nelson Weber mentioned the neighbor notification requirement is important and should remain in the policy. Ms. Turkelson explained that in order to ask for public input, accessory dwelling units must be a special land use.

Stephen Wooden commented if applications could prove neighborhood effects would be mitigated, it might not be necessary to be considered a special land use.

The group discussed whether the minimum lot size should be relative to the lot sizes in the neighborhood or the building size.

Reducing the minimum square footage was discussed. Mr. Bartley explained the IPMC (International Property Maintenance Code) requires square footage and 250 square feet (the area required by the Traverse City policy) is the smallest allowable under the IPMC.

The group considered removing the 12 months of owner occupancy requirement.

The group decided to maintain the two bedroom maximum but considered adding “family” language.

Ms. Turkelson distributed a few pages on Seattle’s policies.

The group discussed Seattle’s clemency program.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting will be on August 3, 2015 from 1:30 pm to 3:30 pm.