



---

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE** March 1, 2018  
**TO** Dundee Riverside Master Plan Code Committee  
**FROM** Becky Hewitt and Matt Hastie, Angelo Planning Group  
**RE** **Code Committee Meeting 1 Summary**  
**CC** Project Management Team

---

The Code Committee met on January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to provide input to the Project Management Team (PMT) for the Dundee Riverside Zoning Code project.

Matt Hastie of Angelo Planning Group (APG) provided an overview of the project objectives and schedule, and the responsibilities of the Code Committee. Note that the project schedule that was included in the Code Committee packet will be updated to reflect the scheduled date for the first community meeting (February 1<sup>st</sup>).

Becky Hewitt of APG gave a brief introduction to the Draft Code Evaluation Memo, and led the Code Committee in a discussion of the Key Discussion Questions provided in the packet. Key questions and comments from the Code Committee are summarized for each of the questions below.

### 1) Housing Targets

Key questions and comments:

- Committee members asked how Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) would fit with housing density targets.
  - City staff explained that the City does not currently allow ADUs, but is going through a code update to allow them and set standards for them, based on a recent change to state law that requires nearly all cities to allow ADUs in areas zoned for single family homes.
  - Some raised concerns about whether allowing ADUs and not counting them in density calculations would overburden infrastructure relative to what was analyzed.
  - One member noted that if ADUs count against the allowed number of homes, developers will likely only build full-size units, since those make more money.
  - APG noted that once ADUs are allowed as of right with a single family home, it won't make sense to count them against the allowed number of homes, since they could be built later anyway. APG also pointed out that the popularity of ADUs will depend heavily on how the City sets impact fees (System Development Charges or SDCs) for them, and noted that the pace of development in the area would likely be slow enough to allow adjustments if more ADUs than expected were being built. They

also noted that ADUs tend to require fewer services than full-size homes on average since the size and number of occupants are lower.

- Some committee members expressed concerns about allowing the density to go too low, and not using the land efficiently, since there is little other buildable land in the city for residential uses.
- One committee member suggested that going above the allowed density could be permitted only as a bonus, for example for providing a mix of housing types (per the next topic).

**Conclusion:** The committee recommended allowing development to go as low as 20% below the target density and as much as 10% above the target density through density bonuses for including higher density housing types (e.g. apartments, duplexes, townhomes, etc.). ADUs would not be included in the density calculation.

## 2) Housing Variety and Mix

Key questions and comments:

- Some committee members expressed a desire to see affordable housing and rental opportunities in the area, and wanted to ensure a mix of housing types in order to help meet those needs.
- Some expressed concern about being overly restrictive if the requirements don't match the market.
- Several expressed interest in using incentives to encourage a mix of housing rather than requirements to force it.
- One member noted that narrow-lot detached homes should be treated like townhomes and considered part of housing mix, because there is demand for ownership of detached homes, but they provide a more affordable / attainable price because of the small lot and smaller home.
  - Some members raised concerns about impacts to on-street parking from closely-spaced driveways, and noted a need for design standards for both townhomes and narrow-lot detached homes that address driveways.
- There was interest in making sure assisted living could be developed in the area.
- There was a suggestion that where housing is allowed in the commercial/mixed use zones, it could be limited to multifamily and similar housing types.

**Conclusion:** The Committee recommended that developers be required to include at least one type of housing other than standard single-family homes (e.g. duplexes, townhomes or narrow-lot detached homes, apartments, etc.), but no minimum amount, and that there be incentives (e.g. density bonuses per the topic above) to encourage more variety.

## 3) Housing in Commercial/Mixed Use Areas

Key questions and comments:

- Some members noted that there is a lot of vacant commercial land in the City, and questioned how much commercial development would be needed in the Riverside District.
- Some noted that commercial land in master plans often struggle, because the population has to be there before the area is attractive for commercial development.
- There was desire for a grocery store, but some felt that there isn't a large enough population in the city, even with the Riverside District, to attract a grocery store.
- Some want to preserve some land for commercial development, even if it takes longer to be developed.
- Some raised the idea of building housing (e.g. apartments or live/work townhomes) with ground floor space that could transition to non-residential use in the future.
- Some committee members felt that resident services and amenity areas (e.g. a salon associated with a retirement community) should not count towards any requirement for commercial use unless they are also open / available to the general public.

**Conclusion:** The Committee recommended allowing more than half of the total ground floor area on sites in commercial/mixed use areas to be developed with housing (e.g. 75%), but keeping some requirement for commercial uses, and allowing temporary residential uses on the ground floor in at least some of the required non-residential area as long as the space is designed to convert to commercial / non-residential uses in the future, and not counting resident amenity / service areas towards non-residential use requirements unless open to the public.

#### 4) Housing in Light Industrial Areas

Key questions and comments:

- Some committee members felt that housing could be compatible with industrial areas if separated by a park, or in limited areas as a transition between other uses (e.g. across the street from other residential areas).
- Others were concerned about what type of industrial uses would be allowed, and felt that housing generally would not be compatible, and that having a street to separate housing from industrial would be better than allowing housing to be a transition that would then be closer to the industrial uses.
- There was openness to live/work housing in the light industrial areas.

**Conclusion:** The Committee recommended allowing live/work housing but not other housing in light industrial areas.

#### 5) Non-Residential Uses in Commercial & Light Industrial Areas

Key questions and comments:

- Several committee members requested additional information about the potential uses prior to making a recommendation, and recommended getting broader community input.
- One member felt that the mixed use area by the river should have a limited list of uses because of its unique location next to a natural area.

- One member noted that there is a lot of vacant light industrial land in the city, and that it is not in high demand.
- One member suggested during a prior discussion that the light industrial area allow flexibility for commercial uses.
- Another member suggested allowing parks in commercial and industrial areas.

**Conclusion:** The Committee recommended that the project team get input from the community on this issue and look at the uses more specifically.

## 6) Residential Design Standards

Key questions and comments:

- Several members expressed support for basic design standards, such as measures to require “eyes on the street” and address garage setbacks.
- Some members noted that the requirements should be simple, and not require staff to do a bunch of calculations from plan sets.
- Members generally supported requirements for variation in the design of the front elevation (e.g. where windows are placed, where the door is, rooflines, porches, gables, etc.) of homes next to each other so that all the houses on a given street or in a given area do not look the same. One member referenced the “five-finger rule” that no house look identical to any of the 5 houses closest to it (the houses on either side and the three directly and diagonally across the street). The commenter noted that most builders today have enough building prototypes or models to accomplish this.
- Some members felt that in some areas it would make sense to require “eyes” to the river in addition to / instead of to the street.
- Some expressed an interest in regulating exterior siding materials, while others felt that this was unnecessary or overly prescriptive.

**Conclusion:** Establish simple, clear and objective residential design standards focused on “eyes on the street”, variation in front elevations (e.g. something like the “five-finger rule”), and “texture” (to avoid a completely flat wall on the front), but recognizing that edges overlooking the river may want / need to face towards the river or a trail.

## 7) Commercial and Industrial Design Standards

Key questions and comments:

- One member noted that the Light Industrial border along the natural area should have design standards as well as the edges along major roads.
- Most members felt that the rest of the Light Industrial area could have flexible standards.
- In commercial/mixed use Area A, some members felt that there should be stricter regulations on design since the recommendation was to be more flexible on allowing residential uses. Others felt that this isn’t a big deal.

**Conclusion:** The Committee generally agreed with the Project Management Team recommendation, with some refinement:

- Commercial / mixed use in area A - basic pedestrian-friendly design standards
- Commercial / mixed use in area D - stronger design standards for very pedestrian-oriented development
- Light industrial – pedestrian-friendly design required along key streets and along the river edge of the natural area, with more functional / industrial design allowed on the interior