

Subdivision and Zoning Working Group

06/28/2018 Meeting Recap

- How are we going to 'invite' public comment?
 - Need to work within the representative format established by City Council (i.e. Community Councils)
- Public Meeting date and time confirmed for public input meeting
 - ***** 7 pm Hyde Park United Methodist Church Little Theater*****

Requested initial thoughts – If we considered Conservation District:

- Complying and complimentary to lot size and massing; not exact matches; approach of conservation district matched the spirit of conversation
- Indianapolis seemed 'strict'; noted doors; level of detail was probably more than Mt Lookout was aspiring for
- Dallas –
 - noted appendix, lot splits and demos – result: only 1 changed its outcome,
 - % percentage issued applied for, demos are only in historic districts – conservation doesn't stop demo, the design review was binding
 - In Ohio with home rule, demolition can be a binding review.
- Finding a balance is our goal
- Beacon Hill Plan
 - Likely to be neighborhood specific, tailor to them; exec summary – not style but historic design character, minimal age requirement.
 - Indianapolis – OK, Nashville – probably not appropriate
- Overlay district is a tactic from a neighborhood plan and can proceed without a Neighborhood Plan
- San Antonio
 - specific districts but common enabling district; comparable to enabling standards in our existing historic and Urban Design Overlay (UDO) legislation; age is not the only; Hearing review: Not demolition (again Texas); nearly all administrative

Other possible solutions

- What are the policy goals of this conversation
- Two big issues: Demolition of older homes and lot splits
 - # of lots to split
 - issue of demolition of older homes
 - 'awkward' lot splits (panhandles) – minimize awkward – on street frontage; lot is big enough you can split it (criteria)
 - shoehorning; In Mt Lookout – more problematic; Hyde Park maybe
- Time and Accomplishments – What do we want to accomplish? Articulate a clear set of 3 goals

- Conservation District –issues with being completed
- Street Fronting
- Panhandles
- Working Groups and Procedurals
 - 2-3 member can work with staff
 - less than quorum = 5
- Community Councils should be the first contact for questions and comments made by neighborhood residents and businesses
- Examples of Problem Sites
 - Herschel
 - Menlo
 - Observatory
- A point was made regarding hillside development and flooding issues, however, it is not within the range of goals for this Working Group
- Concerns regarding
 - Aesthetics, infrastructure, and utilities
- Process and procedure
 - Variance are at the back end of process
 - Understanding the variance process
 - Possible to demolish and subdivide at one time?
 - Clarity in process and procedure
 - Objective and not subjective
 - Clearly stated goals
- Aligning process between neighborhoods and builders
- GOALS to consider moving forward
 - Procedural - Clarity process
 - Objective Determinants – Public and Transparent

For next Thursday

- Conversation key points
- ***Email Jared three priorities to finalize***