

ZONEDETROIT, IWG Meeting

7/18/19, 9 to 11am, CAYMC Room 705 Judicial Conference Room

Introduction

- Overview of project, timeline for IWG comments before public release (30 days)

Presentation of Zoning Analytic by Code Studio

- Especially interested in feedback on red flag items, ideas worth exploring, anything missing

General Discussion/Comments

- Consider zoning vs. not zoning, it's not the exclusive tool for planning. There are other tools such as nuisance law, city-owned land.
- Michigan law doesn't allow amortization under zoning but does allow amortization under police power.
- Parking – should requirements be removed or recalibrated and more alternatives allowed? No maximums are anticipated to be included except maybe big box development.
- By-right vs. conditional uses – form standards can be used to allow more uses by-right
- PDD likes form standards over design review, but if a public subsidy or city-owned land is involved then design review is appropriate.
- Need community buy-in for regulations
- Industrial uses today are much cleaner and safer than in the past. This needs to be considered in the new ordinance. Performance standards are one option.
- Current industrial use definitions are too detailed (different levels of stamping). Consider noise, vibration; make more straight-forward
- The categories of industrial uses should be related to the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Uses need to be re-evaluated, times have changed.
- Vacant land reclamation isn't clear in the current ordinance, need to add uses to existing zones or create new zones. Maybe both, also what about livestock?
- Current zoning district boundaries will not change as part of this project.
- Small businesses need to cluster in order to survive, if there are zoning barriers to clustering, that's a problem
- New zoning districts that are created in this project will be applied in a separate process.
- There may be a conversion if existing zoning districts are eliminated (For example, all existing B3 will now be Bx).

- Market forces for parking are different downtown than in the neighborhoods. Adding excess parking in neighborhoods can be cheap = argument for parking maximums. Need barriers to creating parking lots by-right (storm water ordinance & fees are one). Form standards and setbacks and liner buildings are possibilities. Need strings attached for additional parking.
- Need to concentrate activity in corridors or nodes. Ideally with municipal parking.
- Incentives for sustainability. Two possibilities – base & bonus density work in hot markets, in lower markets it won't matter, the incentives aren't wanted. Need regulations that make it easy for sustainable features to double dip (parking lot landscaping that also functions as storm water mitigation). Green features can be mandated, but not everywhere (i.e. green roofs)
- If standards are too strict, people can't afford to redevelop.
- Michigan & Junction parking lot, used to be city-owned, but part was sold. Centralizing parking in structures is optimal, but expensive. Need to share the cost.
- Air rights transfer should be considered. Aesthetics need to be considered, different planning exercise for substantial heights. Need a realistic view of the present, not 100 years ago. Fire Dept considerations = more tall buildings in one area, requires different equipment than shorter buildings
- Definitions of allowable uses need to be clearer (Residential with permitted commercial, for example). Too many "gotchas". Need to consolidate uses, currently in 5 places
- Open space project currently wrapping up, needs can be incorporated
- Open Counter (current BSEED initiative that helps guide customers through zoning online)
- Eliminate neighborhood petition process?
- Incremental retail, non-permanent – will zoning affect permit? No, doesn't change requirement, just where & how
- Allow more flexible uses – how do other cities do it? Generally forgiveness model, especially small cities. Tolerance and under the radar.
- Public engagement – be strategic about removing from the ordinance. Don't go too far to remove, there's too much public input in some places and too little in others. Much of the process is state-mandated, but the city decides what goes in that pipeline (public hearings, for example). Public education is needed.
- Legally required city notices are generally not good engagement—often isn't clear from notice what is being proposed

Conclusion

- IWG members can comment on draft through Friday, August 16. The public version will be released late August or early September for a 60 day comment period.

**** Need member(s) & feedback from Property Maintenance (no one in attendance)**