ZONE**DETROIT,** ZAG Meeting

July Meeting, 7/17/19, 3 to 4:45pm

Triumph Church – East Campus, 2760 East Grand Blvd.

Introduction

 - Overview of timeline - now through December 2019

- ZAG comments on Zoning Analytic
- Code Studio produces final version of Zoning Analytic
- Zoning Analytic is released for public comment for 60 days
- Public Meetings to publicize Zoning Analytic (need ZAG & Ambassador assistance)
- CPC and City Council will give final direction in November
- Code Studio will begin drafting the Ordinance in December

Presentation of Zoning Analytic by Code Studio

 - Project Values are reflected in report and recommendations align with them
 - Meetings held so far
 - What we heard document
 - Recommendations are divided into four pieces:
1. Making Zoning Easier
2. For the Neighborhoods
3. Growth & Commercial Areas
4. Jobs Jobs Jobs

General Discussion/Comments

 - How does Detroit's current Zoning Ordinance rate compared to other ZO's?

Not the worst, uses two tools: use standards and district requirements to control everything, recommend lightening the touch on use

 - Joe Louis Greenway – zoning needs to be changed so that adjacent developments are compatible

 - Austin has semi-permanent food trailers (not trucks), allows stepping stone between temporary and permanent

 - What about parking maximums instead of minimums? They are generally not very effective or accurate. Site users know better what their needs are

 - If parking minimums are removed citywide, beauty salons have to be exempt (because they generally occupy a lot of parking spaces for an extended period of time). The current requirements for certain uses are not very accurate, doing away with all minimums seems extreme

 - Removing parking requirements isn't the same as managing resources, i.e. using parking kiosks to encourage turnover of spaces. Culture is important too, it's not always about turnover (in reference to beauty salons)

- Need a gentle transition, not a harsh change. The reality is that many are dependent on cars. Also, placemaking is about spending time, people won't spend time if they are worried about a parking meter expiring. If a place is walkable, people can park and go to multiple places

- Trouble parking indicates a successful area

- The drainage fee is a penalty on a parking lot

- The City doesn't want to provide parking or manage it

- If a parking lot owner pays all fees, they don't want anyone else to use it. Incentivize sharing, zoning may not be the way. There are lots of opportunities for shared parking.

- Denver and Raleigh have by-right ordinances that are working well (limited conditional uses)

- Will design standards include material standards? They can, but don't have to. Texas law says that any material allowed by the building code must be allowed. Economics are a reality when regulating materials.

- Isn't there a public land survey going on? (No one had information)

- Someone had been told that a community hub was not allowed in the middle of a block but only at a corner. In this instance, community hub is a place for people to learn to be a developer or fix up a house

- Tactical Preservation effort is exploring ways to reuse a small part of a building. Some issues are related to building code. Aligning zoning with the building code is helpful.

Conclusion

- These recommendations (Zoning Analytic) are the consultants' (not staff). Current comments will be incorporated before the public release.

- Marihuana regulations are on a different track. The future is unclear and depends on state regulations which are expected in November.

- Still seeking survey responses reflecting discussion at last meeting. Could responses be weighted to reflect residents' opinions? We don't want to take bad numbers and make it worse, it's not a scientific survey so applying scientific evaluations won't necessarily yield accurate results

- The original survey had too many open-ended questions, made it difficult to tally results and evaluate. The revised survey has just one space for open-ended comments. However, many of the comments on the original surveys were useful. They weren't measurable though, more anecdotal. Code Studio isn't qualified to do a scientific survey.

- The electronic survey is closed, all future responses will be paper. Makes it difficult to include in email newsletters.

- Comments from the ZAG will be individual, it's not necessary to achieve consensus

- Issues & recommendations can be added, the ZAG is a sounding board

- The next meeting will be a deeper dive on the diagnostic to solicit comments