



**City of Saratoga Springs
Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)
Technical Review Advisory Committee (TRAC)**

AGENDA

November 14th, 2017

3:00 p.m.

City Council Chambers, City Hall, 474 Broadway

- 1. Welcome and Attendance**
- 2. Public Comment (Limited to 2 minutes per speaker)**
- 3. Approval of 10/30/17 TRAC Meeting Minutes**
- 4. Discussion on 75% Draft Materials**
 - a. Article 1 – Introduction (Items requiring additional input from TRAC members)**
 - b. Article 2 – Districts (Items requiring additional input from TRAC members)**
 - c. Article 3 – Requirements for Specific Uses**
 - d. Article 6 – Variances**
 - e. Article 7 – Amendments to Ordinance**
- 5. Next Steps**
 - a. Schedule**
- 6. Adjourn**

Next Meeting: TBD



**City of Saratoga Springs
Unified Development Ordinance (UDO)
Technical Review Advisory Committee (TRAC)**

**Meeting Minutes
Tuesday October 30, 2017
3:00 p.m.
City Council Chamber**

PRESENT:

Susan Barden, Senior Planner; Tina Carton, Parks, Open Space, Historic Preservation /Sustainability; Amy Durland, Planning Board; and Tamie Ehinger, Design Review Commission.

CONSULTANTS: John Behan, Behan Planning and Design (arrived at 4:16 pm).

ABSENT: Brad Birge, Admin of Planning & Economic Development, Meg Kelly, Deputy Mayor; Vince DeLeonardis, City Attorney; Kate Maynard, Principal Planner; and Susan Steer, Zoning Board of Appeals.

CITY OFFICIALS: None.

RECORDING OF PROCEEDING

The minutes are not a verbatim record of the proceedings; the minutes are not a word-for-word transcript.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Doug Kerr of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation thanked the TRAC committee for incorporating many of the changes to the UDO between the 50% and the 75% that they had previously identified. The Preservation Foundation supports the reduction in the maximum height in the UR 1, 2, 3, 4 and 4A districts. They are concerned with the blanket 70" in the T-6 district and how this height can impact adjacent historic buildings and structures. The singular uniform height also does not take into consideration street width. Design guidelines should include setbacks to reduce impacts.

The Preservation Foundation was pleased to see the changes to carriage houses and the removal of previous limitations and the sun setting provision. The new language gives economic advantages that may lead to renovation and restoration of these structures that would benefit the community.

Doug Kerr then discussed the demolition permit section. He questioned who will be determining the significance of a structure. The Foundation recommends that the Design Review Board have this power and not City staff. For demolition by neglect within the Historic District, the UDO has review

by the DRB. The DRB does not look at buildings on a structural level. This should be a code officer.

APPROVAL of 6/27/17 TRAC MEETING MINUTES

Amy Durland was not present at the 6/27/2017 meeting so she recused herself from the vote on the approval of the meeting minutes. The minutes will be brought forth at the next UDO meeting since a quorum was not present.

Discussion on UDO Draft Schematic Materials Article 1

Tina Carton then led the discussion of the 75% UDO. The committee noted that the foreword had been moved from Article 1 as requested. The committee then discussed the second paragraph and recommended removing this since it was deemed unnecessary. Next the committee discussed the Consultant's note on 1.1.7.D (split zoning and district boundaries). The attending members request that Planning staff review and make recommendations on if this section should remain.

Tina Carton then noted the Recreation Committee was struck in 1.1.9.F but not 1.1.9.G. Since the recommendations are referred to other body, agency or department of the City, they recommended striking Recreation Committee from 1.1.9.G.

Amy Durland then directed the conversation back to 1.1.5.F and non-conforming lots. The committee would like guidance from the Planning staff, in particular Kate Maynard, on the history of this item and an opinion on its necessity in the UDO.

The committee went back to 1.1.9. Three additional items were raised as concerns requiring Planning staff review, in particular review by Brad Birge – 1.1.9.H, 1.1.9.J, and 1.1.9.N.

The committee then discussed the Consultant's comment on 1.1.10.H. and if grants only pertained to façade easements. Taimé Ehinger stated that to her knowledge administration of grants has never been part of the purview of the DRC (B). They are overseen by Planning staff.

The consultant also left comments on 1.1.10.L on the need to maintain an architectural style directory. The committee would like Steve Rowland and Brad Birge to comment on this.

Another comment was included on 1.1.10.U. After discussion, it was determined that this is needed in the UDO.

Before moving on to Article 2, members of the committee stated they would like to revisit this section and the remaining section at the next meeting if Brad Birge and Kate Maynard are present.

Discussion on UDO Draft Schematic Materials Article 2

The discussion on Article 2 started with the graphics for districts requiring Civic Space. Tina Carton stated that it would be helpful for applicants to have requirements for Civic Space included. This should then point back to the relevant section of the UDO. Other requirements such as parking should also be noted.

Amy Durland noted that within Rural Residential districts (2.1.3), Planned Unit Development (PUD) is not allowed. This should be called out in this section. Susan Barden requested the consultant to provide information on why 25' was selected as the maximum height for accessory structures. There was no disagreement with other changes within Section 2.1.3.

The committee then moved to 2.1.6 Urban Residential District 2. The consultant noted that the City may want to consider reducing minimum lot width in this district. The committee would like a staff recommendation on this.

For 2.1.8, Susan Barden noted that the green language was not new language but existing language relocated to align with the district information. She also questioned why setbacks between UR-4 and UR-4A would differ. These should be same. The committee generally was concerned with approving the changes with full Planning staff and TRAC committee membership to review and provide feedback. Susan then pointed out that UR-4A includes lot width for 1-unit and 2-unit buildings but not multi-family residences. Since multi-family residences are allowed in this district, dimensions should be provided or they should be general for all uses.

The committee then discussed that the setbacks for terraces and patios was struck in the districts. Amy Durland noted that driveways can be up to the lot line but patios are not similar to driveways and can lead to much heavier uses. Urban areas and less dense districts should be looked at differently for this feature. Maybe the setback should be 5' in urban environments.

The committee then discussed the Highway General Business (HGB) District. The committee would like to revisit 2.2.3.3. when the full committee meets. The committee questioned the 20' height limit for accessory structures. There is a discrepancy between districts for the accessory structure height and it is not clear why there is a distinction. The TRAC committee recommends 25' for all districts.

At 4:16 pm, John Behan joined the discussion. He agreed with the recommendation to keep the accessory structure limit 25' in all districts. The committee then asked John Behan to clarify previous questions regarding UR4-A and lot width, maintaining 1.1.10.U, including Civic Space requirements where relevant in Article 2 districts, and revisiting terrace and patio setback requirements by districts.

During the discussion on T-6, the committee discussed height in relation to neighborhood context. The committee recommended referencing section 4.6.2 Residential District Buffers. The applicant should be aware that the DRB ask the applicant to consider the neighborhood and historic context of the proposed building as well as how the height relates to the street width. It may be appropriate to add urban site design section where setbacks are discussed in the upper floors to reduce the impact of the buildings height. John Behan mentioned that this may require an additional study.

The committee then discussed methods to formal pre-design meetings as well as how to formalize applicant responses to staff comments.

In section 2.2.13 HGB and 2.2.4 TRB, the committee would like Kate Maynard and Brad Birge to review the rear yard setbacks and abutments.

John Behan will ask his staff about the note in 2.2.8.C 6 and 7. It is unclear what needs to be redefined.

Amy Durland mentioned that 2.4.10 Country Overlay Area is not mentioned in the district lists/table. The language in 2.4.10.B "or as modified in subsequent updates" should be removed.

The committee then discussed the Historic District Overlay section. Taime stated that demolition and neglect should not fall under this section and should be separated. It needs to be presented as

its own item. She also pointed out that it is now written that the DRC takes action and not the building code enforcement officer.

NEXT STEPS

For the next meeting, the committee agreed to discuss the following Articles: 3, 6, and 7 as well items that required TRAC member review not present at the current meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Susan Barden opened the second public comment period at 5:20 p.m. There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.

The next TRAC meeting will be held on October 14th at 3 p.m. in the City Council room.

DRAFT