

City of Livingston Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes
Tuesday April 12, 2022

- 1) Call to Order: (5:32PM)
- 2) Roll Call: (5:33PM)
 - i) Zoning Commission members in attendance: Jim Baerg, Deborah Monaghan, Michael Wojdylak, Wendy Weaver, Michal DeChellis
 - (1) Quorum present
- 3) Consent Items: (5:34 PM)
 - i) Approve last meeting minutes (5:34PM)
 - (1) WW says to make a motion to approve the minutes
 - (2) MW seconds the motion
- 4) Public Comment (5:38 PM)
 - i) No public comment
- 5) Agenda Items: (5:39 PM)
 - i) Old business
 - (1) No old business
 - ii) New business
 - (1) Continuation of zoning of school district (SD) property
 - (a) MD motions to untable this issue
 - (b) DM seconds the motion
 - (2) City – Michael Kardoes goes through the staff report again
 - (a) Property is unzoned – if we don't zone it, anything could be done with it, R2 mainly surrounds it
 - (b) SD requested R3, but SD can do anything it wants with it currently
 - (c) Staff suggests R2 or R3
 - (i) Gross units – to absolute max density/typically 60-70% build-outs
 1. 497 – R2
 2. 747 – R3
 3. 995 – MU
 4. Could be zoned public
 - a. Would need to be rezoned if/when someone buys it

- (i) Would like more info on public zoning
 - 1. If school sells or trades, then it would need to be rezoned at that time?
 - a. JB says yes
 - b. A sale of this land would need to go to a public vote, SD has no plans to sell, but may consider some development
- (b) Todd Wester – SD recommends still R3, but wouldn't oppose other zoning considerations, unless the school can afford to build something with its own dollars, anything happening there would require voter approval, SD doesn't really want to be a landlord and they currently can't build anything without running a bond.
- (c) Cynthia Westover – 1105 Prairie Drive
 - (i) Opposes R3 because other area has been turned down for R3, would advocate for R2 or Public
- (d) Rich Crossland
 - (i) Would agree to leave it as public for now
- (e) David Westover, 1105 Prairie Drive
 - (i) Against R3, This wouldn't still be affordable housing for sure, this may not happen
- (f) Janet Rawlings – 1110 Sweetgrass lane
 - (i) Agree with R2 or Public, but not R3
- (g) Nathan Bolton/Amanda Herrera - 1110 West Reservoir
 - (i) Zone public since we don't know what the SD wants to do with it, since there is an option to zone later
 - (ii) Ellen Steckheart– 1111 Prairie Drive
 - 1. Do not suggest R3, prefer R2 or public
- (h) Jonathan Hettinger – 111 N C street
 - (i) Would like to see this zoned at higher density, great opportunity to develop more housing for working class people on the north, could there be a land trust that the SD could do that, the growth policy says that there is more need for MU, great opportunity for higher use – community seems to want that option, R3 could be a good use
- (i) Mary Strickroth – 11 Prairie
 - (i) Would prefer this to stay public, opposed to R3
- (j) Alyssa Durkee – 829 North 12th street
 - (i) Opposed to R3, recommend Public use because this is a great space for dogs, wouldn't want this field to be developed, agree that this wouldn't be affordable housing and the very most R2

- (4) Commissioner comments (6:00pm)
- (a) JB we have received many many letters from the public, they are good and thoughtful
 - (b) JB – Trying to think about what this town will become in the future and how to maintain its character and also help it be what the community needs it to be
 - (i) Started out talking about R3 because the SD asked for this, the community who have participated have preferred R2 or the public
 - (ii) ZC brought up the mixed use designation last time – we consider this because this town needs more rental housing, assume that developers would build and sell at market rate – how to add to density so that people can have options to rent, which is why people want to consider R3, there is a transportation issue as well
 - 1. Public comment to consider residential residential/commercial zoning – this has piqued interest on the zoning board
 - 2. Would like to propose this as Neighborhood commercial – change zoning specifications such that density of the property is closer to medium density of R2, opportunity to put in some commercial district – control the density – limit the height to 27’, increase the setbacks like R2 – creates a parcel that would have max 500 units, which is right at R2
 - (c) Michael Kardoes – No residential in NC, we can’t vote on a new designation tonight
 - (d) Deborah Monaghan – We need to zone tonight, NC with edits is not possible, NC could happen next month
 - (i) Like that idea cause it seems to be middle ground with the growth policy – not sure that the process would roll the way that we want it too
 - (ii) Any zoning change would have to go through any text amendment
 - 1. Can we ensure that these would get put in front of the commission
 - (iii) Michal DeChellis – interested in considering this NC with amendments
 - (iv) Todd Wester – we are not in the master planning process for this property – this could still be a school site, this could still be swapped if voters approve this, there isn’t a plan in place
 - (v) WW – what is that process for planning?
 - 1. TW – helps us understand that we need to move faster on the master plan – need to replace aging facility, desire to consolidate campus – discussions will be happening throughout the school year – need engineering analysis at Winans and Washington, Dr. Scalia said at meeting in homeowners association that she isn’t committed to building anything until there is a better railroad crossing
 - (vi) Michael W – Understand Jim’s idea of diversification, but would want to look more at NC, not sure that he wants to change NC definition, running

right into MU or HC designation – we'd need time to redefine NC – and we need to come to a conclusion on this property and sounds like the SD needs more time to make decisions – the ZC could have more time to make NC designation, moving towards with SD being owner and no plans, want it to stay public until we redefine zoning restrictions

- (vii) WW – thanks for articulating what we are trying to capture, feels like cart before the horse, maybe at some point we can rezone this if this gets sold
- (viii) JB – a revised NC – would be really different than what MU/HC is currently- really medium density and some commercial in it, scale and heights would be compatible with R2 zoning.
- (ix) MD – when would a zoning designation happen? Often a new buyer would ask the SD to come to zoning commission to
- (x) DM – when does this come to the public to the vote on the sale?
 1. MK – this is a SD process – there isn't a vote really – there needs to be a public hearing, City commission has to agree to the sale as well.
 2. TW – the sale would have to be voter approved

(e) WW motions to zone it public

- (i) MW seconds that motion
- (ii) JB is opposed, Motion passes 4-1

6) Future agenda items (6:34 PM)

- i) Sign ordinance
- ii) Gateway Overlay
- iii) NC – MU – medium density zoning designation conversations

b) Staff comments (6:38)

- i) Hiring process for the planner – planner withdrew application when they couldn't find housing – hoping to finish the hiring process in the next 45/60 days
- ii) Would ask that ZC not send recommendations up unless they are zoning annexations

7) Adjournment (6:42 PM)

The next regular meeting will occur on May 10, 2022, at 5:30pm,