

City of Livingston Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes

Tuesday November 9, 2021

- 1) Call to Order: (5:30PM)
- 2) Roll Call: (5:30PM)
- a) Zoning Commission members in attendance: Mathieu Menard, Jim Baerg, Wendy Weaver, Michal DeChellis, Deborah Monaghan, Michael Wojdylak
 - i) Quorum present
- 3) Consent Items (5:31PM)
 - i) Agenda additions
 - (1) No additions
 - ii) Minutes review from October (5:32pm)
 - (1) Change JC to JB in d – iv.....
 - (2) MW Motion to approve the minutes as amended
 - (3) WW seconds this motion
 - (4) Commission approves
- 4) Public Comment (5:40PM)
 - i) No public
- 5) Agenda Items: (5:40PM)
 - i) Old business 5:40PM
 - (1) No old business
 - ii) New business (5:42PM)
 - (1) Recommendation on Manufacturing and Use Table Zoning Text Amendment.
 - (a) Artisan manufacturing in R3
 - (i) MM can work this in in the zoning text amendment
 - (ii) MM don't see too many cons: could be slight odor or traffic, but this allows for more flexibility and home business.
 1. Pros can employee people and can use their residential for business as well if their business doesn't fall under traditional home occupation has to follow sign requirements, but of course there is slightly higher impact
 - (iii) JB when does parking requirements come into play?
 1. MM – zoning is written if you aren't expanding by 10% over original structure then you don't need more parking, if doing a new building then there is a parking requirement

- a. MM – businesses need to follow business signoffs, fire requirements, if making food would need county sanitarian sign-off
 - i. JB – so there is no way to require more parking?
 - ii. MM – not really – there should be space in front of the space to park in the street
 - iii. MW – How does this affect store fronts? And parking needs – will manufacturing orgs start running a store front out of their place of resident?
 - iv. MM – AM doesn't include retail, that is separate zoning – if they had a store front then it would have to go through the major home occupation permitting process through the City Commission
 - v. JB – currently this isn't allowed in residential, but could be in mixed use
 - vi. MM – retail is totally separate and hopefully isn't confusing
 - vii. JB – what did we leave hanging related to green space?
 - viii. MM – concerns with lots being covered and trees/green spaces being removed – Michal and Deborah have more thoughts?
 - ix. DM – seems complicated related to environmental issues and green areas need water so it's hard to say what needs to be sustainable. Not a clear vision to address this.
 - x. JB – other places have an impervious requirement....
 - xi. MD – what about heritage trees and diameter sizes? Also worried about impervious coverage requirements.
 - xii. MM – no maps of trees on private property
 - xiii. JB – what about separate run-offs, do we have an issue, sometimes we have run-offs issues?
 - xiv. MM – there are spots in some places. Especially on the north side. Increase the velocity of the run-off
 - xv. MM - Ways to mitigate stormwater – bioswales on the north side? On-site and off-site management
 - xvi. MD – so in your opinion this might not be an issue and we may not really need to be worried about this as a risk
 - xvii. MM – probably wouldn't see high turnover in terms of lot development, about 70 lots in total on the south side
 - xviii. MW – not enough lots to build enough huge R3 developments, also very expensive

xix. JB – other big picture point, encourage density in town, alleviating pressure from the county and allowing the environment to be protected.

xx. MM – want to protect the rural spaces outside the city, trades some density and green spaces, in exchange you don't have the growth into the rural areas.

xxi. JB – okay this is a good discussion, let's move

b. JB – thoughts about design guidelines

i. MM – they can limit flexibility and make things more expensive, some mixed-use buildings might be covered in the design overlay

c. JB – Motions to allow artisan manufacturing in R2 and R3.

i. DM – seconds that

ii. Commission approves and passes that proposal

d. MM - Add two new definitions to R2 and R3, density changes

e. JB – are we abandoning neighborhood commercial?

f. MM – we could remove it from the zoning map, one NC is a church so it is inconsequential, could make a recommendation to wholesale remove this but we'd need to do a zoning map amendment

g. MW – NC and MU is different

h. MM - NC – doesn't allow for residential, main difference is the residential

i. JB – what manufacturing would be allowed; MU definition is to encourage 20 min neighborhoods and small-scale employment.

2. JB – Adopt the language as approved – text amendment on mixed use

i. JB Motion to add definition of mixed use to the zoning ordinance, add column to use table as MM suggested with the uses that are approved and also to include residential density requirements with 875 sq feet with no setbacks and max in 60' in height

b. WW seconds

c. Commission approves

(2) Discussion on Zone Map Amendments for the Design Review Overlay Zone, R-III, and MU. (6:37PM)

(a) MM - Do we want to wait till next meeting? What maps do we need?

(b) JB – let's move this next month – can we do this in person?

b) Public Comment (6:40PM)

i) No public here

- 6) Future agenda items (6:45PM)
 - a) Discussion on zone map amendments
- 7) Adjournment (6:46PM)

The next regular meeting will occur on December 14, 2021, at 5:30pm,