



# MINUTES

## MANSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION / INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE

AUDREY P. BECK MUNICIPAL BUILDING ■ 4 S. EAGLEVILLE RD ■ COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
Regular Meeting ■ Friday, May 17, 2019

Members present: P. Aho, K. Rawn, V. Ward, R. Hall  
Staff: L. Painter, Director of Planning and Development

### CALL TO ORDER

Aho called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

### MINUTES & SCHEDULE

Ward MOVED, Rawn seconded to approve the 04-26-2019 minutes as presented. MOTION PASSED; with all in favor except Hall, who disqualified himself (3-0-1).

### REVISIONS TO ZONING AND SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS/MAP

#### Small Lot Single-Family/Compact Residential Development/Districts

Members discussed the concept sheet distributed for discussion as well as information on small lot single-family housing in Auckland, NZ and sample cottage housing regulations. With regard to the concept paper, members recommended the addition of objectives related to promoting economic diversity and diversity of housing types/housing choice. In particular, members see the addition of small lot/cottage housing as a way to potentially facilitate development of units at a broader range of sales prices (i.e. smaller lots, smaller units, lower prices). The focus at the next meeting will be on refining areas for a new zone.

### FRAMEWORK FOR JOINT COMMITTEE MEETING

Members discussed the framework for a joint committee meeting with the Economic Development Commission, Conservation Commission, and Sustainability Committee as outlined on the agenda. The Committee would like to have specific proposals to present for discussion. Key topic areas will be small lot single-family/compact residential development; re-establishment of an R-40 zone; and changes to uses within the PB-3 District and other non-residential districts within the Opportunity Zone.

### FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE

- Due to summer availability, members discussed changing the meeting time from Friday mornings to Thursday evenings with a request that meetings start as early as possible. Staff will check availability of Cooley and draft a revised schedule for adoption at the next meeting.
- Members also expressed interest in developing an adaptive reuse regulation for historic buildings/properties that meet certain criteria.

### ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:56 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Painter, AICP, Director of Planning and Development

# Small-Lot Single Family/Cottage/Compact Residential Development Concepts for Discussion

Regulatory Review Committee ▪ May 17, 2019

## Objectives

- ◇ Encourage development of detached single-family homes as viable alternative to multi-family development
- ◇ Maintain the community's rural character through clustering and use of Natural Resource Protection concepts.

## Locational Considerations

As the Committee considers where such development might be allowed, the following criteria are suggested to help guide location decisions:

- ◇ Public Water and Sewer access is essential
- ◇ Location within a Compact Residential District as designated on the Future Land Use Map
- ◇ Properties designated Rural Residential/Agriculture/Forestry could also be considered depending on location; access to public utilities; character of surrounding area; and overall density proposed. For example, the Committee could establish lower density allowances for properties in these areas as compared to those designated for Compact Residential.
- ◇ Transportation Choice (walkway/bikeway connections to Mixed Use Centers; transit connections)

## Review Process

One way to encourage this type of development would be to permit such developments without the need for a special permit. Using the subdivision (for detached units on separate lots) or site plan (for common interest ownership communities) procedures limit the Commission's discretionary ability to deny a proposed development and provide more predictability to a potential developer. These procedures may also have time advantages as compared to a special permit.

## Potential Development Standards

### Density

The following are the main issues for the Committee to consider with regard to density:

- ◇ Establishing different density allocations based on location, future land use designation and/or neighborhood context
- ◇ Establishing different densities for this type of development in a district that also allows for multi-family development. For example, do you create a new zoning district that allows both types of development, but allows for a higher density for single-family subdivisions or common-interest communities of detached units than for a traditional multi-family development.
- ◇ Tying density to the context of the area-for example, establishing an overlay district in certain locations that authorizes this type of development using a multiplier of the density allowed in the underlying district.
- ◇ Would density bonuses be considered/established?

## Buffers from Adjacent Properties

Some communities establish minimum buffers/setbacks between these types of developments and adjacent properties, particularly those that are developed as conventional single-family neighborhoods at lower densities.

## Development Size

Many communities appear to cap the total number of units that could be located in a cottage development, particularly those that are more urban in nature. Additionally, caps on the number of units that could be located in a cluster are also established in some communities. These types of caps may be more appropriate for infill lots or in areas designated for Rural Residential/Agriculture/Forestry Development.

## Lot Size

The Committee should consider the following:

- ◇ Should a minimum site area be established to be eligible for this type of development?
- ◇ Could lot size provisions be established that would provide an incentive for redevelopment of existing 1 acre lots in areas that have become blighted?
- ◇ Tying minimum lot size requirements to unit sizes (i.e. the smaller the unit, the smaller the lot size).

## Unit Size

Particularly in cottage developments, many communities limit the dimensions of dwelling units so as not to overwhelm the lot. In some cases, communities build in flexibility by establishing maximum number of units that may be built to larger dimensions (i.e. 25% of total units).

- ◇ Footprint Size
- ◇ Gross Floor Area
- ◇ Height (1-2 stories)

## Parking

Some communities tie parking requirements to unit sizes; the smaller the unit, the lower the parking requirement

## Open Space

Examples of how open space is determined include one or more of the following:

- ◇ Minimum percentage of overall land area-(common open space)
- ◇ Minimum square feet per unit (common open space)
- ◇ Minimum square feet per unit on each lot/associated with each unit (private open space)

## Design

The smaller the lot, the more important design becomes. Location of garages, transparency, façade projections and recesses, setbacks, etc.

## Other Considerations

- ◇ Do you include other housing types with these developments/districts (i.e. duplexes, townhouses)
- ◇ Owner-occupancy requirements (certain percentage of units) to maintain neighborhood stability. Such requirements would need to be established in a deed.