

ICS Task Team MiCAP Recommendations

March 18, 2008

Dear Planning Commissioners:

The Infill Compatibility Standards Task Team recommends the Planning Commission approve, and the City Council adopt, the options as identified in this report, along with the suggested revisions.

Recommended options

The MiCAP committee recommends options for fourteen topics, as listed in the following table.

Topic Nbr.	Topic subject	Recommended Option Nbr.	Staff Rec.	Comments
1.	Alley-Access-Only Lots	1	1 or 2	Option 2 is also supported if revised. See Note 1.
2.	Building Height	2	2	
3.	Flag Lot	1	1	See note 2.
4.	Lot Depth/Width	2(b)	2(b)	
5.	Lot Frontage	2	2	
7. & 11.	Vehicle Access Corridor & Buildable Area	2 & 2	2 & 2	Conditionally. See Note 3. Otherwise Options 1.
8. & 12.	Density	2	2	
9.	Private Streets	1	1	
13.	Early input	1	1	
17.	Open space credit	2	2	
18.	Required parking	1	2	See Note 4.
19.	Storm water infiltration	1	1	

Notes:

1. **Topic 1.** Options 1 and 2 require revision to strengthen the criteria so as to more effectively prevent creation of new lots with vehicular access only via an alley, except in cluster subdivisions and PUDs. (Staff has suggested a revision for Option 2 that appears adequate.)
2. **Topic 3.** Option 1 requires a revised definition that more effectively defines a flag lot.
3. **Topics 7 and 11.** The staff recommendation to defer Vehicle Access Corridor and Buildable Area to the Infill Compatibility Standards Project is supported only if Items 1 (Alley-access-only lots) and 5 (Lot frontage) are approved in the recommended form.

4. **Topic 18.** The Task Team judged that Option 1 better addressed the specific problem in Residential Parking Program (RPP) zones without introducing a potentially contentious city-wide change.

All recommendations, except for topic 18 (Required parking in residential parking program permit areas), are aligned with the respective staff recommendation.

All topics for which we recommend an option, except for topic 13 (Early input into land use process for neighborhood associations), were identified as “high priority” topics by the Neighborhood Leaders Council.

The Task Team makes no recommendation for the following six topics:

6.	Kennel
10.	Site review with PUDs
14.	Fences
15.	N-plex on R-1 Plats
16.	Portable signs
20.	Final Plat Process

In general, the recommended actions will provide important help in protecting neighborhoods, consistent with the Task Team’s adopted goals statement. Many of the amendments simply correct defects in the code language. Others make modest and reasonable changes that are simple to implement. None of the amendments in any way precludes or predetermines future Task Team recommendations for other code amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Anslow, ICS Task Team Co-Chair
Sue Prichard, ICS Task Team Co-Chair
Marilyn Mohr, ICS Task Team MiCAP Committee Chair