

**CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
STAFF REPORT**

DOCKET: UDO-CC8
STAFF: Tiffany White

REQUEST

This text amendment is proposed by Planning and Development Services staff to revise Sections 4, 5, 6 and 11 of the *Unified Development Ordinances* to revise standards for the Mixed Use--Special Use (MU-S) district and add a provision for Cottage Courts.

BACKGROUND

The *Legacy* Comprehensive Plan makes multiple references to increasing housing variety and residential choice. Specifically, it calls for encouraging “a mixture of residential densities and housing types through land use recommendations.” *Legacy* also proposes efficient use of land and resources within future developments. When considering future residential needs for the county, *Legacy* endorses both increased diversity in housing type and more efficient development patterns.

Similarly, the 2018 *Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Housing Study and Needs Assessment* (HSNA) identified many underlying drivers of future residential need. These include a mismatch of existing housing stock with household size, a lack of “missing middle” style, smaller-sized units, and a need for almost 15,000 new housing units by 2027 to meet demand. The report promoted a strategy to “fill housing stock with ‘*missing middle housing structures*’ and smaller-size units to meet current and future housing needs.”

As part of its 2020-2021 work program, the City-County Planning Board requested that staff move forward with recommendations presented in the *Innovative and Land-Efficient Residential Development Regulations* report (February 2020, attached). Specifically, staff was asked to evaluate Cottage Court and Planned Unit Development (PUD) provisions for possible inclusion in the *Unified Development Ordinances* (UDO). Support for PUD provisions was also expressed in the 2018 UDO code assessment report prepared by CodeWright Planners, which specifically recommended such a provision be added to our UDO to provide an opportunity for unique, comprehensively planned development.

Planned Unit Development

A Planned Unit Development (PUD) is characterized by a mix of residential and nonresidential uses and flexible development standards within a comprehensively planned project. The purpose of a PUD is to allow for innovative design and flexibility in the layout of a proposed development. Between 1973 and 1994, Winston-Salem had a PUD provision, but it was replaced in the UDO by Planned Residential Development (PRD) standards for residential development,

and the MU-S district for mixed-use developments. Neither of these provisions has successfully been able to promote true PUD development, however.

Cottage Courts

Cottage Courts consist of a group of small, attached or detached residences arranged around a central open space or courtyard. This neighborhood-oriented residential style was popular in the early 20th century, especially on the west coast, and has seen a resurgence recently as demand for smaller, walkable housing choices has increased over the past several years. The National Association of Homebuilders (NAHB) in its report *Diversifying Housing Options with Smaller Lots and Smaller Homes*, prepared by Opticos Design, Inc., states that “Over 100 years have passed since the invention of the cottage court, but the need is still the same or even broader” (p.52).

ANALYSIS

After researching PUD standards in other communities, staff felt that the best path for incorporating these provisions in the UDO would be revising the existing MU-S district to function as a more traditional PUD. As mentioned previously, the MU-S district has existed in the UDO since 1994. It was intended to work as a mixed-use district with development standards attached, and was, in effect, the local version of a PUD. In 2006, revisions were made to the district provisions to provide more specific regulation, including tiered standards based on Growth Management Area (GMA), and an open space requirement, among others. The revision also tied the MU-S district to Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) and Transit Oriented Design (TOD) standards.

After researching PUD standards in other communities, staff determined that simplifying the MU-S standards would put our provision more in line with the traditional PUDs in peer cities. To that end, recommended changes to the MU-S district standards include removal of the tiered standards, removal of the TND and TOD references, and removing portions of the ordinance represented elsewhere in the UDO. In addition, the mix of uses required was reduced from three (3) to two (2) to allow for more flexibility and to be more in line with other PUD provisions around the country.

By modifying the existing MU-S ordinance, staff believes that the provision will allow more flexibility, be more user-friendly, and more accurately reflect the essential purpose of a PUD.

As noted, Cottage Courts are an effective way to increase housing choice and variety while maintaining residential character and scale. While Cottage Court ordinances vary by community, there are some commonalities which most ordinances reviewed by staff share. These include:

- A pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood character.
- Minimum and maximum number of residential units.
- Maximum building height or size.
- Building orientation.
- Minimum size or square footage area of courtyard space.

- Location and amount of parking.
- Limits on what zoning districts allow this development type.
- An increase in density over what underlying zoning allows.

Even with these commonalities, Cottage Court provisions are often tailored to fit community preferences. Staff researched multiple Cottage Court ordinances across the country to look for best practices utilizing this housing type. Considering the factors above, staff compiled Cottage Court standards that would be reasonable for Winston-Salem. Key standards include:

- Cottage Courts only being allowed in GMAs 1, 2, and 3.
- Cottage Courts only being allowed in RS7, RS9, RS12, RSQ, RM5, RM8, RM12, RM18, RMU, NB, PB, E, and MU-S zoning districts.
- A minimum of four (4) units and a maximum of fourteen (14) units per Cottage Court development.
- A maximum building height of 30 feet (to promote small-scale residential character).
- A minimum parking requirement of one (1) space per dwelling unit (less than the requirement for standard residential development).
- A density bonus of 25 percent above the underlying density of the zoning district.

Including a Cottage Court provision in the UDO will allow for new residential development that maintains a neighborhood character while increasing housing choice. The smaller size and potential for infill in walkable, pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods also makes Cottage Courts a good option for those wishing for missing-middle housing options in our community. Smaller, neighborhood-oriented residences, such as those in Cottage Courts, can help fill a need for the smaller households of those just entering the market, or those who want to downsize and age in place.

Staff believes revisions to the MU-S standards and the addition of Cottage Court provisions will expand housing choice in Winston-Salem and Forsyth County and allow for quality development and infill. These provisions will further the recommendations of *Legacy*, expand the availability of housing in the County, and ensure that future residential development reflects community desires.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR UDO-CC8 FEBRUARY 11, 2020

Tiffany White presented the staff report.

Chris Leak gave some introductory comments before a quick overview of UDO-CC8 by Tiffany White.

- This case was originally heard at the January public hearing, where staff gave a detailed presentation.
- As a result of that meeting, it became clear that several Board members had questions. They presented their questions to staff, who addressed each one via email.
- The Planning Board Chair believes that staff has given the Board enough information to make an informed decision.

Melynda Dunigan stated that she appreciated the changes that were made for both MU-S and Cottage Courts based on questions and concerns from Board members. Based on the language of the ordinance, Melynda asked if it was possible to build two Cottage Courts next to each other as part of a larger development. She added that the language imposes a maximum of 14 dwellings, but two separate Cottage Courts could allow 28 dwellings. Aaron King responded that, in these situations, a PRD would be more appropriate because it accommodates larger subdivisions better than a Cottage Court would. Melynda asked if that meant the earlier scenario would go in as a PRD. Aaron stated that, rather than go through the process to get two separate approvals for two Cottage Courts that are adjacent to one another, one would most likely propose a PRD with all 28 units.

George Bryan asked whether, for example, a developer who went through the PRD approval process would get the 25 percent density bonus. Aaron answered that the PRD process does not have that option. George also stated that neighborhoods were confused by the inclusion of the proposed changes to MU-S because they thought it was all Special Use. He then asked if there was a maximum number of parking spaces that will be allowed in Cottage Courts. Melynda recollected asking the same question at the work session and being told that staff didn't see the need to have maximum parking rules. Aaron stated that there was not a maximum for this use and that the UDO typically does not regulate maximum parking. There are additional standards with respect to landscaping when 175 percent of required parking is proposed, but that is the only

standard that speaks to limiting parking. Kirk Ericson added that it is in a project's best interest to allocate more land toward components that will generate revenue, given the cost of adding parking to these developments.

George commented that one would have a fairly large parking lot if a developer wanted to put in 28 spaces, and that there is nothing that addresses grouping of parking spaces within the Cottage Courts ordinance. Aaron stated that staff wanted to leave some flexibility for certain circumstances, where groups of parking spaces in larger numbers may make sense and would not be intrusive. Aaron added that, in theory, someone could construct a parking lot; in practice, developers will try to use that land for units and other things that make the development functional. George commented that when he was researching other sites around the country, he found there were other places that accommodated two spaces per unit because of the scale of development. He added that the word "cottage" is misleading because there is no requirement for size.

To Aaron's point, Jason Grubbs stated that the more parking is built, the more issues there will be with ingress and egress points. They also cost money. He added that it would further complicate what the developer is trying to do and that, practically, a developer is not going to build parking lots just to build parking lots. George asked if accessory dwellings or accessory structures are allowed within this format, and Aaron responded that they are not expressly prohibited. Special Use zoning would still be required for accessory dwelling units under the current rules. Accessory structures, like a garage or a toolshed, can be built provided standards for setbacks are met.

In looking at other standards across the country, George stated that these setups have provided for common open space and private open space. He asked if this is defined in the ordinance being presented. Aaron stated that private open space has not been accounted for, and that would not be part of what is proposed here. Kirk added that this ordinance does not require any private or cornered-off open space for the dwellings. Communal centered courtyard open space that serves a whole development is the idea behind the standard. There is no requirement that each individual unit also have private open space. Jason stated that they could be thought of as akin to detached townhomes. Mo McRae added that if one is buying into a development like this, they're buying into the idea of communal living. If someone doesn't want to regulate their front stoop as private, it would not be a planner's job to regulate that use. George asked whether private open space would be included in the calculation of the court, or the common open space, as presented. Kirk answered that it would not. The minimum in the ordinance would have to be located in the highly centralized area of the development. A developer could allocate some other open space, but that wouldn't give them any additional credit towards meeting the minimum requirement.

Melynda commented that being able to communicate with the public is always difficult, especially during a pandemic, and that she really felt that staff and the Board would benefit from having a larger stakeholder process where the community is engaged and there is dialogue on the subject. She added that she is not opposed to Cottage Courts and would like to see staff and the Board come up with a good fit for the community, but she felt a need for more community buy-in and not just community surprise after the fact. She pointed to what was done for the PRD ordinance,

where there was a stakeholder process that involved developers and people from the community, and there was a lot of back and forth discussion. In the end there was a consensus.

The Board Chair noted Melynda's comments, but felt that the Board had received enough information to make an informed decision. The Board will also respectfully take into consideration what the Neighborhood Alliance conveyed in their email. Clarence Lambe stated that he felt prepared to form an opinion and that this was one more tool for development and one more hopeful opportunity to increase the supply of housing. He added that the more supply there is, the more affordable the product will be, which is something everyone is trying to achieve. Mo added that our town is a town of few tools for building affordable housing and that there is a crisis of construction costs and other insurmountable costs. If tools are eliminated, that will also eliminate creativity and hope. She felt that there would be many other opportunities for the public to voice their opinions about development, along with this tool being ready to use.

George indicated that he still felt uncomfortable with the way this has been presented to the community and with recommending approval of the ordinance without clear understanding from the public. He was also concerned with the way the proposed ordinance is written, considering that a Cottage Court can be a gated community, which works against *Legacy* and the cohesiveness of neighborhoods. He added that he could only see this in terms of Cottage Courts being a Special Use approval.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe recommended approval of the UDO amendment.

SECOND: Mo McRae

VOTE:

FOR: Jason Grubbs, Tommy Hicks, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo McRae, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan

EXCUSED: None.

Aaron King
Director of Planning and Development Services

**CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES FOR UDO-CC8
JANUARY 14, 2020**

Tiffany White presented the staff report.

Melynda Dunigan asked whether UDO-CC8 would hold the existing MU-S developments to three uses or allow them to drop to two. Aaron King responded that they would have the flexibility to drop to two uses. Melynda also asked if staff could give the Board some understanding as to how many parcels are zoned MU-S. Tiffany stated that there are currently 11 areas zoned MU-S, with a good bit of those areas made up of multiple parcels. Kirk Ericson added that MU-S is a Special Use district that currently requires three uses. Even if the ordinance allows for two uses going forward, because there is an approved Special Use site plan of record for each district, that plan would basically prevail. Unless developers came in for a Site Plan Amendment or a rezoning to change it.

In response to a question from Clarence Lambe regarding reducing uses, Tiffany stated that when she was looking at what other communities had as far as PUD standards, the majority of them only required two uses. In some of the existing MU-S zonings, the three uses were not as diversified as staff had hoped, so staff was looking to be more in line with other communities.

George Bryan recalled that there had been previous discussion on Cottage Courts in an earlier meeting, but noted that this information seemed also to be looking at modifying the MU-S district. Tiffany stated that both topics had been discussed in the earlier meeting, and that this text amendment has been about both provisions from the very beginning. George added that it looked like Planning staff was moving to get rid of single-family zoning in Forsyth County and that Tiffany, on a number of occasions, used the term "by right." He asked her if that was the direction in which staff was headed. Tiffany responded that his statement was not at all accurate, that staff is promoting expansion of housing choice, and that the majority of land in Forsyth County is zoned RS9, single-family residential zoning. George expressed that he felt the language that the Board received from staff indicated major changes to the ordinance, and he was finding himself playing catchup on a major change that had taken other communities in North Carolina years to manage.

Tiffany reminded the Board that it saw the recommendations from the Innovative and Land-Efficient Development Report in February of 2020, and the Board voted for staff to move forward

on those recommendations. George stated that he was not referring to the report but to the proposed changes before them, which the Board received on Friday.

Aaron explained that when the Board directed staff to move forward on the aforementioned recommendations, staff took two of the items first: PUDs and the consideration of Cottage Courts. There is nothing in the proposed PUD or Cottage Court ordinances that would do away with single-family zoning. Staff brought this to the Board at the October work session and discussed it at length, then met with the Neighborhood Alliance subcommittee before the end of the year for more discussions. It went to the public Friday before the meeting.

George felt that he did not have enough time to get a good understanding of the many references provided in the document. There are many references mentioned in the report that he would like to discuss and get more explanation about from Tiffany, or else be provided those references at the same time as he is looking at the document. Aaron stated that staff would be glad to provide more research or information on certain things.

Melynda agreed that she needed more time to digest all of the information and had several other questions that could be discussed during a work session. Chris Leak asked the other Board members what they felt about delaying this topic for another time. All Board members agreed that it could be tabled to a later date to learn as much as they can. Mo McRae stated that she was fine with a continuation, but she wanted the Board to give the proposed amendment the credit it is allowed. The discussions surrounding Cottage Courts and MU-S have been ongoing for some time, and she felt that pointed questions could be discussed at this meeting. She added that she did not want to ignore the comments about single-family zoning but felt that that was not the intent of what staff was trying to do here. Staff is presenting options, which are wonderful in codes, as well as in communities, and she cautioned the Board to be very careful about being too restrictive on this matter. She reiterated that she was happy to continue, with everyone promising to be open and have a clear directive to Planning staff on what their questions are.

Kirk addressed a few points with the Board, one being some challenges accessing the Clearcode website. The domain name for Clearcode switched from UDOClearcode.com to UDOClearcode.org due to some hosting challenges. In consideration of a point raised by George, Kirk wanted to make sure that all Board members were aware that anything in the proposed ordinance text that is gray is something that is currently in the Clearcode. One can click on that link and be taken to those sections being referenced. Anything in yellow would be new sections added by the proposed text amendment.

It was Clarence proposal that the Board address their questions to staff at this meeting and discuss them. George stated that he had many questions and thought it was more appropriate to ask questions at a work session, rather than at a public meeting, so that the language would be more refined by the time of the next public meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Drew Gerstmyer, 87 North Trade Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- I just wanted to speak in support of the ongoing conversation for increasing flexibility in UDO options concerning infill housing. Cottage Court-type development, along with additional work toward remnant lot infill, can add many non-typical creative housing opportunities throughout the city, and it sounds like that is happening. It is exciting to hear things being worked out. Thank you.

Brant Godfrey, 1598 Westbrook Plaza Drive, Suite 200, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- Members of the Board and Mr. Director, my remarks are very general but they are specifically addressed to the Cottage Court aspect of your presentation. From the development and building side of the community, we're really excited about having this option as a possibility. It is not a drastic change from what exists now from the perspective of density. I'm aware of other areas in the country where there are much higher densities that are being allowed under this sort of development. On a one-acre tract in an RS9 zoning district in Winston-Salem, you're allowed 4.8 units per acre; this would allow 6.
- I think, aesthetically, it is a very attractive option. I love the idea of a central courtyard. It's landscaped, and it would be maintained by the homeowners' association. As opposed to homes facing the street, you would have homes facing an aesthetically attractive courtyard that you could be assured would be maintained for the life of the neighborhood. I think it's a great concept.

Brice Shearburn, 2650 Monticello Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27106

- Thank you all. I am happy to participate in this. There is a tremendous amount of momentum that we can bring to bear on this.
- George, to your point about modifying single-family zoning and density, I agree with all staff comments and everyone else that looks at this in terms of densities and what we are talking about. This is really just empowering our close-in neighborhoods - GMA 1 and 2 neighborhoods - to apply a lot more platforms for different kinds of housing options. I have been in this space for a long time – so has Drew – and what we see here is a real opportunity for this planning board and city to support a paradigm shift in how we look at housing options in these close-in neighborhoods.
- I have submitted a narrative report which I would like to be entered into the record. I appreciate all of the efforts of Aaron and Tiffany and Planning staff and what other stakeholders have expressed here. This is really the way we need to go as a community to meet this extraordinary unmet housing need. And to try to hang ourselves up on one single thing about density is really almost paranoia. I really think this is not the intention of the UDO and it should be our community effort to try to support these initiatives.

Matt McChesney, 2755 Old Town Club Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27106

- I think residential development in Winston-Salem is changing. We are running out of large tracts of land to develop, and that is not necessarily a bad thing. There is a desire to bring more housing closer to the city center to promote growth of Downtown, and we need to be creative when we do this. Infill pieces need to be evaluated for more options than just single-family homes on quarter-acre lots. Flexibility with density and product type can also have an effect on costs and allow for more affordable housing.
- Cottage Courts, in general, promote more engagement between residents in medium-density urban areas. With the right design you can achieve the same 14 dwelling units per acre as you might see in a two-story, generic apartment that would be more easily accepted by local neighborhoods.
- Cottage Courts are a great tool for resolving awkward-shaped parcels with limited street frontage. I feel strongly that this type of forward-thinking flexibility and creativity will spur the type of development that will help Winston-Salem take the next step, and a responsible one in innovative growth. I appreciate your consideration of this option and your time this afternoon.

Brad Klosterman, 1644 Reynolda Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I am a commercial broker and commercial realty advisor who represents a number of landowners that own some of these small parcels that we are talking about. I am also an AICP certified planner. I only bring that up because my ethics at AICP supersede my realtor title, or hat, at this point. I have had the opportunity to review this code and then provide comments. While it wasn't as much flexibility as I had wanted, I am in 100 percent support of what staff has come back with in terms of trying to take these infill parcels, the patchwork we've created from development over time, and really rethinking these into what is a better opportunity, a more socially equitable way for developing property in our town.
- With that, I'll close and make all attempts to be at future meetings, as well as give you all an opportunity to review this language.

Richard Angino, 463 Carolina Circle, Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I am a big historic person so I have done a lot of urban infill projects over the years. I am a big proponent that what they were doing in the 1920s is what we should be doing now because that created the ability to go for housing across different income brackets. I think the current single-family rules that are out there and the cost related to stormwater is basically making that level of housing only affordable to the top 10 percent of our population, which is not serving the other 90 percent of our population.
- We did a Cottage Court neighborhood in Rocky Mount, so we have a good amount of experience related to these Cottage Court neighborhoods. I think one of the big things that you need to have involved in it is flexibility. Any time you do urban infill, it's not like you're going out by the Walmart and building on a brand new piece of land, you're actually trying to do infill, which is the best tool related to it. I think it's a very smart thing to do

when you're going after people who are making 80 percent of AMI and they can afford \$250,000 to \$350,000. You can't build a new house in Brookberry for that.

- This type of product also goes after the additional units that we have. We have 14,000, which is the demand. If you assume a third of those are renters, and then you figure what's left, that would be approximately 2,500 acres we would need just to fill those if they were single-family houses under the traditional model. We do not have 2,500 acres out there. At the same time, multifamily would take up 700 acres of that just at the normal rate. This is a huge number to deal with. We need to be creative. It's great to be able to use what we had in the past related to it.
- One of the comments I have, because it is urban infill, is there is one comment in the report that it is half-acre lots. Traditionally, historic lots that we're talking about were not divided in quarter-acres and half-acres, so I would really make the suggestion 25,000 square feet, which is smaller than half an acre, but it fits better with the actual 100 deep or 200-foot wide lots that we have here in Winston-Salem. You are not going to be able to do many half-acre lots because there aren't many half-acre lots that are pre-World War II type of lots. You have the millennials and the younger folks who are basically deciding whether they want to be downtown or whether they want to be out in a subdivision. And we have more and more people wanting to be downtown.
- We started working on Slate Avenue, which is over on Patterson, and we worked on townhouse units with units above garages and we've gotten a huge amount of interest in that. Because that fits that gap of housing that is at \$250,000 to \$350,000 close to Downtown and walkable to neighborhoods and everything else. Also, the ancillary units would be the very thing for Winston-Salem.
- I appreciate you addressing this. Any time you need reference to actual things built in other places in North Carolina or the region, I would love to get involved in those discussions. Thank you very much.

Chris Leak suggested the Board present questions they may have for staff now or through email so they have an opportunity to research the questions.

George thanked all of the developers for participating in discussions to help Cottage Courts be successful. He also asked the developers to look at this very carefully to be sure that they are successful here because he did not feel that they had been successful in terms of filling in and meeting housing needs in other places.

Regarding the proposed changes to the MU-S district, Melynda asked what would be left once standards are removed like references to traditional neighborhood development and transit-oriented development. Her concern is how the Planning Board and City Council can evaluate projects when they come forward under this pared-down language. She also said that it seemed that when the MU-S district and PUDs were originally proposed many years ago, it was to implement certain goal like walkability, sprawl reduction, concentration of development in activity centers and growth corridors, having an attractive mix of uses, and protecting environmental features. She believes specific language is needed in the purpose statement, or in the objective,

that really steers developers toward high-quality development so that when the Board looks at proposals, they will be able to say it fits with the goals. She hopes staff will consider that and consider whether they think something could be added to steer toward more high-quality development.

Tiffany explained that when TOD and TND standards were put in the original MU-S ordinance, it was reflective of the practice of working with those kinds of districts then. Current practice for TOD and TND, which are usually overlay districts, is slightly different. Most places that have TOD and TND use overlay districts. Another recommendation from the Innovative Land Use Report is to look at what kind of overlay districts might be beneficial to Winston-Salem. She indicated that she didn't want it to seem like staff was disregarding TOD and TND, she just thinks there is a better, more up-to-date tool in planning practice for those specific things.

In response to Melynda's concerns about changes to the MU-S district, Aaron explained that there have been no proposed MU-S developments since the rules were changed in 2006. There have been mixed-use developments using GB-S or GB-L, or PB-S or PB-L. When no one uses a tool that is available to them, that is a red flag that something is wrong with the tool. When Tiffany's report mentioned looking at PUDs, and our code consultant mentioned the need to go back and examine PUDs, one of the things staff wanted to do was look at the ability to have someone create their own district. In exchange for that maximum flexibility, they would need to bring in a site plan and spell out the uses, go through the rezoning process, and meet with the neighborhood. Staff wanted to make it flexible enough to allow the ability to have these things live or die on their own merit. To Melynda's point, Aaron suggested that staff could add some additional language that describes what the intent of these districts is while achieving the same flexibility that staff is trying to create with this tool.

Jack Steelman stated that he will gladly email his written questions upon the adjournment of the meeting. Jason Grubbs noted that in all his years on the Board, he could not recall too many times where there have been a half-dozen people attending a meeting to speak on either side of a UDO text amendment. Nor could he recall too many times where six completely unrelated members of the development community, who really aren't necessarily impacted by the decision the Board makes, show up for the good of what the Board is trying to do and offer their insight regardless of whether you agree with it or not. He felt they were to be commended and stated that sometimes, the market really will take care of issues if we let it work the way it is intended to work.

Clarence asked staff to look at changing the minimum lot size to 20,000 square feet instead of half an acre. Tiffany stated that the half-acre recommendation only applied to non-residential zoning districts, but staff will look at it again.

Chris Leak asked all board members to have questions to staff by Tuesday, January 19.

AGAINST: None

WORK SESSION

MOTION: Jack Steelman moved that UDO-CC8 be continued to the February 11 meeting.

SECOND: Clarence Lambe

VOTE:

FOR: George Bryan, Melynda Dunigan, Jason Grubbs, Clarence Lambe, Chris Leak, Mo
McRae, Brenda Smith, Jack Steelman

AGAINST: None

EXCUSED: None

Aaron King
Director of Planning and Development Services