



PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION

PROJECT#: 26-44-ZTA

MEETING DATE: August 13, 2026

PETITION REQUEST: Small-Scale Multi-Family to R-6 (26-44-ZTA)

APPLICANT/PETITIONER: Tamara Peacock Architects

PLANNING BOARD ACTION SUMMARY:

Staff gave a 22-minute presentation on the requested Zoning Text Amendment reviewing the implications, guidance from the Gen H Comprehensive Plan and a review of the criteria for considering zoning amendments. Following the presentation the Planning Board asked questions about the following:

- How does this impact the proposed downtown design overlay district? *The overlay and base zoning would work together. When one the standards of the underlying zoning district conflict with the overlay district, the stricter standard applies.*
- What would the parking requirements be? *1 per unit (1-2 bedroom) or 1.5 per unit (3+ bedrooms)*
- Would the proposal allow 56 units/acre using typical R-6 Lots (6,000 SF)? *Kind of but not exactly. The Small-Scale Multi-Family (SSMF) use is not density based. It allows 8 units regardless of lot size. If you had multiple SSMF projects next to each other by the same owner then we would treat that as a unified development and it would have to go through a rezoning. Additionally, if you exceed 50 units then you trigger a CZD.*
- Clarification on max. footprint of the buildings vs max. footprint of the site? *Under SSMF, there is a maximum of 4,000 Sq Ft for any one building's footprint. Under Minor PRD, there is a maximum of 40% of the site that can be covered by building footprints.*
- Could you do this same thing today if you went through a Special Use Permit process? *No. SSMF is not listed as a permitted use nor as a special use under R-6. It would require zoning to another zoning district to do have a SSMF use.*
- Should we apply this standard to our largest lot zoning districts instead of our smallest lot zoning districts? *Large lot districts are "low density" and they have a specific character where buildings and uses are spread further apart. R-6 has a smaller minimum lot size which equates to a higher density and a character where building and uses are closer to one another. Adding SSMF to R-6 vs R-15, for instance, it more in line with the current character of the district.*

In total, staff's presentation time concluded after 41 minutes.

APPLICANT:

The applicant was represented by Nicolle Rebolledo. She pointed out the City's affordable housing needs and how cost of construction is a major factor - requiring higher densities be allowed in order to keep expenses down. (1 min).

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ken Fitch – spoke on the threat this posed to neighborhood character and potential incompatibilities. (7 mins)

Lud Burkle – Expressed concern with proposed density and that it did not look good for the Chair to promote expanding the proposed use to all residential districts. (30 secs)

Glenn Lange – Speaking for himself and not the Tree Board. The proposal needs some tree protection standards tied to it. (3 mins)

Lynne Williams, had a number of concerns echoed by others and questioned if this was an attempt to make development projects easier for Mrs. Peacock's clients. (9.5 mins)

Public Comment was closed after 23 minutes.

DELIBERATION:

The Board discussed a number of items related to this proposal at length. A recurring comment was related to the increased transparency that would come along if SSMF was listed as a Special Use that required projects to develop a site plan and go before the Board of Adjustment for approval. This proposal ultimately prevailed after further deliberation.

Other topics included concerns with preserving trees and potential density if the maximum number of units were constructed on smaller lots. There were concerns of the impact this would have on the character of the neighborhood however, counterpoints were made that quadplexes would be permitted and this four-family housing type is needed and would be appropriate with the character of the neighborhoods. A desire for some open space standards was discussed. The cost-effectiveness of higher density development and how that helps achieve affordability was also a recurring talking point. Consideration was given on deferring the decision to see if the text amendment could be tweaked to be made more compatible and to then bring it back to the Board for a recommendation. Mr. Manley discussed the Supplementary Standards for Small-Scale Multi-Family have several requirements that work to require or guide design that is compatible in a predominantly single-family neighborhood. Mr. Holloway clarified that the setbacks are not changing – the R-6 setbacks would stay in place.

In total, Planning Board considered this item for 1 hour & 38 minutes.

MOTION:

Ms. Waters moved to recommend approval with an amendment making Small-Scale Multi-Family a Special Use instead of a by-right, Permitted Use.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY STATEMENT:

The proposed text amendment aligns with the Gen H 2045 Comprehensive Plan goals and Guiding Principles.

REASONABLENESS STATEMENT:

[Rationale for Approval]

1. The proposed amendment creates an opportunity to address the need for additional missing middle housing.
2. The proposed amendment establishes standards to encourage walkable neighborhoods.
3. The proposed amendment would allow development that complement the architecture of existing traditional single-family homes.

BOARD ACTION:

- **Motion/Second:** Waters / Zafra
- **Yeas:** Zafra, Waters, Johnson, McKinley, Robertson (Chair)
- **Nays:** Gilgis
- **Absent:** Peacock (Vice-Chair), Rippy, Russell, Flores