

Summary

To: Mayor and Commissioners

From: Micah Maxwell, Town Manager

Subject: Second Reading of Ordinance 491 – Amending the Land Development Code

Date: 3/27/2014

Summary: The town has reviewed its land development code to identify what changes need to be made in order to provide for appropriate future development or redevelopment in the town. The area that will likely be most effected is presumed to be the Belleview Biltmore Hotel site.

Previous Board Action: The town commission heard this issue on first reading in January but did not approve it at that time. At the February commission meeting the commission asked staff to bring forward the ordinance for first reading again at the 3/25/2014 meeting with discussion at the March worksession. The town commission subsequently approved the Ordinance 491 on first reading with two minor clerical adjustments, and also removing the average unit standard while adjusting the minimum unit size to 1500 square feet.

Background/Problem Discussion: The town currently has two zoning options related to multi-family, RPD and RM-15. RPD is lower density, and takes into account the “sharing” of density with an open space, which then allows for a parcel to take advantage of the full density on a small area or property. With the BCC golf courses already being zoned RPD, and the town’s intent to restrict development rights on the Belleview Biltmore Course, use for such a zoning is really only to provide a multi-family option with a lower density. RM-15 allows for a higher density with a more traditional development scenario. Because of the higher density, RM-15 is a probable target of developer of larger parcels of land., however, the invariable height of 32 feet for RM-15 and RPD would seem to cause some issue with the placement of units on those larger sites in an aesthetic, and sustainable fashion. To combat this, staff has been working to create a third possibility for multi-family, RM-10. This district would allow for 10 units per acre, and would have the ability to provide for a height bonus if a developer were able to meet certain criteria. These criteria include the sheltering of parking and additional setbacks off of roadways and between buildings, while encouraging alternate size and scale for buildings, so as to not have many units that look and feel the exact same.

Alternatives/Options:

- I. Approve Ordinance 491 on first reading
- II. Do nothing

Financial Implications: N/A

Proposed Motion: I move approval of Ordinance 491 on second reading