

**AGENDA
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
January 27, 2015 – REGULAR MEETING
6:00 P.M. (Note time change)**

The New Business items have been placed on the agenda in the order they were received. Please note that at 9:00 p.m., the Commission will evaluate the remainder of the agenda to determine if time constraints will permit the full agenda to be heard at this meeting. All items not heard at this meeting will be postponed to the next regularly scheduled PC/BOA meeting of February 4, 2015, or to a special meeting scheduled by the Commission.

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission/Board of Adjustment will be held on Tuesday, January 27, 2015. The meeting will be held in the Council Chambers of the Town Hall. Agenda for the meeting is as follows:

PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES AND PAGERS DURING THE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

MATTERS FROM PUBLIC

APPROVAL OF MINUTES-

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

1. Downtown District II LDR's: January 27, 2015
 - A. Downtown District II LDR's: from January 21, 2015
 - B. Staff Report: from January 14, 2015

MATTERS FROM COMMISSION

AGENDA FOLLOWUP

MATTERS FROM STAFF-

ADJOURNMENT



Downtown LDR Update

PC Recommended Modifications (Working Draft Updated 1/21/15)

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
<p>General</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brenda Wylie asked that we consider the concern that Fannie Mae/Freddie Mac typically only provide loans for home buyers in mixed-use projects that are a 70/30 mix where at least 70% of the project must be residential. 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> After speaking in more detail with Ms. Wylie, the only way that the LDRs could specifically address this concern is by requiring a certain mix of uses such that at least 70% would be residential. Staff thinks that having a rigid requirement for use-mixes is generally not advisable, except in the TN-4 zone where nonresidential development is limited to .6 of the 2.0 FAR, which limits nonresidential to 30%. In the TN_4, Staff wanted to make sure that the district was primarily residential in character, it was not about financing. If anything, the 70/30 financing question may lend support to the strategy of not requiring deed-restricted affordable housing to be located on-site in mixed-use projects where financing appears to be especially difficult.</p> <p><i>Staff does not recommend any changes to the use-mixes in the proposed zones at this time. However, we are open to considering whether affordable housing should be allowed to be off-site to facilitate financing.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Lodging Overlay be extended to include the Hagen and Winchell properties on the northern end of the South Cache St. corridor? 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> The properties in questions are not currently in the LO and were not recommended to be added by the Council in May, 2013. Staff's view is that the LO is large enough to accommodate the Town lodging needs for the foreseeable future. One compromise option would be to add the properties into the LO but only allow, for example, short-term rentals but not lodging rooms. This middle-ground approach could also be applied to areas where we might want to shrink the LO but necessarily get rid of all lodging uses (TN-4).</p> <p><i>Staff proposes to not add any properties to the Lodging Overlay in the northern end of the South Cache St. corridor.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Lodging Overlay be extended to include the properties between Willow and the Golden Eagle Motel on East Broadway? 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> The properties in questions are currently in the LO but were recommended to be deleted by the Council in May, 2013. Staff agrees with the current proposed LO that excludes the properties east of Willow Street because the goal is to create a vibrant mix-use area that promotes office development, which is a great need in the community. And too because the LO is not available on the south side of East Broadway, it makes sense to begin the office corridor at Willow Street.</p> <p><i>Staff proposes to not add any properties to the LO between Willow St. and the Golden Eagle Motel on East Broadway.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How would the new relief tool of the Administrative Adjustment (Sec. 8.8.1) apply to the form-based standards in the Downtown zones? 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> The Administrative Adjustment provides a 20% modification only for specifically listed development standards. The only standard that would apply to the form-based standards would be for building setbacks (i.e., width of pedestrian frontages, 3rd-story stepback, transparency, etc. are not covered). Staff believes that providing some flexibility for certain form standards would be advisable and so should be added to the list in Sec. 8.8.1.B Applicability (see recommendation below).</p> <p><i>Staff recommends that the following form-standards — pedestrian frontage; story height; transparency; and building façade width —be added to the list of applicable standards for the Administrative Adjustment in Sec. 8.8.1.B.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should all deed-restricted unit be exempted from the FAR limit? 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> Currently, the LDRs allow a 25% FAR bonus for voluntary deed-restricted affordable/employee housing. In addition, required affordable/employee housing does not count against the FAR limit. The question here is whether the 25% bonus FAR should be extended to all voluntary deed-restricted units. Staff believes that this would be a good idea to promote workforce housing. And is allowed building heights and the number sod stories are not increased, then this allowance would not lead to larger structures. This approach is similar to the two-tiered FAR approach described below in that both options provide more development potential for deed-restricted housing.</p> <p><i>Staff is open to the idea of allowing all voluntary deed-restricted housing to be exempt from the FAR limit. However, due to the potential similarity with the two-tiered FAR option, staff would like to discuss the two-tiered FAR option before providing a recommendation on exempting voluntary deed-restricted housing from the FAR limit.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will nonconformities be handled in the Downtown Zones, i.e., such as for existing detached single-family homes, which are not allowed in any Downtown zone? • Are we making the Brew Pub nonconforming? 	<p><u>Staff response:</u> For detached single-family homes, Staff proposes that they would be made nonconforming in the Downtown zones. This is most applicable along East Broadway (TN-2) and South Cache (TN-3) where a number of existing SF dwellings exist. Such dwelling would be subject to the nonconforming use restrictions in Sec. 1.9.3, which allows a 20% expansion of the use. Staff believes that existing SF homes will be eventually scraped for mixed-use projects and not replaced with new SF homes, so the incentive to expand existing SF homes is small. Sales of such homes too will likely be for redevelopment rather than SF use. If SF homes are not made nonconforming, development standards (setbacks, height, etc.) will have to be provided to guide development – such standards do not currently exist.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends that detached single-family dwellings be declared nonconforming in the Downtown zones.</i></p> <p>On the Brew Pub question, proposed standards to clearly distinguish between restaurant/bars (commercial use) vs. breweries (light industrial use) were deleted from the new LDRS as part of a larger effort to simplify the draft. However, the Downtown LDRs are an ideal opportunity to reconsider these regulations which Staff believes are needed and would not make (we believe) the Brew Pub property nonconforming for its brewing use. Below are the proposed LDRs standards that the PC could consider to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Pedestrian Frontages – General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the 15’ pedestrian width to 12’ or 13’ 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> After measuring various sidewalks widths in Downtown for context, it appears that very few existing sidewalks would currently meet the 15’ frontage requirements or 10’ clear width for covered walkways. For example, the covered walkway on the south side of Town Square, which is one of our largest sidewalks, has a clear width of 9’ and curb to building width of about 12 feet. Clear widths of 5’ to 7’ were typical for existing covered walkways. While we want to improve pedestrian facilities over existing conditions, we also do not want to be onerous.</p> <p>UPDATE: After speaking with Code Studio, Staff is convinced that the currently proposed 15’ pedestrian width (not 13’) is preferable to ensure all streetscape improvements (street furniture, etc.) can be accommodated. Plus, if pedestrian frontage width is allowed to be subject to the 20% modification of the Administrative Adjustment (as proposed by Staff below), then this would provide 3’ of flexibility in establishing pedestrian frontages to allow for reasonable and interesting frontages without sacrificing function. In addition, the current draft of the Community Streets Plan uses 15’ to 16.5’ pedestrian frontages as a minimum for mixed-use areas in District 2, depending on the type of adjacent street and so consistency with these standards is advised.</p> <p><i>UPDATED RECOMMENDATION:</i></p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Pedestrian Frontage – Covered Walkway	•		
Pedestrian Frontage – Trees in Grates	•		
Pedestrian Frontage – Trees in Lawn	•		
Building Frontages - General	•		
Building Frontage - Shopfront	•		
Building Frontage - Office	•		

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Building Frontage - Residential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do ADA requirements work with the 2' – 5' ground floor elevation? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> According to Town Building Official, Steve Haines, ADA accessibility is required for projects with 20 or more townhomes (2% must be accessible) and for apartment/condo projects of 4 or more units, depending on configuration. Thus, ADA requirement would apply only to larger projects.</p> <p>UPDATE: After speaking with Code Studio, they felt strongly that ADA requirements should not be a problem. Where a central lobby is provided (and it should be for most multi-family projects), the ADA ramp would be inside the lobby where there is ample space. Where parking is provided in the back, which should be most of the time, an ADA ramp can be provided there without visual or practical difficulty (often to the same main lobby). Townhomes do not need ADA access until more than 20 units are provided (Steve Haines). Lee Einsweiler felt strongly that having ground-level residential is bad design in an urban, mixed-use setting.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes at this time to the ground floor elevation standard.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul N - Wrong building type for the zone where residential is the only building type allowed – TN5 John - TN5 assumes a standard size parcel Paul A. - Applies only to larger type residential uses. Paul N- Give more options where use will stay the same where single residential type is allowed. Adam - 12 is big for residential use maybe 10 or 9 is more appropriate. John - For Accessible reasons don't feel we can require an across the board 2' Paul N – can see elevating in downtown but why require it in areas that are less urban. Add a building type in zones where there is less need for elevating residential (outlying areas) Adam – knock the lodging down a foot in height. In TN5 propose adding another frontage type Adam - Change residential frontage from 2'-5' to 1'-5' John – 0'-5' Paul A. – Have another conversation with consultant and steve h. Paul N. - 5' above grade – would that still meet the definition of a basement.

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Building Frontage - Lodging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
Parking Types- General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking regulations should be reduced – it restricts development in general • Should we remove parking minimums? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> While there is a common perception that Town parking regulations are a barrier to development, Staff believes that with the proposed parking reductions for residential and lodging uses in the Downtown area, plus the many existing parking reductions for nonresidential uses (credits, fee in lieu, shared parking, on-street bonus), the Downtown parking requirements should not be a significant barrier to redevelopment. In fact, in recent conversations with developers, many have stated that they will likely provide more parking than the LDRs require due to market demand (e.g., 2 spaces per DU instead of only 1 as required). Furthermore, our parking supply could be significantly increased, especially for residential uses, if the Town allowed 24-hour parking on its streets. An aggressive alternative would be to eliminate any parking requirement in the Downtown area and let the market provide parking, but Staff feels this would be inappropriate until more public parking lots and overnight on-street parking are available to alleviate parking demand.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes at this time to the proposed parking standards.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David – On-street side parking in evenings to be allowed. • Paul N. – Allow on-street parking to count toward residential parking requirements. (in employee housing scenarios where residential is in a commercial bldg) • Adam – give credit where there is curb but not necessarily on-street parking allowed like east broadway (regardless of whether on-street parking is allowed or not). • PC all – Recommend Town Council to consider on-street parking 24 hours all year and allow it to be credited against residential parking requirements • Choose not to drop C.6

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Downtown Zones - General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should Town consider allowing a 4th story to encourage redevelopment? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> While a 4th story would certainly make achieving the 2.0 FAR more realistic, Staff does not recommend a 4th story based on the extensive community debate during the Comp Plan and recent opposition to four stories in the recently repealed PMUD development option. Any outright allowance of a 4th story would also likely require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which currently states that 2 to 3 stories is the maximum number of stories consistent with the community's character. In addition, if a 4th story is added, the 42' and 46' height limits would likely need to be increased by at least 5' to properly accommodate the 4th story.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes at this time to allow a 4th story.</i></p>	<p>4 story in 51'? with a 5:12 pitch? Is that possible? 47' with a flat roof. David- will the 4th story give us workforce house? If not, then is it worth it?</p> <p>Adam – 3 floor setback to pick up square footage. Otherwise as written by staff. – Adam, David, Paul</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allowed Uses: Should the allowed uses be changed in any of the proposed zones? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff is generally comfortable with the proposed uses in the Downtown zones. However, the primary options for making changes would be to add/delete uses, make certain uses a CUP instead of an outright use, and allow certain lodging uses but not others (e.g., hotels but not short-term rentals).</p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workforce Housing: If workforce housing is not likely to be built in District 2, should our focus be to provide incentives (e.g., higher FAR) for such housing in Districts 3, 4, or 5 and not so much in District 2? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> District 2 was not intended in the Comprehensive Plan to be a major location for workforce housing. However, opportunities to maximize creation of workforce housing in D2 should be considered. One question is whether mitigated housing units that are currently required to be on-site (and are considered a deterrent to redevelopment by some) should be allowed to be located off-site where such housing may arguably be better situated or closer to services.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Maximum Unit Size:</u> Should we establish a maximum unit size for condominiums and apartments (similar to how we have a 10,000 sf max. for single-family detached homes) in order to discourage high-end and second homes in District 2? If so, what number would be effective – 2,000 sf? 1,200 sf? 800sf? Other? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff does not have a targeted unit size for condos and apartments at this time. Also, depending on the goals, unit sizes could differ in different zones. The crux of the issue is whether limiting unit size alone would in fact significantly deter second home and speculation. Stacy Stoker of the TCHA believes that meaningful long-term affordability can only be provided with some sort of deed-restriction, such as an employee-based one that has no sales price restriction. The question may be whether it's possible to create fully free-market units at sales points that still serve a community need? For example, does a 1br for \$350,000 or a 2br for \$550,000 provide a genuine benefit deserving of additional development potential? And will such units be largely purchased by non-locals regardless?</p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What zoning tools might work to incentivize workforce housing? For example, would a two-tier FAR system that provides extra FAR only for workforce housing be a good idea? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The town currently has a deed-restricted employee housing requirement, a 25% affordable housing requirement, and offers a 25% bonus FAR for deed-restricted housing. These are aggressive regulatory incentives compared to many communities. However, given the high cost of real estate and construction, simply offering more FAR does not automatically produce more workforce housing (see staff report). Thus, where lodging and high-end development compete with workforce housing, very little of the latter will be built.</p> <p>If this is true, then a 2-tiered FAR system could help promote workforce housing. Staff offers the following 2-tiered FAR scheme for discussion purposes where the base FAR is essentially the existing FAR and the bonus FAR is the currently proposed FAR for each zone (but see staff report for potential problems in achieving the proposed FARs). Again for discussion purposes, the “Bonus FAR” could be limited to market residential development that does not exceed 1,200 sf (or 800 sf?) in size, with the idea that smaller unit sizes will naturally deter 2nd homes and add more affordable units.</p> <p>TN-1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Base FAR: 1.3 • Bonus FAR. 2.0 	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What zoning tools might work to incentivize workforce housing? For example, would a two-tier FAR system be an effective option? (CONT) 	<p>TN-2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base FAR: 65 Bonus FAR. 1 <p>TN-3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base FAR: .46 Bonus FAR. .1 <p>TN-4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base FAR: .40 Bonus FAR. 2.0 <p>TN-5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Base FAR: .75 Bonus FAR. 2.0 <p>The numbers can be changed as necessary, but staff wants to see if there is support for this 2-tier concept. Another option would be to apply this scheme only to the three zones with the higher 2.0 FAR (TN-1, TN-4, and TN-5) because the bonus is more substantial and the greater max. heights and three stories would provide more room for housing. This system would also significantly reduce buildout numbers— even more so if the bonus FARs are reduced to a more realistic number.</p> <p>Another tool would be to limit or prohibit certain lodging uses (e.g., short-term rentals) within the LO. This would reduce competition to workforce housing from high value lodging.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes at this time to the FARs but offers the 2-tier FAR scheme for discussion purposes.</i></p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The increased thresholds for staff-level review (30,000 sf and 15,000 sf) may be too high. Should they be lowered? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The rationale for the proposed thresholds is to allow staff-level review for development of up to two standard town lots (i.e., two 7,500 lots at a 2.0 FAR = 30,000 sf of development – or 15,000 sf for a zone with a 1.0 FAR). Three of the five proposed Downtown zones (TN-1, TN-4, TN-5) have a 30,000 sf review threshold and two zones (TN-2, TN-3) have a 15,000 sf review threshold. Thus, it is possible to address the review thresholds on a zone-specific basis -- for example, the TN-1 could have a higher (or lower) threshold than another 2.0 FAR zone such as TN-4. While Staff prefers to keep the proposed thresholds, an option would be to base the thresholds on the development of one lot (e.g., 15,000 sf in 2.0 FAR zones and 7,500 sf in 1.0 FAR zones). The current threshold for staff level review is 5,000 sf of nonresidential development.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes at this time to the development review thresholds.</i></p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
TN-1 Downtown Core - Development Standards (setbacks, height, FAR, 3 rd -story stepback, parking, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the 3rd-story stepback be reduced to allow greater use of the FAR? Should flexibility for steep pitched roofs be provided? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Upon further review staff discovered that the 3rd-story stepback measurement as proposed contains an error. The error is that the 45 degree angle for determining encroachments is incorrect – it would be more accurate to call the visual line that connects the top of the 2nd story and top of the third story the “sky plane angle,” which may be different for different projects depending on the height and location of 3rd story. We believe this consistent with the original intent. Thus, the stepback would still be 15’ but it would be the sky plane angle that could not be penetrated except for the 20% allowance and other smaller specified encroachments. This system would allow sloping roofs structures provided the roof line is equal to or below the sky plane angle. Of course, lesser stepbacks, such as 10 feet could be approved, or the 20% encroachment allowance could be increased – the choice is really a policy decision about desired architectural character and FAR maximization.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes to the 3rd story stepback except to replace the 45 degree angle for encroachment with a sky plane angle.</i></p>	
TN-1 Downtown Core - Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		
TN-1 Downtown Core - Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 		

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
TN-2 Office Mixed-use - Development Standards (setbacks, height, FAR, 3 rd -story setback, parking, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
TN-2 Office Mixed-use -Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
TN-2 Office Mixed-use -Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire South Willow corridor should be put in the TN-2 zone (i.e., the portion that was recently moved from District 2 to District 3 by Town Council). 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff agrees that the TN-2 Zone should be applied to the full South Willow corridor. Doing so would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and create a more cohesive character to this busy corridor.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends applying the TN-2 to the entire South Willow corridor.</i></p>	
TN-3 Resort Connector - Development Standards (setbacks, height, FAR, 3 rd -story setback, parking, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should development on Snow King Ave be more intense (e.g., have higher height limits) than on S. Cache? If so, should additional buffers be required when next to residential zones? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff does not believe that these two areas in TN-3 should have different development standards. The Snow King Ave portion is already in the LO so it may naturally have a different character but staff does not support creating a sixth Downtown zone district for a 3 or 4 block area. One alternative would be to apply the TN-4 Residential Mixed-use district to the Snow King Ave properties but this would add more 2.0 FAR zoning and increase buildout.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no special zoning changes for properties facing Snow King Ave. in the TN-3 Zone, such as applying the TN-4 Zone.</i></p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
TN-3 Resort Connector -Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Snow King Ave should allow more commercial and intense <u>uses</u> than the South Cache corridor. Especially because it has Lodging Overlay and is at base of ski mountain. 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff recommends that both areas be kept in the same zone with the recognition that properties in the LO will likely develop with a greater commercial intensity. Additional commercial intensity in the Resort Connector would unnecessarily increase nonresidential buildout.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends no changes relating to adding commercial intensity along Snow King Ave of the TN-3 Zone.</i></p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will high quality residential properties near South Cache and South Willow be negatively impacted by uses in TN-3 Zone? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> While Staff recommends that both areas be kept in the same zone, we do think that certain potentially disruptive uses, such as bars and restaurants, should be conditional uses in the TN-3. This would allow public hearings and conditions of approval to mitigate negative impacts to neighbors.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends that "Restaurant/Bar" be made a CUP in the TN-2 Zone.</i></p>	
TN-3 Resort Connector -Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the westernmost Ford lot and two adjacent Strout properties on Snow King Ave. be put into the TN-3 (currently not part of District 2 but in Subarea 3.2 Core Residential). In addition, should these properties be put into Lodging Overlay? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> Staff believes that the Current Comp Plan, which shows these properties in District 3 and not District 2, are correct. These are not "downtown" properties and the LO should not be expanded to include them. If anything, Staff believes that the LO should be reduced in size, not expanded on its fringes.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends not to include the Strout/Ford properties in the TN-3 and LO.</i></p>	

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
TN-4 Residential Mixed-use - Development Standards <i>(setbacks, height, FAR, 3rd-story stepback, parking, etc.)</i>	•		
TN-4 Residential Mixed-use -Uses			
TN-4 Residential Mixed-use -Map	•		
TN-5 Downtown Residential - Development Standards <i>(setbacks, height, FAR, 3rd-story stepback, parking, etc.)</i>	•		
TN-5 Downtown Residential - Uses	•		
TN-5 Downtown Residential -Map	•		
Zoning Map Boundaries - General	•		

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Lodging Overlay - General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any changes that should be made to the Lodging Overlay? Should the types of lodging uses be customized for each zone (i.e., allow lodging but not short-term-rental in TN-4) • Should the Strout/Ford properties (three lots) on Snow King Ave. be put into the LO? 	<p><u>Staff Response:</u> The Town Council approved a modified and expanded LO in May, 2013. This new LO, however, was not officially adopted. A large part of that discussion was the goal of protecting residential areas from encroaching lodging, balancing lodging with other nonresidential uses, and providing a range of lodging options. If the Council intends to review the LO boundaries again, Staff would advise that opportunities to reduce the LO rather than expand it be explored. One possibility would to remove the LO from much of the TN-4 Zone so that the boundaries of the LO and TN-1 more closely match. This would better focus lodging in the Downtown core and encourage residential development on the perimeter of Downtown. As mentioned above, we do not support expanding the LO to the Strout/Ford properties.</p> <p><i>Staff recommends that the Council reconsider opportunities to reduce the LO, especially in the TN-4 Zone. Staff also recommends not to include the Strout/Ford properties in the LO.</i></p>	
Nonconformities (Sec. 1.9.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		
Allowed Uses – New definitions (Div. 6.1) (Local Convenience, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 		

Section	Proposed Modification	Staff Recommendation	PC Recommendation
Rules of Measurement (Div. 9.4)	•		
Build-out Analysis	•		
Public Comment at TC Meeting	•		