

AGENDA
MONTICELLO PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP
Tuesday, April 7, 2026 – 5:00 p.m.
Monticello Community Center, Academy Room

Commissioners: Chair Andrew Tapper, Vice-Chair Melissa Robeck,
Rick Kothenbeutel, Teri Lehner, Rob Stark

Council Liaison: Councilmember Kip Christianson

Staff: Angela Schumann, Bob Ferguson, Tyler Bevier

1. General Business

A. Call to Order

B. Roll Call

C. Discussion on Amendments to 2040 Vision + Plan and Zoning Ordinance for
single-family housing goals

2. Adjournment



MEMORANDUM

To: Monticello Planning Commission

From: Angela Schumann, Community Development Director

Date: April 7, 2026

RE: Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan and Zoning Ordinance: Single-Family Housing Goals

REFERENCE AND BACKGROUND

The City Council, Planning Commission and the Economic Development Authority held a workshop on March 31, 2025 to discuss goals and objectives for housing in Monticello, with a specific focus on single-family residential development.

The Planning Commission held two follow-up workshops in 2025 to continue discussion on single-family residential land uses. Planning Commission's workshops on August 5, 2025 and November 3, 2025 focused on elements of the Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan relating to single-family housing. The Commission provided feedback on how the plan's land use goal statements and the language within land use designation sections could be amended to support the goals identified by policymakers during the March 2025 workshop.

The March 3, 2026 workshop will move discussion to lot area, width and design standards. Current single-family lot area standards in the 2040 Plan and zoning ordinance will be reviewed for feedback on desired residential density in relationship to those prior discussions. Zoning ordinance language relating to home size and amenities within the R-A and R-1 and T-N Districts will also be reviewed.

A summary of past discussion follows for reference in this memo. Prior workshop minutes are included as supporting data.

AMENDMENT CONSIDERATIONS & SUMMARY TO-DATE

Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan: Chapter 3, Land Use, Growth & Annexation

1. 2040 Residential Land Use Designations

(Estate Residential, Low Density Residential, Traditional Neighborhood, Mixed Density Residential and Mixed Neighborhood)

- a. Define gross versus net densities in *Development Form* area text
- b. Low-Density Residential (LDR)
 - i. Consider a lower density threshold of 2.0 units – 5.0 units/acre | net acre
 - ii. Consider additional language requiring amenities in consideration for higher density range, such as:
 - High-level of front façade detail, including a combination of brick or stone and other architectural elements which build neighborhood character and support the retention of individual unit value
 - Require homes that will face their community using porches, patios, landscaping and de-emphasizing garages
 - Develop neighborhoods that include a sense of community and continuity and avoid monotony and sameness
- c. Discuss alignment between density thresholds stated in 2040 Plan residential land use designations and individual corresponding zoning districts (i.e. between Low Density Residential land use designation and the R-1 Zoning District)

Planning Commission Guidance from August 5, 2025:

The Commission provided feedback that adjustment of the Low-Density Residential (LDR) land use designation density range to more closely align with the R-1 zoning regulations and to indicate that additional amenities would be required to achieve the higher range of density, which could occur through PUD.

- Preference for gross density reference in the 2040 plan.
- Adjust the Low-Density Residential Density (LDR) to 2-4 gross units per gross acre.
- Review R-1 zoning to verify lot areas align with the density range.
- Include language within the LDR designation that indicates a higher level of amenities in the individual units or proposed neighborhood is required to achieve the higher end of the density range.

2. Land Use Goals: Goal #2

Current Goal: City that prioritizes growth inward by concentrating development activities within the existing city boundaries and grows or develops into the Orderly Annexation Area only when development is proposed or planned contiguous to city boundaries, sensitive open space lands are protected and thoughtfully incorporated into the development pattern, and the land is serviced by appropriate utility and transportation systems.

Amendment: Residential development will support Monticello’s vision for retaining our small town character and reinforcing a sense of community and belonging. We will plan for measured, incremental residential growth which is thoughtfully planned and which creates well-designed neighborhoods which will retain their quality and value into the future.

Planning Commission Guidance from August 5, 2025:

The Commission’s discussion indicated support for differentiating between the first two goals in Chapter 3 of the 2040 Plan, with a specific goal related to residential development similar to the following: “Residential development will support Monticello’s vision for retaining our small-town character and will reinforce a sense of community and belonging. We will plan for measured, incremental residential growth which is thoughtfully planned and designed and which creates livable neighborhoods that retain quality and value into the future.”

3. Future Land Use Map

Discuss re-guiding land areas within the growth area for:

- a. Additional Estate Residential designations within both guided areas and Development Reserve areas, focusing on conservation design potential as outlined in the 2040 Plan
 - i. Would require an amendment to the acreage calculations in the plan
 - ii. Would require an amendment to the Future Land Use Map
- b. Re-guide Mixed Neighborhood or Mixed Density Residential areas to align with goals for encouraging additional lower density single-family opportunity while balancing the need for affordable workforce housing options
 - i. Would require an amendment to the acreage calculations in the plan
 - ii. Would require an amendment to the Future Land Use Map

Planning Commission Guidance from November 3, 2025:

The Commission’s discussion focused on identifying the land use characteristics and amenities most likely to support low-density and estate residential development and included initial feedback on locations where current 2040 land use guidance could be reviewed for amendment in support of additional single-family development.

The Commission indicated that estate residential and low-density residential development would be most likely in areas with a higher level of natural amenities, such as wetlands and woodlands. The Commission suggested areas with these characteristics that could be reviewed for amendment to land use guidance in support of Estate Residential (ER) or Low-Density Residential (LDR) classification.

In discussion, the Commission suggested that while larger lots are often discussed as the baseline for estate residential or low-density development, the 2040 Plan’s guidance for conservation-style design could also be used to support single-family development that preserves natural resource areas through a cluster-design. While the lot areas and widths may not be as expansive, the requirements for home sizes and amenities should be aligned with the purpose and goals statements of the land use designation and zoning district.

Monticello Zoning Ordinance: Single-Family Residential Districts

1. Review and discuss current single-family residential districts for alignment with 2040 Plan amendment considerations noted above:
 - a. Discuss lot area and width standards in R-A, R-1 and T-N Districts (and within land use designations as applicable)
 - b. Review finished and finishable square footage requirements
 - c. Incorporate/revise façade treatment statements. Listed below are those used in recent residential PUD ordinances.
 - i. No less than 10% brick or stone requirement when a combination of board and batten, corbels, shakes, garage windows or other façade features exceed 20% of the front façade
 - ii. Livable portions of the home exposed to the front street no less than 40% of the width of the structure, or in the alternative, the addition of usable front porches or expanded front entry patios or entry features

- iii. Front entry doors no greater than 6 feet farther back from the garage doors, or in the alternative, the addition of usable front porches or expanded front entry patios or entry features
- 2. Review and discuss T-N standards in comparison to Traditional Residential and Mixed-Density Residential land use designations

SUPPORTING DATA

- A. November 3, 2025 Workshop Minutes
- B. August 5, 2025 Workshop Minutes
- C. March 31, 2025 Joint Workshop Minutes
- D. Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan, Excerpts
- E. Monticello Official Zoning Map

MINUTES
WORKSHOP – MONTICELLO PLANNING COMMISSION
Monday, November 3, 2025 – 5:00 p.m.
Mississippi Room, Monticello Community Center

Commissioners Present: Chair Andrew Tapper, Rick Kothenbeutel, Rob Stark
Commissioners Absent: Vice-Chair Melissa Robeck, Teri Lehner
Council Liaison Present: Kip Christianson
Staff Present: Angela Schumann, Jim Thares, Bob Ferguson, Tyler Bevier

1. General Business

A. Call to Order

Chairperson Tapper called the workshop of the Monticello City Planning Commission to order at 5:00 p.m.

B. Roll Call

Mr. Tapper did not call the roll, however, it was noted that only three Commissioners were in attendance and City Planner Steve Grittman was also absent.

C. Discussion on Amendments to 2040 Vision + Plan and Zoning Ordinance for single-family housing goals

Community Development Director Angela Schumann remarked on the nature of the workshop as a continuation from the previous Planning Commission workshop, which followed a joint Planning Commission, City Council and Economic Development Authority (EDA) workshop earlier in the year. The purpose of both was to discuss goals and objectives for single-family housing development. She said the discussion points from the March workshop captured a clearer definition and expectation of said goals for further discussion. The subsequent Planning Commission workshop in summer of 2025 yielded direction on drafting potential housing-related amendments of the Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan: Chapter 3, Land Use, Growth & Annexation.

Ms. Schumann indicated that a series of goal statements follows each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan and explained that for the Land Use chapter, a more specific housing goal is desired based on the workshop feedback. During the August 5 workshop, Planning Commission provided guidance for the following goal statement:

“Residential development will support Monticello’s vision for retaining our small-town character and will reinforce a sense of community and belonging. We will plan for measured, incremental residential growth which is thoughtfully planned and designed and which creates livable neighborhoods that retain quality and value into the future.”

Ms. Schumann stated that the prior Planning Commission workshop also resulted in feedback that the 2040 Plan should be amended to specify that the density calculation for residential designations is based on gross density. The Commission had suggested that the Low Density Residential (LDR) designation be amended to 2-4 units per gross acre. Further, the Commission suggested that the Low Density Residential context description should include language that a higher level of amenities in the individual units and/or proposed neighborhood is required to achieve the higher end of the density range.

Ms. Schumann stated that the focus of the current workshop would be identification of Future Land Use Map areas for potential re-guidance to lower density land use classifications, in alignment with the focus on developing additional single-family neighborhoods. She noted it would be important to also consider how to maintain affordable workforce housing options.

Ms. Schumann explained that the EDA has prepared housing needs and demands studies, which inform the City's housing goals and programs. An update of the study is planned for 2026. She noted the presence of Economic Development Manager Jim Thares, who would address any potential concerns pertaining to workforce and affordable housing goals. She noted that a discussion point for the upcoming study will be an evaluation of single- and multi-family residential ratios for development.

Mr. Stark spoke about the current financial aspects of the housing market, recognizing the current housing shortage. He noted that in Monticello, a number of high-density units have already been achieved. Mr. Stark spoke in favor to creating more large lot parcels for estate development.

Staff inquired what makes estate property more desirable for purposes of the map review. Commissioners indicated that generally would include fewer neighbors, more mature trees, and adjacency to wooded or wetland areas.

Ms. Schumann mentioned the cost to provide utility services in relationship to larger lots and asked the Commission how the City might implement larger lots while continuing to provide municipal sewer and water services to future-annexed parcels.

Mr. Tapper noted examples of clustering development for purposes of utility service. He then suggested they review land inventory available within the growth areas that might be attractive for estate residential.

Ms. Schumann said continued conversations with the Township will discuss how each entity may envision goals for the outlying areas of the Monticello Orderly Annexation Area (MOAA). She suggested the Planning Commission should consider areas for lower density that might see more near-term growth.

Ms. Schumann referenced two potential locations, one along Fenning Avenue near the former "Monte Club" site guided as Low Density Residential and another location near the Bertram Chain of Lakes which is guided for medium or mixed

densities. Ms. Schumann suggested the Commission consider where the trunk utilities are located and the terrain necessary for development.

Mr. Kothenbeutel referenced an area south of the Bertram Chain of Lakes, in which the suggested estate homes might fit nicely and could draw interest to similar development.

Mr. Tapper asked if gross density could factor in the amenities of the land. Ms. Schumann responded affirmatively and stated that clustering home sites would allow the development to meet the gross density required, but would result in smaller lots while preserving the amenities.

Ms. Schumann noted that the development of larger lots occurs generally at slower pace to develop and that the City would then see a slower permitting pace.

The Commission discussed how the City would implement the lower-density requirements. Ms. Schumann responded that the amendments to the 2040 Plan goal statement, the reduction in the gross density and the change in text in the 2040 Plan's Low Density Residential classification would be brought forward for decision. With those in place, developers would have a clearer understanding of what is expected for low-density residential development in Monticello.

Members discussed areas on the land use map south of Bertram, providing feedback that these areas should be estate residential. In addition to the presence of the park their proximity to the City and schools was noted. An area along 90th Street and School Boulevard was also suggested as a location for conversation from medium density to lower density residential.

Ms. Schumann referenced that conservation design is written into the 2040 Plan to allow for density while preserving desired amenities.

Mr. Tapper asked about the areas southeast of Spirit Hill in terms of their ability to be guided. Ms. Schumann noted that during the development of the 2040 Plan, these areas were outside of the 2040 Plan's 2% growth projections for housing and guided Development Reserve. However, given the conversations about wetland, wooded areas, and other natural elements which may draw interest, they may be candidates for Estate Residential designation. The Commissioners concurred.

As the workshop concluded, Mr. Schumann explained that the next session will continue discussions on land-use guidance affecting the zoning ordinance for potential amendment. Mr. Gritman will also attend to address zoning considerations related to density and lot area ratio.

2. Adjournment

By consensus, the workshop ended at 5:59 p.m.

Recorded by: Anne Mueller 

Date Approved: December 2, 2025

Attest:



Angela Schumann, Community Development Director

MINUTES
WORKSHOP MEETING – PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, August 5, 2025 – 6:00 p.m.
Academy Room, Monticello Community Center

Commissioners Present: Chair Andrew Tapper, Rick Kothenbeutel, Teri Lehner, Rob Stark
Commissioners Absent: Melissa Robeck
Council Liaison Absent: Councilmember Kip Christianson
Staff Present: Angela Schumann, Steve Grittman, Bob Ferguson, Tyler Bevier

1. Call to Order

Chair Andrew Tapper called the workshop meeting of the Monticello Planning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Discussion on Amendments to 2040 Vision + Plan and Zoning Ordinance for single-family housing goals

Community Development Director Angela Schumann presented background to the Commissioners. She referenced the joint workshop meeting in March with City Council and Economic Development Authority (EDA) members present to discuss housing goals and objectives for single-family residential development in Monticello. A key takeaway from the March workshop was that the members were satisfied with the City's R-1 standards and although the market may be moving toward smaller lots, the City generally wanted to see new residential development more in line with the R-1 standards. There was also recognition that the City still has workforce housing goals, which will require balancing the type of housing developed.

Ms. Schumann stated that the current workshop will review and discuss any potential amendments to the Monticello 2040 Vision + Plan: Chapter 3 Land Use, Growth, and Annexation, and the zoning ordinance to better define community goals and clear expectations for residential development.

Ms. Schumann outlined the memo presented to Commissioners. Mr. Schumann stated that the first topic of discussion will be the 2040 residential designations, particularly the Low-Density (LDR) designation and then defining gross versus net calculations.

Ms. Schumann referenced the goals in the Land Use, Growth, and Orderly Annexation chapter, stating those goals guide the policies and strategies incorporated into the plan. She noted that the first two goals within Land Use, Growth, and Orderly Annexation are the same and should instead be differentiated as related to the city's goals for housing. Ms. Schumann stated that the second goal is intended to relate to Complete Neighborhoods. As a first step, Ms. Schumann recommended discussion for amending this statement to reflect the summary statement that the group developed as part of the March workshop.

Ms. Schumann reviewed the summary statement from the workshop which was “Residential development will support Monticello’s vision for retaining our small-town character and reinforcing a sense of community and belonging. We will plan for measured incremental residential growth which is thoughtfully planned and which creates well-designed neighborhoods which retain their quality and value into the future.” She explained that this statement is reflective of wording in the 2040 Vision Statement, as well as the 2040 Plan’s preferred growth scenario. The goal was that neighborhoods should connect people to one another and to their community.

She inquired whether the statement is reflective of the City’s 2040 Plan goals, and what the Commission is trying to accomplish for complete neighborhoods.

Teri Lehner noted that the Complete Neighborhoods goal should be high-level. She suggested that what might be missing is the “complete neighborhoods” piece, which is not the same as what a “well-designed” neighborhood might look like. She also indicated that wording on amenities could be stronger to support a complete neighborhood.

Ms. Schumann also noted that there is a Value Statement in the 2040 Plan for a range of attainable housing options. Mr. Tapper concurred that Goals 1 and 2 have a relationship to one another but should be unique.

Ms. Schumann spoke to incorporating workforce housing goals to connect to the Plan’s Economic Development chapter goals.

Teri Lehner stated that a “complete neighborhood” should encompass all of the things the City would expect to find, such as parks and walking paths and encourage a variety of housing that retains quality and value to the development. The question is whether “well-designed” encapsulates and is broad enough for those elements to fall underneath it.

Andrew Tapper suggested that a single neighborhood may not encompass a full range of housing types, but could encompass other important “neighborhood” elements. The statement would also not specifically exclude workforce housing.

Ms. Lehner agreed, as long as the policies and strategies support that variety.

Rob Stark concurred that the goal be kept as general as possible to avoid future complications in deciphering through the Strategies and Policies.

City Planner Steve Grittman suggested capturing the notion of livability. For example, a well-designed or beautiful place may not always be livable.

Mr. Stark also noted that when considering the City as a whole, we would seek to create a variety of neighborhoods with different lot sizes and home types, and being intentional about where they are located.

Mr. Grittman also suggested that the Commission review how they would use this goal to make a decision on a land use application. Mr. Tapper responded that the statement “to retain quality and value” would be important in that evaluation.

Ms. Lehner agreed, suggesting that thoughtfully planned details matter and they all seem to be in this statement.

Ms. Schumann noted that those amenities and details speak to the quality of the neighborhood and on-going value.

Rick Kothenbuettel noted that when presented with a subdivision development, such as one of the more recent proposals, that package of housing variety and amenities could have been better when viewing it through this statement; it didn't meet what the City was looking for.

Ms. Schumann reviewed the revised summary statement based on the discussion: "Residential development will support Monticello's vision for retaining our small-town character and will reinforce a sense of community and belonging. We will plan for measured, incremental residential growth which is thoughtfully planned and designed, and creates livable neighborhoods and will retain their quality and value into the future."

Moving to the next topic of discussion, Ms. Schumann referred to the 2040 Plan's single-family designations for Low-Density Residential (LDR), which corresponds directly to the R-1 zoning classification. The interaction between the identified Plan density and lot areas in zoning ordinance is important as it relates to the type of housing the City wants to encourage. She asked Mr. Grittmann to explain how the Plan seems to address density and then move into a discussion of individualized standards.

Mr. Grittmann stated that generally with a comprehensive plan, you are looking at larger future land use areas. He explained that unplanned and open parcels are often reviewed with "gross" calculations. The difference between gross density and net density is what is excluded in the net for purposes of calculation. For example, wetland, slopes or otherwise undevelopable land, or land reserved for open space. Right of way may also be excluded. He stated that it is important to sync the density in the 2040 comp plan with the density you expect to see in zoning or subdivision. For typically single-family development, that is about 2.25 to 2.5 units per acre net density. A rough rule of thumb is that for every gross acre, the noted exclusions account for about 25% of the land in development. He stated that the 2040 Plan seems to suggest a density higher than what the R-1 zoning would allow.

Mr. Tapper asked what the zoning rules work from. Mr. Grittmann responded that the zoning should work off the density established in the Plan. Mr. Tapper questioned the consideration of density over lot sizes.

Mr. Grittmann stated that the reason density is important, is that the City wants to establish an expectation of how many units the City expects to see in a given area. Ms. Schumann stated that practically, the units per acre are also used to plan for long-term infrastructure, such as water and sewer lines or other facility upgrades. There was a brief discussion of lot area versus density, and why both are important in planning. Mr. Grittmann stated that if only lot area is used to determine how many lots could occur on a given property, it would result in an overestimation of the number of lots that can

actually be developed, because there is no factoring in of all the other items a neighborhood needs, such as roads or parks or stormwater ponds.

Ms. Schumann reiterated Mr. Grittman's point which is that cities use density to help achieve comp plan housing goals. The implementation through zoning ordinances is how you achieve that density via setbacks, lot area, etc.

Ms. Lehner stated that it would seem like the City is then not meeting its density goal. Mr. Grittman concurred, stating that the two must work together.

Ms. Schumann stated that establishing the density range is important, noting that for example in PUD the lot sizes may be flexible to accommodate conservation or preservation of a feature or range of housing, but overall the density will match the comp plan range.

Mr. Tapper stated that by establishing the density, the City is still achieving its desired low-density density for example, but may accommodate a change in the lot standards to meet other parts of the housing goal statement.

Mr. Grittman confirmed and stated that right now the 2040 Plan's LDR and R-1 zoning are not consistent. He noted that the 2040 Plan uses gross and net, depending on the designation.

Ms. Schumann inquired as to Mr. Grittman's recommendation for using gross or net calculation in the 2040 Plan. He recommended using gross density because the City does not always know what assets might be in the land, but still accommodate the range of units expected, and also recommended dialing down the density. This is because development typically wants to go to the high range.

Ms. Schumann also spoke to potential tax base implications that housing density can produce, in terms of valuations per acre and cost of infrastructure.

Mr. Grittman suggested that low-density residential is generally considered to be between 2 and 4 units per acre, which is actually what the R-1 zoning allows. The Commission generally agreed 2-4 gross units per acre seemed appropriate for the LDR.

Ms. Schumann then introduced the idea that at the March workshop, there was a discussion of only allowing the higher end of the range when the development included more neighborhood and home amenities. She referred to Hunters Crossing and Featherstone as meeting the base code standards while meeting the lower end of density, where Edmonson Ridge was more dense, but had more amenities.

Ms. Schumann cited that for example, the lot sizes specified in the R-1 zoning would result in a density of about 2.5 units per acre. So, to achieve the higher end of the density at 4 units per acre, the question would be whether to require more amenities.

Rick Kothenbeutel was in favor of requiring more amenities for higher densities, achieving more of the value and character features. Mr. Tapper noted that there could be a balance in that you may also end up with a larger home where there is lower density, but it wouldn't necessarily have as many features. For higher density you would balance that value with more features.

Ms. Schumann inquired what types of amenities the Commission would be seeking to achieve with higher amenities.

Building Official Bob Ferguson said “amenities” could include both amenities for the neighborhood as well as what might be on the individual home. Ms. Schumann stated the LDR purpose statement can include that discussion and that would be brought forward for review.

Ms. Schumann stated that given the discussion, the lot areas in the R-1 will also need adjustment. Staff will complete that calculation and bring back a recommendation.

Further discussion will proceed at a future workshop including conversations for potential reguidance to incorporate more estate residential land use.

3. Adjournment

BY CONSENSUS, THE WORKSHOP ADJOURNED AT 5:55 P.M.

Recorded By: Anne Mueller 

Date Approved: October 7, 2025

ATTEST:



Angela Schumann, Community Development Director

MINUTES
MONTICELLO CITY COUNCIL, PLANNING COMMISSION AND EDA JOINT HOUSING
WORKSHOP MINUTES

Monday, March 31, 2025 – 5 p.m.

Monticello Community Center

Present: Lloyd Hilgart, Kip Christianson, Charlotte Gabler, Tracy Hinz, and Lee Martie,
Andrew Tapper, Terri Lehner, Rick Kothenbeutel, Melissa Robeck, Steve Johnson,

Staff: Rachel Leonard, Matt Leonard, Angela Schumann, Sarah Rathlisberger, Tom
Pawelk, Tyler Bevier, Jim Thares, Jennifer Schreiber

1. Call to Order

Mayor Lloyd Hilgart called the special meeting to order at 5 p.m.

2. Housing Discussion

Angela Schumann, Community Development Director, led discussion on confirming housing priorities. In addition, she noted that staff wanted direction on the characteristic and locations for single-family neighborhood development.

Neighborhood character and location items were discussed by all. A list of items was obtained.

Neighborhood Character items noted were:

- Residential development in support of the 2040 vision, retaining small-town character and reinforcing a sense of community and belonging.
- Plan for measured and incremental residential growth in well-designed neighborhoods which retain value into the future.
- As a community with existing commercial, industrial, residential and recreational land uses of character and quality, new residential development in Monticello must meet this same standard.
- Encourage residential home sites that are consistent with R-1 zoning standards so that residents have room to grow and build equity.
- Support homes with a high-level of front façade detail, including a combination of brick or stone and other architectural elements which build neighborhood character and support the retention of individual unit value.
- Require homes that will face their community using porches, patios, landscaping and de-emphasizing garages.
- Develop neighborhoods that include a sense of community and continuity and avoid monotony and sameness.

- Smaller lots including detached or attached units may be accommodated when integrated into the overall neighborhood and exhibiting the same quality and level of building and landscaping design amenities; these areas will be in small clusters.
- Accommodate infill housing in the core of the community to create naturally occurring affordable housing, building on the character already in place with homes that include architectural detail and amenities.
- Develop opportunities for reinvestment in existing neighborhoods and homes.
- Residential neighborhoods should connect to the natural amenities around them, to their adjacent neighborhoods, and to the variety of community assets surrounding them.
- Consider solutions, opportunities, and incentives which support housing goals as described.

Neighborhood Location items discussed, and comments provided were:

Where should new housing meeting the desired goals be located and why?

- West, south and east into the MOAA as these are areas of natural amenities – including trees and water.
- Natural amenities often result in the ability to have larger, higher value and move-up homes.
- The presence of natural amenities offers more variety of landscape features which add character to neighborhoods.

What are the challenges in supporting the housing development described?

- Costs in the marketplace.
- Cost for utility and street extensions.
- Need consistency with stated goals in future decision-making.

There were other comments provided by Council and commission members. They were regarding future opportunities for large lot development in collaboration with Monticello Township.

- Think strategically about where utilities would be located/extended in the future (and those of other jurisdictions who may serve them).
- Would not be feasible directly outside the City limits as it would create barriers to infrastructure development and future growth.
- May be an opportunity to balance desired housing and lot development annexed to the City (directly adjacent) with the opportunity for larger acreage lots in the outer tier of the township.


- Be thoughtful about strategic areas for this type of growth given the other goals of the City for those areas – such as the Northwest Area where commercial and industrial growth are also planned and included the desired transportation corridors and improvements.

Ms. Schumann noted that the next steps are to Review the 2040 Plan and zoning ordinance for potential amendments in support of the items discussed.


3. Adjournment

By consensus, the meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Recorder: Jennifer Schreiber









Attest:



City Administrator

IMPLEMENTATION CHART: LAND USE, GROWTH AND ORDERLY ANNEXATION











| GOAL | POLICY | STRATEGY | SHORT-TERM | LONG-TERM | ONGOING | THEME |
|--|--|--|---|-----------|---|---|
| <p>Complete Neighborhoods</p> <p>Goal 2: A City that prioritizes growth inward by concentrating development activities within the existing city boundaries and grows or develops into the Orderly Annexation Area only when development is proposed or planned contiguous to city boundaries, sensitive open space lands are protected and thoughtfully incorporated into the development pattern, and the land is serviced by appropriate utility and transportation systems.</p> | <p>Policy 2.1: Neighborhood Diversity & Life-Cycle Housing</p> <p>Sustain a diverse array of neighborhood character and housing types throughout Monticello. These will range from estate residential to established traditional neighborhoods, to new planned subdivisions and conservation development, and neighborhoods oriented around a center or activity generator. The unique design elements that define each neighborhood should be protected and enhanced in the future including its housing stock, parks and public infrastructure.</p> | <p>Strategy 2.1.1 - Adopt zoning regulations that allow for a wider diversity of housing types, identify character defining features and encourage a center of focus for each neighborhood.</p> |  | | |  |
| | | <p>Strategy 2.1.2 - Encourage opportunities for residents to stay in Monticello, with additional options for estate residential, senior living, and other life-cycle options.</p> |  | | |  |
| | | <p>Strategy 2.1.3 - Amend zoning regulations as necessary to allow for small-lot single family homes, neo-traditional housing styles, cottage homes, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), and mansion style condos.</p> |  | | | |
| | | <p>Strategy 2.1.4 - Encourage housing options which incorporate Universal Design to promote equity in housing choice.</p> | | |  |  |
| | | <p>Strategy 2.1.5 - Consider allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs).</p> |  | | | |















Monticello's neighborhoods help define the city's form and **sense of place**. The city's neighborhoods will continue to evolve in the years ahead. In areas where the basic development pattern is already established continued reinvestment in the housing stock and infrastructure is encouraged with an emphasis on sustainable design in terms of private property improvement and investment, as well as capital improvements. In the outlying areas of the city where the development pattern is still evolving, new neighborhoods will be safe, healthy, attractive with a diverse population and housing stock. The planning objective for all Monticello residential areas is to make each neighborhood "complete" — with a variety of housing choices, proximity to neighborhood- scaled commercial services, community services, and neighborhood parks that serve as an identifiable center and gathering place for its neighbors and future residents.

MONTICELLO 2040 COMPLETE NEIGHBORHOODS EXCERPT - CHAPTER 3

IMPLEMENTATION CHART: LAND USE, GROWTH AND ORDERLY ANNEXATION

| GOAL | POLICY | STRATEGY | SHORT-TERM | LONG-TERM | ONGOING | THEME |
|--|--|--|---|-----------|---|--|
| <p>Goal 2: Complete Neighborhoods</p> | <p>Policy 2.7: Locations for Higher Density Housing Generally, locate new higher density housing and mixed-use development in proximity to Downtown where there is good access to parks and open space, proximity to local-serving commercial uses, and proximity to the transportation network. Consider impacts to over concentration of multi-family uses in specific locations. Conversely, the City should discourage the use of vacant sites with these attributes for new low employee intensity or low value land uses.</p> | <p>Strategy 2.7.1 - Amend the Zoning Map to be consistent with the Future Land Use Map and identify areas where mixed-density residential uses are appropriate.</p> |  | | |  |
| <p>Goal 2: Complete Neighborhoods</p> | <p>Policy 2.8: Equitable Planning Ensure that no single neighborhood or population group is disproportionately impacted by flooding or environmental burdens, city services, incompatible uses, neighborhood constraints or potential hazards.</p> | | | |  |   |
| <p>Goal 2: Complete Neighborhoods</p> | <p>Policy 2.9 - Neighborhood Design Support the development of neighborhoods with a strong set of amenities which enhance quality of life, retain residents and support continued investment.</p> | <p>Strategy 2.9.1 - Integrate open space, parks, street trees, landscaping, and natural features into Monticello's neighborhoods to enhance their visual quality, create inviting and safe spaces, and improve access to nature and recreation.</p> | | |  |   |
| | | <p>Strategy 2.9.2 - Create and maintain a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay zoning district to identify areas that should be developed in a manner consistent with conservation style development.</p> |  | | |  |

IMPLEMENTATION CHART: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

| GOAL | POLICY | STRATEGY | SHORT-TERM | LONG-TERM | ONGOING | THEME |
|---|--|---|---|-----------|---|---|
| <p>Goal 4: Redevelopment & Reinvestment</p> | <p>Policy 4.2: Revitalization</p> <p>Support revitalization efforts for publicly owned properties and other opportunity sites throughout the community.</p> | <p>Strategy 4.2.1 - Evaluate any development related processes or fees which could be modified to support or encourage reinvestment in targeted areas.</p> | | |  |  |
| | | <p>Strategy 4.2.2 - Research and develop reinvestment programs for targeted housing areas and other sites throughout the community for long-term investment.</p> |  | | | |
| | | <p>Strategy 4.2.3 - Use strategies identified in the Community Character, Design and the Arts Chapter in revitalization projects.</p> | | |  |  |
| <p>Life-Cycle Housing</p> <p>Goal 5: Goal 5 - Monticello will be a community with a wide variety of housing options that includes workforce, starter, step up, and senior housing to allow for new and existing residents to remain and age in the community.</p> | <p>Policy 5.1: Housing to Support Employment</p> <p>Actively promote and seek opportunities for the development of a wide variety of housing types, styles and price points as a mechanism to support and attract employment.</p> | <p>Strategy 5.1.1 - Continue to market workforce housing development on EDA-owned land along East 4th Street and Outlot A of Country Club Manor, or at other suitable sites in the City, including the Downtown.</p> | | |  | |
| | | <p>Strategy 5.1.2 - Maintain and update annually property availability maps for residential housing sites as identified in the 2020 Housing Report.</p> | | |  | |
| | | <p>Strategy 5.1.3 - Support efforts by private and non-profit entities to develop affordable housing projects utilizing state and federal programs based on housing supply and demand data.</p> | | |  |  |
| | | <p>Strategy 5.1.4 - Examine use and application of available housing TIF dollars per the 2016 TIF Management Plan and the adopted Policy Statements for Available TIF Funds.</p> | | |  | |
| | | <p>Strategy 5.1.5 - Complete updates to the 2020 Housing Study and regular and appropriate intervals.</p> | | |  | |
| | | <p>Strategy 5.1.6 - Continue to periodically examine housing stock for aging or blighted properties and research development of programs for redevelopment and/or revitalization of existing housing.</p> | | |  | |

§ 153.043 RESIDENTIAL BASE ZONING DISTRICTS.

(A) *General purpose.* The residential base zoning districts established in this section are intended to provide a variety of housing options in a comfortable, healthy, safe, and pleasant environment in which to live and recreate at a neighborhood level. More specifically, they are intended to:

- (1) Promote strong residential neighborhoods with a sense of connection to the community;
- (2) Foster citizen involvement in the community, interaction between neighbors and neighborhood oriented support systems;
- (3) Provide a range of housing choices and affordability through varying housing densities, types and designs including accessory dwelling units;
- (4) Seek quality over quantity in new residential growth;
- (5) Maintain a connection to the natural environment by incorporation of natural characteristics into the development setting.

(B) *Standards applicable to all residential base zoning districts.*

(1) *Zero side lot line development.* Residential unit lots containing duplexes or townhouses may be subdivided along the common wall in a "zero lot line" arrangement, provided:

- (a) The combined area of the base lot and individual unit lots contains the required amount of lot area per unit as prescribed elsewhere in this chapter;
- (b) Unit lots shall meet all required setbacks from the boundaries of the base lot;
- (c) Any shared wall facing on a zero side lot line is a structural wall capable of providing protection from fire, noise and visual encroachment.

(2) *Condominiums.* Residential lots of non-single-family structures may be divided for the purpose of condominium ownership provided that:

- (a) The principal structure containing the housing units shall meet the setback distances of the applicable zoning district.
- (b) Each condominium unit shall have the minimum lot area for the type of housing unit and usable open space as specified in the area and building size regulations of this chapter.
- (c) Condominiums shall be designed to meet the International Building Code as adopted in the Monticello City Code.



(C) *Agricultural Open Space District (A-O).* The purpose of the "A-O" Agricultural-Open Space District is to provide suitable areas of the city for the retention and utilization of open space and/or agricultural uses, prevent scattered non-farm uses from developing improperly, and to secure economy in government expenditures for public utilities and service.

- (1) *Lot area* minimum: two acres.
- (2) *Lot width* minimum: 200 feet.

Typical A-O Lot Configuration




TABLE 3-3: A-O DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| | <i>Required Yards (in feet)</i> | | | | <i>Max Height (stories/ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Building Width (ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Roof Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/horizontal run)</i> |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <i>Front</i> | <i>Interior Side</i> | <i>Street Side</i> | <i>Rear</i> | | | | |
| Principal Structures | 50 | 30 | 30 | 50 | NA | 1000 | 20 | NA |
| Accessory Structures | [1] | 6 | 30 | 6 | 15 | NA | NA | NA |

[1]: Accessory structures shall not be located beyond the front building line established by the principal structure.

- 1: Agricultural production is permitted
- 2: Agricultural Buildings are permitted
- 3: 50 foot rear yard setback
- 4: Stable is a permitted use
- 5: Minimum lot size of 2 acres



- 6: 30 foot side yard setback
- 7: 50 foot front yard setback

(D) *Residential Amenities District (R-A)*. The purpose of the "R-A" Residential Amenities District is to provide move up housing in the form of low density, single-family, detached residential dwelling units and directly related complementary uses in areas of high natural residential amenities including such conditions as woodlands, wetlands, and significant views.

- (1) Base lot area.
 - (a) Minimum: 14,000 sq. ft.
 - (b) Average: 16,000 sq. ft. (at least 40% of lots created through subdivision shall exceed 15,000 sq. ft. in size).
- (2) Base lot width.
 - (a) Minimum: 90 ft.
 - (b) Average: 100 ft. (at least 40% of lots created through subdivision shall exceed 100 ft. in width).

Typical R-A Lot Configuration



TABLE 3-4: R-A DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| | Required Yards (in feet) | | | | Max Height (stories/f t.) | Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.) | Minimum Building Width (ft.) | Minimum Roof Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/horizon tal run) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| | Front | Interior Side | Street Side | Rear | | | | |
| Single- Family Building | 35 | 10 [1] | 20 | 30 [2] | 2.5 stories 35 feet | Minimum foundation sizes by home type [3] 2000 finishable [4] | 24 | 6 in./12 in. no minimum soffit [5] |

[1]: For interior lots in R-1 and R-A districts, attached accessory uses shall be setback no less than 6 feet from the side yard property line, provided that the sum of both side yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 20 feet.

[2]: The required rear yard shall consist of a space at least 30-feet in depth across the entire width of the lot that is exclusive of wetlands, ponds, or slopes greater than 12%.

[3]: 2,400 square foot gross floor area excluding a basement or cellar for two story homes and a 1,600 square foot foundation for multi-level, rambler and split entry homes.

[4]: Finishable square footage is exclusive of required attached garage floor area.

[5]: Roof gables, shed roofs, dormers and porch roofs to allow for a lower pitch to incorporate as an architectural feature, provided no such exempted roof areas shall comprise any more than 20% of the total horizontal roof area of a single-family structure as measured from a bird's-eye plan view.

| | |
|--|--|
| Accessory Structures and Uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An attached garage shall be included with all principal residential structures in the R-A district. - See § 153.092(B) for all general standards and limitations on accessory structures. - The minimum floor area for the required attached garage shall be 700 sq. ft. - No portion of any garage space may be more than five feet closer to the street than the front building line of the principal use (including porch). - See footnote [1] above as related to setbacks for attached accessory uses on interior lots. |
| Other Regulations to Consult (not all inclusive) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - § 153.042, Common District Requirements - § 153.043(B), Standards Applicable to All Residential Base Zoning Districts - § 153.070, Building Materials - § 153.067, Off-Street Parking - § 153.060, Landscaping and Screening Standards |

1: 14,000 SF minimum lot size

2: Detached accessory structure meeting the side street setback (20') and rear yard setback (6')

3: Base density of 2.7 units per acre with lots averaging 16,000 SF in size


4: Single Family home meeting front yard setback (35') with appurtenance (porch) not extending more than 6' into the setback

5: 10 foot interior side yard setbacks

6: 30 foot rear yard primary structure setback

7: 35 foot front yard setback

8: 10 foot side yard setback



(E) *Single-Family Residential District (R- 1)*. The purpose of the "R- 1" Single-Family Residential District is to provide for low density, single-family, detached residential dwelling units and directly related complementary uses.

(1) Base lot area.

(a) Minimum: 10,000 sq. ft.

(b) Average: 12,000 sq. ft. (at least 40% of lots created through subdivision shall exceed 12,000 sq. ft. in size).

(2) Base lot width.

(a) Minimum: 70 ft.


(b) Average: 80 ft. (at least 40% of lots created through subdivision shall exceed 80 ft. in width).

Typical R-1 Lot Configuration



TABLE 3-5: R-1 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| | <i>Required Yards (in feet)</i> | | | | <i>Max Height (stories/ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Building Width (ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Roof Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/horizontal run)</i> |
|--|---|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <i>Front</i> | <i>Interior Side</i> | <i>Street Side</i> | <i>Rear</i> | | | | |
| Single- Family Building | 30 | 10 [1] and [2] | 20 | 30 | 2.5 stories 35 feet | 1,050 foundation/ 2,000 finishable [4] | 24 | 5 in./12 in. no minimum soffit [5] |
| | <p>[1]: For interior lots in R-1 and R-A districts, attached accessory uses shall be setback no less than 6 feet from the side yard property line, provided that the sum of both side yard setbacks shall be a minimum of 20 feet.</p> <p>[2]: Interior side yard setbacks for single-family homes on lots of record with a lot width 66 feet or less in the Original Plat of Monticello and Lower Monticello shall be at least six feet.</p> <p>[3]: The required rear yard shall consist of a space at least 30-feet in depth across the entire width of the lot that is exclusive of wetlands, ponds, or slopes greater than 12%.</p> <p>[4]: Finishable square footage is exclusive of required attached garage floor area.</p> <p>[5]: Roof gables, shed roofs, dormers and porch roofs to allow for a lower pitch to incorporate as an architectural feature, provided no such exempted roof areas shall comprise any more than 20% of the total horizontal roof area of a single-family structure as measured from a bird's-eye plan view.</p> | | | | | | | |
| Accessory Structures and Uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An attached garage shall be included with all principal residential structures in the R-1 district. - See § 153.092(B) for all general standards and limitations on accessory structures. - The minimum floor area for the required attached garage shall be 550 sq. ft. - See footnote [1] above as related to setbacks for attached accessory uses on interior lots. | | | | | | | |
| Other Regulations to Consult (not all inclusive) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - § 153.042, Common District Requirements - § 153.043(B), Standards Applicable to All Residential Base Zoning Districts - § 153.070, Building Materials - § 153.067, Off-Street Parking - § 153.060, Landscaping and Screening Standards | | | | | | | |



(F) *Single and Two-Family Residential District (R-2)*. The purpose of the "R-2" Single and Two-Family Residential District is to provide for low to moderate density one and two unit dwellings and directly related complementary uses.

(1) *Base density.*

| Unit Type | Minimum Lot Area/Unit |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Single-family | 10,000 sq. ft. |
| Duplex/two-family | 7,000 sq. ft. |
| Townhome* | 7,000 sq. ft. |
| Multi-family (3-4 units)* | 5,500 sq. ft. |

*By conditional use permit only. See also multi-family dwelling unit standards.

(3) *Minimum lot width.*

| | R-2 District | Original Plat |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Lot Width | 80 ft. | 66 ft. |

Typical R-2 Lot Configuration



TABLE 3-6: R-2 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| Required Yards (in feet) | Max Height | Minimum Floor Area | Minimum Finished Floor | Minimum Building Width | Minimum Pitch & Soffit |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | <i>Front</i> | <i>Interior Side</i> | <i>Street Side</i> | <i>Rear</i> | <i>(stories / ft.)</i> | <i>(sq. ft.)</i> | <i>Area (sq. ft.)</i> [3] | <i>(ft.)</i> | <i>(vertical rise/ horizontal run)</i> |
|--|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--|

TABLE 3-6: R-2 DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| | <i>Required Yards (in feet)</i> | | | | <i>Max Height (stories / ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Finished Floor Area (sq. ft.)</i> [3] | <i>Minimum Building Width (ft.)</i> | <i>Minimum Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/ horizontal run)</i> |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <i>Front</i> | <i>Interior Side</i> | <i>Street Side</i> | <i>Rear</i> | | | | | |
| Single- Family | 30 | 10 [1] and [2] | 20 | 30 | 2.5 stories 35 feet | 1,050 foundation / 1,800 finishable [3] | Minimum finished square footage must be equivalent to the principal use unit foundation size | 24 | 5 in./12 in. no minimum soffit [4] |
| Duplex | 30 | 10 [2] | 20 | 30 | 2.5 stories 35 feet | 1,050 foundation | | 24 | |
| Townhouse Multi- family Building | 30 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 2.5 stories 35 feet | 1,400 finishable | | 24 | |

[1]: For the Original Plat of Monticello and Lower Monticello, where adjacent structures (excluding accessory buildings within same block) have front yard setbacks different from those required, the front yard minimum setback shall be the average of the adjacent structures. If there is only one adjacent structure, the front yard minimum setback shall be the average of the required setback and the setback of the adjacent structure.

[2]: Interior side yard setbacks for single-family homes on lots of record with a lot width 66 feet or less in the Original Plat of Monticello and Lower Monticello shall be at least six feet.

[3]: Finishable and finished square footage is exclusive of required attached garage floor area


[4]: Roof gables, shed roofs, dormers and porch roofs to allow for a lower pitch to incorporate as an architectural feature, provided no such exempted roof areas shall comprise any more than 20% of the total horizontal roof area of a structure as measured from a bird's eye plan view.

Accessory Structures and Uses

- An attached garage shall be included with all principal residential structures in the R-1 district.
- See § 153.092(B) for all general standards and limitations on accessory structures.
- The minimum floor area for all required attached garages shall be 450 sq. ft.
- No portion of any attached garage may be more than 10 feet closer to the street than the principal structure.
- Except for single-family buildings, any driveway leading directly to an attached garage may not exceed 18" in width at the front yard property line.

Other Regulations to Consult (not all inclusive)

- § 153.042, Common District Requirements
- § 153.043(B), Standards Applicable to All Residential Base Zoning Districts
- § 153.070, Building Materials
- § 153.067, Off-Street Parking
- § 153.060, Landscaping and Screening Standards



(G) *Traditional Neighborhood Residential District (T- N)*. The purpose of the "T-N" Traditional Neighborhood Residential District is to provide for medium density, single-family, detached residential dwelling units and directly related

complementary uses.

- (1) Minimum lot area: 5,500 sq. ft.
- (2) Minimum lot width: 55 ft.
- (3) Minimum lot depth: 100 ft.

Typical T-N Lot Configuration



TABLE 3-7: T-N DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

| TABLE 3-7: T-N DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|-------------|--------|--------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| | Required Yards (in feet) | | | | Max Height (stories/ft.) | Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.) | Minimum Building Width (ft.) | Minimum Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/horizontal run) |
| | Front [1] | Interior Side | Street Side | Rear | | | | |
| TABLE 3-7: T-N DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS | | | | | | | | |
| | Required Yards (in feet) | | | | Max Height (stories/ft.) | Minimum Floor Area (sq. ft.) | Minimum Building Width (ft.) | Minimum Pitch & Soffit (vertical rise/horizontal run) |
| | Front [1] | Interior Side | Street Side | Rear | | | | |
| Single-Family Building | 25[1] | 10 | 20 | 30 [2] | 2.5 stories 35 feet | 1,050 foundation/ 2,000 finishable [2] | 24 | 5 in./12 in. no minimum soffit [5] |
| | <p>[1]: The minimum width of the dimension of the principal building living area across the front building line shall be no less than 12 ft., which may include a usable porch of at least 6 ft. in depth. The maximum building line of the attached garage may be no more than 20 ft. across the front building line.</p> <p>[2]: Finishable square footage is exclusive of required attached accessory space garage floor area.</p> | | | | | | | |
| Accessory Structures and Uses | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An attached garage shall be included with all principal residential structures in the T-N district. - See § 153.092(B) for all general standards and limitations on accessory structures. - The minimum floor area for the required attached garage shall be 480 sq. ft. - For front-loaded attached garages, no portion of any garage space may be more than five feet closer to the street than the front building line of the principal use (including porch). - No private driveway leading to an accessory structure may exceed 24 ft. in width at the front yard property line. Driveways shall be offset and separated to maximize on-street parking capacity. | | | | | | | |
| Other Regulations to Consult (not all inclusive) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - § 153.042, Common District Requirements - § 153.043(B), Standards Applicable to All Residential Base Zoning Districts - § 153.070, Building Materials - § 153.067, Off-Street Parking - § 153.060, Landscaping and Screening Standards | | | | | | | |

§ 153.070 BUILDING MATERIALS.

(A) *Purpose.* The purpose of these regulations is to enhance the quality and longevity of buildings in all zoning districts of the city, and to protect citizen investments in property value by ensuring complementary building style, construction, and appearance.

(B) *General requirements.*

(1) *Consistency required.* In all districts, all buildings shall be finished on all sides with consistent architectural quality, materials, and design.

(2) *New materials.* In recognition of the ever-changing marketplace for new finishing materials, the Community Development Department may authorize the use of materials not listed herein if it is determined that such a material is substantially similar or superior to one or more of the approved building materials.

(C) *Residential district requirements.*

(1) *All residence districts.* No metal siding shall be permitted wider than 12 inches or without a one-half inch or more overlap and relief.

(2) *R-1 and R-2 Districts.* A minimum of 15% of the front building façade of any structure in the R-1 or R-2 Districts, less the square footage area of windows and garage doors, shall be covered with brick or stone. Any attached or major detached accessory building that can be seen from the street shall meet this same standard when consistent with the principal structure. Structures with front facades covered by at least 70% stucco or real wood may reduce the brick or stone coverage to 5%. The Planning Commission may approve optional facade treatments prior to building permit through site plan review when additional architectural detailing so warrants. Such detailing may include usable front porches, extraordinary roof pitch or other features.

(3) *R-A and T-N Districts.* A minimum of 20% of the front building façade of any structure in the R-A or T-N zoning district, less the square footage area of windows and garage doors, shall be covered with brick or stone. Any attached or major detached accessory building that can be seen from the street shall meet this same standard when consistent with the principal structure. Structures with front facades covered by at least 70% stucco or real wood may reduce the brick or stone coverage to 10%.

(4) *R-3 District and other districts with multiple-family housing.* The R-3 and R-4 District and other districts with multiple-family housing shall be subject to building material standards as follows:

(a) All building walls facing a public street shall be covered with stone, brick, cultured masonry simulating brick or stone, or other enhanced materials to an extent not less than 20% of the exposed wall silhouette area; and

(b) Multiple-family structures of 13 or more units shall, when using lap horizontal siding, be constructed of heavy gauge steel or cement-board, with no use of vinyl or aluminum permitted. Natural wood or species that is resistant to decay may be permitted.

(5) *Roofing materials.* Roofing materials in residential districts, including for principal and accessory buildings, shall consist of shingles made of asphalt, fiberglass, durable rot-resistant wood (such as cedar), stone (such as slate) or architectural metal (including steel and copper). Heavy gauge steel or copper may be used for standing-seam roofing. Steel may be used only when designed to resemble traditional residential architectural roofing materials.

(D) *Business district requirements.* In all Business Zoning Districts (see table 3-1), the following building materials standards shall apply.

(1) No galvanized or unfinished steel, galvalum, or unfinished aluminum buildings, except those specifically designed to have a corrosive designed finish such as "corten" steel, shall be permitted in the districts listed herein.

(2) Buildings in these zoning districts shall maintain a high standard of architectural and aesthetic compatibility with conforming surrounding properties to ensure that they will not adversely impact the property values of the abutting properties and shall have a positive impact on the public health, safety, and general welfare, insofar as practicable.

(3) Exterior building finishes in the districts subject to this section shall consist of materials compatible in grade and quality to the following:

(a) Brick.

(b) Natural stone.

(c) Decorative rock face or concrete block.

(d) Cast-in-place concrete or pre-cast concrete panels.

(e) Wood, provided that the surfaces are finished for exterior use and wood of proven exterior durability is used, such as cedar, redwood, or cypress.

(f) Glass.

(g) Exterior insulated finish systems, where said system is manufactured to replicate the look of one of the approved building materials in this section.