Meeting Minutes City Council Neighborhoods Subcommittee Meeting

August 21, 2023 | 3:00 p.m. City Hall 5th Floor Large Conference Room 175 S. Arizona Ave., Chandler, AZ



Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Subcommittee Attendance

Vice Mayor Matt Orlando Councilmember Angel Encinas Councilmember Jane Poston

Staff Attendance

Priscilla Quintana Vivianna Barrientes Kimberly Moon Tera Scherer Kevin Mayo Mickey Ohland John Sefton Micah Miranda Leah Powell John Knudson Andy Bass Dawn Lang David De La Torre

Discussion

1. Galveston Area Projects

PRISCILLA QUINTANA, Neighborhood Preservation Program Manager, introduced the item and presented on the Galveston Area Projects.

MS. QUINTANA described how the projects will align with Chandler City Council's Strategic Framework. The area referred to as "Galveston" encompasses 10 neighborhoods in the area north of Chandler Boulevard to Ray Road and Arizona Avenue to McQueen Road with over 1,800 traditional homes, as well as apartment and mobile home communities.

MS. QUINTANA presented the project scope, timeline and funding that will be completed in two phases: phase one includes improvements to stormwater and water and sewer lines; phase two

will include park and streetscape improvements to the area surrounding Gazelle Meadows Park with estimated completion in spring of 2024.

MS. QUINTANA spoke of the public outreach that began in 2018 with the hope of learning more from the residents about their neighborhoods. In 2021, this became known as Envision Galveston with several organized events each year to empower residents to improve their neighborhoods, the quality of life for residents and develop positive relationships with the city. The plan is to continue this initiative for 10 years to build trust, identify partnerships, and bridge needs within the community.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked what top three needs were identified for this neighborhood.

MS. QUINTANA responded the residents identified a desire for park improvements, flooding has been an ongoing issue with several homes impacted during monsoons, and the third is their identity and to not always be recognized as Galveston, but rather the many neighborhoods in the area.

Further, Ms. Quintana stated there have been requests outside of what the city can provide such as assisting the community's non-profit organizations. She also stated education and information was provided to residents on available grant funding many homeowners may be eligible for. Ms. Quintana then described the recent events held in the Galveston area.

VIVIANNA BARRIENTES presented the water, sewer and storm drain improvements in the Detroit Basin and Gazelle Meadows Park area. Engineering and modeling were completed this past spring, with construction on improvements beginning in the fall.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if this area is in a floodplain.

MS. BARRIENTES stated that it is.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if residents will be notified that they may be eligible for insurance discounts upon completion of the project.

MS. BARRIENTES stated the Letter of Map Revision (LOMR, a request to officially revise the current FEMA flood zone map) was submitted but is still under review. Ms. Barrientes showed subcommittee members the updated floodplain map that will remove about 70 percent of the structures from the current flood zone.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO thanked Ms. Barrientes for her expediency in preparing this information for the residents.

MS. BARRIENTES presented the subcommittee members the existing conditions of traffic circulation, on-street parking, and encroachment along Erie Street from Arizona Avenue to Hamilton Street. Staff worked with the contractor to make the listed improvement recommendations.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if street parking will still be allowed on Erie Street.

MS. BARRIENTES confirmed parking will still be allowed, however, no additional parking can be added and will instead be provided within the park.

MICKEY OHLAND provided an overview of Gazelle Meadows Park improvements planned. Gazelle Meadows, Armstrong, and Pima parks are the recreation areas within the square mile of the residents of the Galveston area neighborhood. Gazelle Meadows Park is under 9 acres in size and was originally designed as a retention basin in 1985 and then additional park amenities were added in 1992. In 2016, a fence was installed between the Union Pacific Railroad and the park, the addition of LED lights and some ADA needs were also addressed at that time, with the last improvement to this park in 2017-2018 when a new playground element was installed.

MR. OHLAND explained that staff provided residents with four different touch points to gather input on amenities they would like. He continued the presentation with the conceptual design that incorporates the identified improvements and additions. Included is an added shaded picnic area, swings to enlarge the play area, and a skate plaza, which will not be a full skate park, but rather a smaller area. The team plans to work with administration and students at Galveston Elementary School to incorporate some educational elements. Additional planned amenities include a lighted basketball court, and a 20-space parking area. The current walking paths will be reviewed for ADA compliance.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked about the size of trees and shrubbery planned for this project.

MR. OHLAND replied that on a new park project the standard is 24" box trees and on park remodels the norm is 24" or 36" box trees. He further stated that it is dependent on the budget for the project and hopes to be able to install larger trees to create instant shade.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS stated that at the community meeting it had been discussed to explore a loading/unloading area and wondered if it had been considered. This would be beneficial for sports teams for their equipment or for those that may be hosting a birthday and bringing a lot of party supplies, for example, rather than hauling it across the park.

MR. OHLAND responded that a loading or unloading zone would have to be marked as such with striping. He further stated that the reason for the parking area location was so it was used more by park users, versus overnight resident parking. He said they will explore this option further.

MR. OHLAND continued the presentation, stating the project is expected to be completed in fall 2024. Feedback from residents has been positive.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if the parking lot will be lighted.

MR. OHLAND responded affirmatively.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if more lighting was needed.

MR. OHLAND stated they will look into improved lighting along railroad tracks as a deterrent.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked where the decorative fencing was being installed.

MR. OHLAND stated they are working with the Arts Commission and Peter Bugg. Further, they would like to consider incorporating the decorative fencing elements with the park signage at Erie and Exeter streets on the southeast corner.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked to verify that it is a decorative element, not actual fencing along the perimeter.

MR. OHLAND confirmed this.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if the shaded area with benches is just along Erie.

MR. OHLAND confirmed that the shading and benches will be along the right-of-way area.

MS. QUINTANA added that this area leads into three schools and the students primarily walk down Erie Street, so it was important for that area to be shaded.

2. City Code Amendments

LAUREN SCHUMANN, Principal Planner, introduced the item and stated the intent of the meeting is to identify code and policy issues, introduce amendment options and seek input from the committee. Ms. Schumann further stated the Planning team worked together to identify areas of concern and research practices and policies from surrounding municipalities in the valley in an effort to make positive changes for the residents of Chandler.

The first potential code amendment is to permit single-family in multi-family districts. Currently, if an existing property is located within an area zoned for multi-family properties, a Use Permit is required to rebuild.

There are 675 properties identified that have a multi-family zoning, most of which are single-family homes today. These older homes may be in need of renovations and with the current zoning, those updates cannot happen without first applying for a Use Permit or rezoning.

MS. SCHUMANN stated they would like to propose that the City permit single-family dwellings by right within certain multi-family zoned properties. This would be limited to lots of 12,000 square feet or smaller.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO inquired about cases where properties are zoned single-family but requesting multi-family zoning.

KEVIN MAYO, Planning Administrator, stated there have been a few cases where they wanted to take one unit and make it into a multi-family unit. In those cases, those rights are still preserved, they currently would not be able to re-build a single-family home on the property. More often it is a developer wanting single-family homes but is unable due to zoning. Mr. Mayo stated that this is the problem they are trying to rectify with this amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN stated that with this potential code amendment many of the homes within the area would then be preserved, as they'd be protected by zoning codes and would not be required to build two or three units in order to comply with current zoning.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if they would still be able to build multi-family units on these lots.

MS. SCHUMANN confirmed, but this code amendment is also granting them the ability to build one single-family home by right.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS clarified that this is allowing current homeowners to build single-family homes, but it is not changing their right to build multi-family units.

MR. MAYO confirmed that this is correct, they won't have to go through zoning process in the event there was a fire, for example, as they would not be permitted to build a single family home the way the zoning is now.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked about the boundaries for this area of discussion.

MS. SCHUMANN referenced slide 5 of the presentation, stating the area is Pecos to Galveston, then McQueen to Alma School, but only properties indicated in yellow, which is approximately 645 homes.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO stated the subcommittee members are in agreement with staff on this recommendation.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the next proposed code amendment that relates to front yard driveways, with current code requiring off-street parking be connected, including additional driveways to access rear yards, and gave the example of RV gates. The current code requires that all driveways must connect, resulting in removing landscaping.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if this has been an issue with homeowners that are remodeling or updating their landscaping, or if it was a matter of not wanting to pour concrete.

MS. SCHUMANN stated that this issue is quite common for planners when residents come in to inquire. She further stated that many people want to pave in front of RV gates so they can safely and easily get their trailers in and out of their storage areas.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked why this code was written this way.

MR. MAYO agreed that this one is quite old and that it goes back a long while and does not have those details.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS referenced the presentation (slide 7) and verified that the bottom photo does not meet current code requirements but wonders if there will be an issue with code enforcement with those residents then parking on unimproved surfaces.

MR. MAYO stated the code still requires they pave from the street to their RV gate if they plan to drive and park in the area in front of the gate.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO and COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked to verify the top photo is compliant, but the bottom photo (slide 7 of presentation) is not compliant.

MR. MAYO stated that was correct, and why they are proposing to eliminate the requirement for the areas to be connected.

The subcommittee members agree with the proposed change as presented.

MS. SCHUMANN presented the next proposed code amendment pertaining to accessory dwelling units within single-family districts, stating that the current code requires single-family properties allow for guest quarters with no cooking unit and cannot be connected to a separate meter. Ms. Schumann stated they are proposing that permit accessory dwellings be allowed by right within single-family zoned properties meeting requirements for accessory buildings, setbacks, height and architecture that must match the house. These buildings would be considered the allotted

one accessory building per property and must also require one uncovered off-street parking space.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked what the setback requirements are.

MS. SCHUMANN repeated that setbacks must meet requirements outlined in zoning, usually five feet on the side and ten feet at the rear of the property with a maximum height of 15 feet to the top of the structure or mid-point of a pitched or sloped roof.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if that is the same requirement for ramadas.

MS. SCHUMANN responded that those are normally ten feet, but there are some exceptions.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if there was any way we could reconsider the setback requirement to ten feet to provide more distance for the neighbor.

MR. MAYO stated that may be difficult to do, as each setback is already laid out in each PAD (planned area development) and each neighborhood has its own requirements.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO requested staff look into the setbacks, as he does not want residents upset over this, but ultimately, he has no problem with the addition of a stove.

COUNCILMEMBER EINCINAS asked if we would be allowing additional meters or if the electrical will be tied into the existing meter.

MR. MAYO responded that it would still pass through the primary power supply but there could be a subpanel added.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if these ADUs could then be used as rentals.

MR. MAYO stated that that could happen, and short-term rental laws will hinder our ability to govern that.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the next proposed amendment relating to Home-Based Businesses and an overview of what is currently allowed. The proposal today is to permit personal services such as consulting or therapy with only one employee or one customer at a time, within defined operating hours and without displacing required garage spaces. The activity cannot generate traffic that would alter the character of the neighborhood.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS inquired whether signage will be allowed and if inventory storage would be increased.

MS. SCHUMANN responded that those policies would not change.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked how this policy is managed and if it would change in the future.

MR. MAYO replied that we are unable to enter residences and this policy relies heavily on third-party reporting.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked how the permitting process works for home-based businesses.

MR. MAYO stated that there used to be a home-based business permitting service within the Planning division and then the resident would have to go to Tax & Licensing to file a business registration. They have since combined that and the application process is available online. Tax and Licensing manages that process.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked what happens if a resident is found to be non-compliant.

MR. MAYO stated they seek compliance versus enforcement of these issues, but if an agreement cannot be reached a zoning violation would be issued.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if dog groomers would be considered with this amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN responded that dog grooming businesses would not be permitted due to the sounds that might be generated from that type of business as well as the number of dogs allowed on-site.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if swimming lessons are allowed.

MS. SCHUMANN responded swimming lessons are not permitted by right, as more than one person would be in attendance at one time, but homeowner could go through the Use Permit process to seek approval.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked how many home-based businesses are licensed in the city.

MR. MAYO stated there are many permitted businesses but is not sure how many are operating without proper approval, such as piano teachers.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if there would be a comprehensive list of allowable businesses available.

MR. MAYO responded that they would make this information available.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked how we can help in mitigating swim lessons through permitting so this service can be made available as a safety against drowning. He suggested the allowance of only one or two children at a time as he would not want to shut down qualified individuals from offering this type of service.

MR. MAYO stated they were unable to draft language specific to swim lessons that then could not be applied to other home-based businesses.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON agreed with this and stated there is nothing stopping these swim teachers from hosting lessons at others' homes with ten students, as there is nothing in place from keeping those instructors from going outside their own backyard.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if there have been many applications for swim lessons.

MR. MAYO agreed that there are not a lot.

MS. SCHUMMAN continued the presentation with the next code amendment to reduce setbacks for residential swimming pools from five feet as measured from the property line and align with building code requirements of three feet from any horizontal plane.

MR. MAYO stated that the current setback requirements used to align with building code, which was five feet at the time, but has since updated to three feet.

A very brief discussion was held among subcommittee members that indicated agreement with the proposed update.

MS. SCHUMMAN went on to the next recommended amendment update to increase the size of residential open air ramadas, as there is no limit to the number of ramadas a resident can install as long as they are under 150 square feet and ten feet in height with a one-foot separation between units. The recommendation is to eliminate the maximum square footage of an open air ramada, as long as residents abide by a five-foot setback from property lines and a maximum height of ten feet to the top of the structure. Additionally, all ramadas cannot exceed 30% of rear yard area and structures must be open on all sides except one wall of up to seven feet in height.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked how many complaints are received.

MR. MAYO responded that it is not common for them to receive complaints from neighbors, as most complaints are from residents about the process for approval to build a structure.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked why 30% of the backyard is specified.

MS. SCHUMANN stated accessory buildings cannot exceed 30% so they would align this amendment with that rule.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if each of the structures shown could have a wall (referring to example on slide 13).

MS. SCHUMANN responded that each structure could have one seven-foot wall. She further stated that primarily the walls are used to hang an outdoor TV or to complete a backyard kitchen area, as examples.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked for clarification on how 30% of the backyard is calculated.

MS. SCHUMANN explained a line would be drawn across the back of the home and calculated from that plane.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS stated he does not have any issues with that and is glad there is still the five-foot setback.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked staff to look at a ten-foot set back.

MS. SCHUMANN stated that code currently allows for structures with a five-foot setback so all the existing open air ramadas would be considered non-conforming.

With this additional information the subcommittee members were in agreement with this proposed amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation on buildings constructed of shipping containers and that current zoning code does not address this trend other than metal buildings cannot be used along arterial roads. She further stated the planning department has received an increase in the number of requests from developers to use shipping material as their main material for both commercial and residential projects. The proposal today is to allow for buildings to use shipping containers if designed creatively and with the use of additional materials.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if this proposed amendment would pertain to certain areas or all of Chandler.

MS. SCHUMANN responded it would apply to all of Chandler.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO stated he agrees with this amendment. He further asked about a company in Chandler that does modular-type homes out of shipping materials.

MR. MAYO stated Z-Modular is the name of the company and it is a different type of construction method.

A short discussion was held among the committee members and each stated agreement with the proposed amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN presented the next code amendment relating to neighborhood perimeter walls. Current code does not require minimum wall height or consider grade differences between adjacent developments, which could then lead to the addition of privacy screening and possible safety concerns between developments. Ms. Schumann stated they would like to add a requirement to maintain or provide a minimum six-foot high perimeter wall for new developments abutting residential areas, to be measured from the highest point within five feet of the wall.

Subcommittee members stated agreement with the proposed code amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN next presented the proposed amendment to prohibit double walls as our current code is silent on this issue, with new developments preferring to build a new fence adjacent to existing development, causing potential safety concerns. The proposed amendment would prohibit double walls, with the developer required to work with adjacent property owners to replace existing walls.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if irrigation ditches were an exception.

MS. SCHUMANN responded affirmatively.

All subcommittee members were in agreement with this proposed amendment.

MS. SCHUMANN presented the next proposed code amendment relating to parking requirements in multi-family developments, with current code requiring a certain number of spaces per unit based on number of bedrooms. They are proposing to require an additional .25 parking spaces per unit for guest parking and to prohibit charging fees for required parking spaces within the development.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked if they have heard from developers that this is an issue.

MS. SCHUMANN stated primarily they hear from residents, as some complexes charge for parking spaces for residents. She further stated that this amendment would prohibit these developments from charging residents for required parking.

MR. MAYO stated there's complexes that charge residents additional costs for a parking space so residents are forced to park elsewhere, as their rent budget is already going towards the apartment itself.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if we would be able to enforce this amendment.

MR. MAYO stated they would work with our legal department on the language so this can be enforced.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked to whom residents would complain to about this type of parking issue.

MR. MAYO responded that the Planning division is who they would work with.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked for clarification on the formula using the graph (referencing slide 18). He stated that seems like a lot of additional spaces and worries about the impact it may have on the revitalization of some areas within the city.

MR. MAYO reminded the subcommittee members that this is code; Council can always approve a reduction to the requirements within the code through the PAD process when appropriate.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS expressed concerns with the additional parking requirements if it takes away from the number of units available, with such a need for affordable housing in our community.

Discussion was held among the group on how to find a balance between the number of units and accommodating parking needs, without overburdening developers with parking formulas to calculate required parking.

MICAH MIRANDA, Acting Development Services Director, reminded the group that this is a starting point, and that feedback from the private sector and developers is important to negotiate what will satisfy the private market as well as the city's overarching goal.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO suggested beginning with the .25 calculation to see what pushback is received, with staff negotiating the formula and coming to an agreement that suits all parties, versus mandating a certain number of parking spaces and potentially changing the integrity of the complex.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS stated that calculating at .25 for the 425 unit complex used in the example is too high.

The other subcommittee members were in agreement with this point.

MR. MAYO stated that they will bring this amendment forward to Council with other options so a consensus can be made, and staff will continue to gather feedback from developers. He reminded the subcommittee members that although this guideline would be written in the code, there is still the PAD process that could be approved where appropriate.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked if other cities use .25 as their calculation.

MS. SCHUMANN stated that through their research they found that many valley cities use .20 - .25, with the City of Phoenix requiring one parking space for a one bedroom unit and two spaces for a two bedroom unit. Mesa does not account for guest parking spaces because their parking requirements are very high, with about three spaces allotted per unit.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON inquired about what staff may hear from developers that they may have to give up making mandated parking spaces available and if it is landscaping, number of units or outdoor living spaces within the communities.

MR. MAYO stated that it would be the number of units that will be reduced, as that will in turn reduce the number of required parking spaces, or they will need to build up to keep the number of units.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO stated that the subcommittee members agree with the proposal to require an additional .25 parking spaces per unit and continue to gather feedback.

The subcommittee members stated their agreement.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the next proposed amendment pertaining to guest parking requirements for residential developments. The current zoning code does not require designated guest spaces but the policy is to provide guest spaces throughout the development. The proposal is to require guest parking spaces if parking on-street is unavailable within the development. Per policy, they have been trying to get .25 parking spaces per lot for developments that have driveways and .5 per lot for developments that have no driveways to park, with spaces distributed evenly throughout the development.

MR. MAYO stated that they already have a policy in place, this proposal is to codify it.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS wanted to verify that developers will have the opportunity to seek approval if their plans do not fit within code requirements.

MR. MAYO stated that planning staff does work with developers to reach an agreement and they always have the PAD process available to seek approvals outside of the code. The code is meant to save time and effort by having guidelines in place for all parties to begin the process.

MR. MIRANDA added perspective to this conversation that once the developments are built the enforcement then falls within our Neighborhood Resources Department on the code compliance side and what they continue to receive a lot of is complaints surrounding parking issues. This code will help alleviate some of those issues by providing overall positive livability within the communities with designated parking and hopefully reduce some of those enforcement issues before the community is built out.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the next code amendment of holiday lights in city right-of-way. Currently, requests require multi-departmental review and approval, which is time consuming and confusing to the applicant. Staff would like to simplify this process with a nofee encroachment permit being issued by the Development Services Engineering Division.

Discussion was held among committee members verifying that residents are required to follow safety and minimum height requirements.

MR. MAYO stated that there are certain requirements that must be met for approval, but rather than the application process taking months, it can be reduced to a matter of days, with one person verifying all requirements are met and issuing the permit.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS wanted to verify the city isn't liable for any emergency situations that could occur because of the approval process.

MR. MAYO verified that the city is not responsible and that the permit process states the party applying for the permit holds responsibility.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the conversion of alley to curbside collection for garbage. The current code states that a neighborhood *wishes* to convert. Staff is proposing to clean up this language to align with current practice and changing the word *wishes* to *votes*.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked what the voting process is for a neighborhood.

JOHN KNUDSON, Public Works and Utilities Director, explained that it is through a petition process that city staff initiates. The outcome is determined by a 50 percent plus one requirement.

MS. SCHUMANN continued the presentation with the final item relating to Satellite Dish Regulations. The current zoning code restricts height, location, and size of satellite dishes. She stated they are proposing to remove this zoning code altogether to align with federal laws.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked what the current federal laws are.

MR. MAYO stated they change regularly and that the FCC regulates the laws.

VICE MAYOR asked for more details and Mr. Mayo responded that he would need to follow up with him after researching further.

Discussion was held surrounding types of complaints that have been received.

MR. MAYO brought up a resident with a ham radio that requested antennae that was far beyond what zoning limits. The City Attorney's Office researched and the City is unable to prevent this due to a federal regulation that allows the practice, stating satellite dishes fall into the same category.

Further discussion was held surrounding the practice of residents who rent a home, install a satellite on a wall or roof, move out a year later and leave the dish, with the next resident having a new dish installed.

VICE MAYOR ORLANDO asked that staff define parameters rather than removing the zoning code completely and suggested, "no more than X dishes," or "no more than X feet from..." to help with the really egregious cases and further suggested getting input from the City Attorney's Office.

MR MAYO stated that it was the City Attorney's Office that advised it be removed from city code.

COUNCILMEMBER ENCINAS asked where the companies usually install the satellite dishes.

Discussion was held among the group that dishes can be installed on the roof, fences and on posts in the ground.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked which agency has the most rigid laws surrounding satellites.

MR. MAYO responded that the city code is more strict than federal law.

Further discussion was held regarding code issues from the past, with the city's legal department ultimately advising against enforcement due to federal laws.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if this could lead to a code enforcement issue.

LEAH POWELL, Neighborhood Resources Director, stated there are rules on the size, number and location of satellite dishes in our public housing units, further stating she is unaware of how zoning code changes would affect them.

MS. SCHUMANN stated next steps include further research on items the committee advised and presenting these findings to the Planning and Zoning Commission at their work session on September 20, 2023, meeting. From there, the draft ordinance text would be provided to stakeholders for additional comments, with a goal of having finalized and on the agenda for the December city council meeting.

COUNCILMEMBER POSTON asked if comments and information from today's meeting would be provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MS. SCHUMANN stated the presentations from today's meeting as well as the previous subcommittee meetings, plus the minutes from both would be provided along with draft language.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:44 p.m.

Recording Secretary