

SUMMARY MINUTES
UNIVERSITY DISTRICT REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 11, 2010 @ 5:00 p.m.
Bowling Green City Commission Chambers
City Hall, 1001 College Street

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Rich Cothern

Charley Pride

Lucinda Anderson

Velma Runner

Joe Denning

ABSENT: Richard Morgan

STAFF: Jonathan Britt

Sandy Clark

The University District Review Committee was called to order by Chairman Velma Runner. Chairman Runner then requested the Secretary, Sandy Clark, to call the roll. Four (4) members were in attendance and two were absent when the roll call was taken. Quorum was determined with four members in attendance.

Chairman Runner then asked the Board if they received and read the Minutes from the previous meeting of December 09, 2009. Being no corrections or additions, the Motion was made by Mr. Pride, seconded by Ms. Anderson and the Board unanimously approved the Minutes of the December 09, 2009 meeting as recorded and transcribed.

PUBLIC MEETING:

Chairman Runner announced that the purpose of the meeting today is for the review and discussion of proposed changes to certain sections of Zoning Ordinance of Warren County with respect to the University District.

Jonathan Britt, Senior Planner, began the discussion by stating that Mayor Walker asked to speak with staff and representatives of the University District in order to ask about proposed changes in the University District. After this meeting, staff prepared proposed changes to the actual Zoning Ordinance, based on the discussions and previous recommendations, and that is what we are here today to discuss. The first thing suggested was in Article 3, being:

Five (5) at-large representatives: three (3) representatives from neighborhoods that surround to include those residents located within ½ mile of the University District boundary; one representative from a Greek Housing Corporation; and one University representative.

Rick Cothern entered the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

After discussion, it was decided to add the wording: . . . *neighborhoods that surround to include those residents located within ½ mile of the University District boundary . . .*

The next discussion was about Article 3.17.2 - *The Review Committee shall review the Monitoring Plan and any changes in the University District Site Plan before granting annual re-certification.* Basically, staff felt this was a clean-up of wording to *re-certification* and the review committee agreed to this change.

Then under F., about enforcement, it was proposed to delete the statement that *F. All enforcement shall be the responsibility of the Planning Commission,* when in fact it could be Fire or Building Inspectors who could enforce any safety issues, property maintenance or building code problem found in the University District area.

There was discussion also about 3.17.3 – 2 (a) wherein it was determined to add the word **Local** to the Housing Corporation representative as it is important to know who to contact here locally if there is a question about the paper work. Therefore, this paragraph would read as follows:

a. *The name and telephone number of the resident representative and the Local Housing Corporation representative. These persons will be responsible for on site compliance with the monitoring plan and will be the contact person for local officials, the University, and surrounding property owners.*

The next discussion was a carry-over from the last meeting this Review Committee held in December, wherein it was discussed if the section of the Monitoring Plan about meeting with the neighbors and getting written reports from each of the neighbors that surround the houses. Therefore, in Article 3.17.3 (2) – it was mentioned that we might need to just delete the section (b) about *the resident representative meeting with the contiguous neighbors at the beginning of each semester and shall submit a written report on this meeting to the University District Review Committee at the annual review.* After discussing the reason behind this Neighborhood Survey form and discussing the fact that the housing person seems to pick and choose who fills out the form, it was just decided to not include that portion of the paper work, but to look at the police report form and see what is actually happening at the houses. Staff said that removing the section (b), would allow a re-numbering of the remaining sections for (c) to (g) to letters (b) to (f). The review committee agreed to these changes.

Then under Section 3.17.4 (C) there was direction about changing the wording to read *Site Plan* instead of *Detailed Development Plan* and then change 12 months to 6 consecutive months:

C. *The Review Committee shall not consider a parcel of land or any portion thereof for the adoption or amendment of a site plan or monitoring plan until six (6) consecutive months shall have lapsed from any final action as defined in this Ordinance.*

The next Article is Article 4.9.4. B.1. - External Appearance. The staff proposed that there would actually be written standards similar to other overlay districts, so the following was proposed to the review committee:

3.9.4 – B (1) External Appearance. *When such use is located in any residential or public district, the external appearance of the structure shall be in the form and character of a single-family,*

detached dwelling.

a. All new structures to be approved by the Review Committee shall have the following minimum architectural requirements:

i. Building materials shall consist of at least 75% brick, stone or other modern masonry materials.

ii. Building material shall extend to all facades of the structure facing a right-of-way

iii. Each residential structure shall consist of a pitched roof.

iv. Each residential structure shall have a shingled roof.

After discussion of the Board and staff, the review committee thought it appropriate to have design standards in this overlay district and agreed with the ones proposed in *a. (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).*

The next discussion of staff and the Board had to do with signage. After meeting with the Mayor and others, it was thought that perhaps signage could be made smaller and more compact next to the houses, rather than the large signs that stand out away from the houses and have been damaged and vandalized. The signs would only be affected if changing the sign and/or replacing a sign or establishing a new house in the District. All remaining signs are grandfathered in. After discussion, the following was proposed:

4.9.4. (4) – Signs

a. Identification signs shall be wall-mounted signage, no greater than 12 square feet in area and shall not be externally illuminated.

The Review Committee next discussed with staff a proposed addition that would be a major safety factor addition so to Article 4, add a Section 5 which would state the following:

5. Safety

a. Each new residential structure shall be required to provide a fire suppression system internal to the structure which shall be required to meet the minimum requirements of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), Section 13.

The Committee expressed concern that not only is the review necessary, but there could be life safety issues and important business conducted and house representatives must be in attendance at meetings and take responsibility for paper work and take care of business that comes.

ACTION: The Motion was made by Mr. Pride, seconded by Mr. Cothorn, for the University District Review Committee to accept the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance as presented today and set out herein. The Vote was five (5) yeas.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Runner thanked the staff for their work in preparing the proposed Amendments to present to the Planning Commission.

There was discussion about the Sigma Nu house and it being sold to another fraternity and if it becomes a part of the Historic District and is part of the University District. It was noted that the City of Bowling Green and the Sigma Nu fraternity entered into an agreement about the property coming into the Historic District.

There was discussion about mailing packet information versus emailing the information and it was noted that Ms. Anderson said she would print the information if sent it by email to her.

Being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m. by Motion of Charley Pride, seconded by Lucinda Anderson. All members concurred.

VELMA RUNNER, CHAIRMAN

Sandy M. Clark, Secretary