UDC Text Amendment (PLN-140003)
Front Setback – Alternative Compliance
March 28, 2014

Staff Report:

Staff identified this amendment to the planning commission, in petition form, on March 17, 2014 and the Planning Commission affirmed proceeding with the text amendment in accordance with UDC text amendment (2.4.1.b.3).

Issue:

Staff is looking to add some additional flexibility for new single-family development by providing for an Alternative Compliance (2.3.4.b.1) to allow the front setback to be 15’; as opposed to the standard of 25’ when the garage placement, access and other standards are achieved for Compact & Mixed –Density Neighborhoods (Compact) (6.6.4).

This topic has been mentioned as a means to provide for different single-family options which include options for smaller lots and allow for greater flexibility when an area may be geographically constrained. It is an option that was often developed in Cheyenne and communities across the country prior to WWII. It is also a development option that has reemerged in other communities more recently.

The value of this type of amendment has been known for some time by anecdotal conversations with various developers and general observation of the development pattern being allowed elsewhere. This text amendment request is germane to a proposed subdivision to be introduced April 7 which is a geographically constrained infill subdivision. This sort of adjustment is relatively simple to make and is substantially consistent with the purpose and intent of the UDC and PlanCheyenne.

Above: Typical new development with a reduced front setback but maintain a larger garage setback.(Google Street views)
Above: Typical historic development in Cheyenne with a reduced front setback, again with garage setback further or alley loaded (Google Street views)

In general, the Compact standards are able to address issues that arise when uses are in close proximity to each other and the public street. For example the Compact standards address the setback of a garage independent from the setback of the house because a garage and driveway have different functional and visual impacts than does just a house.

In addition to using the existing framework of the Compact standards, the proposal uses the existing framework of an Alternative Compliance (2.3.4.b.1), which is an administrative approval.

**Review Criteria:**

1. The amendment is in accordance with the general goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
   a. **Principle 1.4:** Revitalization and infill in our urban core will provide choices for housing, employment, and services in our older neighborhoods and districts.

   **Policy 1.4.a: Infill Opportunities**
   The community will support infill in existing neighborhoods, but ensure that infill is compatible with neighborhoods and districts through design standards (e.g., to address scale, height, and character of infill as it relates to existing development).

   b. **Principle 2.3:** Our future urban neighborhoods will contain a mix of housing types, styles, and densities.

   **Policy 2.3.a: Mix of Housing Types**
   The community will strongly encourage using a variety of housing types and models, sizes, and price ranges in new neighborhoods to provide expanded housing options.
Incorporating a mix of housing types at both the neighborhood scale and the block scale helps create varied and interesting streetscapes and a diverse community.

2. The amendment is consistent with the Wyoming Statutes, and specifically the Municipal Planning and Zoning Statutes.
   a. The proposed amendment is in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and therefore is consistent with the referenced statutes regarding zoning to be consistent with or supported by the comprehensive plan.

3. The amendment promotes the general health, safety and public welfare.
   a. The amendment would create opportunities for more diverse housing options, increasing opportunities for housing, in locations that are more urban in context, typically nearby existing utilities and service areas.

**Proposed Amendment:**

6.6.3 General Residential Design

d. Alternative Compliance for Residential Front Setback. The Director may approve a 15’ front setback as a means of alternative compliance when the Compact and Mixed-Density Neighborhood Design Standards in Subsection 6.6.4 and access standards in Table 4-13 are both met. In existing neighborhoods the front setback shall match the context of adjacent dwellings or 25’ whichever is less.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Recommend approval of the Development Code text amendment establishing alternative compliance for reduced front setback for residential development.