I. Call To Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval Of Minutes

IV. Chair Report

V. Public Hour - Hearing Of Citizens

VI. Land Development Plans

VII. Community Planning

A. Request To Rezone A Portion Of Tax Parcel 36-26-223 (732 E Marylyn Ave)

B. Request To Amend The Zoning Ordinance To Allow Four-Car Garages At Single Family Dwellings

VIII. Official Reports And Correspondence

A. Borough Council (BC)
   i. Conditional Use Application For Core Spaces Signature Development

B. Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB)
   i. Appeal Of Zoning Officer’s Determination - 704 McKee Street

C. Upcoming Land Development Plans

D. Staff Updates

E. Centre Regional Planning Commission

IX. Upcoming Meetings

X. Adjournment

Documents:

Meeting Agenda  
State College Borough Planning Commission  
January 23, 2020  
Room 304 / 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

Zoe Boniface, Chair  
Anita Genger, Vice-Chair  
Scott Dutt  
Jon Eich  
Mary Madden  
Ron Madrid  
Mallory Meehan

III. Approval of Minutes - January 8, 2020

IV. Chair Report

V. Public Hour - Hearing of Citizens

VI. Land Development Plan(s)

The January 21, 2020 Design Review Board meeting was cancelled; therefore, no plans will be reviewed this evening.

VII. Community Planning

A. Request to Rezone a Portion of Tax Parcel 36-26-223 (732 E Marylyn Ave)

A request has been submitted by Mark Torretti of PennTerra Engineering to rezone a portion of Centre LifeLink’s property at 732 E Marylyn Ave; to the east of University Drive. Presently, the entire 3.47-acre property is zoned Public Activities (PA), but Centre LifeLink wishes to rezone the northern portion of the property to Residence 2 (R2). The area was originally zoned R2 but was rezoned to Public Activities in 2001 prior to construction of an ambulance station, which was not a permitted use in R2. Since that time, an existing single-family dwelling on the northern part of the property has been utilized by Centre LifeLink staff, however it is no longer needed for that purpose. Centre LifeLink would like to rezone that portion of the property back to R2 and subdivide it so that it can be sold.

Council has referred the request to the Planning Commission for review and a recommendation. **Attachments** include the request letter and an engineering drawing of the area proposed for rezoning. [Page 9]
Planning Commission Action: The Planning Commission should review the request and provide a recommendation to Council.

B. Request to Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Allow Four-Car Garages at Single Family Dwellings

A request has been submitted by Herman Slaybaugh on behalf of Pam Michaleris, owner of a single-family home located at 1353 Penfield Road. In September 2017, Ms. Michaleris asked Borough Council to amend the section of the Borough Zoning Ordinance that limits attached garages to three car bays. Ms. Michaleris proposed two possible approaches to amending the ordinance:

1. Keep the current language intact but add a size limit on any accessory building used as a garage in lieu of the three-car restriction.

2. Amend the text to distinguish between accessory garages for single family homes, duplexes, and multi-family dwellings, and add a size limit in lieu of the three-car restriction.

Borough Council forwarded the proposal to Planning Commission in October 2017, and the PC recommended forwarding the request to the consultant team that was working on the comprehensive rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance. Council agreed with the recommendation and voted in December 2017 to address the request as part of the rewrite.

Due to the complexity and length of time the rewrite will take, Council has been asked to revisit the issue, and has requested a recommendation from the PC.

A detailed proposal for the amendment is attached beginning on page 11.

Planning Commission Action: The Planning Commission should review the request and provide a recommendation to Council.

VIII. Official Reports and Correspondence

A. Borough Council (BC)

1. Conditional Use Application for Core Spaces Signature Development
   On January 13, 2020 Council conducted a public hearing for the Core Spaces Signature Development conditional use proposal. Council will review and vote on the written decision at an upcoming meeting.
B. Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB)

1. **Appeal of Zoning Officer’s Determination - 704 McKee Street**
   On December 10, 2019 the ZHB heard an appeal of the Zoning Officer’s determination on a slight encroachment of a fence into the public right-of-way. A de minimis variance for the encroachment was granted at the January 14, 2020 ZHB meeting.

C. **Upcoming Land Development Plans**

1. Final - 706 and 708 South Atherton Apartments (formerly 430 W. Irvin Avenue)
2. Final – Pennsylvania State University (PSU) West Campus Substation
3. Preliminary - PSU West 2 Building

D. **Staff Updates**

E. **Centre Regional Planning Commission**

IX. **Upcoming Meetings**

   Wednesday, February 5, 2020 at Noon
   Thursday, February 20, 2020 at 7 p.m.

X. **Adjournment**
Meeting Minutes  
State College Borough Planning Commission  
January 8, 2020  

The State College Borough Planning Commission (PC) met on Wednesday, January 8, 2020 at the Municipal Building, 243 South Allen Street. Ed LeClear, Planning Director, called the meeting to order at Noon.

Members Present

Zoe Boniface, Anita Genger, Jon Eich, Mary Madden, Mallory Meehan, and Ron Madrid

Members Absent

Scott Dutt

Others Present

Ed LeClear, Planning Director; Greg Garthe, Planner/Zoning Officer; John Wilson, Zoning Officer; Isabel Storey, Planner; and Denise L. Rhoads, Administrative Assistant

Mr. LeClear introduced Mallory Meehan, the newest member of the PC.

Ms. Meehan stated she was from the Pittsburgh area and had lived in State College for the last 14 year. She noted she spent eight years at Pennsylvania State University as an undergraduate in Marketing and Finance with a joint JD/MBA. Following that, she started a career in commercial real estate and transitioned back into the academic setting where she spent the past the last three years as a Clinical Assistant Professor of real estate and was now the Assistant Director of their Institute for Real Estate Studies at Smeal College.

Election of Officers

A motion to nominate Ms. Boniface for Chair was made by Ms. Genger and seconded by Mr. Eich. The vote was unanimously in favor.

A motion to nominate Ms. Genger for Vice-Chair was made by Ms. Boniface and seconded by Ms. Madden. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Eich and seconded by Ms. Madden to approve the December 4, 2019 meeting minutes as amended. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Chair Report

Ms. Boniface, Chair, welcomed Ms. Meehan to the PC. She also expressed her appreciation of Mr. Kalin’s service with the PC and noted he would now be on the Zoning Hearing Board.
Public Hour

No comments or concerns were heard during the public hour.

Community Planning

Proposed Glennland-McAllister Certified Redevelopment Area

Mr. LeClear stated the Planning Department was proposing a new site for a Certified Redevelopment Area (CRA) in downtown State College and his brief overview included:

- A parking analysis would be finished sometime in the spring.
- Because land value was very high, it would make it hard to acquire new property downtown.
- Looking into public involvement electronically for future additional input.

Ms. Storey discussed:

- Expansion of pedestrian-centered infrastructure had numerous benefits which included:
  - Reduced carbon emissions.
  - Reduced mental and physical health risks.
  - More opportunities for various business development.
  - More accessibility of local amenities.
  - Increased social and economic cohesion.

Next discussed: The Urban Redevelopment Act (URA) of 1945

- The URA was guidance for redevelopment of blighted areas according to community objectives and plans while also providing legal and financial tools to carry out projects.
- Required PC’s to prepare a plan for any CRA.
- 7 Conditions for Blight:
  - Unsafe, unsanitary, or over-crowded conditions of the dwellings.
  - Inadequate planning of the area.
  - Excessive land coverage by the buildings therein.
  - Lack of proper light, air, and open space.
  - Defective design and arrangement of the buildings thereon.
  - Faulty street or lot layout.
  - Economically or socially undesirable land uses.

While only one condition was necessary for classification, staff suggested the four below.

- Lack of proper light, air, and open space – several dark sections, lack of openness to downtown, and lack of greenery throughout streets.
- Excessive land coverage by the buildings therein - lack of outdoor pedestrian space, the open eating area on McAllister was not inviting, and need to expand upon public art.
- Inadequate planning of the area – lack of pedestrian-oriented infrastructure outside of Beaver Avenue.
- Faulty street layout – narrow sidewalks along Calder Way and no sidewalks along Humes Alley (goal would be to balance the needs of both pedestrians and vehicles).
Ms. Storey noted within the CRA there were 10 tax parcels, 44 addresses, and 3.95 deeded acres. The area was bounded by Humes Alley, McAllister Street, East Calder Way and Beaver Avenue. She stated the inner streets were South Pugh Street and McAllister Alley.

Ms. Storey noted in the 2013 Downtown Master Plan the long-term vision for Calder Way included:

- Noted as one of four streets with the most potential for enhancement.
- Emphasize pedestrian-centered, funky character.
- Service and infrastructure alley.
- Attractive storefronts and public art.
- Expand pedestrian-oriented infrastructure for a “shared space”.

Ms. Storey discussed the redevelopment goals which included:

- Expand upon existing pedestrian-oriented infrastructure and assets to cover the entire District and ultimately to other alleys and the rest of Calder Way.
- District had a lot to offer in terms of variety of businesses to users.
- Bring balance to Calder Way as a street for everything: pedestrians, cyclists, motor vehicles, service trucks, and infrastructure.
- Make it a “complete street”.

PC’s comments

- Ms. Genger asked about West Penn Power (WPP) and their utilities. Mr. LeClear stated WPP refused to bury the utilities because they considered State College to be rural and would require the Borough to pay for burying the lines.
- Mr. Eich asked what the major structures were surrounding this area. Mr. LeClear stated the Pugh Street garage, Glennland building, Calder Square and the other Friedman properties, along with McAllister deck, The Brewery, and residential properties owned by Rodney Hendricks.
- Mr. Madrid asked what the original intent was for Calder Way and what the cost would be to the residents. Mr. LeClear stated the original intent was for a service alley to provide access for some properties in the back and to provide a utility corridor. He also stated staff received a lot of feedback regarding a more pedestrian structure. Mr. LeClear stated the Downtown Master Plan understood the need for balance in this area regarding services and pedestrians.
- Ms. Madden stated she hoped both the physical design and the management side would be looked at closely. She noted she was concerned about vacant shop fronts in the downtown and the market/economics of this area.
- Mr. Madrid pointed out the commercial entities that would front this CRA should note what their contribution to this effort would be. He noted there would be a significant improvement to the properties and wanted them to share the cost with the residents of the Borough.
- Mr. Eich asked if it was possible to have the alley remain one-way for vehicles and two-way for bicycles. Mr. LeClear stated staff would look at this.
- Ms. Boniface stated she was looking forward to hearing from the businesses that faced Calder Way and what the Downtown Improvement District had to say.

Eric Boeldt, 400 South Gill Street, and Chair of the Design Review Board (DRB), noted after the DRB meeting, it was discussed what would happen if the Borough built up to the to the zoning limit would there be enough utilities. Mr. LeClear stated, two years ago, Public Works entered
into a contract with Gannett Fleming to upgrade the sewer system. He noted the Borough also received tapping fees from developers when they applied for permits.

- Mr. Eich stated from the perspective of the water authority from the Municipal Planning Organization, step one of the Atherton Street improvements from Park Avenue to South Atherton Street would be rebuilding the water line for additional capacity. Mr. LeClear noted there would be conduit, water/sewer, fiber, electrical, and storm water needs, and the Borough wanted to do the design comprehensively.

2020 Work Program

Mr. LeClear’s overview included:
- Every year a draft work program was prepared by staff for review by Council
- He discussed, briefly, the mandatory items.
- He noted staff would be focusing on a meeting in the second quarter with neighborhood leadership.
- He stated staff would be combining some tasks regarding the zoning rewrite. The Zoning Revision Advisory Committee would meet late spring and summer spending time on revisions then forwarding on to the PC in the third and fourth quarter with something for Council to review in 2021.
- He noted staff was looking at a zoning ordinance for Airbnb, tourist homes, etc.
- There would be in-house revisions on the sign ordinance, and an Inclusionary Housing ordinance review later in the year.
- Mr. LeClear also noted the fraternity issues would be a priority in 2020.

PC’s comments
- Mr. Eich suggested adding an extra PC meeting September through November and devote one strictly to the zoning ordinance. Mr. LeClear stated staff would need to check with Administration and also look at their fall schedule.
- Ms. Madden asked if the term “tourist home” was a Supreme Court term or our local ordinance term. Mr. LeClear stated it was in our local ordinance.
- Mr. Eich suggested some changes to the Work Program information.
- Mr. Madrid suggested staff should meet with the Neighborhood Coalition in the first quarter instead of waiting until the third quarter in order for them to have an opportunity to review the information.

A motion to approve the 2020 Work Program as amended was made by Mr. Eich and seconded by Ms. Genger. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Official Reports and Correspondence

Borough Council (BC): Mr. LeClear reported BC reorganized this past Monday with Jesse Barlow elected as Council President. It was also Mayor Ron Filippelli’s first meeting. He noted the temporary closure of Allen Street was asked to be put back on the agenda and would be discussed at the meeting on January 13, 2020. Mr. Garthe stated the conditional use hearing for the Core Spaces would be heard on January 13, 2020 as well.
Zoning Hearing Board (ZHB): Mr. Garthe reported on the items below:

1. **Variance - Foxdale Village**
   On November 26, 2019, the ZHB heard a request for a variance to allow paving, curbing, sidewalks, and plantings within a utility easement area on property Foxdale Village intended to purchase. Per Ch. XIX, Section 2001(b)(7) of the zoning ordinance, structures and other obstructions were prohibited within utility easements. The variance was granted at the December 10, 2019 ZHB meeting.

2. **Appeal of Zoning Officer’s Determination - 704 McKee Street**
   On December 10, 2019, the ZHB heard an appeal of the Zoning Officer’s determination. The Zoning Officer determined a recently constructed fence had a slight encroachment into the public right-of-way. A decision was expected at the January 14, 2020 ZHB meeting.

**Upcoming Land Development Plans:** Mr. Garthe reported on the items below:
- Final for 706 and 708 South Atherton Apartments (formerly 430 W. Irvin Avenue)
- Final for Pennsylvania State University (PSU) West Campus Substation
- Preliminary for PSU West 2 Building

Ms. Genger noted PSU was closing off some parking on campus already and asked where those spaces would be moved to. Mr. LeClear stated Rob DeMayo, PSU Transportation Director, would be able to answer the question.

**Staff Updates:** Mr. LeClear reported the Senior Planner-Redevelopment Specialist position was still open.

**Centre Regional Planning Commission (CRPC):** Mr. Eich had nothing to report.

**Revised 2020 Meeting Calendar:** A motion was made by Mr. Eich and seconded by Ms. Genger to approve the revised 2020 meeting calendar. The vote was unanimously in favor.

**2020 Conflict of Interest Memorandum & Policy:** Mr. LeClear noted the policy was required to be distributed at the beginning of every year for informational purposes.

**Upcoming Meetings**

Thursday, January 23, 2020 at 7 p.m.
Wednesday, February 5, 2020 at Noon

**Adjournment**

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Madrid adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Denise L. Rhoads
Administrative Assistant
November 18, 2019

State College Borough Council  
State College Borough  
243 South Allen Street  
State College, PA 16801

RE: Rezoning request for portion of Center Lifelink property & East Marylynn Avenue

Dear Council members,

On behalf of my Client, Centre Lifelink, I am requesting the rezoning of a portion of their property located at the intersection of University Drive extension and East Marylynn Avenue and the adjacent East Marylynn Avenue right-of-way area from PA, Public Activities District to R2, Residence District.

The property, Tax Parcel 36-26-223 consists of 3.48 acres and is owned by Alpha Community Ambulance Services, Inc. c/o of Centre Lifelink EMS. The parcel was originally zoned R-2. However, in order to develop it as public ambulance station, the entire property was rezoned to PA in 2001 along with the adjacent Marylynn Avenue right-of-way. The property was then developed for the ambulance station in 2003-2004 with the existing single-family dwelling remaining and the dwelling being used by the ambulance staff.

There no longer is a need for the existing dwelling to be used by the Centre Lifelink staff and they ultimately plan to subdivide off the dwelling from the main parcel so that it may potentially be able to be sold. However, under the existing PA district, a single-family dwelling is not a permitted use. Therefore, we are requesting that that area of the property containing the dwelling unit, (0.922 acres) and the adjacent Marylynn Avenue right-of-way, (0.426 acres) be rezoned back to R-2 Residence District, (A total of 1.348 acres proposed to be rezoned). Please note that the adjacent property to the east on the other side of Slab Cabin Run is also zoned R-2.

Your consideration is this matter is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please contact me at 814-231-8285, extension 310.

Sincerely,

Mark Torretti  
Project Manager

Enclosures

cc: Scott Rawson, Centre Lifelink  
Tommy Songer, Centre Lifelink Board of Trustees
Memorandum Two

To: State College Borough Planning Commission
From: Herman Slaybaugh & Pan Michaleris
Date: January 23, 2020
Subject: Zoning Amendment Requested to allow 4-car garages at 1-family homes

Background
This zoning ordinance amendment, which if adopted would allow 4-car private garages at 1-family homes when the garage is integrated as part of the house itself, was originally requested in the fall of 2017. The Planning Commission, following referral by Borough Council, reviewed the proposal at its October 2, 2017 meeting and recommended the change be made, but it be done through the comprehensive zoning rewrite process that Clarion Associates was doing. Staff concurred with that recommendation and Council voted at its December 4, 2017 meeting affirming the recommendation. Subsequently, Staff forwarded the proposal to Clarion for incorporation in the rewrite. At the time, it was believed the rewrite would take about one or two years to complete and be adopted as law.

Although disappointed that the 2017 recommendation was not to adopt the amendment right away and separately from the rewrite, Mr. Michaleris was open to waiting for the two-year rewrite process to unfold with assurances that the request would not fall through the cracks. But now, two years later, the comprehensive rewrite hasn't happened because of unanticipated problems and complexities that have arisen. Staff now advises it may take another year or two to bring the rewrite process to fruition.

In light of this unanticipated further delay, we respectfully ask the Borough to pursue the amendment separately from the rewrite process. We believe that an additional year or two delay is unreasonable and unnecessary considering the simplicity of our proposed amendment. We further note Borough Council recently enacted a zoning ordinance amendment allowing cat cafes in the UV District, and that proposal was pursued separately from the comprehensive rewrite process. We are hopeful that the Borough Council, Planning Commission, and Planning Staff can support pursuing this request separately from the comprehensive rewrite and will find doing so justifiable as a matter of fairness.

Nature of Request
Pan Michaleris, along with his family, owner occupy the 1-family house located at 1353 Penfield Road. Several years ago an addition was built onto the house connecting the garage and house together forming one integrated structure. The major portion of that addition is used as a 3-car attached garage with 3 overhead garage doors, but there is enough extra space to establish a fourth parking bay with its own garage door. (See attachment 1, photograph of Michaleris house addition.) However, the zoning ordinance does not allow any garage, whether attached or detached, to exceed storage for more than 3 motor vehicles. Thus, he has been hamstrung from using this existing space as a logical place to shelter a 4th car, even though the space can be used for any other type of storage that is accessory to his 1-family house.

Current Zoning Rule/Public Policy
The size of private garages is regulated by 2 sections of the zoning ordinance. The first is the definition of Garage (Private) which provides as follows:

An accessory building or part of a main building used for the storage of motor vehicles as an
accessory use when the storage space does not exceed (a) for any 1-family dwelling: 3 vehicles (not more than 1 of which may be a non-passenger vehicle); (b) for any 2-family dwelling: 2 passenger vehicles per dwelling unit; (c) for any other dwelling: passenger vehicles, not more than 1 per dwelling unit in the dwelling. (Section 201. Definitions, Ordinance 559, June 20, 1959)

The second is found under Exceptions, Additions, and Modifications to Use which provides:

A private garage (including carport) as an accessory building or attached to the main building shall not exceed a capacity as provided in definition, “Garage: Private,” or have a door opening over 8 feet in height; when detached from the main building, a private garage shall not include living quarters. {Section 501.l(5)}

Together, these two sections prohibit any individual garage, whether attached to or detached from a 1-family house, from being larger in size than that needed to accommodate 3 vehicles. By corollary, the prohibition can be read to say that no matter how large a garage is in physical size, no more than 3 cars can legally be parked in it. This is an old rule that has been on the books since 1959.

**Reason for Vehicle Limits**

Because it is an old rule, one can only speculate today why the rule was established, particularly for attached garages which are lumped together with detached garages in the Definition. A plausible explanation for detached garages would be to prevent private garages, as accessory structures, from becoming bigger than the main building (1-family house) on the lot. However, there is no need for such a rule when the garage is attached as part of the main building. Applying this limitation to both situations might have been a matter of utility when writing the definition in 1959 which recognized that the number of automobiles operated per household then was small, unlike today. So, in 1959 this rule had little adverse impact on home owners, who had no need for larger garages whether attached or detached. Or, it just might have been the consequence of poor draftsmanship. This same rule also limits private garage size for duplexes and other residential uses.

A second reason may have stemmed from the fact that most of the original neighborhoods in the Borough (Highlands, College Heights, Holmes Foster) were laid out with an alley system that ran behind the lots. An exception in the zoning rules allows detached private garages to be set back 5 feet from side and rear property lines in all residential districts, except R1 {Section 502.f.(8)(h)}, a significant reduction from the rear setback required for other similarly sized accessory buildings. This reduced setback exception facilitates locating detached garages behind a house with easy close-in alley access, a design layout still viewed favorably today.

But, allowing a large detached garage with little setback runs the risk of overshadowing its neighbors. The framers of the 1959 ordinance, in trying to balance these two competing factors, likely establish the 3-vehicle cap at 1-family homes to insure that larger detached garages were not built too close to neighboring property lines. In other words, a 3-vehicle garage is the largest size deemed appropriate to be located within 5 feet of a property line without overwhelming its neighbors. We think that is still a valid reason for limiting the size of detached private garages, but a similar restriction is not needed on attached garages because more recent zoning rules cap the total building footprint area allowed on a lot and the amount of open space that must be retained. Together, these two rules establish the maximum
build-out allowed on a given lot thereby limiting the size of the main building. (The “lot coverage” rule varies by lot size, allowing between 20% to 30% of a lot's area to be covered by building footprint. In R1 and R2 zones the open space rule requires that at least 50% of a lot's area be free of structures and parking areas.)

**Ambiguity – Size of 3-vehicle Garage**

Under the current definition of “Garage (Private),” the 3-vehicle rule is vague. The zoning officer has to somehow determine just how big in footprint area is a 3-vehicle garage. Should parking area per vehicle be considered to be 12 feet wide or is 10 feet or some other standard reasonable? Presently, there is no metric provided for guidance. How big is too big? This ambiguity can be cleaned up concurrently with our proposal by establishing a nominal garage parking size per vehicle of 288 SF (12 feet by 24 feet). Under this approach, a 3-vehicle detached garage in a residential district could not exceed a footprint of 864 SF, a size that has been deemed reasonable by the zoning hearing board in the past when the 3-car rule was challenged.

**Why Change the Law**

Because zoning regulations regulate private property, and in that way restrict a property's use, zoning rules should always be the least restrictive needed to achieve the public purpose for which they are intended to serve. This basic principle in upholding zoning regulations as a valid exercise of the “Police Power” has been established by Pennsylvania courts. We suggest the current law regulating garage size, which applies the same 3-vehicle standard to both detached and attached garages, overreaches by being more restrictive than it needs to be to protect the public purpose of preventing detached private garages from overshadowing their neighbors. By separating the two situations, a finer tuning can be accomplished that extends more individual property rights without sacrificing the public purpose for which we believe the rule was intended to serve. And while we are at it, ambiguity and conflicting sections of the ordinance can be cleaned up.

**The Proposal**

Two options are provided for consideration that amend the Definition of Garage (Private). Option One simply removes the current limits in the definition from applying to private garages when integrated as part of the main building on a lot. Thus, there is no change in public policy size for detached garages. Size of attached integrated garages defaults to existing building coverage, setback, and height rules in the zoning district for main buildings. Adjacent municipalities like College Township do it this way in their zoning schemes and have seen no need to place a cap on size when the garage is integrated as part of the house. (See attachment 2, 4-car garage in College Township). What difference does it really make on how much of a person's home, which is capped in size by the aforementioned rules, is allocated toward area for parking vehicles? When last discussed by the Planning Commission in September 2017, Commissioners were of the opinion it didn't matter from a public interest standpoint and the only control needed is for the detached private garage.

Option Two does exactly the same thing as Option One, but clears up the 3-car size vagueness by establishing a measurable metric of 288 SF (12 by 24) per parking space area within any detached garage.

Additionally, a small change is made to Section 501.l(5) which makes it match the amended definition.
An accessory building or part of a main building used for the storage of motor vehicles as an accessory use when the storage space does not exceed (a) for any 1-family dwelling: 3 vehicles (not more than 1 of which may be a non-passenger vehicle); (b) for any 2-family dwelling: 2 passenger vehicles per dwelling unit; (c) for any other dwelling: passenger vehicles, not more than 1 per dwelling unit in the dwelling.

Option One:

Amend Section 201 to read as follows:

An accessory building or part of a main building used for the storage of motor vehicles as an accessory use to the primary use of the lot. The storage space for detached garages shall not exceed (a) for any 1-family dwelling: 3 vehicles (not more than 1 of which may be a non-passenger vehicle); (b) for any 2-family dwelling: 2 passenger vehicles per dwelling unit; (c) for any other dwelling: passenger vehicles, not more than 1 per dwelling unit in the dwelling.

Option Two:

An accessory building or part of a main building used for the storage of motor vehicles as an accessory use to the primary use of the lot. Building footprints of detached private garages shall not exceed the following limits which use a nominal size of 288 SF per vehicle: (a) 864 SF for any 1-family dwelling; (b) 1152 SF for any 2-family dwelling; (c) for any other residential use, 288 SF per dwelling unit. These size limits do not apply to private garages when attached to and made a part of the main building which must comply with the required yard depths, lot coverage, height, and all other requirements applicable to main buildings on the lot.

Current Section 501.l(5)

A private garage (including carport) as an accessory building or attached to the main building shall not exceed a capacity as provided in definition, “Garage: Private,” or have a door opening over 8 feet in height; when detached from the main building, a private garage shall not include living quarters.

Amend Section 501.l(5) to read as follows:

A private garage (including carport) as an accessory building shall not exceed a capacity as provided in definition, “Garage: Private,” or have a door opening over 8 feet in height; when detached from the main building, a private garage shall not include living quarters.

Comment: The words “or attached to main building” are struck.