

Summary of Planning Commission Actions Regarding Zoning Code and Map

Changes Recommended

1. Map/East: The Oxford University School (within the Grand Oaks PUD) requested a change from Suburban Residential (SR) to Suburban Multi-family (SMF) for an “L” shaped portion of their property, just north and east of the school. After discussion the Planning Commission supported changing the “western” portion of the “L” to Suburban Multi-Family (SMF); but for the residual “northern” leg of the property to remain Suburban Residential. The concern was the opposition to the change from the owners of lots to the north. (PPINs: #28582, #31297)
2. Map/Central: A resident of N. 11th requested a change of zoning for N. 11th (from Jefferson to Washington) from TNR to TER (Traditional Estate Residential). After discussion, the Planning Commission recommended a change for these properties to Traditional Suburban Residential as most appropriate, with sufficient protection for this street segment. PPINs: #6063, 5849, 5848, 5869, 5847, 5846, 18160, 5791, 5836, 5835, 5834, 5833, 5832 (Adams & N. 11), 5837 (N. 11th & Wash.), 17465 (N. 11th & Wash.)
3. Map/Central: Several Planning Commissioners raised the issue of why the properties on the west side of the intersection of University with Bramlett/S. 18th Street had been removed from the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. After discussion, **on a 5-2 vote**, they recommended putting this property (and the one across the street from it) back into the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District. (PPINs: #26622, #8049, #8114, #14409, #7995, #15588, #16019, #7997, #7996, #6295)
4. Map/West: Residents of the Woodlawn Neighborhood requested additional restrictions in the Legacy TNB District that would eliminate the Service Station use totally. After extended discussion of various options, the Planning Commission **voted 6-1** to instead eliminate the Legacy TND District entirely, and to instead place this one mapped area in TNB. The Commission also recommended a change to the TNB district standards noted below. (PPINs: portion of #14590, #6694)
5. Map/West: A property owner requested a change of zoning from Neighborhood Residential (NR) to Suburban Multi-family (SMF) for a property off the south end of Ricky Britt Blvd. After discussion, the Planning Commission supported this request. (PPIN: #17804)
6. Code: The Commission voted to support for any required technical and corrective changes. This included the staff technical correction to the “Dwelling Unit Occupancy Standard” language (10.2.95) that was raised by a person at the Public Hearing; and technical corrections to the references to the use standards in Article 10 refer back to the correct sub-section of Article 3, raised by a Planning Commissioner; and support for a technical change to add a cross-reference regarding uniform setbacks in residential districts (Sec. 2.6.4.1).

7. Code: A Planning Commissioner was concerned that the revised regulations for Tree Mitigation in a TND development did not go far enough. Staff had recommended 100% compliance for the middle and edge, and 50% compliance for the center. After discussion, the Planning Commission voted to recommend 100% compliance for all areas of a TND.

A few people questioned why Tree Mitigation compliance is not required Phase by Phase, rather than over the entire project. Staff explained to the Planning Commission that this is not required for other phased developments such as PUDS and Subdivisions. After discussion the Planning Commission did not recommend a change to the method for Tree Mitigation compliance.

8. Code: A Planning Commission brought up a concern about the wording of one element of the Common Interest Development use (Section 3.4.8.5.c.i.). After discussion the Commission recommended a modification to establish setbacks based on the standards governing the property as zoned, rather than the current language.
9. Code: Given the concerns raised by residents of the Woodlawn Subdivision, the Planning Commission recommends adding a standard to the service station use in a TNB District, so that it cannot be proposed (even by special exception) on a property that adjoins an Estate Residential district.
10. Code: While discussing the Woodlawn concerns, the Planning Commission got into a discussion about the use type called "Tavern". This is a carryover from the existing zoning code, which in various places lists "bars", "taverns", and "nightclubs", although none of them are defined. A discussion raised the notion that the reality is that given how Mississippi ABC laws are written, there are no real "taverns" or other such places that have limited food options. All places that sell alcohol must sell a certain level of food, and consequently, all places that sell alcohol (even if that is a large portion of what they sell) are classified as restaurants. Therefore the Planning Commission recommended that the Aldermen, staff, and City Attorney eliminate the "Tavern" use and consider only a difference between restaurants that do or do not serve alcoholic beverages.

Consideration Recommended

11. Map/East: A planning commissioner brought up a concern about the Urban Center zoning proposed for properties to the west of the intersection of University Avenue and Hwy 7. Her concern was traffic and access issues at the location, and the view of the building that might be built from the intersection of University and South Lamar. After discussion the Planning Commission made no recommendation for change, but requested that the Aldermen carefully consider this proposed zoning given the existing traffic and access issues.

Staff recommended this zoning in only a very few places. This location was chosen because it has direct access onto Hwy 7; and with a substantially more urban type of development the intersection would have to be improved to eliminate the double lights at this location.

12. Map/East: A property owner requested a change from Traditional Neighborhood Business (TNB) to Urban Center (UCN) or Suburban Center (SCN) at the southwest quadrant of the Hwy 6 and Hwy 7 intersection. After extended discussion there was no support for changing the zoning recommendation, primarily due to concern about access to the property. The Commission indicated that the property would be appropriate for higher density zoning if a second access was created off Hwy 6 or Hwy 7. (PPINs: #8778, #8799)

Changes not Recommended

13. Map/North: The property owner requested a change from TSR to TNB for a property on Chickasaw that borders TNB (to the north). After discussion, there was no support for changing the proposed TSR to TNB for a property on Chickasaw that borders (to the north) TNB. The concern was the extension of commercial zoning down Chickasaw for property that does not have any frontage on Molly Barr. (PPIN: #5044)
14. Map/North: A resident of Vivian Street requested a change from TSR to TER for a section of Chickasaw. With little discussion there was no support for this request from a non-resident of the street.
15. Map/South: A property owner requested a change from NR to SMF for a property along CR 300 near the Oxford Farms development. After discussion, the Planning Commission did not support this request. The concern was that there is already a lot of SMF zoning in this area. (PPIN: #16804)
16. Map/Central: A property owner requested a change from TNB to UCN for a property at the northwest quadrant of University and Bramlett. After discussion, **on a vote of 6-1** the Planning Commission did not support this request. The concern was height and traffic congestion at this location.
(PPINs: #7995, 6295, 7996, 14409)
17. Code: A Planning Commissioner had some concerns about the accessory dwelling unit use (Sec. 3.5.6.), but after discussion and further explanation of how the use would be approved, his concerns were resolved and no changes recommended
18. Code: A person had questions the language of Sec. 4.9.4.2. regarding Alternative Parking and Shared Parking provisions granting flexibility to the City of Oxford. After discussion the Planning Commission did not recommend any changes to this section.
19. Code: A number of people had written to express concerns about the Bed and Breakfast use (Sec. 3.8.2.), and a Planning Commissioner brought up his concerns about the use. After discussion and further explanation of how the use is permitted and what uses it permits, his concerns were resolved and no changes were recommended. Staff notes that the concerns expressed about “Bed and Breakfast” actually relate to short term home rentals like AirB&B or VRBO.