

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
May 8, 2014
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Lee, Puri, Stanton, Strodtman, Tillotson, Wheeler

Commission Members Absent: Loe, Reichlin

Staff: Bacon, Cantin, MacIntyre, Smith, Teddy, Zenner

Guests: None

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

Added announcement of Council requested change to the Planning and Zoning Commission terms.
Details provided by Tim Teddy.

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **C-2 Update**

Mr. Teddy requested input from the Commission on additional information the Commission needed regarding the proposed ordinance. He noted that he could prepare responses based on the Commission's needs for the May 22 public hearing, but was reluctant to produce a new draft since individuals may still be reviewing what has been proposed.

Commissioner Burns asked about the work that Clarion had done on the C-2 district. Mr. Teddy explained what the draft outline contained and Clarion's presentation before Council on May 5. Mr. Teddy noted that the Clarion commented on the proposed revisions and would have preferred that no changes be made; however, felt that the changes proposed were narrow enough that they would not present issues to their work. He further noted that Clarion indicated that if the changes did not fit into the proposed "form-based" standards they would propose necessary changes.

Commissioner Stanton indicated that he met with the Consultants on his own on May 6 and that they indicated that they supported the incremental changes. He supported the Clarion's approach and felt that it would allow for the current issues to be addressed and not compromise the long-term amendments.

Commission Tillotson questioned Mr. Teddy as to why there was not a reference to a minimum height. He also asked about the creation of non-conformities should the ordinance be adopted. Mr. Teddy indicated that he would have to do additional research on both topics; however, noted that such questions were similar to those submitted by Dan Simon and were very relevant to the discussion. Such questions weren't stating opposition to the proposed ordinance, but were seeking clarifications and looking at unintended consequences.

Commissioner Wheeler indicated that he had talked with several Boards about the issues. He felt that any additional standards restricting the usage of existing building in the C-2 was a taking of property

rights. He would; however, support changes if they were to apply to future developments not existing property.

Commissioner Wheeler also felt that the revisions were too significant to be rushed forward. He felt that the Commission needed more time to adequately study the issues and the proposed solutions. He had concern with certain aspects of the ordinance and felt there should be more specifics within the proposal such as what was meant by an "active" first floor and what street frontages would such a standard apply to.

Commissioner Wheeler further commented that density and parking have difficult being reconciled. If one is desired the other must give. Most parcels are small; therefore, trying to provide parking is likely not easily met. He noted that this issue was not new and the real issue, he believed, was trying to be addressed by the revisions was parking.

Chairman Puri asked the Commission if the concerns expressed by the Commission were something that should be talked about in the open forum or if they should be consider at greater length within work sessions. He noted that trying to resolve these during the public hearing would likely not be productive. He recapped what he understood to be the three primary issues that the C-2 were trying to resolve which were height, parking, and non-conformities.

Based on Chairman Puri's suggestion, Commissioners discussed the benefits/drawbacks related to the approval or denial of the proposed amendment. Commissioners provided individual comments on what they preferred. It was concluded that additional time was needed to address the topic more fully and make the ordinance as good as could be.

There was agreement to hold the public hearing on May 22 and then move to table it to a following meeting in July to allow for work session discussion.

- **Neighborhood Planning**

Mr. Macintyre gave an overview of the proposed process and what the outcomes were expected to be. He noted that staff had been preparing background data in a graphics format for the first proposed study area to assist in engaging the public. While focused, the data package was intended to be used as "template" for future planning areas. He also stated that the process envisioned using work-groups with specific tasks to help move the planning process forward without getting bogged down in details.

He noted that the process envisioned a more specific land use map for the planning area that was based on the participant's vision. Several Commissioners expressed concern with a more specific map. They felt the area plans should not be parcel specific.

Mr. MacIntyre indicated that staff intended on refining the data collection and producing the neighborhood engagement materials prior to beginning the first area plan which was to be centered on the area surrounding Again Street Park. He said prior to proceeding forward he would welcome

additional Commissioner feedback. Additionally, Mr. MacIntyre indicated that prior to moving forward with the first area plan staff would provide a report to Council of its intentions.

Commissioners had general discussion about the proposed process. There was general agreement that what was proposed would produce a good product. The Commission also felt that the desire to produce two plans per year was reasonable.

OLD BUSINESS

No old business items discussed.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: April 24, 2014 minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:50 p.m.