

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
August 21, 2014
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Lee, Loe, Reichlin, Russell, Stanton, Strodtman, Tillotson
Commission Members Absent: Burns, Puri
Staff: MacIntyre, Teddy, Zenner

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business:

- **Steep Slopes update**

Mr. Zenner provided an overview of the topic. He explained the slope graphics that were prepared on a city-wide level as well as at the site specific level. He commented that it appeared a significant amount of the land area that would be affected by the proposed ordinance was either outside the city boundary or the USA boundary as defined within Columbia Imagined. Mr. Zenner pointed out several areas within the USA and current city limits which were already protected by other regulatory provisions.

There were several questions asked regarding the area lying within the stream buffers. Mr. Zenner explained that the area shown represented the minimum “base” stream buffer. He noted that in areas where slopes greater than 15% were adjacent to the stream buffers there would be additional setbacks; therefore, providing greater preservation.

Mr. Zenner noted that the site specific examples showed how developments could be designed to avoid sensitive areas. He stressed that the approach to land development needed to change – developers first need to look at site assets and then at lot yields. Mr. Zenner noted this would require a balance of “carrots” and “sticks”. The regulations proposed could be the “sticks”; however, there appears to be few “carrots”. One carrot could be the establishment of cluster subdivision standards outside a planned development. Another could be transfer of density. Both possible carrots could be used as a way of ensuring balance between lot yields and the preservation objectives.

There was general discussion on this concept. Mr. Zenner noted that the proposed ordinance would fulfill several objectives of Columbia Imagined and change had to begin somewhere. While the ordinance may create challenge in some locations in others it would have little impact. He suggested that the Commission look further at the graphics and offer any ideas about possible changes at the next work session.

Mr. Zenner noted that the changes proposed by the EEC may be all that is needed to complete this assignment. He also explained that he had met with the Building and Site Development Manager and discussed the ordinance. During this discussion it was noted that the proposed 3:1 (33%) slope for graded areas, recommended by the EEC, may be too severe for a homeowner to maintain. It was suggested that potentially it should be 4:1 (25%). Making such a change would require disturbed areas to be no steeper than those areas that were off-limits to disturbance. However, proposing such a change would require revisions to other codes.

There was general discussion on this observation as well as the point that Mr. Zenner made regarding the development industry not having reviewed what was being discussed as a possible amendment. The

Commissioners indicated it desired additional time to consider further the information just presented before moving forward with the assignment.

Mr. Zenner noted that he would distribute the graphics shown tonight on Friday morning so Commissioners could review them in greater detail. He also noted that he would begin to revise the ordinance to include the minor revisions recommended by the EEC and have them available for the next work session.

- **Update on Module 1 – Columbia Codes Update**

Mr. Teddy provided the Commission an overview of the Module 1 material prepared by the Codes Consultant. He went through the August 5 presentation highlighting specific slides that gave examples of what the Consultants were recommending for the Code. There was general discussion on the product produced. Mr. Teddy explained how future modules would be structured and the anticipated content.

Mr. Teddy provided the anticipated timeline for project completion explaining that prior to the public receiving the modules for review the staff was reviewing them for errors or major omissions/oversights. He noted that additional public engagement would be obtained in future forum meetings as well as through focus group meetings.

Mr. Teddy explained that the Consultants were seeking input on the Module 1 material now through September 15. Comments received would be forwarded to the Consultants for review and incorporated into future drafts of the overall code. Mr. Teddy further explained that any comments incorporated into the draft would be footnoted so everyone would know what changes were made.

Mr. Teddy suggested that the Commission feel free to contact him with any questions. If he could answer them he would or he would get the consultant to follow up. He further added that all comments regarding the first module should be e-mailed to him.

- **Building Permit Report**

No report was given due to time constraints.

OLD BUSINESS

- **Work Program Status – status update**

No report given

ACTION(S) TAKEN: August 7, 2014 minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:55 p.m.