



Advisory Group De-briefing Meeting

April 3, 2008

Members Present:

Gary Bakke
Brent Campbell
Lee Clemmensen
David V. Gray
Jan Hoem
Ken Jenkins
Nick Kaufman
Heather McMilin
Judy Smith

OVERVIEW:

- ◆ Quick review of changes made to the draft since the Advisory Group last met.
- ◆ Summary dialogue based on the previous night Public Workshop.
- ◆ A revised version of the Concepts and Direction Report will be issued in response to the 4/2/08 Public Workshop

OBSERVATIONS:

- ◆ Relationship to the Downtown Master Plan process and future recommendations.
 - Parking and residential component is important
 - Can we explore incentives to level the playing field between development of greenfields and development within the City's downtown?
- ◆ Clarify how this process relates to other planning efforts:
 - Distinguish between ongoing projects that flow into this process and others that do not.
 - Describe for the committee, the various tracks of what goes in and what doesn't from other structured planning/policy processes.
 - This will help Advisory Group members communicate about the scope of this project to members of the community.
- ◆ The policy business of local government will continue to go on. Council may determine that some issues should be addressed sooner than waiting for the Code Update project. Those projects will be coordinated with the Code Update Project (with Consultant awareness) but will run on a different timeline.
- ◆ Discussion about policy pieces is good, but then we may need to determine to park those ideas for separate processes.

- ◆ The new ordinance may establish place holders (or framework) for new tools to come in. For example the idea of Neighborhood Conservation Districts (NCD): An enabling ordinance may be developed in this Code Update project, but the specific NCD will not. Any NCD would be developed as later steps and at the request of a neighborhood.
- ◆ Concern was raised over due process and allowing people to know what’s going on. Changes to zoning regulations and zoning districts should be tied together. Developing different zoning regulations means going out to people to tell them what is going on.
- ◆ Sense from one member that special interest groups are driving this process. People don’t trust the government or OPG. This claim was countered by comments from others that they have seen a positive change and this process is an opportunity to build trust.
 - Is there more we can do to build trust?
- ◆ A member wants real information on affordable housing separated from emotions. Feeling that no “impact studies” are prepared for development proposals.
 - This claim was countered with the statement that impact and community analysis is done for subdivisions.
- ◆ Interest in the neighborhood response to growth. Important to plan for growth for the next generation while also considering neighborhood character. There should have set criteria (defined) for elements of neighborhood character so that it can be addressed evenly with each neighborhood.
- ◆ Suggestion to go to neighborhoods specifically with the ideas to let them know proposed revisions once there is some regulatory language developed. Seen as part of the role of the Advisory Group to spread the word about the project.
- ◆ Relationship to affordable housing: Question to continually consider – will the actions recommended in the code update make housing more expensive?
- ◆ Concern over interpretation of the meaning of “spot zoning.” New zones may be developed as a part of this process. When an applicant considers applying the new zone through a rezoning process will claims of spot zoning occur?
- ◆ Important to think about the regulations for what can be retained for future generations – impacts to cost, infrastructure, etc. Neighborhood character should look 20 years into the future.
- ◆ Concern over not losing entitlements. There is a need to allow infill but respective of character.
- ◆ Concern over the loose of commercial and industrial zoned land.
- ◆ Concern over preservation of farmland.
- ◆ Important to plan for complete street design.
- ◆ Care to not focus too far into the future and less about the current condition.
- ◆ Skepticism about how much of the report could actually be accomplished.
- ◆ Make sure there are enough tools for future application.
- ◆ Optimistic that things will be put in the right place and there will be more clarity and fewer overlays.

NEXT STEPS:

The consultant will begin developing modules of code regulations. Those modules will be reviewed by staff and technical advisors and then distributed to the Advisory Group for its review. No date for a next meeting was set.