Development Sub-Committee

SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting 6: October 19, 2015

Attendance

Present:	Absent:	Staff:	Others:
Bill Adler	Don Cox	Bayer Vella	Councilmember Mike Zinkin
Diane Bristow	Kit Donley	Elisa Hamblin	
Bill Leedy	Barry Gillaspie	Chad Daines	
Stephen Roach		Nora Campbell	
Michael Schoeppach			

Welcome and Introductions

- Bayer Vella welcomed sub-committee members and thanked them for attending the meeting.

Meeting Business

- Bayer Vella outlined the agenda of the meeting:
  - Discuss if any changes need to be made to the criteria.
  - If changes need to be made, what should they be.
- Bayer Vella reviewed why the meeting has been called:
  - The Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the 60% draft and recommended that the word "unreasonably" be added to the first criteria.
  - During the August Sub-Committee meeting, the sub-committee felt that the body of the text covered the idea of "adverse impact to the community", and it was therefore removed.
  - On October 6, a commissioner asked that the Sub-Committee reconsider the changes between the 60% and 90% drafts. The Commission directed staff to discuss this with the Sub-Committee. The direction the chair gave was not to change the document; it was to think about the suggestion and decide to make a change or no change.
  - Through email, half of the committee requested we meet.
  - Bayer then opened up the conversation to the committee.
- Bill Leedy discussed the view of the Planning and Zoning Commission
  - Commissioner Barret more fully understands the process of the General Plan and has thus withdrawn her request.
  - Her objective was not intended to make the amendment process more difficult.
  - Her objective was to require that input from the public be included in the criteria and consideration of the proposal. Melanie recognizes that the criteria in the 90% does this.
- Mike Shoeppach discussed the plan from a development perspective.
  - The amendment process considers two sets of interests: the property owner and the community's greater interest with the understanding that the land use map will change.
  - There should be a balance between the two to ensure that the community's rights are maintained.
  - The guiding principles aren't mentioned in the introduction to the criteria.
  - The current criteria are too vague and may not clearly define if the amendment is in the common interest of the plan.
- Dianne Bristow:
  - I would like to see the original sentence fragment to be reinserted because the impact of the community needs to be heard.

- Bill Adler discussed that community impact is in the second criteria.
    - It's the job of Town officials to ensure that the community's voice is heard and recognized. We don't need to put everything into the criteria. Considering public input is part of the amendment process.
    - Impacts are mostly unavoidable. It's the job of Commission and Council to determine if and how far a proposal should mitigate. It's not possible for language to quantify mitigation of impact.
- Bill Leedy:
    - I looked closely at Barry's email and do not see the concern that he sees.
    - The 90% draft adds subjectivity to what has been far too objective in the past.
    - We now have a well-articulated pictured of the community's vision with a fair amount of prescriptiveness.
- Bill Adler: We should add "guiding principles" to the criteria.
    - Bill Leedy, Mike, Dianne and Steve voiced their support
- Dianne: is mitigation in the developers favor?
    - Bill Leedy: No, it's often very costly to the developer. Commission can as the developers opinion or make conditions without any regard for the developer.
- Bayer:
    - I think that meeting all three criteria is an appropriate mix of thematic and prescriptive requirements.
    - Is everyone comfortable with adding "guiding principles" to the first criteria?
        - Everyone: Yes

Homework and Next Steps

- Bayer thanked the group for their work and commitment to the project.
- Next, the General Plan 90% draft and the sub-committees change will be presented to:
    - Planning and Zoning Commission: October 20, 2015
    - Town Council: November 4, 2015
    - The community next year for education

Public Comment Period

- No comments were made.