

Douglas S. Wright, Jr., chair, called the special meeting to order at 4:02 p.m., on Monday, December 20, 2021, on the Zoom virtual meeting platform.

I. Roll Call

Also participating were commission members:

- J. Stone, vice-chair
- C. Davis
- T. Martinez
- R. Thomas
- J. Wheeler
- S. McIntire, ex-officio

The following staff members were participating:

- K. Maher, PCAD Director
- S. Bockmiller, Development Planner/Zoning Administrator
- M. Flick, Planner

II. SPECIAL MEETING

A. Planning Commission Business

1. Amendment to Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan

Staff report: Ms. Maher updated the Commission that no additional input has been received on the proposed amendments since the public review meeting on December 8. Staff investigated Mr. Wright's inquiry about a former transportation improvement recommendation to connect All Star Court to Hamilton land to the west which is not shown on new Map 5-5. A graphic illustration of possible alignment of such a road was shared to assist with discussion. According to the City Engineer's office, with plans for a controlled new intersection at the Hamilton property to serve this area and the Doub Farm, the connection between the Hamilton tract and All Star Court only benefits All Star Court properties. If this road alignment were to be added to the Comprehensive Plan as a recommended transportation improvement then the developer of the Hamilton tract would be required to build it for the benefit of the All Star Court properties or offer right-of-way for future construction by others.

Commission discussion: Mr. Wright indicated he agreed that such a road connection would no longer serve a public purpose. The Commission agreed that it should not be added to the recommended amendments.

MOTION: Ms. Davis made a motion to recommend the proposed amendments to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan to the Mayor and City Council for their review; Mr. Thomas seconded. Motion passed 6-0, with Ms. McIntire abstaining.

2. 2021 Amendments to Land Management Code

Staff report: Mr. Bockmiller updated the Commission that no additional input has been received on the proposed amendments since the public review meeting on December 8. As requested by the Commission, staff drew a sketch to show in profile view what the attached garage rear setbacks would be for the various residential districts and cluster developments. If the Commission favored such an illustration, a more professional version would be added to the text amendments.

Commission discussion: Mr. Wright suggested that both plan and profile view illustrations be used to help everyone understand the concept. Mr. Wright suggested that the Commission review the opposition points raised by Fred Frederick in the public review meeting related to Amendment #7 – *adjustments to zoning ordinance and subdivision and land development ordinance to promote traditional residential design over contemporary suburban subdivision design* – and get the Commission’s thoughts on the record for future review by the Mayor and City Council.

Discussion on Amendment #7: Mr. Bockmiller went over points in his memo. Mr. Stone indicated that upon further reflection he is not comfortable with amending the code to prioritize a certain style of development over other alternatives. Mr. Stone feels that development design should be dictated by what the market prefers. Mr. Bockmiller expressed the opinion that it is time to up our expectations, particularly as what gets built will likely last many generations. Mr. Stone observed that there are all different types of design represented in the city and feels that is a good thing. Ms. Davis observed that the Commission and her time on the Historic District Commission demonstrates that the City’s boards have shown flexibility with developers who indicate they cannot work with certain standards. Ms. Davis expressed the opinion that setting higher standards and priorities is important, then developers can come forward and explain why they can or cannot work with something. Ms. Wheeler agreed with Ms. Davis and said it is important to set an expectation that others can negotiate but lets the public know our goals. Mr. Wright expressed opinion that we are providing housing for the future and we do not want more developments with the backs of houses facing the street – alleys help to avoid that issue. In response to Mr. Frederick’s observation that adding alleys will add imperviousness and increase the cost of construction and thus the cost of housing, Mr. Wright observed that developers can create stormwater management structures to address run-off from impervious areas. A long discussion followed on what design parameters might be set for new alleys and what might be appropriate for access by fire apparatus and garbage trucks while keeping imperviousness area as low as possible. Ms. Maher suggested that staff could involve the Planning Commission in review of any suggested revisions to the City’s Public Ways Standards to address the traditional development design standards. In response to Mr. Frederick’s observation that there will be increased development costs related to the addition of alleys, Mr. Wright observed that there are many design standards that will increase costs. In response to Mr. Frederick’s concerns

about two-way traffic on alleys and width requirements, Mr. Wright indicated that would be addressed later with revisions to the City's Public Ways Standards. A discussion followed on alley trash collection, its desirability, and what impact that would have on alley design and maintenance. In response to Mr. Frederick's inquiry about whether the alleys would be HOA or City maintained, staff indicated that they would be City alleys so maintained by the City but not typically plowed by the City. If trash collection were to occur in the alleys, the City would need to review the alley plowing issue for these new areas. Mr. Wright observed that the majority of Commission members seem to be in favor of moving forward with Amendment #7. Ms. Davis expressed the opinion that a lot of buyers, especially younger buyers, prefer this style of development, so we should encourage it to be built. Mr. Thomas expressed desire to move forward with Amendment #7. Mr. Wright observed there are a lot of good reasons to live in Washington County which makes us competitive with other housing markets. Mr. Stone requested that Amendment #7 be moved out of the package for separate vote, so he can vote against #7 but vote in favor of everything else.

Discussion on Balance of Amendments Package: Mr. Wright asked if any Commission members had any concerns about any other proposed amendments in the 2021 package, and no one indicated so.

MOTION: Mr. Thomas made a motion to recommend Amendment #7 to the Mayor and City Council. Ms. Davis, seconded. The motion passed 5-1, with Mr. Stone opposed. Ms. McIntire abstained from voting.

MOTION: Ms. Davis made a motion to recommend the full package of amendments to the Mayor and City Council, and Mr. Thomas seconded. The motion was withdrawn.

MOTION: Ms. Davis made a motion to recommend Amendments #1-6 and #8 to the Mayor and City Council, and Mr. Thomas seconded. The motion passed 6-0, with Ms. McIntire abstaining.

III. ADJOURNMENT – 5:14 p.m.

1/12/2022

Date



Kathleen A. Maher, Director