

Code and Character Taskforce

April 1, 2008 – Notes

Mayor's Boardroom, City Hall

Called to Order: 3:42pm

COMMUNITY MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Baumgarten, Brian Evans, Darby Watson, Jim Bishop, Liz Jennings, Danne Neill, Nick Hartrich, Ted Mischaikov, Allen Matsumoto

STAFF PRESENT: Tim Stewart, Nicole Oliver, Linda Stewart, Marilyn Vogel, Heather Aven

Nicole advised that an e-mail has been drafted to be sent to the stakeholders on the list. She explained that the e-mail will be an invitation with necessary information; as well as, an attached flyer talking about the Planning Academy. She also stated that an e-mail will be sent to the MNAC and the Neighborhood Association Presidents asking them to select 2 people from their respective neighborhood to attend the Planning Academy.

There was discussion about the names on the list and the content of both the e-mail language and the content of the flyer. Nicole also mentioned depending on the number of interested participants from the invitations and neighborhood representatives will determine if a press release is necessary.

Marilyn explained that the *Maker's Study* is the result of an independent critique of the residential code (both subdivision and zoning standards), as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. She stated focus groups, which included builders, designers, and staff, met together and used their technical backgrounds to determine the best way to introduce the different neighborhood development options to the community, based on the results of the study.

Tim pointed out that the *Maker's Study* provides a common vocabulary. He also stated, in his opinion, there are four different levels of decision making for land use options. The first, an administrative decision, does not include a public review and is quite straight forward; if you meet the code, the permit is issued. Next, a discretionary decision, requires a public notice and some process prior to decision. He explained that any appeals to this decision are heard by the hearing examiner. Tim stated an example of the next decision level is a conditional use permit. He stated that the hearing examiner makes the decision after a public hearing is held. Finally, a legislative action, will require a public hearing, often before both the Planning Commission and the City Council. He pointed out that these decision levels will need to be considered when deciding how the different components of the toolbox will be adopted, how one receives entitlement, and which zones will be affected.

There was discussion about what the Planning Academy will achieve and how different messages will be proposed to the attendees. The taskforce talked about who will facilitate

the meeting. It was suggested that Christianson lead the “where rubber meets the road” portions and allow groups of 8-10 people discuss questions about other “hot” topics to be presented.

ADD TO THE LIST:

Donna Auer

Jason Levy, Western Washington University Professor

PLANNING ACADEMY CURRICULUM CONTENT

Things to keep in mind for the Planning Academy:

- Be clear and open
 - Not doing the “where” during this Planning Academy
 - Requires a map change
 - Requires additional public process

Things to be done the first session – April 30th:

- Orientation
 - Introductions – keep short
- Discuss WHY the Planning Academy is being held.
 - Establish a common language that all neighborhoods, builders, developers, and city staff can use and understand.
 - The need to build capacity
 - Address some of the problems that the neighborhoods have
 - Some want to divide their lot
 - How can they do that
 - Access / Private Roads
- Explain WHY infill must be done to some extent in almost every neighborhood.
 - The legal obligation per the Growth Management Act (GMA)
 - “No growth” is not an option
- Explain WHY the code needs to be revised and some of the issues it currently imposes.
 - Policy Foundation / GMA Compliance
 - UGA / Industrial land / jobs / supply
 - Updates to existing subdivision code
 - Creating innovative forms
 - Flex car
 - Bicycles - Missoula’s model
 - Carless ADU’s
 - Change in parking requirements
 - Stormwater during construction
 - Potential Incentive
 - Allow as amenity – not just because
- Discuss the benefits the public will realize both in their neighborhoods and the community at large.
 - Affordability
 - Sustainability

- Ability to build smaller / smarter
 - Infill will help the transportation by encouraging more riders
 - More convenient stores
- Discuss “big picture” on timing of development
 - Could happen NOW – depending on the location and development proposal.
 - Process Map
- Explain how the “Where” should be determined
 - Present different options
 - Present case studies to show as an example of what can happen
 - Terrain / topography
 - Different examples from City / underutilized
 - Transitional
 - Re-developing sketchy areas
- Provide training materials to attendees
 - Encouragement on how the neighborhoods can get to the “where”
 - Tools to take back to stakeholder group

PARKING LOT:

- Planning Academy III
- How are we going to address concerns

HOMEWORK: Marilyn would like to have the taskforce offer some substance on design standards,