

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
March 23, 2017
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Members Present: Burns, Harder, Loe, Rushing, Russell, Stanton, Strodman, Toohey

Members Absent: MacMann

Staff: Caldera, Smith, Zenner

Guests: None

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:

None

TOPICS DISCUSSED – New Business

- Building Permit Report

Mr. Zenner provided the February 2017 building permit report to the Commissioners for information purposes. There was discussion regarding two projects that did not appear on the monthly permit summary, but did appear on the 3 year summary. The discussion was that with these projects included in the 3 year summary the revenue numbers were looking good in comparison to prior years. Mr. Zenner noted that he would have to determine what projects these were and asked if the Commission desired more detailed information regarding the permit reports. The Commissioners indicated that was not necessary. Mr. Zenner noted he would be happy to ask a representative from the BSD Division to join our next meeting if necessary.

- Infrastructure Scorecard

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and gave a brief summary of its background noting that work was suspended last year as the Commission began its more intense evaluation and work on the Unified Development Code. After providing this background he turned the meeting over to Mr. Smith for a more detailed discussion of the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure (MTFI) and where the scorecard may be heading in the near future.

There was discussion of the MFTI's recommendation that a scorecard be developed that would be more qualitative, reviewed annually, and be used as a guideline or educational document intended to inform the regulatory bodies of development impacts prior to approval of proposals or permit issuance. Mr. Smith and Mr. Zenner discussed how this recommendation was consistent with the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan and was more in-line with what other city staff believed was the scorecard's appropriate purpose.

Mr. Zenner explained that there were concerns among other city staff that using a numerical scorecard system could potentially negatively impact lands that rated lower than others proposing development simply because of infrastructure limitations. Mr. Zenner noted that such limitations could be overcome if appropriate private resources were allocated to the developments. Mr. Smith noted that a more "narrative" analysis could be effective in getting the point across that some property was better suited for development than others versus a pure numerical system.

There was general Commission discussion regarding the MFTI's recommendation and the way that the scorecard was to be used. Several Commissioners expressed concern that the development of a scorecard system would potentially be seen as an unfair burdening of property that was less served by infrastructure and could result in increased development costs. Mr. Smith and Mr. Zenner noted that while this was likely an outcome of creating the scorecard, a process which identifies deficiencies and means by which to correct them was necessary. To

allow development to occur on the fringe areas of the City in lieu of in areas where adequate capacity, albeit aged and in need of replacement, exists was contrary to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Zenner noted that focusing new development internally and requiring replacement of the aged infrastructure would likely overtime result in a more “equalized” system of similar quality improvements. The problem that truly exists is that original infrastructure has not been replaced or funded for replacement adequately overtime. Creating the scorecard and recognizing its ability to stimulate conversation about how to address this imbalance is really what staff sees as the benefit behind creating the scorecard itself.

There was additional Commission discussion and it was agreed that staff should proceed forward to refine the scorecard with the understanding that it would be qualitative. Mr. Smith noted that he would move forward with this guidance and would report back to the Commission in May/June on his progress. He also noted that the staff was working on several other projects that may be integrated into the scorecard process that would provide opportunity to address the second portion of the scorecard assignment dealing with “adequate cost allocation”. Mr. Smith noted he would report back on those projects as well when he presented the refinements to the scorecard itself.

TOPICS DISCUSSED – Old Business

- Council UDC Public Hearing Progress

Mr. Zenner noted that he’d like to debrief the Commission on the Council’s actions relative to the UDC and follow up on several outstanding topics/possible amendments that need to be addressed. However, given the limited time remaining in the work session he noted that the discussion would need to be postponed to the April 6 meeting.

ACTION(S) TAKEN:

Work session minutes from February 23 were approved without modification. Mr. Zenner announced that there would be a link to the 2018 Capital Improvement Plan on the next work session agenda and that there would be time allocated for Commission discussion about their general impression of proposed projects. He further noted that formal department presentations would be made at the April 20 work session from Public Works, Utilities, and Parks & Recreation. No votes or motions were made. Meeting adjourned approximately 6:55 p.m.