

**Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes**  
**August 9, 2018**  
**Conference Room 1-B - 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall**

**ATTENDANCE:**

Commission Members Present: Burns, Harder, Loe, MacMann, Russell, Stanton, Strodman

Commission Members Absent: Rushing, Toohey

Staff: Bacon, Caldera, Palmer, Zenner

Guest(s): None

**ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA:** None

**TOPICS DISCUSSED**

**New Business:**

- **Comprehensive Plan 5-year Update – Future Land Use Map Update**

Mr. Zenner introduced the topic and explained what was desired to be obtained from this evenings discussion and then turned the presentation over to Ms. Bacon for more specific details. Ms. Bacon began by providing an overview of what was previously discussed at the last work session regarding this topic. She noted that the staff would be working on three different types of activities related to the 5-year update. Activity one included review of the text within the Plan which would potentially amend/updated the Plan via an addendum. The second activity included updating the interactive implementation table for the Plan goals and objectives. And finally, the third activity would be dealing with looking at the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and considering potential adjustment to it. It was the third activity that Ms. Bacon wanted to spend the rest of the meeting discussing.

Ms. Bacon displayed a series of PowerPoint slides that showed the various components that make up the FLUM for the City. She also described how the “district” designations presented in the Plan related to what was being displayed within the images. There was also discussion regarding how the Urban Service Area (USA) boundary was conceived and mapped. Ms. Bacon suggested that one potential task to address changes that have occurred over the past 5-years could be to look at the approved annexations and adjust the FLUM accordingly. It was also suggested that the other rezoning actions could be looked at to ensure that they were not inconsistent with the FLUM “district” designations. Ms. Bacon noted that most annexation and internal rezoning requests were not inconsistent with the FLUM “district” designations given their board scope.

There was discussion about the potential to review the “district” designations within the Plan and determine if they should be refined. There was also significant discussion regarding the USA boundary and how it was or could be an impact upon future development. Mr. Zenner explained that the intent of the USA boundary was to encourage more thoughtful discussion regarding the expenditure of public monies outside the area that was shown as being improved with sewer 5 years following the adoption of the Plan. It was never intended to serve as a bright line in the sand that “thou shall not” develop beyond.

He further explained that there are areas inside the USA boundary that are impacted by factors that make such areas less developable without significant capital expenditure either from the public or private sectors. These areas, due to being inside the boundary, are the ones where expenditure would generally be more appropriately focused to encourage infill and reuse of previously overlooked property. Such actions would better fulfill the overall objectives of Plan by ensuring a compact and contiguous municipal boundary. Arriving at a more meaningful way of determining how funding for potential improvements in these areas could be obtained or at least identifying what improvements would be necessary are part of what the Development Scorecard project is working toward. Mr. Zenner noted that the Scorecard project would be brought back to the Commission in the near future. There was additional discussion relating to Mr. Zenner comments and an acknowledgement of the interplay between infrastructure availability and the FLUM as well as the USA boundary.

Ms. Bacon also discussed how the FLUM acts as an overall guide for development of the community at the macro level and how this informs and impacts staff analysis of land use changes. However, she also indicated that when the City prepares a neighborhood plan, such as the West Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan, such documents get to a more micro scale of land use. The neighborhood planning process was intended to augment the FLUM and provide greater specificity to the staff and community of what land use changes and mixtures were intended in particular areas.

There was discussion about the neighborhood planning process and the need to create additional plans similar to the one for West Columbia. Ms. Bacon and Mr. Zenner agreed such actions were necessary; however, added that such actions are not generally initiated by staff. Rather such actions generally were an outgrowth of neighborhoods desiring to engage in such a process. While the Plan indicates that the City should be producing one to two neighborhood plans annually it has been concluded that such goal is unrealistic given the staffing levels available and the time it takes to physically pull such a document together. Given this reality, Ms. Bacon indicated that this would be one change to the Plan's implementation table.

Ms. Bacon concluded her presentation with several future action steps. She noted that Commissioners could begin by reviewing the descriptions of the Land Use District shown on the FLUM and offer suggestions for changes. A second activity would be to evaluate the boundary changes that have occurred over the prior 5-years and prepare a formal amendment to the Plan to have the FLUM updated. The third activity would be more complex discussion to examine how the USA boundary may need to be adjusted to address possible future annexation requests. Commissioners agreed these additional activities were appropriate. Ms. Bacon and Mr. Zenner indicated that they would be scheduled on a future work session agenda.

#### **Old Business -**

- **Business Loop 70 Corridor Plan Follow-up**

Mr. Zenner noted that following the presentation of the Corridor Plan to the Commission a resolution was proposed to have the Plan adopted by the City Council as a part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. During the meeting discussing the resolution, it was determined that such an action would first require that the Commission hold a public hearing and make recommendation on the Plan's adoption. Given this desire, Mr. Zenner noted that a public hearing for the Commission to make recommendation was scheduled for the September 6 regular meeting. In preparation for this meeting Mr. Zenner indicated that he had requested review comments from several departments relating to how the plans goals and objectives may impact their operations. These comments as well as a summary of the Plan's purpose and goals and objectives would be provided at the September 6 meeting.

Mr. Zenner noted that the purpose of the Commission's review was to make a recommendation on the appropriateness of adopting the Plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The hearing was not intended to seek revisions to the Plan or to change the area to which the Plan would apply. Given that the plan was prepared by outside consultants and went through a non-City public input process it may be the finding of the Commission that such a plan is not appropriate to be given similar standing as a plan developed by the City. Mr. Zenner further indicated that the comments regarding the Plan's contents and their impact upon the City's other departmental operations would hopefully provide the Commission additional perspective.

The Commissioners indicated an understanding of the purpose of the upcoming hearing. There was some discussion regarding the plan and how it could/should be adopted as potentially a neighborhood plan. Mr. Zenner indicated that such a discussion may be more appropriate at a subsequent work session. Commissioners indicated that was appropriate. Mr. Zenner indicated he would place this topic on the next work session agenda.

**ACTION(S) TAKEN:** July 19, 2018, minutes were approved. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:55 p.m.