

Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session Minutes
June 6, 2019
Conference Room 1-B - 1st Floor City Hall

ATTENDANCE:

Commission Members Present: Burns, Carroll, MacMann, Rushing, Stanton, Strodtman, Toohey

Commission Members Absent: Russell

Staff: Caldera, Bacon, Smith, Palmer, Teddy, Zenner, Stone

ADJUSTMENTS TO AGENDA: None

TOPICS DISCUSSED

Old Business -

- **Rock Quarry Stakeholder Group Report**

Mr. Zenner provided the spreadsheet that the Commission had been working through. He said there were four pages to finish. There was general discussion of the interrelationship between the Scenic Road Overlay (SRO) and the UDC. The Commission worked to identify areas of the Stakeholder Report that would help inform the SRO regulations globally for any future designated overlay areas, and elements that were specific to Rock Quarry and its specific SRO. There was a desire to address holes in the regulatory structure in terms of enforcement to ensure compliance with the SRO and the report. There was also discussion on triggers for enforcement, many are only complaint-driven, but some are a factor of permitting or applications. Generally compliance and enforcement had improved in recent years through inter-department cooperation and the new UDC, but more could be accomplished.

There was general discussion regarding how to close the gap on issues such as the desire to remove invasive species such as honeysuckle along the corridor, but to still have a mechanism to get an appropriate vegetative buffer put back in place. There was discussion of exploring a retroactive provision and/or a funding program for restorative vegetation. Council could initiate a process to explore options and prepare legislation to change the code and regulatory structure. There was discussion on what appropriate triggers for restorative action might be and how there may be commonalities and differences between corridors on what the appropriate screening and buffering might be in a wooded versus a farm-based corridor, as an example of different types of corridors. Technically, this may include elements such as defining how much opacity and how high the buffer should be. Looking at the current SRO ordinance to identify global versus specific elements was discussed as a next step the Council could direct the Commission to spend additional time on.

There was discussion of opportunities to educate buyers at the time of property purchase of overlay requirements, not just information at the time of permitted. This would take resources. Looking at the existing GIS maps was proposed as a place to start to provide information. The Cityview map and Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) could be a starting point. There was discussion of using this information to create a robust inventory of the existing conditions on the corridor both in terms of plant preservation and restoration needs. It could be periodically updated if resources were directed for the data monitoring over time.

There was discussion of engaging with County staff on the potential for shared corridors and shared standards as a future action item. There could be a shared character district. The Rock Quarry SRO is applied at the time of annexation into the City, but there could be preservation of the corridor while in the County. The climax forest look-back period was cited as an example. A MOU was discussed as a related option with the County. Mr. Zenner cited the East Area Plan as a similar collaborative effort.

Building relationships with other external and intergovernmental agencies was discussed as another tool to explore. This may include state agencies and utility providers. This may allow the opportunity to develop overlays with a bigger, more global picture in mind. Partnerships would allow education and sharing of resources. Developing green infrastructure plans as called for in the Comprehensive Plan to provide wildlife corridors, green tourism and sensitive area protection

were discussed. The impact of sharing information and coordination on utility corridors, such as mowing and clearing best practices, was discussed. These agencies may also be able to partner to provide data for eco inventories.

There was discussion of the present state of the Rock Quarry Neighborhood Association. It had been very active and had been responsible for much of the SRO work for the corridor, but had been split in two and less active since Grindstone Parkway was built. Supporting a strong neighborhood association was discussed as a way to continue to implement corridor elements in terms of education and enforcement.

There was discussion of next steps. It was determined staff would summarize the discussion and prior meeting minutes and bring back a list of next steps the Commission may recommend to the Council in terms of specific aspects for the Rock Quarry corridor and the implementation of the report, and then the Scenic Roadway Overlay more globally. This would be prepared in a staff report for the public hearing. For the public hearing, the Commission could have an identified course of action to move forward. There could be a work session before the public hearing to go through the result/action column of the spreadsheet and staff could propose sample text amendments which may address the action as desired.

Mr. Zenner said it was clear statutorily that the Rock Quarry Stakeholder Report needed to have a public hearing and then be forwarded to the Council with a recommendation. He said because recommendations would ultimately inform future ordinances and code revisions to the UDC. He said if Council wants the Commission to come back in the future to look at a more tailored Corridor Plan for Rock Quarry then could ask the Commission to engage in the work. This could be in the form of an updated SRO ordinance and/or an area plan. Mr. Stanton strongly suggested a neighborhood action plan and getting the neighborhood association back up and running. There was also consensus to work to build relationships with utility providers to help implement the report and overlay's objectives. There was consensus staff would prepare the requested summary of potential actions to address the issues raised by the Commission and prepare a strategy moving forward and to hold a public hearing to hear feedback from the public on how they would like the Council and Commission to move forward with the Report.

ACTION(S) TAKEN: Made motion (Burns, seconded by MacMann) to approve agenda as submitted. Made motion (Stanton, seconded by Toohey) to approve the May 23, 2019, minutes as submitted. No other votes or motions were made.

Meeting adjourned approximately 7:00 p.m.