# Planning Commission Work session January 24, 2012 Minutes

### **Commissioners Present:**

Ms. 0	Genevieve	Keller (	(Chairperson)
-------	-----------	----------	---------------

Mr. Kurt Keesecker

Ms. Lisa Green

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

Mr. Michael Osteen

Mr. John Santoski

Ms. Natasha Sienitsky

# **Staff Present:**

Jim Tolbert

Missy Creasy

Brian Haluska

Richard Harris

Michael Smith

Willy Thompson

**Ebony Walden** 

Ms. Keller convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m. and turned the time to Jim Tolbert. Mr. Tolbert informed the Planning Commission of the Supreme Court ruling which does not allow the Planning Commission to grant waivers. Staff will be reviewing both Chapter 34 and 29 to find all waivers occurrences and recommend updates to comply with the legal interpretation. A Public Hearing on the text changes is anticipated for March.

#### <u>Discussion on Housing and Transportation Survey</u>

The Planning Commission and City Council would like a copy of the 60 pages of comments from Survey Monkey in order to review the raw data. One highlight of the survey was that most who responded were happy with where they currently lived. It is anticipated that this data will be linked to the build out analysis.

#### **Upcoming Events**

Ms. Creasy informed the Planning Commission of the Livability project community meeting on Thursday February 23 on "Long Range Transportation" to be held at the Water Street Center. The City and County are in the process of scheduling a joint Planning Commission meeting for April.

### **Build out Analysis**

Brian Haluska presented a report on the Build out Analysis. This is part 6 of the Land Use Project. He noted the process used to construction the data and gave an overview of the report.

Mr. Rosensweig would like to focus on historical housing data analysis and review data from different periods of time. He would also like to look at HUD standards for housing in relation to this data. He noted that CEDA funding is available but feels that it is hard to find properties where the financing makes sense. Even when lots are available, there are issues with financing. He feels that the University zoning needs to be looked at as a model of success as well as the Standards and Design Manuel and subdivision regulations.

Mr. Osteen felt that some "non-vacant" sites are being redeveloped. He feels that if there is pressure from the community, then change will come incrementally and that some things should not be rushed.

Mr. Santoski mentioned that the development of city owned properties could be explored.

Ms. Keller also mentioned the precedent of development at McGuffey School in the past and the possible potential for similar types of development on school properties today.
Ms. Green would like the community to be balanced as a whole. She would also like to look at certain areas and to rethink community infrastructure needs.
Ms. Keller feels that more people might be living in R-1 areas today because of the economy with adult children and aging family members creating more multi-generational households than in the recent past. She wondered if we may have too many mixed used areas that are diluting the kind of vitality we were intending to create through mixed use zoning, and that some of those areas could be looked to for change
Mr. Keesecker feels that potential redevelopment areas could be mapped. He feels the City should help more with focused infrastructure funding when able. He would like to map community density based on census tract data.
Ms. Sienitsky noted that it appeared that some Planning Commission members felt zoning changes were needed while others did not.
The following questions are pending based on the discussion:
Mr. Osteen wanted to know how we identify families looking for larger units. He also wanted to know if critical slopes maps could be overlaid to refine numbers.
Mr. Rosensweig asked how many sites took advantage when new SUP regulations were put into place.

Mr. Santoski would like to know what amount of growth is realistic and where things are really going based on the data?
Mr. Keesecker would like to know the current density in certain areas of the City.
<ul> <li>Mr. Haluska summarized the discussion, including the following which need to be addressed:</li> <li>Modify the build-out analysis projections to use a "typical density used" in multi-family projects.</li> </ul>
Incorporate HUD data on families seeking 3-4 bedroom units.
Map areas of the City that might be subject to large amounts of development.
Map opportunities for development – and redevelopment
Create a visual representation of density, including density by building for larger projects.
Mr. Haluska also highlighted the following:
<ul> <li>The build-out analysis does not consider absorption rates.</li> </ul>

0	The analysis does not take into account unit types. Further research may be able to yield more information on the unit makeup of new construction.
0	The analysis raises the issue of the changing face of single-family residential development – family size, accessory units, etc.
0	It raises the issue of City investment in infrastructure to serve the future needs. (roads, utilities, etc.)
0	Financing is a potential hurdle for all development, although mixed-use developments can face some unique challenges. It could present an opportunity for partnerships.
0	Changes since 2007 (Martha Jefferson Hospital relocation, West Main St construction) have impacts that may not have been fully realized or understood.
0	The analysis does not speak to whether the units will be owner or renter occupied.
0	R-1 Density. Do the current regulations serve the greater interests of the community?

Kristin Szakos complemented the commission on the discussion.

# **Public Comment**

Bill Emory was interested in viewing the map showing vacant land in the city. He noted that the City could be broken in to quadrants to see where density is located.

Jack Marshall of ASAP noted that he was impressed with the discussion and feels that good information was given. He would like the commission to discuss whether the population number is appropriate and to clarify what the community wants to look like in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 pm.