

## MEETING NOTES

Zoning Update-Technical Committee Meeting  
Metropolitan Planning Commission  
Surrency Conference Room  
September 19, 2007  
3:00-5:00 PM

### I. Introduction of New MPC Planner

Geoff Goins was introduced as a new addition to the MPC staff. He will serve as a Comprehensive Planner. Geoff previously worked as a planner for Los Angeles County, California. He received a Master's degree in Public Administration from North Carolina State University.

### II. Downtown Master Plan

Staff mentioned that the new process for site and design review for the Landmark Historic District took effect on September 1. Alvin McGrath, the Permit Services Administrator for City Development Services, said that thus far seven applicants have held pre-application conferences with the Site Plan Review Team (city infrastructure staff and MPC staff).

Staff updated the Technical Committee on the Downtown Master Plan meeting held on September 11. The nine "commandments" for large-scale development were discussed briefly.

### III. Component 2 (Administration)

A. **Overview of Meeting** - A short PowerPoint presentation was provided to explain the purpose of the section—establish the authority of each administrator and commission/board; improve public notification; create a neighborhood meeting requirement for some types of reviews; and refine and add new review procedures. The presentation will be posted to the Zoning Update webpage to keep the public informed of the committee's work.

The committee reviewed the following draft sections: Section 3.1 (Purpose); Section 3.2 (Application Requirements); Section 3.3 (Public Notice); and, Section 3.4 (Neighborhood Meetings).

#### B. Section 3.1 Purpose

No comments were provided on this section.

#### C. Section 3.2 Application Requirements

The committee supported the proposed requirement for a pre-application conference prior to consideration of the listed types of projects. The

consensus was that this requirement would speed up the review process by addressing issues in an informal setting prior to submittal.

The committee supported the proposal that applications in all historic districts (the Landmark District excepted) would follow the same application and review procedure. Design standards, however, will vary for each district.

#### **D. Section 3.3 Public Notice**

The committee supported the proposed public notice table and the attempt to achieve consistency among the notices for various types of applications. Staff explained that the table will not be completed until all of the sections have been written.

It was recommended that the PIN (Property Identification Number) be included in addition to the street address as information to be provided on mailed and published notices, but that the legal description not be included.

There was support for the requirement for a neighborhood meeting for any development application requiring Planning Commission review. The proposed registry for neighborhood associations should include the criteria proposed by the City Manager for establishing valid neighborhood associations.

The committee supported the idea that the local government be responsible for posting notice on the property. The suggestion was made that posting notice could be subcontracted to a company that would provide the sign, post it, and remove it after the meeting. The cost would be bourn by the petitioner.

#### **E. Section 3.4 Neighborhood Meetings**

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the content of neighborhood meetings and whether staff could or should attend these meetings. The committee members agreed that a staff presence at the neighborhood meetings would be beneficial, but there was also concern that the volume of meetings could overwhelm MPC's personnel resources. It may be possible to set thresholds that would limit the volume of neighborhood meetings to a manageable number. It was suggested that staff should research neighborhood meeting procedures in other communities to provide guidance on this issue.

In addition, the following recommendations were made regarding neighborhood meetings:

1. Required Meeting Elements should include: a printed agenda, a sheet outlining the technical elements of the proposal and defining

the limits of the MPC's discretion, information on buffers and proposed transportation linkages, and a description of any variances that are being requested.

2. Provide the results of the Sufficiency Review for the applicant to distribute at the meeting.
3. Establish a standard procedure for conducting the meeting and a standard procedure for reporting the results of the meeting.
4. Consider requiring some neighborhood meetings to be conducted through the neighborhood association to help ensure high attendance and participation.

#### **IV. Next Steps**

Staff asked the Technical Committee to review the sections that were provided but not discussed. They include: Section 3.24 (Administrative Adjustment); Section 3.25 (Variance); and, Section 3.26 (Written Interpretations).

The next meeting is Wednesday, October 17, 2007 at 3:00 PM.