

LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of February 2, 2023

Members Present

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| ✓ Steve Gendler, Co-chair | ✓ Joyce Lenhardt |
| ✓ Chris Linn, Co-chair | ✓ Jean McCoubrey |
| ✓ Jan Albaum | ✓ Andrew Moroz |
| ✓ Jason Friedland | ✓ Camille Peluso |
| ✓ John Landis | ✓ Craig Schelter |
| ✓ Greg Lattanzi | Kathi Clayton, President CHCA (ex-officio) |
| | ✓ Larry McEwen, VP Physical CHCA |

Others Attending:

Elizabeth Wright, CHCA board member
Tony Banks, CHCA VP Physical
Karen Pilling, CHCA board
Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:03 pm by Chris Linn, co-chair. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. There are two items on the agenda: review of LUPZC Charter and LUPZC meeting procedures.

LUPZC Charter

•Introduction: The Charter (bylaws) is being rewritten to provide consistency between the committee bylaws and the revised CHCA charter. The marked up version of the LUPZC charter is being reviewed.

•Purpose Statement: The proposed changes should stand as revised.

•Type of Committee and Area of Program: Beth Wright noted that the committee is a “Standing *Advisory* Committee.”

•Membership: The final sentence of paragraph A should be removed as paragraph B describes an advisory, no-voting member. Celeste Hardester asked how non-voting members would be appointed. This is not yet known. It was thought that these members would need to follow member procedures. It was suggested that time needed to approve could be a problem. Paragraph C should state that members must live, work or own property. It is not an expectation; it is required. In addition “active members” should be “current members”. In paragraph D, it was suggested that “voting” be added to “potential new voting members”. The reworking of the paragraph was acceptable. The process for new members applies to both professional and non-professional members. Anne McNiff noted that the bylaws cite that there are 12 members. Beth Wright added that the committee has 12 regular seats. Ad-hoc members, such as an attorney, would not be included in that count. It was noted that that position could create conflicts of interest. Paragraph E that includes attendance. It was noted that there are rarely 12 meetings per year. It was suggested that attendance should be stated a 70% of announced meetings. The remainder of the paragraph was accepted. Paragraph E deals with term limits. There was extensive discussion about the length of the term (3 years vs 4 years) and the

number of terms (2 vs 3). A one year step-off period was generally accepted. B Wright suggested a balance that does not lose good members and opens opportunities for new blood. Readmission to the committee depends on availability. The paragraph includes affective start dates for current member terms. Current members are not required to complete four years from that date.

- Chairperson: Changes to the Chairperson section stands as corrected with the exception of Paragraph D: “The Co-Chairs or their delegated representative”. Joyce Lenhardt suggested that all committee members should be willing to serve as a chair. New members should be oriented to be able to serve as chairs.

- Activities, Duties and Responsibilities: No Changes

- Authorization and Limitations of Power: In Paragraph A, a quorum should be 5 active members; Discussion followed as to the Chair being counted for the quorum. It was thought that the chair should be counted toward a quorum. The co-chair who is not presiding is counted in the quorum and can vote.

- Standard Committee Procedures: Regarding executive sessions, it was thought that there has been a bad perception of pre-reviews. Executive sessions should be used sparingly and should have a HR-like function. S Gendler noted that other committees have formalized procedures for pre-review, which can be valuable. C Hardester noted that pre-reviews are expected by some community groups. E Wright noted that an understanding regarding executive sessions needs to be shaped. There should be transparency and there should be few executive sessions. It was also suggested that “RCO property reviews” be changed to “RCO property applications.” Paragraph H stated that requirements are stipulated by the DRC. The requirements are not mentioned. That reference should be removed. The DRC can set up requirements. The LUPZC can recommend resources. This communication needs to be at the DRC meeting. Professionals need to present projects. Poor documentation of design at the LUPZC wastes time. Andrew Moroz noted that this requirement should be in LUPZC meeting procedures. C Hardester noted that all reviews do not require architectural professionals; an example is for a fence. L McEwen suggested stating that changes in the building footprint should require a design professional. It was also suggested that envelop changes be a trigger for a required professional.

- Formalities: The committee should maintain a list of members, professional status, and dates of service. At present Celeste Hardester maintains an annual report including the members list.

- Questions from the GC: There was a question about fairness. Discussion followed regarding the community at large vs the neighboring properties, J Landis noted that all are given access and a voice. This language is not in the charter. C Linn addressed the concept of fairness. More discussion is needed. Another question was regarding the LUPZC’s role in neighbor notification. The LUPZC does urge applicants to notify neighbors beyond the ZBA notification list. Meetings and topics are in the Local and on the CHCA. The DRC has the RCO responsibility. E Wright asked how neighbors can be notified appropriately. There are two layers of notification: ZBA letters and near neighbor notification. C Linn asked about a spreadsheet for projects and the decisions with provisos.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 10:03 PM. Meeting procedures will be addressed at a future meeting.