

LAND USE, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of April 6, 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:

Anne McNiff, Executive Director CHCA
Celeste Hardester, Development Review Facilitator
Melissa Nash, recorder

The meeting was opened at 8:00 pm by Chris Linn, co-chair. This meeting was conducted remotely using Zoom. Approval of the minutes followed. Minor typo corrections were noted. A question was asked regarding the chair being counted as part of the quorum was asked. The chair does count in the quorum. During a meeting the chair can express opinions and moderated the meeting. With those corrections/understandings, it was moved that the minutes be accepted. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved. There are two items on the agenda: review of LUPZC Charter and LUPZC meeting procedures.

LUPZC Meeting Procedures

•Introduction: Two documents were used in the discussion: Jean McCoubrey's original proposal and Andrew Moroz's markup. The Moroz document generally elaborated on the McCoubrey content. Items are arranged from the general to the specific, committee reviews involve the community and take the historic nature of the community into consideration. Camille Peluso suggested streamlining the process. It was noted that the CHCA works with the CHCA and the Conservancy in going through the review process. It was also noted that the CHBA intends to become an RCO in June. Reviews should avoid leading questions. Applicants and neighbors should be aware of the process. It was suggested that the procedures could be put on hold as the CHCA is still working on its charter. It was thought that the procedure review should be worked on now even if changes need to be made in the future. The procedures document is intended for the committee's use. A question was asked regarding defining benefits to the community as mentioned in the variance process. Craig Schelter noted that problems arise due to one neighbor as in the Vanna Venturi house. It was asked about the state of an appeal for the Venturi house. It has not yet had an appeal. Jan Albaum asked about the applicant's need to explain community benefits or to describe that there is not detriment to the community. The ZBA application asks about benefits and detriments to the community and near neighbors. Benefits and detriments involve effect on use of property, light and air and traffic congestion. These are important considerations for public facilities as they have greater community impacts. C Schelter noted that variances are viewed as bad, but that there are many. The new code seems to have made rules tighter. It was noted that all questions in the list of community questions were not required. The applicant receives a DRC check list that explains what is required for them. This procedures document is a guide for committee members. J Albaum noted that questions 1-5

relate to Streetscape. This can be discussed. A question was asked about the new sign at the shopping center. It is probably going to be backlit, which is allowed (Code 14.9.04 discusses signs) A Moroz noted that the procedures document should be fairly short.

- Preliminary Reviews: Discussion followed about having these reviews and how they should be conducted. Should these be conducted as executive sessions? There are two ways to conduct these reviews. They could be conducted in a non-open venue but this can be seen as secretive and non-transparent. This is perceived in a bad light. They could also be conducted in public but developers may not like this. Some communities have preliminary reviews built into their process. City Zoning meets with developers before they go to L&I. CHCA preliminary review should not give approval, just advice. Celeste Hardester described the Roxborough system, which includes a preliminary review. The problem of ill-prepared presentations was discussed. Positive examples should be available. A Moroz noted the working group is talking about the process. Anne McNiff noted that preliminary reviews with other committees could prolong the process with multiple meetings.

- Procedures: C Linn stated that altering the essential character of the neighborhood includes the impact to the environment. It was noted that John Landis's revision (not distributed) was more specific. The City has time limits on the review process, but that the developer can extend these. The various versions of the procedures documents should be distilled. There are procedures and open suggested questions. J McCoubrey can re-distribute the documents, including John Landis's revisions. Preliminary reviews should be separate document. A Moroz asked if historic importance should be included or should it be the task of the HDAC. Good design is welcome more by neighbors than bad design.

Committee Business

- There will be 2 properties coming to the LUPZC next month from the DRC. It was asked how people become aware of the process.

Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 PM. (LUPZC charter was not addressed at this meeting.)