

COMMITTEE FOR CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

MEETING NOTES

Tuesday, March 6, 2018

5:30 p.m. - Meeting – Rosemont Conference Room

Present: Ken Pryor, Emily Smith, Gail Holmes, Russ Axelrod, Teri Cummings and Gary Walvatne.

Citizens Present: None

Staff Present: John Boyd

1) Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 5:40p.m.

2) Approval of the February 27, 2018, meeting notes.

Member Axelrod made a motion to approve the February 27, 2018 meeting notes with one change. Seconded by Member Holmes. Motion passed unanimously.

3) Public Comments

There were none.

4) Continued from February 27, 2018 meeting – Planning Process: Continuation of Problem Identification & Topic Review

Member Axelrod summarized the steps taken to develop an updated Version 5. He reviewed the annotated draft and the clean draft without any markup of changes shown. He discussed the creation of the finished draft with a cover page, listing of acronyms and bulleted priorities.

Gary Walvatne arrived at 5:50 pm.

Member Axelrod outlined the notable changes in Version 5 such as code changes (two NA meeting section, the timing of the second meeting and options when considering the second meeting. There was additional discussion on the process.) Member Cummings discussed a concern of timeliness and reasonableness for the developer and in the needed response by the NA. The Committee recognized constraints for some NA's in their meeting schedule. In addition, the committee discussed options to consider for addressing a second meeting notice period deadline and the recognition that the NA must decide to hold a meeting and then follow the notification process for their meetings. Member Holmes

noted her experience in setting up meetings as NAP President. For the process discussed, she expressed a concern that the second meeting should point out how requested changes were addressed and that they will be incorporated into the draft application.

Chair Pryor has concerns relating to the reinstatement of DeNovo. He noted that Council has a goal of revisiting DeNovo after testing how the interim process worked. He also noted that the Planning Process review will consider appeals and wonders if the working group could consider a review of DeNovo. He expressed concern of providing an opportunity for the working group to raise the question and consider removal of DeNovo. He based this concern of potential working group action on the open ended date for the reconsideration of DeNovo provided by Council. The Chair did not want this DeNovo issue to be reconsidered without adequate notice and discussion by the CCI members. Member Axelrod summarized the issues raised and noted he would update the working version 4 to add the new issues raised.

The members understood the concern and then reconsidered the process under review tonight was to address problem statements for the draft planning process to be presented to Council. The Committee's task was to develop a recommendation for Council to consider as a listing of problems or concerns and this is not the time to provide solutions. The Council can consider the recommendation, assign the work group and address the tasks with the understanding that these issues be reviewed by the assigned working group. All agreed that the solution was not required to be developed at this meeting.

After considering this discussion, Member Axelrod noted he will expand Section 3.3 Code Changes to include the concerns raised tonight. The Committee reviewed the listing of pre-application meetings in CDC 99.030 and then a sub list of those actions that also require a NA meeting (addressed in CDC 99.038.) The Committee concurred these listings were a good standard that should be continued. Member Axelrod continued with the discussion of other sections reviewed. For example there was an expanded Item 4 and updated Item 6 along with additional items that include separate staff reports generated by other departments. The Committee discussed examples that considered past land use actions that needed a response from other departments. The lack of response triggered the additional problem statements as potential changes to include in the Planning Process document.

Chair Pryor asked a question of who can file an appeal in Section 2.6 and the standing issue. The Committee reviewed that section and discussed how to file an appeal. He noted that the city's process was more restrictive than the state's appeal process. He used the example of prior appeals under DeNovo and how appeals were processed. The Committee discussed the replacement of separate sign in forms with a single sign up list for all public members to use for a specific land use hearing. The Committee concurred and added those items as new concerns for the project listing. Chair Pryor noted the deliverables to be provided from the working group have not been defined. It was discussed the process hasn't been defined by Council, in addition, the expectation is CCI members will be on the working group to maintain historical consistency with the process. He completed his comments to note his preference for the Planning Commission to have a summary discussion after an issue occurs (after the conclusion of the land use action). The discussion also considered how to improve the process.

Member Walvatne noted the Planning Commission discussed the same option but had to delay discussion until the appeal process limits were completed. The CCI chose to add a recommendation at the end of the process, as part of an annual review for training purposes. These reviews would be general in nature and consider the process or procedures and consider if CDC changes were needed. Member Walvatne noted an example of storm water and that the Planning Commission expected to see feedback from Public Works. He said this process has been delayed until Public Works has hired a consultant to work with the Planning Commission. The CCI noted the Council meets quarterly with groups and suggested those types of issues should be raised to consider action or changes. This recommendation was added as a new concern in the project paper.

The Committee reviewed the appeal process, including a review of the definition of standing and

determined all existing language was adequate. The Committee discussed changing the problem statement to simplify the information and conclude the current language is adequate. The next issue considered was during an appeal if new information is introduced, the hearing must address how that new evidence or information may be reviewed. The process allows the applicant to grant additional time in the form of an extended hearing date or leaving the record open. The Committee considered the existing process (which has a DeNovo appeal) is adequate and wanted to better understand the problem identified in the Planning Process report. The Committee expressed a concern that the language seemed to challenge the standards of DeNovo. The Committee will review subsequent drafts to consider if the language is supportive of DeNovo or if amendments are needed to support DeNovo when that item is reconsidered in the future. Member Axelrod noted he will incorporate the changes suggested at this meeting and he will provide a clean copy for the Committee to discuss at the upcoming meeting. The Committee preferred a draft that accepted the previously discussed changes and shows only the changes proposed at today's meeting. This version will be identified and number six.

5) Member Comments

Chair Pryor noted the next meeting is March 13th. There will be a quorum and the members discussed how there will be review of the changes proposed tonight. The expectation is that the draft will be completed and presented to Council in April 2018.

Member Axelrod noted Councilor Cummings was assigned to the CCI and replaces Councilor Martin.

6) Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:15. The next meeting is March 13, 2018, at 5:30 p.m. and will be held in the Rosemont Room located in City Hall.