Land Use Committee

January 7, 2016

7:12-9:12 pm

In attendance: Roger Purdy, Stephen Mastey, Les Everett, Sherman Eagles, Daniel Sarasti, Keith Hovland, Carol Herman, Ray Bryan (chair), Ian Luby, Alex Susko, Bob Straugh, Fred Foster

Staff: Suyapa Miranda, Cailin Rogers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Introductions and approval of minutes | **Bob moved to approve the minutes. Keith seconded. Passed unanimously.** |
| Agenda | **Alex moved to postpone the election of a chair and take Anton Jerve off the committee agenda because he was not available this evening. The motion passed unanimously.** |
| 2016 Goals | The committee reviewed 2015 goals. Development guidelines helped us achieve greater process formalization this year. Now that we have development guidelines, how do we use those guidelines? We have vision created for the neighborhood from planning that has happened. We need to be proactive in executing that vision. Perhaps one of the avenues for advancing our work is in understanding the zoning of the neighborhood. We should become familiar with the planning that already exists for the neighborhood. Much of this was supported by city staff in its inception, so we may have help in the city in implementing many of these things.  Ideas include:  Take an active role in updating the 10-year plan by:   1. Understanding what the current zoning is for the neighborhood. 2. Reviewing the current neighborhood visions and plans.   2. Continue to review collaboration with developers, especially the development guidelines, to promote positive development within the community.  Tree preservation ordinance  Anticipate trends that impact the neighborhood  Proactivity |
| ADU Task Force Recommendations | **Keith moved to formally thank the ADU Task Force for their work, long hours, and dedication to the process of reviewing ADUs in the neighborhood. Fred seconded. It passed unanimously.** Keith suggested that we submit the thank you to the Bugle. **Keith moved to accept the ADU Task Force report. Carol seconded the motion.** There was discussion of the wording of the motion. The difference between receiving the report and accepting the report was considered. **The committee passed the motion 10-0-1.** **Stephen abstained from voting**. Bob suggested giving room to the Task Force members present to report back on their process and/or recommendations. Task Force members spoke about the process and how the recommendations developed: through research, community outreach, and compromise. Phil clarified that the Task Force’s recommendations were intended to apply to the entire neighborhood. Fred suggested adding in a statement to the full Council acknowledging the contentiousness of the issue and to pass it on without a recommendation or non recommendation. Task Force members suggested that those sentiments were inherent within  Ian asked about the specific differences between the city recommendation and the Task Force recommendation. Phil clarified that detached ADU differences existed and also that the Task Force did not discuss minimum lot size. Stephen brought up the question of preserving significant trees. Phil clarified that because the City does not yet regulate all trees on single family homes and because they did not see precedence in other ADU discussions in their research that the Task Force did not put it in the report. Stephen suggested a galvanizing opportunity around this issue in thinking about adding a recommendation to both ADUS recommendations to preserve and/or replace significant trees. Sherman suggest d that the Land Use Committee either support or deny support to the recommendation as they send it on to the full Council. Sherman indicated concern with the lack of explanation in the report for not recommending detached ADUs. Phil clarified that the Task Force saw a difference between an ADU and something like a shed. A contractor from the community at the meeting weighed in on the aesthetics of ADUs. Members of the community discussed the importance of value issues in the context of value issues and how the internal vs. detached ADUS conversation can go either way.  **Les moved to endorse the recommendations of. The Task Force and pass them on to the board. Roger seconded the motion.** Stephen wondered why the Task Force didn't consider minimum sizes for ADUs, suggesting that if an ADU can work as a micro unit that it be allowed to exist. Phil said that the question of size would have taken too long for the Task Force to decide on. Fred suggested that it would not be appropriate to endorse the recommendations because of the diversity of opinions on this issue. He noted the confusion on the issue and the need to address it in terms of a zoning issue. Stephen wondered about what the Task Force found in their research on design professionals being assigned to these projects noting that it would offer some security to the process if a design professional were to work with the homeowner. Sherman spoke in favor of the motion. Bob spoke in favor of the motion and moved to amend the motion to add that the Committee give room to allow those who have not given comments on the issue have space to do so. Les did not accept this as a friendly amendment. **The committee passed the motion 6-1-4. Fred voted nay and Stephen, Bob, Daniel, and Ian abstained.** |
| Adjourn | **Roger moved to adjourn.** |