

Montpelier Planning Commission
January 11, 2010
City Council Chambers, City Hall

Subject to Review and Approval

Present: Jesse Moorman, Chair; David Borgendale, Vice Chair; Missa Aloisi and Bethany Pombar.
Staff: Clancy DeSmet, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Garth Genge, Community Development Specialist, and Kristin Feierabend, VISTA.

Call to Order:

The January 11, 2010 meeting of the Montpelier Planning Commission was called to order by Jesse Moorman, Chair, at 7:00 P.M.

Review of Minutes:

Upon motion by Bethany Pombar and David Borgendale, the January 11, 2010 minutes of the Montpelier Planning Commission were approved 4 to 0.

Floodplain Regulations – Flood Maps:

Staff, Clancy DeSmet, presented an update on the floodplain regulations and flood maps to the Planning Commission.

enVision Montpelier Master Plan:

Mr. Moorman said the Infrastructure and the Built Environment is one of the largest sections in the Master Plan and is one of the sections that have a lot of translation to revisions to our zoning bylaws that will take effect after the Master Plan is adopted. The Steering Committee is reviewing this before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Pombar said in the goal language she sees something reflected in the targets and strategies that she doesn't see reflected in that language, and that is something about design that reflects and supports existing neighborhoods. There is a lot of language in the targets and strategies that spoke to supporting existing neighborhoods. It seems to her we have a commitment if we look at the broad enVision plan to creating structures that support community. For instance, we talked briefly about the Barre Street apartments that were built. It is great they provide a lot of housing but they don't provide any actual space within there for the tenants to have a meeting space. Highlighting something like that would give us some backing if they are looking zoning laws and designs we prefer. It is throughout target 1 and a few other places as well that it would be our recommendation to highlight that commitment with some language in the goal statement.

Mr. Moorman asked if she had some suggested language.

Ms. Pombar said something along the line of designs that reflect a commitment to reinforcing or complementing existing neighborhoods.

Mr. DeSmet said for the goal it could read that the housing adapts over time to reflect changes in demographics, climate and technology.

Ms. Pombar said she doesn't think that speaks to the need for community space as something acknowledge within that.

Ms. Aloisi said there could be a new strategy that said if a certain size public building for housing you would then incorporate this percentage of community space within it. It is open to interpretation to the developer that they use a percentage of the overall size of the project, whether it is outdoor or indoor space. She isn't talking about the design of the structure but program within the structure. Program is two-bedroom and three-bedroom apartments.

Ms. Pombar said she actually sees it within here couched under the neighborhoods. She thinks they are looking at the section of governments and access they talked about the need for trying to facilitate community space being built within each neighborhood, and this seems like another place to want to reflect that. Somehow we need to acknowledge that connection and commitment.

Mr. Moorman asked if they wanted some reference to community space. Ms. Pombar replied yes.

Ms. Feierabend asked if it should be included in a target.

Ms. Aloisi said she thinks Bethany was simply suggesting something like end of goal.

Ms. Feierabend said she would ask the Steering Committee what they think about developing a new target tomorrow in terms of accessibility in terms of bringing community together in terms of all building types.

Ms. Pombar said it could fit under target 1 as another strategy.

Mr. Moorman said he prefers not to throw it back to the committee because they are moving forward on other sections.

Ms. Feierabend said target 1 is mainly talking about the Historic District. It isn't talking about different neighborhoods. Target 2 is zoning. Target 3 is affordable housing. Target 5 talks about safer, healthier and more accessible housing.

Mr. Moorman said it could be a strategy under target 5.

Ms. Feierabend said it is in the context of maintaining historic integrity. She doesn't think it belongs in just the historic section. Any time Montpelier is accommodating 60 new housing units per year.

Ms. Pombar asked if it could fit under target 9 and allow for a variety of public purposes within the existing space.

Mr. Moorman replied yes, absolutely. Public buildings include private residences. Someone mentioned that at the Steering Committee meeting, that public buildings include multi-family dwellings.

Mr. Borgendale said he doesn't think that is what this section means.

Ms. Feierabend said they could also add it to target 4 where they are talking about accommodating new housing.

Mr. Borgendale said he is a little confused about what mean when they talk about community space. Can someone elaborate on what they have in mind when you use that term.

Ms. Pombar said it could be a multi-purpose room where people could have meetings there for the residents. If you are in the Barre Street apartments an open space could be used for community meetings there or other functions in some space that is available. It was highlighted in the governance section when they talked about the need for neighborhoods to meet that there is a lack of meeting space. By community space she means a space that people in that area have access to. She is talking about an actual room.

Mr. Moorman said he likes the concept of community space and promoting it but stating it as a policy that specific are we hemming in development?

Ms. Pombar said if they only include it as encouraging we aren't saying these are the zoning or bylaws but our vision. If we use language that doesn't mandate it but says it is encouraged it would be okay.

Mr. DeSmet inquired why not under target 2 somewhere? You could say you encourage the inclusion of community space in large multi-family dwellings. It has to be general in this.

Ms. Feierabend said this is just for large housing developments.

Ms. Pombar said it is, but they had talked about other buildings that are created having a multi-use space. There isn't enough space in neighborhoods. The neighborhood is the priority for building the multi-use spaces. Some neighborhoods have already existing places in their neighborhood where they can meet in a church or City Hall if they

are in the downtown area, but a lot of neighborhoods don't have any place to meet. As we have been embarking upon trying to build community in those neighborhoods there is a huge barrier.

Mr. Moorman said they have been talking about indoor space. What about outdoor space? We already have stuff that encourages pocket parks.

Ms. Pombar said this is specifically about indoor space. It would fit under strategy 2.c.8. would work.

Ms. Feierabend said she doesn't know how they would do it in a residential area that is all privately owned. When you are doing a new larger residential private development you could incorporate something like this into it, but for a single family dwelling you can't do that.

Ms. Pombar said it would be mostly applicable to large apartment buildings.

Mr. Borgendale said if you look at the current structure of this community in most of the existing residential areas where are you going to see the construction of large new apartment buildings? Where is it going to happen? The answer is it probably isn't for a real long time. The biggest problem we have with increasing housing within existing neighborhoods is small unit infill and not building anything of a large multi unit housing. There is material in here about increasing mixed use in neighborhoods. If you are looking for facilities that would be appropriate for this kind of space you are probably looking at some other use other than residential that would provide something like that. It could be small office buildings. If somebody puts retail space in a neighborhood he doesn't think they will want to open it up for community space. He is thinking as a practical matter looking at the neighborhoods what sorts of things could we think about doing to provide this type of space. What type of building would you build?

Ms. Pombar said what if some of the buildings on Elm Street were torn down at some point.

Mr. Borgendale said our historic preservation goal says we aren't going to do that.

Ms. Pombar said it certainly isn't applicable everywhere, but we could look at the Sabin's Pasture development and the condos at Freedom Drive and those spaces that will see future development. If there are more condos built they should have a space within those condos that would accommodate the people that live there.

Mr. Borgendale said he is surprised that there isn't community space up at Freedom Drive. In suburban Boston they are forced to provide that sort of thing. The question is whether we anticipate a substantial amount of development in the community.

Ms. Feierabend suggested they keep this on the back of their minds and go through the section and figure out where it might be best suited.

Mr. Moorman said strategy 1.d talks about where entirely new neighborhoods are created and this might be the place for this thought. We aren't going to inject it into historic neighborhoods that are already developed out.

Ms. Feierabend said the first thing on page 15 under Other Historic Preservation Strategies it talks about updating and revising Design Review guidelines to incorporate energy efficiency and modern restoration techniques. She would like to add barrier free accessibility to that.

Mr. Borgendale said one of the things that disturbs him about all of this is there a tension between historic preservation and all of the other energy efficient and accessibility goals. He doesn't see anything here that addresses the need to come up with better ways to resolve those tensions. There are historic characteristics of buildings here that are very contrary to energy efficiency. You could make the point that historic preservation means keeping energy inefficient, and he doesn't think they want to do that.

Ms. Aloisi said once a building is listed on the National Historic Registry then it is the federal regulations and not state. There is a review by the local and state, but if it is a public building and you will be receiving tax credits then it

is all federal. She is dealing with this at Moran in Burlington and it is potentially listed on the National Register, they have their guidelines and in order to get the tax incentives you have to meet their national guidelines.

Mr. Borgendale said he understands that specific instance but he is talking more in general sense because certainly not everything within the Design Review District is on the National Historic Register.

Mr. DeSmet replied that most of it is. Montpelier has the largest historic district in the state. 89 percent of it is contributing, and was in 1978 as well.

Ms. Pombar asked Mr. Borgendale if he was looking for more of an education around mitigating the tensions between historic preservation and eco efficient buildings.

Mr. Borgendale said let's just bring up the issue for windows.

Ms. Pombar said perhaps that could under the second bullet under preservation strategies regarding public outreach. That includes information around eco efficient restoration.

Mr. Borgendale said he doesn't know that it is just a public outreach and education issue. It is really a guide to decision making within all parts of the city and all bodies that make decisions about such things. Whether it be what they specify in zoning or what the Planning Department or Design Review Committee does, the thing that comes to his mind all of the time is the whole issue of windows.

Mr. Genge said the first bullet doesn't mention historic preservation specifically.

Mr. Moorman said he looks through all of the targets and while target 1 seems to talk about preserving and maintaining the integrity of our historic structures, target 2 talks about getting our buildings to be efficient, there is no marriage of those two concepts which is what David is pointing out. Perhaps they can achieve that marriage by creating a new strategy from the bullets with that very purpose in mind. He would suggest starting that strategy off by saying encourage historic preservation strategies that incorporate energy efficiency and modern technique while at the same time preserving the historic character and integrity of the building.

Mr. Borgendale said one of the reasons he is thinking about this a lot is he just spent almost three weeks in a southern Germany that the center of the city is basically a medieval city. It looks like a medieval city but when you go into the buildings they have solar on the roofs and are incredibly water and energy efficient and have efficient heating systems and energy efficient windows yet it definitely has the character of a very old almost medieval city. If they can do that sort of stuff we should be able to figure out how to do it here. He hopes this document talks about the need to figure it out.

Ms. Aloisi said she believes there should be a new strategy that addresses historic preservation. She is confused why the other historic preservation strategies are under strategy 1.d. It seems randomly placed.

Mr. DeSmet said he didn't think it was supposed to be there.

Mr. Moorman said the last three bullets get at smart growth, sustainable development, preservation of resources and land, and just as you preserve and restore a historic building rather than building a new you acknowledge the energy in the existing structure. Those types of statements don't seem to necessarily fit in the same tone and format as our existing strategies.

Mr. Genge said it seems to him you could take the whole section and combine it into a strategy expressing whatever everybody seems to be thinking and then it would fit with the other strategies in target 1.

Mr. Moorman said he thinks it would be more of a recognition that historic preservation can be sustainable development. Historic preservation might be a waste of resources in some instances.

Mr. Genge said for example with 58 Barre Street it is in a historic district and they are going to have to preserve it. No matter what it is still going to cost less to restore it into something than it would be to build something new of the equivalent square footage. You are preserving something. The costs are pretty high to get the achievements that David is talking about, but it is doable.

Ms. Aloisi said they are also keeping all the waste from going into the waste stream and capturing all of that energy.

Mr. Genge said if all of the bullets were reworded into a strategy to express what they are saying it would solve it.

Mr. Borgendale said he would agree that in many cases that renovating and improving an existing structure may be the most economical way to go, but there are going to be cases where that is not true as well.

Mr. Moorman said he is looking more broadly than just economy but sustainability so that would take into factors not only dollars because economics often hides some of the true costs.

Mr. Borgendale said very often times historic preservation gets into issues of authenticity, things like as simple as what color were buildings, etc. Maybe modern restoration techniques covers that.

Mr. Genge said target 2 addresses this stuff more directly relative to the zoning regulations. This is the design standard and the next is the zoning standard which is directly towards the energy efficiency.

Mr. Moorman said he is on target 2.

Ms. Pombar said in other sections they have said we wouldn't use uncommonly used words. Mr. Moorman said perhaps a footnote to the Euclidian zoning would suffice.

Mr. Moorman asked if they could take out the reference to LEED. The target here is the policy statement we want our zoning and building codes to meet these state and national standards.

Ms. Aloisi said she thinks a lot of states like Oregon and Washington that all government buildings have to meet the LEED standards. That is their base guideline.

Mr. Moorman said in effect we are saying whatever the applicable state and national standards that is what our subdivision zoning and building codes have to meet. Ms. Pombar said they should footnote LEED and note what it is. Smart growth principles might be one of those terms to include in a glossary or footnote.

Mr. Moorman asked if there were issues with the bullets under strategy 2a.

Mr. Borgendale said he has an issue with the very first word. He doesn't like the word consider. He wants it to be "Make revisions." He wants to be much more directive than considering doing it.

Mr. Moorman said this isn't necessarily making zoning changes. It is saying make a complete paradigm change in how the zoning works. Right now it is the prescriptive Euclidian zoning. This is saying to consider revisions that would establish performance and goal oriented criteria. This enables us to consider whether we want to go down that path and not just make revisions to the zoning regulations as they exist. That is a mandate to revise it with the overhaul. This can contain some regulatory language. They are going to revise the zoning regulations; there is no question about that.

Mr. DeSmet said the reason it says consider is there are a little different forms out there.

Ms. Aloisi said what she doesn't like about the envisioning so far is that it is very much encourage and not very directed.

Mr. Borgendale said there are a whole lot of models that are built around the concept of performance and goal oriented criteria for zoning as opposed to the very restrictive stuff they have talked about. When they went through this stuff three or four years ago they looked at a number of models. Strategy 2a says consider and what consider means that it leaves open the possibility of considering it and deciding not to do it. He feels pretty strongly that should not be what their strategy is.

Mr. Moorman said he suggests they leave it consider because that leaves the option out there that it might be a bad idea.

Ms. Feierabend said they could say “Revise the Zoning Regulations, Zoning District Map, and Design Review Guidelines taking into consideration zoning that establishes performance and goal-oriented criteria that provide residents with a menu of compliance options and clear guidelines for the forms of development in particular areas.”

Mr. Genge said the zoning changes will be coming to the Planning Commission anyway.

Mr. Moorman said if they were to take out consider and just say revise they are thereby precluding themselves from enacting some zoning that is along the prescriptive Euclidian style because conformance with the Town Plan is the furtherance of the goal.

Mr. Borgendale said he liked that change. Regarding Strategy 2b.1 one of the things they have been through is the concept that you couldn't build a neighborhood under its current regulations. If you have 90 percent of the city in that situation, which we did, it becomes an absurdity. The important thing to keep in mind is that zoning regulations also are a way of talking about how we want the character of a particular neighborhood to change and you will want to leave a lot in noncompliance if you don't like how it is.

Mr. Moorman said it says we recognize that it's not appropriate in all instances to re-zone.

Mr. DeSmet said one of the glaring examples of that is the Elks Club. The Elks Club is a private club located in low density residential and it is not permitted there. The golf club and the club have been there longer than some of the zoning. It was never contemplated that this facility would exist. A building like that which is 15,000 square feet we shouldn't just get rid of it because it isn't a permitted use. Maybe this addresses this where there is a reevaluation of the policy of nonconformity.

Mr. Borgendale said there are some basically strip mall like corridors on a couple of ends of the city that if you did it over again you wouldn't let that happen.

Mr. Moorman asked if any members had comments on Strategy 2c.

Ms. Aloisi suggested there should be encouragement of accessory dwelling units.

Mr. Moorman said that is done in a separate target.

Ms. Aloisi said she is talking about existing neighborhoods and not new ones. It talks about low density residential here.

Mr. Genge said there is discussion about broadening the definition of what an accessory apartment is and making it guiding some of the same strategies that are in 2c. Right now the help for doing an accessory apartment and making it easy is state mandate so it is a real minimum low level option of what you can do on an accessory apartment. By state law you can't restrict it. Somewhere here it expands that definition so even larger or more apartments would be encouraged by making them accepted uses. He would try to broaden Strategy 4b a little more. The Housing Trust Fund is going to be looking at broadening their focus on funding for more different and wider types of apartments. If you have a small house and want to add an apartment on to it, right now to be an accessory apartment if you have a 1,000 square foot house you can only put a 400 square feet apartment. It is 40 percent. Do you want to enlarge that?

Mr. Borgendale said they had a long discussion about that when they were doing the previous zoning revisions. There was quite a debate about the whole percentage business and the question was why it couldn't be 50/50.

Mr. Genge said because the state was mandating it for the whole state they did a minimum requirement that was acceptable across the board so each individual town could upgrade to increase what they wanted to allow.

Mr. Moorman said looking under Strategy 2c.5, should we reemphasize the point about accessory dwelling units. He sees it as fitting under both Target 4 and Strategy 2c.

Mr. Borgendale said he is a little troubled by Strategy 2c.2. He thinks he knows what the intent is. A strategy that says we should limit hookups to city water and sewer bothers him a lot.

Mr. Moorman asked if he would like it more direct.

Mr. Borgendale said they want to limit that kind of development period, but using water and sewer hookups as a mechanism to discourage it seems not right.

Mr. Genge said there are a lot of ways they can limit that even by just increasing fees by locations.

Mr. Borgendale said his preference would be to require hookups and then make it very expensive to do it so people won't.

Mr. DeSmet said one of the reasons that is in there is because on their Growth Center application, which was one of the major points of contention, was that the Planning Coordination Group and the Smart Growth Collaborative didn't want us to have sprawled growth on the outside of our city. One of the ways we could do that is to limit the amount of infrastructure that would facilitate that kind of development.

Mr. Borgendale replied that is a separate issue because there we are talking about subsidizing it as opposed to requiring the developer to pay for it. The whole point of the Growth Center and some of the tax increment financing is to actually subsidize the development of infrastructure. It seems to him by saying they can build all they want in LDR as long as they don't ask to hook up to city water and sewer isn't right. He doesn't think we want people drilling wells and putting in septic systems. We could say they have to hook up to city water and sewer but they don't receive any subsidy for doing it. If they are developing in LDR and they need to pay for all of that infrastructure it makes probably not economically viable to do the building.

Mr. DeSmet asked if Mr. Borgendale was talking about where the infrastructure already exists or expanding.

Mr. Borgendale replied he is talking about expanding.

Mr. DeSmet said right now they have to hook up if it is there.

Mr. Borgendale said it bothers him that there is any private water supply and sewage disposal anywhere in the city.

Mr. Genge said the intent with this is to discourage sprawl.

Mr. Borgendale said they should require water and sewer hookups and requiring the development bare the full costs of putting the infrastructure in place. The overall goal in terms of development here should be is that we shouldn't be doing development where you can't provide common city based infrastructure. He doesn't want people building that can't be serviced by common city infrastructure, either.

Mr. Genge said they are zoning the areas to be low density residential to begin with so they are restricting how much density they can actually achieve anyway.

Mr. Moorman said he agrees with David that as written this really may not accomplish what we want because we have said someone can build there and just not hook up. In fact, we are going to limit our amount of hookups. That doesn't really act as a tool to focus the growth and direct it.

Mr. Genge added that he wouldn't make it universal because there may be some places you want people to be able to build but you will never want to get water and sewer there.

Ms. Aloisi said there could be an outdoor learning center with VINS some day they will want which would be its own unit and they would have composting toilets.

Mr. Moorman said he would like to get through the whole housing section. Target 3 has 20 percent of Montpelier residents report the availability of affordable quality housing is good or excellent currently.

Mr. Borgendale said affordable housing has a concrete definition by state statute at this point and you don't need to ask people to report on the availability. He would much prefer to have a target that says there will be this much housing which is affordable by government definition by a date certain.

Mr. Moorman said affordability is based on mean or median incomes. What is affordable? Let's say we have a city of residents who are twice the median income. They will all report it is affordable.

Mr. Borgendale said establishing the percentage of affordable housing would depend on the demographics.

Mr. Genge said there are different definitions according to levels, but technically the definition of affordable housing is that people don't pay more than 30 percent of their income to be housed. It is really dependent upon your income.

Mr. Borgendale said basically what the Legislature did when they developed Chapter 117 two or three years ago they put a legal definition into the statute as to what affordable housing is. It is 30 percent.

Mr. Genge said in the city it doesn't matter what your income is. There is some housing out there at 30 percent of your income level you can find. You want that across the demographics of the area you are in.

Mr. Borgendale said there was a time when the availability of housing period, whether it was affordable or not, was not adequate. When we start establishing goals for affordable housing we are trying to say of the available housing stock a certain amount meets this definition of what is affordable.

Mr. Genge said this target is really aimed towards the quality of what is affordable.

Ms. Pombar said she likes the concept of talking about the adequacy of it and using this measure in terms of what the broader definition of what affordable housing is and creating a target that has specifics about what percentage we want to be in for affordable housing. It would have to be a different strategy that speaks to the quality of that housing, and a measurable target.

Mr. Moorman said he is missing how the residents report.

Ms. Feierabend said this particular question was asked on the National Citizens Survey so potentially in another five years they would be asked again about what the availability is.

Mr. Borgendale said he had a question about the 20 percent. That seems like an odd number for an answer to that question. It doesn't seem to be consistent with the number of people that would even be looking for affordable housing.

Mr. Moorman said they will use the target and fill in the x as a measure of success through the implementation of the strategies. With all of the problems they might see with the target he says they just go in and stick in a percentage and focus instead on the strategies which are aimed at increasing affordable housing. If in five years the percent is more

than 20 percent we know we are doing something okay. What is a good percentage? By 2030 over 20 percent is a good suggestion.

Ms. Aloisi said Strategy 3c says encourage the development of affordable housing through innovate standards and practices.

Mr. Borgendale asked what they mean by non-market housing under Strategy 3c.5.

Mr. Genge said the only way he is familiar with it is in subsidized housing where if you have a two-bedroom apartment its market rate is x but it is a tax credit property so it cannot go above a certain level that is tied to an area median income. It really means subsidized housing.

Mr. Borgendale said he is a little troubled by Strategy 3c.7 not because it is a bad idea but just being this particular category because he thinks homelessness has a lot more complex set of causes than the lack of affordable housing.

Mr. Genge said perhaps they could add to support programs because there are existing programs. We could support the allowing of their development within the city's limits.

Mr. Moorman said he is ready to move on Target 4. He is reading this in a way that could be beyond accessory dwellings as well to allow a homeowner who wants to split up a large home into 3 or more apartments.

Mr. Borgendale said he has a question on the target date. Is 60 units per year consistent with what the regional plan calls for?

Mr. DeSmet said there were 8 last year.

Mr. Borgendale said the regional plan has a housing growth allocation to the city which everyone agreed was a reasonable one. We should be consistent with that because we agreed with the allocation.

Mr. Moorman said we as a community have to readopt a municipal plan every five years. This 60 new housing units per year without a limit in perpetuity is a little scary. Since we agree with the regional plan we could incorporate that into this.

Mr. DeSmet said Gwen said 60 units is the Growth Center target.

Mr. Moorman said this says 60 new units per year. That is astonishing growth given our own history of our city in the next five years. Let's look at the regional plan. Ms. Pombar said it says an average of 60 units per 20 years.

Mr. Genge said that is actually about what the shortage is.

Mr. DeSmet said apparently the regional plan is not consistent with the Growth Center target.

Gwen Hallsmith, Planning Director, joined the Planning Commission via speaker phone. She said they challenged the Regional Planning Commission number and went through a fairly extensive process looking at those numbers while they were preparing the Growth Center materials. She would recommend going with the Growth Center targets and not the regional plan targets.

Mr. Moorman said they are ready to discuss Target 5.

Ms. Aloisi asked about existing buildings that have no historic integrity.

Mr. Borgendale said he doesn't understand the context of maintaining historic integrity and would like to strike that. They have already talked about that in Target 1.

Mr. Moorman inquired if they used to have a certificate of occupancy program. Mr. Borgendale said he thought they did, too.

Mr. Genge said there is a certificate of occupancy program now for newer renovations. Building permits would address certain changes for a new kitchen, and if there were plumbing and electrical changes everything would have to be brought up to code. The city has adopted certain national regulations.

Mr. Moorman asked what 5a adds that we don't already have.

Ms. Aloisi said it is an apartment inspection when you aren't doing a renovation or an addition. It is when you switch tenants and it gets inspected again.

Mr. Genge said he does inspections now, but there isn't an organized program. He is just trying to get into every building he can and make sure they are up to the minimum standards. If you implement a building code and make standards and you give the building inspector the capacity to inspect every building in the city that could be a threat to your housing because landlords don't have enough money to bring things up to a new code it is difficult.

Mr. Moorman said that is why he likes this worded as it is because we may want to grandfather some stuff. Strategy 5f is a nice way to state the accessibility strategy.

Ms. Pombar said her only concern with 5f is that for private dwellings that is fine, but for public or non-private they have to be ADA compliant.

Ms. Aloisi said any time you get a permit you have to meet the code which is accessibility. We already have regulations for encouraging inclusion.

Mr. Moorman said strategy 5f is directed just at new housing or substantial renovations of single family dwellings. This is attempting to cover those instances where another layer of regulation doesn't touch them already.

Ms. Aloisi said if they are doing new housing construction or substantial renovations you have to meet ADA code. This is redundant.

Mr. Genge said you have to meet basic code. If you are four units or less you don't have to put an elevator in.

Ms. Pombar said in Strategy 5g we should mention asbestos along with lead paint. How different are strategies 5f and 5h from each other?

Mr. Genge said they could combine them and decide whether it is a mandate or encourage.

Mr. Moorman said they are ready to move on to Target 6.

Ms. Pombar said in this section they switched language where it is all green and now it is all eco efficient. For consistency throughout the document we should stick a term and stick with it. Maybe eco efficient is more appropriate.

Mr. Borgendale said he thinks eco efficient is part of what people mean when they talk about green. Hopefully, this incorporates concerns about both energy and water. This talks about energy and water efficient designs but the criteria says use less energy and it doesn't address the water issue. Strategy 6e is what he started talking about on Target 1. He doesn't know what City Scape is.

Mr. Genge said it is the basis for design review. It informs everything from restoration to imagery to concept, and it is from 1976. It needs to be updated. It is like a manual for Design Control.

Mr. Borgendale said perhaps they could replace do not with minimize.

Mr. Moorman said they are ready to discuss Target 7. He said this target is not limited to educational programs under the strategies.

Ms. Pombar said Strategy 7b sounds like mandated language. She isn't sure if that is going to be true across the board.

Mr. Moorman said they are going to be changing the zoning regulations and that change could be tweaking the existing waiving. With a policy statement here we know at some point it was important to the community to maintain that waiver for CB-I.

Mr. Borgendale said the problem with the parking requirements in the zoning regulations are certainly an impediment to a lot of development and yet it becomes very controversial to change them because nothing seems to generate more complaints in the community than parking.

Mr. DeSmet said they are never going to remove ourselves from that dependency of asphalt and cars if we don't do something like this.

Mr. Moorman said Target 2c.7 has good language about reducing the land dedicated to automobiles by revising the parking requirements. Promoting infill may have that same concept in mind of reducing the land devoted to parking. He said Strategy 7b should be reworded to be more general, that it is a policy directed to consider revision in the parking requirements to allow greater flexibility.

Mr. Borgendale said the parking requirements are an impediment for infill development.

Mr. Moorman said they are ready for Target 8. He suggested inserting in Target 8 after alternative an emphasis on the non-vehicular because that is what it is all about. Alternative transportation is away from automobiles.

Mr. Borgendale said they mean no cars.

Ms. Aloisi said they could say they encourage the use of walking, cycling and public transportation as alternatives.

Mr. Moorman said he is ready to discuss Target 9.

Mr. Borgendale said 2015 is a pretty ambitious goal for that.

Mr. Moorman said Strategy 9a is pretty controversial.

Ms. Feierabend said that language was sent to the School Board and was reviewed at their meeting on Tuesday and they said it was okay with them.

Ms. Aloisi said they could add a Strategy 9c to deal with community space.

Mr. Moorman said he would invite members to come to the next meeting with some suggested language and where it would fit. Their next meeting is two weeks from now.

Mr. Borgendale said he would like this a little broader in terms of having buildings be both designed and managed for multiple uses. Maybe they could insert under Strategy 9b designed, managed and maintained.

Adjournment:

Upon motion by Bethany Pombar and Missa Aloisi the Planning Commission adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clancy DeSmet
Planning & Zoning Administrator