

April 3, 2018

7:00 p.m.

Planning Department

Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners George Morrison, George Swaney, Gene Hicks, Arnold Cantu, Natalie Black, Joanne Denney, Brent Dixon, Julie Foster, Lindsey Romankiw, Darren Josephson. (10 present with 9 votes).

MEMBERS ABSENT: Margaret Wimborne.

ALSO PRESENT: Planning Director, Brad Cramer, Assistant Planning Director, Kerry Beutler, Brent McLane, and interested citizens.

CALL TO ORDER: George Morrison called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the public hearing procedure.

CHANGES TO AGENDA: Cantu moved to remove the Minutes item from the Agenda, Denney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Minutes: None (See motion above).

Public Hearing:

1. RZON 18-001: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT. Amend from Lower Density to Commercial. McLane presented the staff report, a part of the record. Dixon asked if the Sunnyside Study stated anything about the pre-existing properties. McLane indicated that it didn't state anything about pre-existing properties, but it does state, and is quoted in the staff report about the majority of land use adjacent to the arterial street should be predominately residential. Dixon indicated that planned transition has generally transitioned from residential to something else. Dixon asked what this property will transition to. McLane stated that this property will not be changing as far as commercial use, but the overall properties in the area could be designated as planned transition. McLane stated that 3 or 4 houses are residential, and then there is some commercial properties. McLane stated that they are planning to propose a change to the Comprehensive Plan for the entire area in an upcoming meeting. McLane stated that some of the properties are commercial and likely will not change, but they want to be able to look at each property individually and the planned transition designation will allow for any type of use if it fits. Dixon asked why they are bringing forward a single lot in the Comprehensive Plan instead of bringing in the entire area. McLane stated that when they came to the decision to address the entire area, they didn't have enough time to notify the properties. McLane stated that this is a single property brought by a single applicant. Dixon asked if they have investigated other options for the property such as grandfathering their use and not changing the Comprehensive Plan. McLane stated that it is hard to go against the Comprehensive Plan and they'd have to show very good reasons. Hicks asked if there is a rush for this application or can they wait and do the entire area in one hearing, so they do not make the access onto Sunnyside an issue. McLane stated that the designation doesn't require any access points. McLane stated that the Access Management Plan will help encourage the development of the area and reduce the amount of access points and they would require shared access agreements at the time of development. Hicks asked if this could be postponed. McLane stated that it is not pressing for staff, but it is for the applicant as they would like to proceed with the project.

Morrison opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Jeff Freiberg, 946 Oxbow Lane, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Freiberg read from the staff report: "...and it would be difficult for this property to be developed into low density residential due to the size constraints." Freiberg indicated that it is not difficult, it is impossible due to the subdivision ordinance and there is not a developer in the area that would want to buy the lots and develop into residential. Freiberg stated they are backed into a corner of what to do with the property along Sunnyside. Freiberg stated that the applicant would like to develop this summer and so they are in a rush. Black asked if they have met with the adjacent neighbors. Freiberg stated that they tried to get the lots to the east involved in the application, but they didn't have enough time to talk to their lawyers before the deadline. Black asked if Freiberg was meeting with the neighbors about purchasing the property. Freiberg stated he met with them about changing the designation to commercial. Freiberg stated that it would be in the best interest of the other property owners to change the Comprehensive Plan to commercial. Morrison asked what they plan on putting on the property. Freiberg stated that the applicant owns City Bagel and would like to put a bagel and coffee shop in the location.

McLane reminded the Commission that the use of the property is not part of the application.

Support:

Kevin Murray, 3525 Merlin Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Murray stated he is the realtor working with the applicant. Murray indicated that he has talked to every parcel that is still in the County, including the parcel that tried to get multi-family and was unable. Murray stated that this is something they have been working on, and it will be best for the City to Annex this area and they are trying to take care of everybody's needs. Murray stated that there is skepticism by everyone. Murray indicated that these parcels are already hooked to City Sewer. Murray stated that the staff has worked hard on getting the application put together properly. Black asked if they have spoken to the neighbors about high density. Murray stated that the parcel to the east was on their own and Murray had nothing to do with that application. Black asked if they are only looking for commercial or is there interest in high density. Murray stated that everyone is only interested in commercial and no interest in high density housing.

Josh Jackson, Brokers First Real Estate, 234 West 16th Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Jackson is representing the Grays. Jackson stated that applicants approached the Grays recently and the due diligence period has been shorter. Jackson stated that the market has changed and there are people willing to spend money right now and commercial is the highest and best use. Jackson stated that if this application is approved it would be a good precedent for future developers on other lots. Jackson stated that they are aware of the access points. Jackson stated that it is already zoned commercial in the County and one of the main concerns is to put the expense on the developer instead of the current owners because the City taxes are 2x the County and the City has different laws. Jackson stated that the owners are aware that other access points will be eliminated. Jackson stated that it would be good to zone the parcel commercial.

Cramer stated that there is not a direct reference in the Study as to how to handle existing uses other than when it relates to access. Cramer read: "Direct access to Sunnyside road should not be permitted except where the option of indirect access has been eliminated by existing land use patterns." Cramer continued to read in Land Use: "Development in the Sunnyside corridor should be predominately residential, but R-3A or PB zoning may be permitted on the north side of Sunnyside between St. Clair and Hitt Road to allow development associated with EIRMC, limited neighborhood commercial development should also be permitted as described in the

policy on Neighborhood and Commercial Development”. Cramer read from Neighborhood and Commercial Development: “A limited neighborhood commercial zone may be mapped at the intersection of any collector street with Sunnyside Road and the location of limited neighborhood commercial sites should be established at the time of platting. This would allow convenient stores, grocery stores, similar uses on sites of 2 acres or less and these sites would be developed with limited signage, landscape buffers and design features that are compatible with the residential environment.” Cramer stated that they are leaning toward a planned transition approach. Cramer stated that Planned Transition is intended to deal with properties that are moving from commercial to residential land use pattern.

Dixon asked about the County zones along the south side. McLane indicated that all the County property along Sunnyside are zoned C-2.

Morrison closed the public hearing.

Dixon stated that the problem is bigger than what is being presented. Dixon directed the Commissioners to the plat map and the property to the west has a long skinny southerly facing triangle along the edge of the canal and that property is landlocked and the only way that can develop is with an access out to Sunnyside. Dixon stated that they need to consider that piece of property and targeting one lot is not addressing the issue.

Hicks agreed with Dixon and stated that they need to address the entire area instead of one lot. Hicks asked why they are deciding on a County piece of property that hasn't been annexed.

McLane clarified that the application is for the Comprehensive Plan designation that deals with future land use designation and not a zoning designation. Hicks asked why they can't delay and address the entire area.

Black stated she thinks of the vacant corner lot where they wanted high density housing and it wasn't large enough. Black stated that her vision is high density housing in the area with one access. Black recommends for the Comprehensive Plan Change to high density not commercial.

Swaney stated that the purpose of this application is to change the Comprehensive Plan to allow the Commission to move to the next item on the Agenda which would be to annex and initial zoning of this property in the City. Swaney stated that the property owners have been working with Community Development and have a plan and the reason why they are requesting the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is to change it from County Commercial to City Commercial, so they can develop the property. Swaney stated that everyone has great ideas, but not everyone invests the money that the property owners have invested in the property. Swaney stated that the property owners have a prerogative to try and make the best use and most advantageous use of the property financially. Swaney stated that the application is to change the Comprehensive Plan to Commercial and then annex the property in the next hearing with commercial zoning. Swaney stated that it will benefit the property owner and the City of Idaho Falls.

Foster stated that a change to the Comprehensive Plan is a serious change to make especially when it is one lot in the middle of Low Density Residential that will set the precedent for the row on Sunnyside, and the Commission should expect to get other commercial development on the same row, and that will mean traffic problems. Foster stated that it is important for the property owner to maximize their profit, but not when it isn't consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Foster stated that this application is rushed, and she wants the neighborhood to have ample time to respond.

Black stated that part of the Commissions' task is planning, and this would be a change in the Comprehensive Plan and the question is do they want commercial development where there is some, but very limited and in an area that is marked residential. Black stated that they need to look what is the best benefit for the area.

Josephson asked if they don't approve the Comprehensive Plan change to Commercial, can the applicant develop in the County because they are already hooked to City Sewer.

Dixon asked if there is an agreement for these properties to willingly annex once they became adjacent.

Beutler stated that Public Works has not located an agreement for this property. Beutler stated that with the change in use and new development on the site, the City would not allow for the continuation. Beutler stated that the County couldn't issue building permits without water and sewer, so annexation is a requirement for future development. Beutler indicated that they are planning to demolish the building, and so for development to occur it needs to be annexed into the City. Beutler stated that a change to the Comprehensive Plan to Planned Transition would allow them to consider commercial, high density residential, whatever the appropriate land use at the time the request comes forward for development. Beutler stated that they need to be careful not to confuse the planned transition zone (overlay) with the planned transition Comprehensive Plan designation. Beutler stated that the designation for planned transition in the Comprehensive Plan is for areas along arterials where the land use pattern is changing and transitioning. Beutler stated that the Transition designation would allow staff to consider development as it comes and what would be the most appropriate zoning.

Dixon stated that if all the properties were coming in together the depth of the lots can create the possibility of having one or two accesses and then have a road on the back that connects them all and have it come in as high density residential as a single development, or as commercial as a single development, but it will manage the access points onto Sunnyside.

Morrison stated that areas that are surrounded by the City already are hard to deal with and although it is unusual to change the Comprehensive Plan for one lot, these are unique examples of left over remnants from prior planning.

Dixon stated that if they bring in a single lot it will set a precedent, but it would be an individual development and the entire area would not develop jointly and each development would want an access onto Sunnyside. Dixon stated that when you look at the Comprehensive Plan this is spot "zoning" or spot "planning".

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council denial of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential to Commercial for M&B: Approximately 0.864 Acres NW ¼ Section 43, T 2N, R 38 E, as presented, Black seconded the motion and it passed 7-2. Swaney and Romankiw voted against the motion.

Swaney indicated he opposed the motion because he feels there is confusion within the Commission. Swaney stated that the presentation from staff was for a designation on the Comprehensive Plan for Planned Transition location for this lot that would be extended to

all the other County island lots in the area. Swaney stated that Planned Transition designation would not lock any lot into a zone, rather that zoning would occur when the property became annexed and zoned within the City. Swaney stated that he believes they are voting on a motion in error and if they were considering the Planned Transition designation in the Comprehensive Plan as presented, the Commission would see things differently. Swaney stated he disagrees with the motion because they are convincing themselves that they are making a recommendation to City Council, not based upon what the application is before the Commission, but what the conception is of spot zoning. Swaney stated that this is not spot zoning, it could be spot designation for the Comprehensive Plan. Swaney stated that the only way the County island is going to get re-designated as anything other than R-1 (low density housing), is for the Commission to take a different approach. Swaney stated that the testimony that was presented before the Commission, is it is highly unlikely that there will be residential development on the area. Swaney stated that the residential development has occurred all around the property and it is not going to occur on this property.

Romankiw indicated she seconded Swaney's concerns. Romankiw stated that the Commission is not talking about access right now. Romankiw stated that staff indicated that the access management plan will come into play at the time of the development and that shouldn't be a consideration of this application.

Dixon stated that the application before the Commission is to change the one property to commercial designation in the Comprehensive Plan. Dixon stated that the suggestion by staff quoting from page 2: "Staff recommends changing the Comprehensive Plan designation of this property from low density residential to planned transition." Dixon stated that they also recommend looking at addressing something else, but that is not what is before the Commission.

2. ANNEX 18-002: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING C-1. Wallace Annexation. McLane presented the staff report, a part of the record. Dixon asked if the new Zoning Ordinance has a PT Zone. McLane stated that the new Zoning Ordinance has a PT Overlay. Romankiw asked what the current buffer is between the residential and commercial. McLane stated there is space and a fence. McLane stated that the new zoning ordinance would require the fence height to increase to 8' and trees planted 20' on center. McLane indicated that the PT Overlay uses only have exclusions, so the items listed on the table are things excluded from being used in the PT Zone.

Morrison opened the public hearing.

Applicant: Jeff Freiberg, 946 Oxbow, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Freiberg stood for questions.

Support:

Josh Jackson, Brokers First Real Estate, 234 West 16th Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Jackson indicated that the neighbors are in favor of the annexation and zoning. Jackson stated that the Tirrells and Grays know that the back portion of their property (approx. 6.5 acres) would be a retention pond for development. Jackson stated that commercial is the highest and best use of the property.

Morrison closed the public hearing.

Dixon stated that on page 2 on the Staff notes it mentions that limited neighborhood services should be located at intersections of arterials and collectors; and this area is not an intersection. Dixon stated that at the bottom of page 2 it states that they should cluster community service centers rather than encouraging strip commercial along arterial streets. Dixon stated that this is a single lot. Dixon stated that on page 3 it states that to reduce land use conflicts existing land uses are recognized as starting points for future land use patterns. Dixon stated that he would be in favor of bringing this in a zone that is compatible with its existing use.

Black stated that if this parcel comes in C-1 it could include an indoor amusement center, building material, garden and farm supplies, communication facility, financial institutions, equipment sales/rental, fuel station and vehicle repair and service.

Foster indicated that they are rushing to change the zone to C-1 without any other neighborhood comment and time allowances.

Swaney stated that it is commercial currently and as Josephson mentioned earlier, if it wasn't for the need for utilities, they could proceed without coming before the Commission. Swaney stated that all the things that they are worried about being developed are already available to them in the County commercial zone. Swaney stated that it is a class A annexation into a zone that is similar to its current use.

Dixon stated that there are a lot of uses within commercial that are not what the current use, but the PT Zone Overlay does eliminate a few things including fuel stations, vehicle repair, building material, garden and farm supplies, while still allowing the existing use, including eating establishment, and that might be a way to accommodate the historic use without broadening potential redevelopment uses.

Swaney moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the annexation for the property as presented, with initial zoning of C-1 with PT Overlay if the new ordinance isn't adopted; or, LC Zone if the new ordinance is adopted, Josephson seconded the motion.

Dixon proposed an amendment to the Motion that the property be zoned C-1 with PT Overlay if the new ordinance isn't adopted or the LC Zone with PT overlay if the new ordinance is adopted, Josephson seconded the motion. The Amendment to the motion passed 8-1. Foster voted against the amendment to the motion.

Foster opposed the motion and the amendment because she believes they are rushing to set a precedent of commercial along the strip and the neighborhood needs time to prepare and comment.

Morrison called for a vote on the original motion with the amendment and it passed 7-2. Black and Foster voted against the motion.

Black opposed the motion because she feels like this is a transitional time for the area and it is coming through too fast and it doesn't match the Comprehensive Plan and they want to do a transitional time they need to make the transition now.

Foster opposed the motion for the reasons stated above.

3. PLAN 17-001: FORM BASED CODE. Revision of the City of Idaho Falls Form Based Code. McLane presented the staff report, a part of the record. Romankiw asked about the difference between store front and stoop. McLane explained that a store front is like most shops downtown with full glass front whereas stoop has a different entrance with steps going up like the old post office. Dixon asked how tall the Bonneville is. McLane indicated it is 5 stories and there are no 6 story buildings Downtown. Black asked and McLane confirmed that if something built on the old DI lot it could go 6 stories high.

Morrison opened the public hearing.

Applicant: City

No one appeared in support or opposition to the application.

Morrison closed the public hearing.

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Revisions to the City of Idaho Falls Form Based Code as presented, Denney seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Business:

4. PLAT 18-004: FINAL PLAT. Silverleaf Estates Division 3. Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record. Dixon asked how many more lots the final plat added. Dixon stated that it will make the lots narrower and it will be cause the same problems as the Village had. Beutler stated that as they looked at the modification to the zoning ordinance, they considered that problem specifically and as they looked at the set back requirements for R-1 they adjusted the setback requirements to accommodate that. Beutler stated that the new zoning code provides for reduced set back in R-1, and by the time this Final Plat goes to City Council and development occurs the new zoning ordinance will have been considered. Dixon stated that if they consider and reject the new zoning ordinance, then will this area have enough room to accommodate the setbacks and still develop reasonable structures. Beutler deferred to the applicant on the home type and indicated that the lots are sufficient size that they can be built on. Dixon stated that it would be nice if the City would consider where the southern access into the Village across the City Park and turning north, they could add a road stub that goes straight west and goes into the area that will be developed into future park.

Applicant: Kurt Rowland, Eagle Rock Engineering, 1331 Fremont Ave., Idaho Falls, Idaho. Rowland stated that the lots are sufficient for the homes the developer is building.

Swaney moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Silverleaf Estates Division 3., Cantu seconded the motion and it passed 8-1. Dixon opposed the motion.

Dixon indicated he doesn't appreciate when the developer squeezes in extra lots on a final plat.

5. PLAT 18-005: FINAL PLAT. Park Place Division No. 5. Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Applicant: Blake Jolley, Connect Engineering 1150 Hollipark Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Jolley stated that they are continuing to work with City staff on the engineering level concerning 65th and they are working through the issues as they finalize the development agreement.

Dixon moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Park Place Division No 5., Hicks seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

6. PLAT 18-006: FINAL PLAT. Park Place Division No. 4. Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record.

Applicant: Laeth Sheets, 901 Pier View Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Sheets stated that most of the comments on the preliminary plat pertain to this area with the connection to Fox Run Drive, and they've been accommodating and flexible to those needs. Sheets indicated that it will have a very large pond and green space to be irrigated and have grass. Sheets stated that there is a lift station and they will maintain access to the lift station for the City. Sheets clarified that it is a regional lift station with a large sewer line going to it. Sheets stated that the pond will accommodate the current storm water from the existing subdivision. Dixon asked if this development is owned by the same person that owns the stretch south along Maggie Drive down to Division 5. Sheets indicated that it is the same owner as this development. Sheets stated that his client will extend sewer to the undeveloped area, so they have access to sewer main and to the lift station.

Josephson moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the Final Plat for Park Place Subdivision No. 4, Hicks seconded the motion.

Dixon indicated that he is considering an amendment that would say that no additional development north of this division can take place until the stretch of Maggie Drive that is between this development and Division 5 is completed, so they don't have the stretch not developed and then all the development north will funnel down Fox Run. Dixon stated that Maggie will be more expensive to develop because it's a wider street and it will be harder to make money off that division versus the other division. Dixon stated that City Council could consider restricting future development. Beutler stated that his concern is that it is outside of the boundary of the preliminary plat that was approved, and it is outside the boundary of this division. Beutler stated that it can be included as a comment or recommendation, but not a condition to approval. Dixon stated that they discussed the order of development should go from the south northward. Dixon stated that he understands that this needs to be approved so they can bring the utilities in.

Morrison called for a vote on the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

7. ANNEX 18-003: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING OF R-1. M&B: 5.15 Acres 5th W.

Beutler presented the staff report, a part of the record. Black asked if the Connecting Your Pathways will be included in construction of the road and utilities. Beutler confirmed that there is a proposed pathway along 5th West, and they will meet the City standard for that. Dixon asked if the development will put curb and gutter on both sides, or only on the west side and leave the County section on the east side of the road. Beutler stated that there is a wider section and as property on the east side annexes and develops they will have to meet the same requirement and they will be responsible for any development of road or infrastructure, utilities, etc., and they will have their obligation through a pay-back provision, if it has already been installed. Beutler

stated that he is unsure if curb and gutter will go on both sides and he is not sure if they are developing the full road section at this time. Beutler stated that the trip generation will only be sufficient for two lanes and until further development occurs they won't have the necessity for the additional lanes of traffic. Beutler stated that they are annexing all the County right of way and what was dedicated with the development. Beutler indicated that Horrocks Engineers are present, and they designed it.

Laeth Sheets, Horrocks Engineers, 901 Pier View Drive, Idaho Falls, Idaho. Sheets stated that on 5th West they did their half and dedicated what they could. Sheets stated that when they submitted their plans to the County engineer for review they had a lot of changes as the roadway didn't meet their road section. Sheets stated that it started discussions between County and City and County decided to have them take it over, so the County doesn't have to worry about it. Sheets stated that they can develop to the fence on the east side which only allows for 12' lane. Sheets stated that it will be all new road and it will be paved with more road on the west side versus the east. Sheets indicated that it will have curb, gutter, landscaping on the west side and the east side will only be asphalt edge. Sheets stated that they have relocated the canal to the other side of the development away from the road so there won't be an irrigation facility going down the road, it will be all landscaped up to the development. Black asked if there will be a bike path. Sheets stated that the sidewalk is part of the City section and the BMPO has a certain type of bike/ped priority for the road which has a 15' landscape buffer, then a pathway.

Applicant: City of Idaho Falls

Swaney moved to recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of annexation and initial zoning of R-1 for a portion of 5th West, as presented, Dixon seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Miscellaneous:

Neighborhood Meeting Discussion. Cramer stated that Commissioner Hicks asked this item be placed on the agenda. Cramer stated that this item came up during the Midwest Townhomes hearing.

Hicks stated that one of the things that keeps coming up during public hearings is the public is not aware of what is planned or what is going to happen or what is going to be developed. Hicks stated that based on the document Cramer sent to Hicks for what Moscow has implemented, Hicks believes it is appropriate that there be something in the requirements for a notification and a neighborhood meeting prior to the presentation to the Commission. Hicks stated that would assure that those people that are interested can have an idea of what is planned. Hicks suggested that they make it a requirement like Moscow.

Cramer stated that one of the things they were undecided on before was when to require the hearing as it is not necessary for every type of application. Cramer suggested that preliminary plats, PUD's, CUP's, things that have a specific plan. Cramer asked the Commission if they want to institute a requirement for a neighborhood meeting for certain applications.

Morrison asked how much the requirement would delay normal activities. Cramer stated that it depends on when the meeting is required. Cramer stated that if you require the meeting to be done before they submit an application to the staff, then it might delay it a bit, as the staff requires the applications to come in 6 weeks before the meeting. Cramer stated that the

challenge is, by the time the developer submits an application, the plan is pretty well in place and it is harder to make changes.

Black asked how it is working with just a recommendation from staff to hold the meeting. Cramer stated that it is better than it used to be, but still hit and miss.

Hicks stated that based on what he has seen since being on the Commission, it is not working well as it comes up at almost every meeting. Hicks asked Cramer what his recommendation would be for requirements.

Cramer stated that he would lean towards requiring it in some way as they have seen that if they do not have a neighborhood meeting, then the public hearing becomes the discovery meeting for the neighbors and that creates really ugly public hearings. Cramer stated that if some of the issues could be dealt with on a basic level prior to the meeting, it reduces the emotion that shows up in the public hearing. Cramer stated that the neighbors wouldn't feel as panicked at the public hearing and feel like this is their last stand and only chance to be heard.

Black stated that she is opposed to requiring the meeting because if the Community Development recommends to the developer that it goes better if they have a neighborhood meeting, but if it is a requirement, it is more requirements on the developer. Black stated that if the City strongly recommends it, it will be ok.

Dixon stated that requiring it in all cases doesn't make sense, but new development that may be different than the current use there is more reason for people to have concerns. Dixon stated that it becomes too subjective for it to be a requirement. Dixon stated that his concern is when they meet with the neighbors they present what they are planning to do, rather than what the action would be. Cramer stated that they wouldn't want to do hearings with zoning, but a PUD, a Preliminary Plat, or CUP where there is an actual plan being discussed it could be beneficial. Dixon stated that a PUD has elevations and something to discuss. Dixon stated that if they only did it on PUDs is that the most cases that it is needed as the PUD is looking to get around a part of the zoning. Cramer agreed that PUD and preliminary plats would make the most sense.

Morrison stated that he believes its been working well, and no matter when you hold the meeting there will always be people that claim they didn't get the notice.

Swaney agreed with Morrison and stated that the Community Development organization has the opportunity to meet with the developers and put forth the recommendation and to say that it is to your advantage as a developer to hold a meeting, especially on items that might become controversial, so you don't have groups of people that are opposed to change of any kind that come to the public hearing angry. Swaney stated that if people have knowledge and understanding of what might happen they are happier.

Black recommended that they take a year and revisit the issue, see how it goes and if they find that a lot of the developers are not meeting with neighbors then they can readdress it.

Cramer stated that they will develop a guideline sheet on how to hold a meeting, what is helpful, etc.

Dixon stated that they should talk sometime about under what conditions they can specify order of development, and if so what kind of changes they need to do that.

Morrison Adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted

Beckie Thompson, Recorder