

## **BEAUREGARD REZONING ADVISORY GROUP, MEETING #9**

**Jerome “Buddie” Ford Nature Center**

**Monday, February 11, 2013**

7:00-9:00pm

Members Present: David Baker, Chair, At-Large Representative; Don Buch, At-Large Representative; Donna Fossum, Planning Commission Representative; Carolyn Griglione, At-Large Representative; Kevin Posey, Transportation Commission Representative; Catharine Puskar, Developer Representative; Stephen Beggs, Parks and Recreation Commission Representative; Mike Caison, Affordable Housing Advisory Committee Representative; Josh Sawislak, Environmental Policy Commission Representative.

Absent: Dave Cavanaugh, At-Large Representative; Hector Pineda, At-Large Representative.

City Staff Present: Mr. Farner, Deputy Director, P&Z; Mr. Sindiong, Principal Planner, T&ES; Ms. Contreras, Urban Planner, P&Z; Ms. Friedlander, Urban Planner, P&Z, Mr. Imm, Urban Planner, P&Z.

Community members present: Roger Sullivan, Susan Sullivan, Pete Benavage, Dave Dexter, Annabelle Fisher, Sam Stiebel, James E. Brown, James Durham, Judy Cooper, Read Scott Martin, Rachel Leonard, Rebecca Hierholzer, Lynn Bostain, Sharon Annear.

### **A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by David Baker at 7:10 pm.**

#### **I. Approval of January 26, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

Dave Baker asked for any additional comments from the Group and or community from the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. No comments received.

Donna Fossum made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 26<sup>th</sup>, meeting, seconded by Cathy Puskar. Motion carried, meeting minutes from January 26<sup>th</sup> accepted.

#### **II. Finalize Design Guidelines**

##### **Pg. 3.18, Table 3.H.1**

**February 5 Version:** (Community Gardens & Dog Parks) Stormwater quality controls shall be incorporated in the design of the dog parks

**Revised:** Stormwater quality controls should be incorporated in the design of the dog parks and community gardens. – To be removed and handled in the conditions

##### **Pg. 4.1, a, I, 1:**

**February 5 Version:** Block sizes are still under discussion

**Revised:** Block sizes shall have a maximum perimeter of 1,600 feet. The intent of this standard is to maintain the permeability of all blocks in order to facilitate pedestrian movement and ensure the opportunity for blocks to accommodate uses that otherwise meet the urban design goals of this document. Block perimeter shall be measured as the right-of-way perimeter adjacent to public streets (dedicated or public access easements). Block size is further illustrated in Chapter 10 – Definitions.

##### **Pg. 4.3, c, I, 3:**

**February 5 Version:** Multi-family buildings shall provide an average setback of 10 feet from the property line for a minimum of 30% of the total frontage of each building. See streetwall definition and illustration in Chapter 10-Definitions.

**Clarified:** Typo and agreed upon in previous version, as noted above

##### **Pg. 4.6, f, I, 1:**

**February 5 Version:** Ground floor residential uses along street frontage for average floor height still under discussion. Exceptions shall be allowed for ADA/FHA compliance. See illustrated definitions in Chapter 10 – Definitions.

**Revised:** Ground floor residential uses shall have a finished floor height above average sidewalk grade of a minimum 12 inches if set back a minimum of 5 feet. All other ground floor residential uses shall have a finished floor height above average sidewalk grade of a minimum of 18 inches. Exceptions shall be allowed for ADA/FHA compliance. See illustrated definitions in Chapter 10 – Definitions.

**Pg. 6.2, i, 6:**

**February 5 Version:** Where parking structures are permitted to be architecturally screened (as defined herein), the screening shall be provided for each level for the entire length of each street or park frontage. The architectural screening shall consist of the following:

- a) The design and materials shall be similar to the adjoining buildings, including the fenestration;
- b) Screens, panels and comparable elements shall be limited to accent elements
- c) The structure shall comply with the solid-to-void requirements herein

**Revised:** removed item “c”

**Pg. 6.2, b, ii, 2:**

**February 5 Version:** Vehicular entrances to parking lots, parking structures and loading areas directly facing the street frontages should be no wider than 26 of pavement. Exceptions may be allowed during the DSUP process, if combined for multiple uses.

**Clarified:** exceptions may be permitted if entrances are combined to serve for multiple uses.

**Pg. 8.1, a, I, 8:**

**February 5 Version:** Bulb-outs shall be provided for each intersection-crosswalk, where parallel parking is provided

**Revised:** To be discussed with Advisory Group

Discussion of whether or not bulb-outs should be required in all locations where parallel parking is provided. Marina Khoury and Cathy Puskar suggested that in some places they’re not necessary, especially on residential streets. Staff recommended the language stay in as is. Kevin Posey brought up concerns from the Transportation Commission’s perspective—cars are not allowed to park within a certain distance from an intersection anyway, a bulb-out makes it physically impossible to park where it wouldn’t be allowed. Josh Sawislak discussed storm water requirements; if bulb-outs are pervious it decreases the amount of impervious surface. Kevin Posey motioned to make bulb-out requirement a standard, Don Buch seconded the motion. Motion carried.

**Pg. 8.4, i, I**

**February 5 Version:**

- 1) The stormwater management pond shall not be fenced or otherwise segregated. Public safety shall be provided through the modification of slopes, water levels, or other design solutions.
- 2) Other than the Level II pond, stormwater treatment techniques shall not reduce useable open space or public access to the open space

**Revised:** 1) to be included, 2) to be placed in Conditions

**III. Finalize Matrix**

**Topic Area 2: Blocks & Street Network**

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 8.10b

**Topic Area 2 Completed**

**Topic Area 3: Land Use**

AG Reviewed Checkmark Added: 4.15

**Topic Area 3 Completed**

**IV. Public Comment – 7:52pm**

Roger Sullivan of Seminary Park referred to a chart from Transportation Commission meeting on February 6<sup>th</sup> showing Home Properties. He had heard about the proposed 45’ green buffer zone in the Adams neighborhood along Seminary Heights and supports it and expressed his desire to have had something similar at Sem Heights sF Homes and John Adams School

Annabelle Fisher expressed her desire to have meeting minutes from the previous meeting posted before the meeting at which they are approved so that citizens can see them beforehand, wanted the discussion of the letter from AG moved before Public Comment. Asked Cathy Puskar what the timeline to start development for shops at Mark Center would be.

Cathy Puskar responded: first phase has major retail component – grocery store – south of existing center across Raymond at Stoneridge. Parts of that development will come down for new residential with ground floor retail. The existing shopping center with Giant and Starbucks will not redevelop in the first phase. Some apartments will be removed but the number of units to be removed is unknown at this time.

Annabelle also expressed concern about the curb cuts mentioned in the Design Guidelines. Cathy Puskar, Marina Khoury, and Jeff Farner responded by explaining that the curb cuts are intended to be concentrated on “B” and “C” streets, and there will be none on “A” streets. Therefore, the curb cuts may be wider as they shared by multiple uses, but there will be less of them.

## **V. Overview of Zoning Conditions – Structure**

Jeff Farner

Once the Beauregard Rezoning staff report is released to Planning Commission & City Council before the April hearing, staff asks to have another public meeting with the Advisory Group to discuss the report and conditions. This discussion is to explain exactly where and how the recommendations from the Beauregard Small Area Plan are addressed as staff predicts there will be a lot of questions regarding some of the more complex conditions such as implementation of developer contributions. Meeting date to be determined.

## **VI. Letter from Advisory Group**

The Advisory Group is to forward a letter to the Director of Planning and Zoning as required by the original directive from City Council. This letter is to memorialize the work of the Group. Staff is creating an outline which will be forwarded to Dave, then forwarded to the Group for comment.

The letter will contain comments from the Group members and community, to be endorsed by the Advisory Group. Annabelle Fisher asked that the letter include community comment. Dave Baker encourages the Group to use the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> of February to have a discussion.

The letter will be distributed to the Group for comment before the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> and will be posted on the website in draft form for the public to review. Comments should be brought to the meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup> for consideration by the Advisory Group.

Staff reiterated that it is appropriate to include comments from the public, but ultimately this letter is from the Advisory Group to the Director of Planning and Zoning. Dave Baker reminded the group that the review of the letter is not to be an opportunity to argue old issues and asked that the letter be reviewed in context to capture the essence and substance of the work of the Advisory Group.

## **VII. Closing Comments**

Reminder of Open Space – Park Planning meeting for the Polk Site on February 19<sup>th</sup> at 7pm at William Ramsay Recreation Center.

Rebecca Hierholzer provided an update on the parallel road issue, said that Council members had visited the homes along the Adams neighborhood. Dave Baker reiterated that the condition language had been already approved by the Advisory Group.

Reminder of City Council Work Session update on Beauregard Rezoning Implementation on February 12<sup>th</sup> at 5:30 pm in the City Council Work Room.

**Meeting Adjourned at 8:18pm**