

Minutes - Draft

**PECS-Planning, Economic Development & Community Services
Committee**

Thursday, July 7, 2022

4:00 PM

Special Called Meeting

This meeting will be conducted via teleconference (Zoom). Simultaneous public access to the meeting will be available

*(1) via live stream on DCTV's webpage,
(2) on DCTVChannel23.TV*

Meeting Started At: 4:00PM

Attendees: Commissioners Johnson, Davis Johnson, Rader, Cochran-Johnson, Terry

Present 3 - Commissioner Larry Johnson, Commissioner Jeff Rader, and
Commissioner Mereda Davis Johnson

I. STATUS UPDATE

2050 Unified Plan

-presentation provided by Sylvia Smith

-Question JR: the community had not seen this final draft of the comp plan, and requested the means by which for them to make comments. At that point there wasn't a way to provide commentary on the website; I understand that you all are in the process of doing that. I have some reservations about the character area; there is a suggestion that R-100 is no longer appropriate in that appropriate area. I'm concerned about destabilization of many of our single family neighborhood, as they are under pressure from several other factors. I would also like to suggest that by using the mechanism of a more widespread infill and diversification measures - my fear is that if we infill walkable neighborhoods with townhouse communities, small parcel commercial infill, etc., we'll be taking air out of the balloon of the area that creates new areas that need that investment. Before we send this to DCA for their review, that we not be on the road to debating and changing the plan. I do have some concerns that we're going to the DCA with a document - we need to cultivate and listen to citizen input in the document before we go forward with the plan. I'm not suggesting that it's not in general a good plan, but I want to ensure we have buyin on it before we close the process and move beyond

-Question LJ: do you have time to get more input

-A Baker: based on DCA's policies, they wanted us to do a transmittal resolution; we do have time to work it and massage it prior to adoption. The public hearing process will also be started, and we will continue to meet with commissioners 1 on 1 to get their input. We just posted the availability for the public to provide comments on the website; we are shooting for September and are putting things in place for it to move forward in October

-C Hudson: we are open to changes as long as they are not substantive changes; and we can continue to review with DCA as long as they are not substantive

-JR: regarding District 2, I would like to change the map if we can keep that particular plan category. I need to understand what is a possible change after the DCA review; I'm not sure that I'm there yet

-response provided by Cedric Hudson

-Question JR: it seems the walkable designation is spatially based; are there parameters that relate to the actual block pattern, presence of sidewalks, and other amenities recommended for that purpose?

-response provided by Cedric Hudson

-Question LJ: how did those items slip in? Is this a template from Kimley-Horn or is it the ARC standard that's being used?

-response provided by Director Baker

-Question LJ: so the transmittal letter is not the end all be all?

A Baker: correct, our plan for adoption is September

-TT: I agree on holding off on the signing of the transmittal letter. I wonder if there is a process to have a citizen-directed approach not as large as a small area plan.

-Question LJ: is there a way to address the letter and still have time to address the points that need to be fleshed out by September? Is there a way to say that in a transmittal letter?

-A Baker: If we're shooting for September, deferral for 30 days wouldn't impact us

-LJ: we'll need a motion to defer for 30 days at the proper time to give people the opportunity to provide feedback

-Question JR: the September deadline is self-imposed?

C Hudson: yes sir

-JR: it would be great if we used our channels for people to provide their feedback on it. Additional information provided by Commissioner Rader

-Question MDJ: my question was related to the deadline for the transmittal letter. I thought it was soon for us to confirm the transmittal resolution. There's a lot we don't know

-JR: motion to defer transmittal letter 30 days

Second MDJ

Vote: yes unanimous

Public Hearing Signs

-presentation provided by Brianna McCloud

-Question LJ: if you order the big plastic one, can you glue over the new message and take up the old paper?

-response provided by Ms. McCloud

-Question LJ: do you have the price you're paying now for signs and printing?

A Baker: the current cost for signs was about \$6500. If we want to go up, we could subtract that from what the new cost would be. If it is the will of the commissioners to change and upsize the signs, we are giving an idea of what the signs would be, so that this may be included in a midyear budget amendment

-Question JR: I'm interested in the idea of the applicant-installed signs. It seems whether we could develop a template that vendors could use that would include the 'slots' for the information needed for the sign, and we gave the applicant the list of vendors that agreed to use the template, and allow them to purchase the signs from the vendor. That way we would relieve the cost from the County, and we would do away with the hand-written elements of it. It would be posted and paid for by the applicant. Did we investigate potential to provide electronic template for the sign company to use, so the applicant/department can provide information with the appropriate information on it?

-B White: that's essentially how it would work. Additional information provided by Mr. Baker.

-Question JR: how much would those signs cost on an individualized basis?

B White: \$18.88 per sign

-Question MDJ: I would like to see the cost to the developer. I am all for signs that people can read. I'm fine with the recommendation of the Planning Department for the 32x48 signs. Who is responsible for once the sign is up and it comes down? I would rather keep that with the County and have assurance that we have a sign that the community is comfortable with and not pass the sign to the developer.

B White: right now we're responsible for the signage; if they are missing we are responsible for replacement. We have changed it so that the applicant is responsible if it were to be issues such as missing. Additional information provided by Mr. White.

-TT: the idea of these changes started when I came to the Commission. The purpose of branding and marketing something is treating our citizens with respect. The opportunity for public engagement begins with those signs going up. If it's all in handwriting at some point it won't be eligible. When I proposed this idea the points I made were ignored; I reject the notion that asking the developer would an undue cost in asking them to put up a sign, marketing what they are going to do, that would affect the entire neighborhood. Let's do something that will make us look good; I don't see a problem with the developer paying for it. Otherwise it's handwriting and a QR code

-LJ: we've always asked for bigger signs. Commissioner what you're proposing, I'll let Mr. Baker discuss why that wasn't considered

-MDJ: this was not the first discussion about signs when Commissioner Terry came on. Also you're looking at conflict too, between what the developer says and what the resident says. I think they may be at odds because they have an interest in the signs. It should be someone independent. I don't think we're showing citizens disrespect if we don't have a particular type of signage. We're not a Fortune 500 company, we are a government that takes care of its citizens.

-information provided by Director Baker

-Question LCJ: I was under the impression that we do assess a fee to the applicant that is used to offset this cost, correct? A

Baker: we have a fee for the cost of doing a rezoning. I don't think we single out a cost for the signage, but we can't change those fees or costs without Board approval

-additional information provided by Brandon White

-TT: I take issue with the notion that these signs are for people solely driving by. The sign that I'm talking about is for people that live in the neighborhood that are affected by the rezoning. We need to make the signs for the people that live in the neighborhood that don't just drive by the sign. I would ask that a static website is created, that is always the same and simple. My last point is that the large sign idea is ridiculous

-JR: I recommend we provide for applicant-procured signs that is to the staff's sign recommendation, and that it include a QR code and a more accessible means of accessing the department (number or website), and that a template be developed that can be printed by a large number of printers. We will have to strengthen the expectation of maintaining the sign as posted. In doing so, the more responsibility is transferred to the applicant, the more attention is applied to that.

-JR: motion follow staff's recommendation on the sign, to have the signs produced at the expense of the applicant but per a template of the Planning department that would make the sign printed rather than handwritten, and that the placement of the signs be left to the County staff

Second MDJ

Vote: yes unanimous

-MDJ: I agree with Commissioner Rader, except for the costs going to the applicant. If I say there was no sign there, and the developer says I put a sign there, how do you distinguish that? I would like Planning to let me know how that would be monitored

-LJ: I'm for the signs regarding the price, but in terms of the administration we should keep that in house. Mr. Baker let us know what you think

-response provided by Director Baker, Brandon White

-Question LJ: So you need more time to flesh out this idea correct?

B White: yes sir. there is also the public notification process, such as the newspaper, website, etc. to take into account. There is a multi-faceted approach, and the sign is one part of that process

-MDJ: my second stands if it can remain in house

-JR: there are 2 aspects of remaining in house; first is the expense of the sign, and secondly the placement of the signs. I would be glad to reduce the cost of the application by \$20 if that were the concern. What I meant was that the department would provide a template with sign vendors, but the applicant would be responsible for obtaining the sign and maintaining it on their property.

-MDJ: if we can keep the same procedure that we have, I'm good with that. To put that full responsibility on the developer, I see a problem with that in the future

-JR: I'm just trying to get rid of the hand-written signs

-LJ: will you accept that the placement of the signs be left to the County staff?

-JR: that's fine if that's the will of the committee

II. DISCUSSION

Workforce Housing Ordinance

-LJ: we will hear this at the July 12th meeting

Meeting Ended At: 5:24PM

MOTION was made by Mereda Davis Johnson, seconded by Jeff Rader, that this agenda item be adjourned meeting. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 3 - Commissioner Johnson, Commissioner Rader, and Commissioner Davis Johnson

Barbara H. Sanders-Norwood CCC, CMC