

# **Community Benefits Resolution**

Planning & Zoning Committee

Withdrawal Action

June 7, 2011

The Resolution was introduced on February 1, 2011 by Mark Antell and Jerry Auten. It was “sent” to the Planning and Zoning Committee for recommended Action.

Ultimate result is a withdrawal of the resolution (although the same or modified resolution could be introduced in the future – “without prejudice”).

The Committee believes that such a reintroduction will not be necessary as long as the agreements and an action plan made with CPHD occur. Moreover, the P & Z committee have agreement with CPHD for quarterly meetings to discuss the action plan progress and/or problems. We believe such interaction will mitigate problems which otherwise might occur.

## Premise for Withdrawal

- Resolutions might or might not produce results.
- Agreement by staff often can achieve same or better results.
- Introduction of resolution itself had impact.
- Agreement notwithstanding – quarterly meetings can help.

1. ACCF has often used resolutions to either state a position or to encourage action by the County (Staff)
2. Some resolutions go through a “cumbersome” process – Board to Manager to Staff and back up the chain – time consuming and often desired results are not achieved.
3. In this case CPHD management and staff were concerned and receptive to taking action that would have an even better result than the “resolution” process.
4. A set of “desired actions” were defined that would have comparable results that, if achieved, would allow the “makers” to comfortably withdraw the resolution. Moreover, an agreement to hold quarterly meetings can only help to ensure we are on “track” with the “desired actions”.

## Steps Taken

- Planning Zoning had three meetings
- Two meetings with Staff + many emails
- Significant investigation
- Familiarity with planned new Systems
- Defined set of materials to rectify concerns

1. The Committee discussed this resolution at meetings on February 20<sup>th</sup>, March 20<sup>th</sup> and May 1<sup>st</sup> – the first and third at significant length
2. A select group had meetings with some staff on April 8<sup>th</sup> and a “major” determining meeting was held May 24<sup>th</sup>. In addition we had many email “conversations”!
3. Material was reviewed including “Standard” Site Plan Conditions and, what publically available material that existed was researched (e.g. what was in the library for 4.1’s – determined “packages” often not complete).
4. Part of the process included determining, to the degree possible, the components of the planned Permits Plus system.
5. Finally at the May 1<sup>st</sup> meeting we defined necessary materials and/or actions that would ameliorate concerns and hence the need for a resolution – those needs were sent to Staff on May 5<sup>th</sup> and were the subject of our May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting with CPHD leadership.

## What we Get

1. Additional SPRC “Guides” and Training
2. Post “e-copies” of site plan documents:
  - Full 4.1 filing
  - Revisions
  - Staff Reports
  - Approved Final documents
  - Access to Permits Plus for tracking
  - Items in force after COA

1. Staff will prepare a narrated presentation describing the SPRC Process so the community can participate efficiently and effectively – we recognize lack of “knowledge” is a part of the perception/problem.
2. Hopefully CPHD will establish a URL for each site plan with multiple items including full sets of original filings, all changes, staff reports, County Board Actions and tracking during project. Moreover material would be available that might be “tracked” subsequent to the COA (similar to use permit conditions embedded in the site plan). The intent is one place to easily find as aspects related to a Site Plan.

## What we Get (Continued)

### 3. Materials for first Site Plan meetings:

- By-right zoning for site
- Additions/Exceptions for Site Plan
- Required Developer Contributions
- Existing Easements, vacations, encroachments (where known or being considered)
- New precedents and Administrative approvals
- County Attorney & Zoning Administrator decisions

Additional materials (sometimes “available” but not readily accessible) would be available for the first site plan meetings. We have listed some of these – but these are not exhaustive – each Site Plan often has unique aspects. Other specific material needs might yet be identified.

## Ongoing Meetings - Key Element

- Agreement for quarterly meetings help ensure success
- Meetings can identify problems in “information fulfillment process”
- Meetings can allow for additional information desires

***Grateful to CPHD for  
helping resolve member concerns***

The decision by CPHD to allow quarterly meetings is a key advantage of this approach. Such meetings will allow both Planning and Zoning and, more importantly, CPHD to address problems before they become an impediment to success of these agreements.

Not everything goes as smoothly – and most importantly we recognize that many items on which we concurred, will take significant time to accomplish. Not only must we rely on new systems just out of a requirements phase (e.g. Permits Plus has not been implemented yet) – but coordination and concurrence is necessary with the Planning Commission (an additional “party”) and its subcommittees to ensure full transparency!

Finally, we (Planning and Zoning Committee expertise) are available – and you (CA members) should consider us if you ever take part in the Site Plan process – especially for the first time.