

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
Final Minutes Work Session August 23, 2022**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a work session on Tuesday, August 23, 2022, at 4:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Karen Firehock, Chair; Corey Clayborne, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Lonnie Murray.

Members absent: David Bailey.

Other officials present were: Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

Ms. Firehock asked each present member to state their name. She established a quorum.

**Work Session**

**a. ZTA202200002 Zoning Ordinance Modernization**

Mr. Rapp thanked the Chair. He said there had been several work sessions with the Commission about setbacks and land use matrix, during which they found new insights into their process and some additional information that was needed, as well as things that should be reconsidered and other impacts that potential changes to those sections might have throughout their ordinance. He said with the feedback from the Commission, staff, and with everything learned, there was an opportunity to reset and think about the approach, knowing that it would be a multi-year endeavor. He continued that this must be paired with the comprehensive plan, and they should reassess what sections would be affected and the different changes so that it would be in a much more comprehensive and effective format.

Mr. Rapp said staff had been meeting with consultants from the Berkley Group, several of whom were present at this work session to discuss the several phases of the process and what the phases and their engagement would look like and how they planned to accomplish this. He said they looked forward to hearing the Commission's feedback. He said now, Darren Coffey from the Berkley Group.

Mr. Firehock asked for the speaker to state his name for the record.

Mr. Coffey introduced himself as Darren Coffey, Principal with the Berkley Group. He said also with him were Rebecca Cobb and Chris Musso, who were present at previous work sessions. He said they had held several meetings with staff, during which they "dove into the deep end", which was a very difficult thing to do with a zoning ordinance update. He said due to the complex nature of the projects, reevaluating it at this level was the appropriate thing to do. He said he believed the Commissioners would agree that it was sensible. He said the Planning Commission, who was the group responsible for land use in the County, was also working on the comprehensive plan update, which was another major project. He said they were allowing the comprehensive plan to get further ahead in construction because it informed the land use policy, so when changing the

zoning ordinance, they would understand what the County leadership desired within that framework. He said that way it would be done correctly the first time.

Mr. Coffey said the Berkley Group was a local consulting firm formed in 2010 by Drew Williams and himself. He said they consulted with local governments and assisted in many facets of local government, not only in land use, however, he himself was a land use planner and the team working on this was composed of land use planners who had worked throughout the Commonwealth. He said they were committed to strengthen and support localities in a holistic manner. He said they had consulted on comprehensive plans before and understood what EPR was doing with the Planning Commission and what that process entailed. He said their bias as planners was that these were the two most important things they could do as a community, not only with regard to land use but in terms of transportation, economic development, and other things that these projects touched on.

Mr. Coffey said they believed that local government had the greatest impact on citizens' lives. He said many of the employees of the Berkley Group had previously worked as public servants in local government job positions. He said they were not consultants who would simply hand them a plan and exit; they were going to do a good job and partner with the County to achieve more with their work. He said their position was as an extension of their own staff so that they would be able to get these projects done in a meaningful, holistic, and transparent way.

Mr. Coffey said the project team included himself, the Principal-in-charge, Kelly Davis, Planning Director, Rebecca Cobb, Project Manager, and Catherine Redfearn, Chris Musso, and Darla Orr serving as project support. He said that Ms. Redfearn had been a land use consultant for her entire career, but the rest of the members had direct experience working in local government. He said Ms. Cobb would be giving the rest of the presentation, with time for any questions or dialogue they may want to have.

Ms. Cobb introduced herself as Rebecca Cobb. She said she would begin by discussing the overall project intent. She said as mentioned, this was a large, multi-year project, so overall, they were looking to accomplish several things. She said one was to make sure the ordinance was in compliance with the Code of Virginia, so that would be the first that they made sure accomplished. She said in terms of modernization, making the ordinance user-friendly for staff, the Commission, and the general public. She said in those terms, they wanted to clarify language. She said they wanted to address modern zoning issues; the old ordinance was missing data related to current development, and they also wanted it to be able to reach potential future development.

Ms. Cobb said that was where they wanted to ensure there was flexibility to readdress or reamend a new business when it occurred. She said they wanted to make sure it worked with the comprehensive plan; they understood they were working on the comprehensive plan currently, so they tried to stage this project so that it could address the work being done in public engagement and the decision-making related to land use. Ms. Cobb said another intent was to have a good structure so to the ordinance so that it was easily accessible.

Ms. Cobb said the ordinance was a mandatory document that would mandate land uses, size, and height of buildings, ensures light and air, and was there to protect citizens. She said it also needed to achieve the vision they were working on and the goals they were creating for the comprehensive plan. She said that throughout the process, they would assess what those goals were so they could make sure this was working to bring that to fruition.

Ms. Cobb said the project overview had three main phases. She said there was an investigation that began with their current meeting with the Planning Commission. She continued that they may have community engagement throughout the other phases of this project that may include interviews with Commissioners and staff, as well as focus groups that could discuss specific topics. She said they would also host open houses and a county tour in order to see in person the subjects that were being discussed so that they would have a more intimate knowledge when drafting.

Ms. Cobb said that content development encompassed that drafting portion; the first two items listed, which were ordinance diagnostic and table of contents were items that they would be working on right away, and the other items were the other articles of the zoning ordinance to be drafted. She said adoption would be later and include additional public engagement, hearings, and a public hearing before the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Cobb said when looking at the project phases, they were beginning the first phase with interviews of the Commissioners, staff, and a focus group, as well as a review of the ordinance in comparison to state code to see where there may be misaligned or could be improved. She said they would draft the table of contents, which would be the table of contents for the full ordinance, so that they could see sections of the existing ordinance and where things should be changed or removed along the course of the project.

Ms. Cobb said the first four articles were general administration, permits and applications, and nonconformities. She said these articles were easier to address because they typically were heavily related to the Code of Virginia, so there was little room in choosing advertisement and decision-making timeframes, whereas there may be nuance in permits and applications articles. She said that concluded phase 1, and she would discuss it in further detail later in the presentation.

Ms. Cobb said that phase 2 would have some investigation, but at this point, they had not determined what that was. She said they believed it would include a focus group, likely a group familiar with the landscaping and lighting requirements so they could add their input to that. She said this would focus on design standards. She said it was different in that they would allow time before they got into the districts to allow the comprehensive plan to be developed further so that when they began talking about the district standards such as setbacks, lot size, density, and the zoning map during Phase 3, they would have the context of what had been gained through the comprehensive plan process.

Ms. Cobb said Phase 4 would be the use matrix they looked at a little bit, and they would talk about performance standards, such as when the uses were going to be allowed by right and if there were impacts, they needed to address through performance standards. She said they would also look at specific uses and discuss different areas of the County. She said Phase 5 was where they would conclude drafting with a final compilation to take to the public to receive input, and then would bring it back to the Planning Commission for final drafting and then could be moved forward to adoption. She said these phases would take approximately three years to complete. She said there may be additions or rearrangements, contingent upon the comprehensive plan's progress.

Ms. Cobb said she would further discuss phase 1. She showed a slide with the timeline of the Phase 1 schedule, beginning in August, holding interviews in October and November, followed by another work session with the Planning Commission in December to discuss the diagnostic report, look at the ordinance in detail, and plan the path forward. She said that would be shared in January as an open house with the public to let them see what the plan was, what had been discovered so far, and allow them to give feedback. She said the ordinance and articles would then be drafted in February and April work sessions, and in June, they would have an additional investigation, discuss with the focus group what had been drafted so far, and work with the Planning Commission so that it could be revised once more before moving forward to the Board that month.

Ms. Cobb said that community engagement and investigation for Phase 1 would be staff interviews. She said several interviews were planned with groups of staff because they were most familiar with the ordinance, working day-in and day-out as well as hearing complaints from the public, so they could shed light on those matters and any administrative difficulties that they had, process improvements that could occur, so that those things could be incorporated in the ordinance. She said they also wanted to have interviews with the Planning Commission in a two-by-two format, with two Berkley Group staff and two Commissioners to sit down and bring insight and voice concerns, as well as what they liked about the ordinance so that as they moved forward in the drafting, they could apply that knowledge.

Ms. Cobb said the focus group sessions for Phase 1 were going to be with people who were applying for permits and going through the administrative process so that their concerns and opinions could be voiced as well. She said in the future, they would likely have focus groups composed of different people having a particular interest or experience with a particular topic. She said with Phase 1, there would also be an open house where the diagnostic would be presented, and the public would be made aware of the process. She asked if there were any questions about the engagement or investigation.

Mr. Murray said that a lot of this concept seemed backward, because they had not yet had discussions about the natural resources chapter of the comprehensive plan, so they could not discuss ordinances until they looked at the natural resource section and decided what the goals were with natural resource conservation. He said the same could be said for many parts of the plan; without understanding what their objectives were, they could not effectively talk about how to change ordinances to meet those objectives.

Ms. Cobb said that they wanted to hear about the flaws of the current ordinance. She said they wanted to hear the concerns of the community about the existing ordinance, and they were phasing the process so that they were not making land use decisions before the comprehensive plan was addressed. She said the decisions made right away would be Planning Commission duties, Zoning Administrator duties, and what things needed to be supplied in a permit. She said those things could happen prior to getting community input from the comprehensive plan process, and then they would come in and get that information in order to make those decisions.

Ms. Firehock said that for example, they did not have a lot about utility-scale solar facilities in the comprehensive plan, which was an environmental issue. She said they may say there was a hole in the plan there, but they did not yet have comprehensive plan guidance, so that must be created. She said she did not disagree with anything that Mr. Murray just said. She said it seemed it would

be an iterative process with a starting checklist that began with the staff, and the Commission may have different opinions on what needed to be done.

Mr. Rapp said this first phase was avoiding the topics that Commissioner Murray just mentioned to let the comprehensive plan guide them when they got to those sections in the zoning ordinance. He said this first phase of sections was more about the specific requirements, such as how long a site plan should be reviewed, what was the Commission action, what type of materials were submitted, and other process-related things, not substantial topic-related material, so that that progress could be made with the comprehensive plan. He said some of the topics they had tried to broach were premature because the comprehensive plan did not have guidance for them, so this phased approach would let them set out a framework and table of contents for how everything would be addressed.

Ms. Cobb said if there were topics that were very important that must be addressed, they should be discussed as such. She said it did not mean that they would immediately have to draft it a certain way because it was mentioned, but it would allow them to know when they got to the related section that they should look at comprehensive plan comments and goals to glean information from that and draft it appropriately.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Missel said he appreciated the previous comments about diving into the deep end. He asked if there was any previous public engagement that could be implemented moving forward, or if there had not been any community engagement to date.

Ms. Cobb said they had not done any community engagement. She said that was identified as a missing component and needed to occur, which was why it was planned to happen early in the process.

Mr. Bivins said that this was easier to understand the path they were embarking on. He suggested that there be specific interviews with Board of Supervisors members before the end of the process so that they had an opportunity to see it or weigh in. He said that the Supervisors were the ones who fielded complaints from the public, so all of the issues he discussed with his Supervisor were issues that had come to her about particular "zoning perceived issues," so listening to people about their experiences might be helpful to them.

Mr. Bivins said when they sat down with staff, they should consider issues that were complaints that they had no way to address. He said there were a number of things that happened in their community that they had no control over. He said a good portion of the Jack Jouett District was in the development area, so there were many complaints about unkempt property. He asked what the proper term for those areas was.

Ms. Firehock asked if Mr. Bivins was referring to entrance corridors.

Mr. Bivins said yes. He said those areas happened to be in entrance corridors. He said if they were engaged in a conversation about how to ensure the development area was attractive to people and businesses, yet there was nothing they could do about a property that was neglected or turned into something else, not only did it have an impact on the people around it, but also had a broken window effect on the neighborhood. He said staff had no obligation and no way to solve

it, so looking at issues that linked to other things that the Supervisors would like to see happen here was important.

Mr. Bivins said in public engagement, they tended to hear from well-organized, well-funded contractors who could hire lawyers, consultants, and advocates, and had a mechanism to navigate the zoning ordinance, particularly when it came to new development, in ways that other people did not. He said they also had a large population of medium-sized contractors who were more likely to struggle with the zoning ordinance and may benefit from additional guidance from staff throughout the process.

Ms. Firehock said she understood why the Commissioner interviews were being held two-by-two so that they would not be considered a public meeting so that people could speak frankly, but she would still require that after all of those interviews to be brought back together for a full discussion and summarize what developed during the interviews. She said she wanted to ensure that was part of the process.

Ms. Cobb said that it was.

Ms. Firehock said those perspectives gained during interviews may change with a full discussion. She said that the Phase 2 community design standards included items “such as, but not limited to” so she assumed that if two Commissioners came up with an issue that was not on the horizon, they would bring that forward as potentially something to add to the list.

Ms. Cobb said as they approached each phase, they would consult with staff and determine what topics they needed to address. She said they would work out what they would talk about in each phase prior to it, so as of right now, it was a loose list that would be tightened as they approached it.

Ms. Firehock said that for example, lighting standards had a history. She said the comprehensive plan called for them to update their lighting ordinance; they had a dark skies goal. She said the fodder was there in the comprehensive plan and that was not the issue, but since they did the last comprehensive plan, stakeholders had been calling for the County to modernize their ordinance, had volunteered to help with roundtables, and had gotten experts in lighting to volunteer services, yet the County’s response had been that the issue did not deserve priority. She said this in turn made people upset, because the comprehensive plan said that they were going to do it, so lighting standards might need a more robust sub-process to bring up all the issues that needed to be addressed and potentially more work involved.

Mr. Rapp said they had discussed that with certain topics there would be interest groups or people who were passionate about individual topics. He said they had received emails about landscaping that day. He said that VDOT would be an obviously heavy stakeholder when they discussed streets and sidewalks, so they would tailor it to each individual section and its stakeholders.

Ms. Firehock said that particular process might require some additional thought because it was not pre-cut. She said along those lines, she assumed that tree preservation also referred to planting trees, because it should not be about only protecting existing trees.

Mr. Rapp said that it was their new authority to put into an ordinance format and regulate tree replacement in the state. He said both he and Ms. Firehock had served on that committee for a period and there were new opportunities that could be explored with that.

Ms. Firehock said that historic preservation was an issue that she wanted to bring attention to. She said there were some people who wanted a historic preservation ordinance; they currently had no way to protect a historic building from being torn down. She said whether or not to have the ordinance at all was also a big topic.

Mr. Rapp said that was a comprehensive plan-dependent discussion, and they wanted to have a discussion about land use as well as historic preservation.

Ms. Firehock said this might be another process that required a lot of input and effort.

Mr. Rapp said yes.

Ms. Firehock said to summarize, there were some of these that had a vested interest and not equal to others and might require different processes. She said she hoped this was recognized by others, and as background information was given by staff, they may realize what elements required more work.

Ms. Cobb said that was why those topics were not scheduled at this point; they would talk with staff and create a plan for how to approach those.

Ms. Firehock said there were other plans they had worked on that had goals and objectives that must be acknowledged during this work. She said there was a map of habitat cores and corridors for the County that had not been fully integrated into planning. She said more would be learned during interviews, but she wanted to make sure the graphics shown did not lead them into a cookie-cutter process, because some topics would get complicated.

Ms. Cobb said yes.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were any other comments.

Mr. Clayborne said he would encourage that part of the process was proactive and not reactive in order for there to be equitable participation.

Ms. Cobb said absolutely.

Mr. Murray said that when he saw “zoning modernization,” red flags were raised, partially because they just found out that their Water Protection Ordinance was eviscerated through a code cleanup modernization process, where neither the Board of Supervisors nor the public understood the clear implications of what that code cleanup was. He said it was important as they went through the process of cleaning up the ordinances, they needed to understand the implications of that and if they were taking away or adding protections to certain things.

Mr. Murray said another comment he had heard from the public was that discussion of the rural area always seemed like an afterthought, when in fact the majority of Albemarle County was the rural area, and a significant amount of their population lived there. He said in this process, the

first mention of the rural area was at the very end, so he would encourage that discussion about the significant issues in the rural area to happen much earlier in the process.

Ms. Cobb said it would be talked about during the district standards and the uses. She said in terms of administration in this first phase, there was not a need at this point to talk about the rural area, plus they wanted the comprehensive plan to move along so that they could hear what people in the rural area had as concerns so that when they got to district standards and uses, they could apply those comments to the text of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Bivins said he had heard that there was a hope that the County would increase in its building code the number of R-factor and houses and enforce solar panels on homes. He said he was concerned about that approach. He said he understood there was a significant amount of people who thought that was appropriate, but there were many people in the community who could not afford that. He said that when putting building requirements on, it should be done with a sense of how it would affect the entire community.

Mr. Bivins said he was sensitive to the fact that the median price for a household in the County was \$465,000, and while that was a lot of money, it meant there were many houses that were likely not in good shape. He said Ms. Firehock and others had mentioned how there were lots of opportunities in the community to do rehabilitation in order to have affordable housing, and he would not want the County to have zoning that made the houses would be extraordinarily expensive. He said he knew they could encourage people to do things by giving incentives like density or tax rebates, so that they could achieve a balance in a community that had an eclectic group of incomes.

Ms. Cobb said she was hearing great ideas that they should bring to the interviews to discuss, and some of these items were great comprehensive plan goals, such as the maintenance of property.

Mr. Missel said he would hold his comment until the end of Ms. Cobb's presentation.

Ms. Cobb continued that in the Phase 1 work sessions, there would be four work sessions. She said that work session one was review of the diagnostic, and part of the diagnostic would be a summary of the engagement from the staff as well as the Commission, so they would be able to see the discussions and points that everyone had brought up. She said this was also where they would look at the table of contents and the crosswalk between the new structure and the current ordinance to see where everything fit together in the new ordinance.

Ms. Cobb said work session two would be for drafting; at that point they would bring them drafted articles, the general provisions, and the administration. She said at that point, the Commission could edit the text. She said in work session three, they would move onto permits and applications, then onto nonconformities. She said in work session four, all of those four articles would be brought back to be looked at again to ensure the changes were incorporated and make final changes before moving into Phase 2. She said it would be fast paced, but they needed to be efficient and work together through this process to make it successful.

Ms. Cobb said at the end of Phase 1, deliverables would include a table of contents, crosswalk, the diagnostic report, and the engagement results. She said when they came to the Commission at first, they would have the diagnostic report and what was heard from staff and the Commission,

but they wanted to include the open house and what they learned from that. She said they would also have a draft of the four articles: general provisions, administration, permits and applications, and the nonconformities.

Ms. Cobb said to make this a successful project, they must agree upon some ground rules. She said those included staying engaged from start to finish, review the material, and be prepared to participate and discuss. She said they must strive for consensus, and that would be very important. She said sometimes, they heard lots of ideas from different people, but if there was not a consensus that a majority of the group wanted that change, she could not go back and draft anything that they would be able to move forward with. She said at each meeting, they must come to some agreement on what should be changed and what should be kept.

Ms. Cobb said in form, they should listen to constituents and the community. She said lots of engagement was happening through the comprehensive plan. She said also to reach out to neighbors and others to hear what they had to say, and seek input from staff. She said this was something they would be doing as well, drafting chapters that they thought fit Albemarle based on what they knew as planners and as best practice around Virginia. She said they would then send it to staff to review and give feedback on, and any further changes would be incorporated before the text came to the Commission, so that when they received it, if there were things, they had questions about, they could reach out to staff about that and get their opinion on some of those items. She asked if anyone disagreed with these rules.

Ms. Firehock said she did not disagree. She said in terms of being prepared and asking questions, they needed adequate time to review material between meetings. She said sometimes she spent eight hours on a Sunday reviewing material and ran out of time to get things done. She said for a major zoning rewrite, two weeks was more appropriate than four days. She said they all were planners, so they thought about zoning constantly, but most members of the public did not think about zoning until it affected them locally and then asked questions.

Ms. Firehock said she would like to establish greater public awareness of zoning and its influence in Albemarle County. She said she was unsure of how to get people to attend their planned meetings beyond the usual environmental groups, planning groups, and neighborhood associations. She said they should think about how to make zoning an exciting topic to get involved with, because as Mr. Murray had experienced in his district, people were now analyzing County ordinances and seeing their effects. She said Mr. Clayborne said something similar earlier about making sure it was accessible and relatable to people who may know little about planning.

Ms. Cobb said that was true and was a difficult challenge. She said there would always be some constituents who were unaware of a specific item, but they would work with staff to have a presence online and advertise and educate as much as possible, because they did want people to be aware and make effort with this.

Ms. Firehock said radio station promotions might be useful. She said people went on the website, but it was not a normal activity. She said she knew firsthand that community engagement was a difficult job. She said the County did a survey when there was a water shortage, and all of the responses received were from people with a master's degree or Ph.D., indicating that they had only reached the wealthy members of their community. She said they should think about how to reach every person. She said it was a challenge that lay with the consultants.

Ms. Cobb said they would work with staff to see what they could come up with there.

Ms. Firehock said that she would do her best to make sure the announcement was well-distributed, but she lived in a very rural area.

Mr. Murray said that with the stormwater conservation district, they had great success advertising on social media.

Ms. Cobb said that the first homework assignment for the Commission was to consider the applications and consider that when they got applications and made decisions before them, did they feel they had what they needed to make an informed decision, or were there things missing that they wished were included? She said that was something to think about and bring to the discussion when they had their interviews in October and November. She said any general ordinance issues, such as what was working or was not working, and other important items that the Commission wanted to make known as they moved throughout the process.

Ms. Cobb said the next steps were to perform the interviews in October and November. She said staff would be organizing and choosing dates for that. She said then, there would be a County tour in November, where if Commissioners had examples that related to their earlier discussions, she would like to see them in person and understand. She said she hoped to see some of those important items. She stated that December would be when the first work session would be held, and continue into January 2023. She said December was the diagnostic review and table of contents, and January would be the open house for the public. She said that concluded her presentation and she could take any other questions.

Mr. Missel said he thought Commissioners should accompany the consultants on the County tour. He said in his experience, it was important to have a dialogue when going on a tour.

Ms. Cobb said it was, and they had done it several times with staff leading the tour and showing concerns of Board members, and they had also all hopped into a van or small bus and looked at things. She said if they were concerned about it being considered a meeting, only two members could go. She said it would only be a one-day tour, so she would let staff figure out the logistics of that.

Mr. Missel said that an overlapping schedule for the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance would help show how these projects align and help each other.

Mr. Rapp said they could work on that. He said the comprehensive plan had been very similar to this as a learning experience. He said because it was a very engaged community, they had to adapt to both of these projects as they received feedback, learned new things, and began to explore ideas. He said preparing for Phase 2 of the ordinance and the comprehensive plan was when they discussed more specific topics, while the first phase of the comprehensive plan was more about what they wanted to allow.

Mr. Missel said it would be helpful to review this schedule at the CAC meetings as part of the community outreach.

Mr. Rapp said that could be helpful to update people.

Ms. Firehock said at a CAC, the presenter could call into the meeting and tell them.

Mr. Missel said perhaps there was a location on the website that could put the most updated progress, similar to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Rapp said they had been discussing creating a website for the ordinance update so that everyone could engage on the same platform. He said they would be working with the Communications and Public Engagement Department to do that.

Mr. Missel said that was excellent. He said related to what Commissioner Murray said about modernization, he had also wondered what modernization technically meant.

Mr. Rapp said it was acknowledging the zoning ordinance was about forty years old and had never been updated.

Mr. Missel said that they mentioned solar and other uses that were new, but he wanted them to focus on process and how to create an efficient process. He said there may be some things learned that would help them become more efficient for the development community or others working through the rezoning process.

Mr. Murray said that when writing computer code, the first thing done was to set up a list of requirements, or the needs of the community they were trying to meet. He said that was the most important thing and they should be coming up with that first before writing it in code.

Mr. Bivins said he hoped they could use and enhance their localized credibility so that people looking in at the process and not only see outsiders. He said he thought it was necessary for the process to be appreciated and to be accepted. He said some of his colleagues discussed how they managed the knowledge, but they should also think about how they managed as a company within this specific environment so that the process did not get out of sync with a vocal community.

Ms. Firehock said as they worked with the development community, there may be differing opinions as to what was wanted within the context of zoning and process. She said if they had better information on a number of applications received in the past year, those applications would have gone forward, but because they could not make a decision, those were deferred. She said if they were done correctly with the correct information, that was helping the developers because they were either moving forward or being given a definitive no, and either way, they knew where they stood and could make the next decision.

Ms. Firehock said a better process could result in more defined decision-making that could be done at the dais instead of deferrals or withdrawing applications. She said many people called her and asked when deferred items would come back, and there was no answer for that question, so she would like to limit the number of items being deferred by having better information supplied. She asked Ms. Cobb if she needed any further information from the Commission.

Ms. Cobb said she did not. She said she would see the Commission again in October.

Mr. Rapp said that it was a very long process outlined that they would be embarking on over the next couple of years, and there were quite a few opportunities for improvement within the ordinance. He said there was no perfect zoning ordinance; the best practices were to revisit the

zoning ordinance every two years and make updates annually. He said it was important for them to find consensus and not let deliberations go on forever.

Ms. Firehock asked if anyone in the audience would like to make a comment. She asked the speaker to state their name for the record.

Mr. Williamson introduced himself as Neil Williamson. He said in the Commission's discussions, they had referred to this as being a zoning ordinance update. He said there was some concern about modernization, but he did not think anyone wanted to have auto-laundromat in their zoning ordinance; it was a modernization issue because it was a car wash. He said the discussion about revisiting tree canopies, the historic preservation ordinance, and a number of other items were beyond an update. He said those were large items that deserved a lot of discussion. He said if they could whittle it to just a zoning ordinance, it would be more effective. He said they should have those other discussions, but he did not believe they belonged with this one. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak.

Ms. Firehock said she agreed with Mr. Williamson. She said some of the items might require a much more involved process than could be dealt with in what was couched as an update.

Mr. Bivins asked if someone would send the questions to the Commissioners.

Ms. Firehock said that would be helpful.

**Recess**

The Commission recessed its meeting at 5:07 p.m.



---

Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Alberic Karina-Plun; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 09/27/2022
Initials: CSS