



**UDC OHP Amendments  
Task Force Meeting  
June 20, 2019**

---

**Attendance**

Ashley Farrimond  
Barbara Witte-Howell  
Brad Carson  
Cherise Rohr-Allegrini  
Irby Hightower  
Jay Louden  
Luis Miguel Martinez  
Monica Savino  
Paul Kinnison  
Sam Aguirre  
Sarah Gould  
Vince Michael  
Zac Harris

**City Staff**

Shanon Miller  
Cory Edwards  
Alma Lozano  
Lauren Sage  
Cat Hernandez

---

**Meeting Notes**

**Infill Review Overview**

Discussion

- Question about if the SA tomorrow plan implement increased infill projects. Answer: no.
- Talk about how long each case is
- Dependent on context and applicant
- Violations are an issue, so he likes the things we are doing regarding zoning cases, etc because it's being proactive.
- Discussion of definition of neighborhood

Notice to the Neighborhood Discussion

- Concern that notice to neighborhood comes late; better when developers talk to neighborhood beforehand. City Council office contacts neighbors beforehand; maybe the notification requirement is moved up.
- DSD Staff: Mentioned tentative agenda for the Zoning Commission.
- Discussion of wanting more information included on the Tentative Zoning Agenda.
- Conversation about requirement meeting with the neighborhood.
- Concern about suggestion because some associations don't always have a meeting or organized board to present to.
- Discussion of having a check mark box on the zoning or HDRC application



- Concern of wanting earlier notification of these large projects. MV doesn't hear about things until after a project has gone through a few steps already.
- OHP Staff: there isn't support for increasing the HDRC review of 19 days

#### IDZ Discussion

- Discussion on the idea to expand HDRC role
- Separating design and use — why is zoning reviewing site plan — should just be use
- Discussion of staff approval of site plan; general consensus; concern about HDRC changing it after OHP staff approval.
- Discussion that HDRC would be the appealing body versus BoA to staff's decision of site plan.
- Discussion on the concerning issue with HDRC vs Zoning approval timeline. Economically, you're wanting to get USE first, then spend money on design.
  - ➔ Should be sequential;
  - ➔ The problem is people think that they get use of 20 but cannot get 20 at HDRC
  - ➔ There shouldn't be two bodies deciding where the building is, just by process
  - ➔ Building location is the discrepancy; the big issue with IDZ is the buffer and the height (site plan and massing)
- Discussion conveyor built of inevitability at commissions. The last commission to review feels an obligation to approve because the applicant already spent so much money up front.
- Discussion of approving things in the abstract, and the final product is not represented of the initial, and the abstract isn't legally binding unless our code says so; so some of concurrent review process but not sure what that is
- Discussion about requirements for site plan
  - ➔ OHP Staff reminded all that OHP will be updating the infill guidelines. Included will be the creation of tools for people to use to understand the elements of the projects affect on neighborhood
  - ➔ 3D site plan?
  - ➔ Site plan with various components? Driveway cuts? Vehicular access? Create a maximum and minimum - could be numerical and abstract