



**UDC OHP Amendments  
Task Force Subcommittee Meeting: HDRC Process & Administrative Review  
July 11, 2019**

---

**Attendance**

Luis Miguel Martinez  
Amy Kastely  
Paul Kinnison  
Jeff Fetzer  
Brad Carson  
John Bustamante  
Sarah Gould

**City Staff**

D1 – Sydell Brooks  
Lauren Sage  
Shanon Miller  
Cory Edwards  
Alma Lozano

---

**Meeting Notes**

**Goals:** Streamline review processes, improve consistency and predictability, shorten length of public meetings, and make sure important cases are afforded the attention they need

Discussion by Topic

**DRC Organization**

- Meetings broken into A and B items (A on Tues, B on Wed)
- Commissioners will be assigned to A or B (so just one day)
- Attendance will be more critical
- Include citizen members to help with quorum (3 additional from AIA, ULI, and neighborhoods representative)
- Formalize reporting structure. Official report or recommendation of the committee would carry more weight at the hearing

Discussion

Neighborhood communications

- Challenges to timelines and who sees what at what time. DRC sees something that the NA doesn't see.
- Discussion about neighborhood discussion requirements.
- Would it help if the NA knew DRC cases ahead of time?
- If so, what's the DRC timeline for applicants? Positive feedback on applicant side now.
- Identify which projects have NA positions and schedule for NA to attend?



- Discussion about commissioners' time. Requiring NA application? Issues with absent or competing NAs. Would need a definition of who represents the NA. A checkbox. Just yes or no.
- Question about existing NHSD registration process in regards to Government Hill.

DRC and stipulations

- Read section about DRC process in UDC Sec. 35-803(i).
- Discussion about what the applicant gets and whether or not a recommendation is made or sometimes not.
- Discussion about whether or not a recommendation SHOULD be made. No quorum and no recommendation. Just notes. Is it an open meeting if there is a recommendation.

**HDRC Organization**

- Mayor gets three additional appointments for total of 14 commissioners
- 7 review A items and 7 review B items (DRC membership)
- Quorum reduced to 5; retain simple majority voting (concern about vacancies still)
- "Shift change" (or separate day) would occur between agenda sections

\*This requires UDC amendments but there is probably support

Discussion

- Concerns about splitting DRC then how that is represented at HDRC;
- Geographic? DRC reps from those districts.
- Meetings once a month, divided in two?
- Benefit of HDRC is that it only take 2 weeks; only has 60 days.
- Violations board once a month? – Good feedback for this.
- Time on Residential items vs Commercial items? Answer: Commercial is typically 1.5 hours or less;
- How should we divide per time?
- Rotate through the violation board member?
- Could mimic Planning Commission: TAC

**Admin Approvals (with new standards?)**

Discussion

- Meeting with the neighborhood trigger admin approval?
- Discussion of what's currently administratively approved
- Photo documentation reconstruction
  - E.g. porch toolkit; based on style, etc.
- Standards for front yard fence? (not admin now)  
 NA INPUT at the Admin Level discussion
- Meeting with NA includes OHP staff → formalized
- Does the NA understand the historical fabric of the neighborhood? Balance between NA and HDRC; concerns about having longview. Some are more concerned about crime.
- OHP to review items on consent and stayed on consent/not pulled; listed out what those scopes are; add those to the list and maybe with more direction. Or could DRC take action on these?



- Discussion on whose time it saves; how to code
- Participant gave examples of how to code; using square footage, asking if questions, based on existing conditions
- If updated design guidelines, then why cannot staff approve? If gray, goes to HDRC.
- Maybe, staff posts, then there is a public comment period, instead of a hearing. If comment or commissioner notes, then goes to HDRC.
- There are always different perspectives. Can it literally check the box?
- We can define what would be eligible for this public comment case.
- Notifications? What if citizens don't have a computer? Yard sign? Mailings? Note to NA?
- Cases where administrative approval was fine, but no one knew, so public comment would help with that.
- General agreement. Early notification is important for MV. Volunteers on NA board. MV would like to have a more significant role in the approval process for certain projects. Concerns about open backyards.
- Divide commissioners geographically might work. Not random. There's an appreciation for the neighborhood when by district.
- Concerns about commissioners representation.
- Order (Staff, CTBH, applicant); no time for rebuttal. More discussion on this to be had.
- Quality of some applications are poor.

*Topics we ran out of time for*

**Violations – prevention and enforcement**

**Speaking times – applicants, owners, and citizens**