



**UDC OHP Amendments
Task Force Subcommittee Meeting: HDRC Process and Administrative Review
July 25, 2019**

Attendance

Amy Kastely
Jeff Fetzer
Brad Carson
John Bustamante
Tony Garcia
Paul Kinnison
Monica Savino
Gemma Kennedy
Evelyn Brown

City Staff

D7 – Fred Ramirez
Lauren Sage
Shanon Miller
Cory Edwards
Alma Lozano

Meeting Notes

Goals

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

Ideas

Expand Administrative Approvals List

- Might need to develop certain standards (front yard fences)
- Work in registered NA support letter
- Majority of consent items: Front yard fences, solar panels, appropriate additions, ADA, rear accessory structures (new and modifications), backyard stuff
- 30-day notification and comment period for certain work types (additions, accessories)?

Design Review Committee

- Expand membership
- Split based on project size or geographical area. (Group leaned toward geographic area)

HDRC

- No changes to composition. Create HDRC Technical Advisory Committee
 - o Meets once a month (fourth Fridays?)
 - o Catches overflow cases (violations, other specific application types like accessory demolitions or tax incentives?)



- DRC membership could also include TAC members

Action Items / Policy Updates

- Add checkbox for NA meeting to application

Potential Recommended UDC Amendments

- Update to 35-677, Administrative Approval
- Update to 35-803(c), Composition and Qualifications
- Update to HDRC Rules of Procedure
- Update to 35-803(i) – Comments not recommendations.

Still need to talk about limiting speaker times (applicants included)

Discussion on Applicants and Citizens to be Heard policies

- Supportive of a cap on applicant's time at the podium
- maximum time to be discussed; possibly 20 minutes; maybe less if it's a second hearing or previously reviewed by a subcommittee (does this need to be in the rules of procedure); applicants need to know that there is a time limit on presentations; maybe if the applicant wants over 20 min they can be put at the end of the agenda; there is no problem limiting architects presentation time, no exceptions. "not to exceed 20 minutes" and maybe chair can set lower limits if repeat case, etc. THEN only 3 minutes for the applicant's rebuttal.
- Discussion about matters outside of the scope of the project
- Limit CTBH to 2 minutes? – then maybe 3 people can yield their time → total of 8 minutes; is this worth it?
- Citizens beyond state their name, address, should say if they are speaking for an organization or individually, and whether or not they are in support or opposed into the record (possibly added to the chairman's statement and instructions on the podium)
- There is a limit to applicants in other municipalities, only 10 minutes
- Applicant vs CTBH order – CTBH are now before the applicant; procedure says that CTBH should follow applicant – CTBH at a disadvantage since no opportunity to comment; commissioners have the ability to call people back up; support for returning to the order mentioned in the rules of procedure
- Question about when a CTBH can sign in to speak
- Discussion of changing order of cases during the hearing based on number of CTBH
- Discussion of time certain items for controversial items

Discussion about late/new exhibits

- Pull it if there are last minute/change exhibits – a few not supportive of not accommodating new exhibits after posted; discussion about tweaks vs new scope; discretion to the chair of what is a tweak or what needs to be pushed to the next HDRC hearing; public needs to be aware of amendments – what is the threshold of what needs to be re-notified; maybe the threshold is that amendments responding to staff stipulations, but not for a non-recommendation; concerns



from NA that the posting to HDRC hearing is a short review period for the public; QUESTION:
when does this happen? Only new construction?

- Concerns about the 60 day limit – questions about why 60 days
- Staff introduces the matter of what exhibits were received and if there are any agreements; OHP policy is to not review new stuff right before or at meeting; a concern would be that staff could be seen as an advocate and not neutral

Discussion

Increasing items that can be approve administratively

- Taxes, maybe could go through the public comment period; or making the Staff Recommendation Report more streamlined so that it would still be posted; could still pull individually based on questions or CTBH, possibly --- exclude in the motion if needed
- Fencing