



## ATTACHMENT C:

### PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS NOVEMBER 13, 2018

#### **Case TC1800008 (Text only Development Plan)**

**AL-TURK** – I voted to recommend approval. I think this is a great step in the right direction, given my concerns about applications without a development plan. This amendment, however, would only allow applicants to specify, limit, or prohibit uses. The Planning Department suggested that they are considering adding language to broaden this to other commitments applicants can make, and I look forward to seeing those proposed amendments.

**BAKER** - I voted to recommend approval of the amendment to the UDO. This is a reasonable amendment and would provide an additional tool for staff, commissioners, elected officials, and developers. Staff conducted excellent work.

**BRINE** – I voted to recommend approval of this text amendment. I think that it is an appropriate step forward.

**BUZBY** – This is a very wise step in the right direction, I vote to approve.

Many of us on the Planning Commission, myself included, are often uncomfortable voting on zoning map change without a development plan. This is often a concern specifically due to the large number of uses allowed under most zoning districts. Right now, there has not been then ability to remove any uses if there is no development plan.

This proposal would allow an applicant to remove uses without a development plan, which is a positive step in the right direction

**GIBBS** – Appropriate step to accelerate the step-by-step process.

Specific project proposals receive normal review, public comments, etc. process.

**HORNBUCKLE** – It would help understand different proffers more clearly.

**JOHNSON** – I think the proposed development plan makes sense and is needed to aid Planning Commissioners in assessing the validity of zoning cases w/no development plans but that may have merit for support.

**KENCHEN** – I recommend approval. This is an excellent solution and should make this process easier.

**MILLER** – The City Council and the Board of County Commissioners should approve this change to the UDO.

The proposed change to the UDO would allow rezoning applicants to append to their rezoning requests certain commitments in text form only without the maps and plans currently required by the UDO for all development plans. Development plans allow rezoning applicants to limit the scope of the requested zoning on their properties to something less than the full scope allowed by the zoning regulations for the requested zoning district. Sometimes the limitations are best expressed in graphic form by lines and shadings on maps and plans. In many other cases, however, the limitation can easily be expressed in the form of simple text commitments which need not be illustrated graphically. One form of simple text commitment is the limitation of the future use of the property to a single use or list of uses allowed under the UDO's use table for the applied-for zoning district. It is very common for applicant to indicate that the future use of the property will be limited to a single use when the use table would allow that use and others. If this is the only commitment that the applicant desires to make, the maps and plans required currently by the UDO are unnecessary and add nothing to the evaluation of the applicant's request.

The preparation of maps and plans require the applicant to engage a professional land planner, engineer, or landscape architect. This work is expensive. If the maps and plans are unnecessary, the expense is unnecessary and can actually work to deter developers of small projects from using a development plan. Because development plans provide a means to more particularly shape future land uses, they are often favored by neighbors, the Planning Commission, and the governing bodies. Reducing the cost of development plans where cost reductions are a factor is a good thing.

It is important to note that this proposal would allow text-only development plans in cases where the commitment is one relating to uses. It would not be available in cases where the commitment relates to building dimensions, buffers, landscaping, roadway improvements, etc. If this change to the code passes and yields fruit in practice, I would support opening up text-only development plans to other types of commitments.