

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

Design Review Committee
05/02/2022
Q=Jenah Thornborrow
Q1=Jason Jones
Q2=Hannah Ball
Q3=Maureen Gersham
Q4=Brett Labrie
Q5=Man
A=Atty. Charles Wadams
A1=Greg Hahn

Q: All right. Um, the next item on the agenda is a - a public hearing for a Code Amendment to Garden City Title 8, 83C86B, and 87A2. And, uh, the applicant is Garden City and City Attorney, uh, Charles Wadams will provide, um, both the application and staff report on this in conjunction.

A: Uh, thank you, Miss Thornborrow. I am here for Code Amendments as you said for the design review process and to talk about what we should do with the, uh, Surel Mitchell overlay district. So there's three documents in your packet that I'm gonna reference specifically. I'd like to go through my memorandum first and then look at a couple of different options for, um, what we can do. So looking at my memo, it is in your packet. I would like to just first draw everybody's attention to page 3 of my memorandum. (Unintelligible) since we share the screen. (Unintelligible) Sorry. Okay. So first thing I want to point out is what I have in bold up here. Oh, this doesn't seem to be working. There it goes, right here. Standards for review or approval. And I've been talking about this for years. Um, but this just indicates the reviewing - reviewing body needs guidance concerning how to determine compliance. If there are no standards for review and approval an ordinance maybe struck down for vagueness or decisions overturned as being arbitrary and capricious. We knew this was the law. This has been a law for years. I've been preaching this for years and this is what happened just recently. So, uh, we are court-mandated to fix portions of our code as a result of, you know, we - we - we're concerned about this happening, and it did

42 happen. So this is a judicial mandate and that's why I'm here today. So if we
43 could go to page 7 of my memo please. Okay. So, uh, I'm gonna take these
44 sometimes in order and sometimes maybe a little out of order. Uh, but we
45 have this judicial decision, and it said a couple of things. Um, it said that you
46 have some vague subjective criteria, uh, in your c- in your factors for design
47 review approval, and you have some vague criteria for Surel Mitchell. And so,
48 uh, one thing we could do on Surel Mitchell to deal with the ambiguity is just
49 to repeal it. And I do wanna say on the record what - what the city is looking
50 at right here is if the city and the decision-makers and the recommending
51 bodies think that Surel Mitchell should be repealed that doesn't - that doesn't
52 mean that anybody is recommending that we're getting rid of the branding.
53 Um, there's current signage, there's current math, and there's current
54 marketing. And so, uh, repealing the ordinance - repealing the overlay district
55 would not get rid of any of those things. We would keep the brand name as,
56 uh, Surel Mitchell District. We could maybe call it a design standard instead
57 of a overlaying. So, uh, this design and review committee is recommending
58 body. One of the things we're gonna be asking you today is if you have a
59 recommendation on repealing the overlay district and keeping the branding or
60 trying to repair the overlay district. So that's one of the - kind of the, uh, large
61 issues that I'm gonna ask for recommendations for, uh, today. So if we're
62 lookin' at page 7 of my memo, the first thing I have here is explanation of
63 proposed amendments impacting all design review applications. So I'm gonna
64 start with the broader issue and there's all designed review applications, and
65 then I'm gonna go down to the narrow- narrower issue of the Surel Mitchell
66 overlay district. Looking at the broader issue and the overreaching theme in
67 all of this is our code needs objective criteria, um, it- not subjective criteria
68 where jurisdictions can get in trouble and where, um, Judge (Manama)
69 indicated we have some subjective criteria is in this area. And what does that
70 mean? That means o- objective criteria means anybody can look at it and
71 understand what it, you know, if they're gonna pass or if they're not gonna
72 pass. Uh, subjective is, you know, maybe you need 10 parking spots. Maybe
73 you need 15 parking spots, kind of depends on how we feel in particular day.
74 We cannot do that. We need clear objective criteria. And so that's what staff
75 and I have been trying to come up with, um, here today. So when we look at
76 these different things, what I did was I looked at several different jurisdictions
77 and I thought maybe we could cherry-pick some wording from other
78 jurisdictions or - and - and not, uh, recreate the wheel, so to speak. Or maybe
79 we do want to recreate the wheel. Uh, Garden City is not Eagle. Uh, Garden
80 City is not Boise. Garden City is our own entity. We have a lot of infill, we
81 have a lot of issues that are particular to our jurisdiction. So those are some of
82 the quan- quandaries that we've been looking at. For all design review

83 applications, there's current required findings, and they're one through seven,
84 and it's 86B3D. And if we could just scroll down a little bit, so we could
85 (unintelligible). And so I'm gonna start here, and I'm gonna say does this look
86 like objective criteria's to anybody that's looking? Um, some of those words, I
87 know I'm not a planner, some of those words, I have no idea what they mean,
88 to be honest with you. Um, so we - if I don't understand them then I don't
89 know how the general public can understand them. And so that's what we're
90 here to try to fix, uh, starting today. Uh, we've already had a neighborhood
91 meeting and a work session in front of the council, and so we're starting here
92 with design review to get design reviews recommendations, and then we'll go
93 to planning and zoning for their recommendations and then ultimately it will
94 be up to the City Council to decide. But let's look - what everybody's looking
95 at on the screen right now are the required findings as currently written. Um,
96 as you go, and you look through examples from other municipalities, uh, they
97 have different wording. Um, I provided in my memo, City of Meridian, uh,
98 City of Boise, City of Eagle, City of Caldwell. Uh, I think that's it for design
99 standards. And the point is is that each jurisdiction has different standards,
100 which I could see how that could perhaps be confusing to developers. Uh, so
101 when we're looking at these standards, some of the questions that I've had, and
102 I will continue to have until they're answered are, uh, should there be any
103 exceptions to these, uh, requirements? Should there be alternative compliance
104 sections to the requirements? Uh, Meridian has a alternative compliance
105 section. Uh, and the - I think Eagle has an exception section. So are these, uh,
106 do we want any waivers from these? Do we want any variances from these?
107 And if so why do we want that? But this is where - this is our starting point on
108 this particular point- part of the code. Um, the judge has pointed out some
109 specific wording that he says is ambiguous and vague, and I will get to that in
110 a minute. So as I went to the - through the other, uh, jurisdictions - Meridian
111 starts on page 9 of my memo - uh, I - I generally understand what they're
112 saying. They're talking about specific objective things on pedestrian walkways
113 on parking lots, on site design. Me as a - just a lawyer not a planner I can look
114 at these words and understand what these words mean. If it's two acres or less,
115 something happens. If it's greater than two acres, something else happens.
116 That's when an objective criteria is. I would next like to talk about the specific
117 issues the, um, Judge (Manama) pointed out in our code and that starts on
118 page 15 of my memo. And, um, and again, these are just, uh, these are specific
119 to all design review applications. Uh, one of the criteria and if you recall is
120 that it half- the standards have to they have to adhere to the standards for the
121 protection of health, safety, and general welfare. What the heck does that
122 mean? I don't know what that means. Protection of health, safety, and general
123 welfare. It seems to me like that is whatever somebody says it is on a

124 particular day. So that is one of the issues that Judge (Manama) brought up.
125 That's one of the issues that were gonna try to fix in this Code Amendment.
126 Status recommendation, um, on that one is that we just fall back on LUPA,
127 and I think that's probably a pretty safe strategy. So on page 16 of my memo,
128 uh, I - I indicate this is what LUPA says health, safety, and general welfare
129 and means. And so our proposal on this Code Amendment - either on the
130 repeal or the repair - 'cause this is an amendment that applies to all design
131 review applications. They should just look to what that means under LUPA.
132 So under LUPA at 676502 the Idaho Legislature has said this is what health,
133 safety, and general welfare means. So you can go through here and just ask
134 yourself, do these look objective to you. There's some morning in here, um, I
135 mean, it's the Idaho legislature and nobody's attacked this wording, but I'm not
136 sure what undue concentration. I'm not sure what undo water and air pollution
137 means. I'm not sure what encouraging something means. How do you
138 encourage? F, to encourage urban - urban type development. That seems, I
139 mean, it's what the state has and so, um, we're recommending that we use the
140 state wording or improve upon it, but I'm not sure what encourage means, and
141 I'm not sure what undo means. So, on those issues, um, we look forward to
142 recommendations on that. Another issue that we were looking at is Garden
143 City Code on now page 17 of my memo, 8-78-2. And this gets into like I said
144 up - up trying to update definitions, uh, trying to make it clear, uh, what these
145 definitions mean. But so we have a definition, and I'll get to it in a minute
146 exactly defining what health, safety, and welfare is like I just mentioned,
147 trying to define what mixed-use means, trying to define what work, live,
148 create property means, if that's what - if we're gonna keep it, uh, trying to
149 define other terms like archaeological sites, Boise River, waterways, and
150 wetlands. We pulled definitions from other accepted, uh, sources. These are
151 not definitions that we came up with on our own. These are definitions that we
152 looked at to other jurisdictions. And so these are just basically other
153 jurisdictions definitions that we've cut and paste from. Uh, s o I've provided
154 on th- those general fixes for all design review applications. Those are the
155 initial thoughts that I'll go over in more detail here in a minute. Of course, we
156 could pick what we like from other jurisdictions and discard what we don't
157 like from other jurisdictions. We could try to fix what we currently have,
158 which is what we're recommending here today. Uh, but I mean we- there's a
159 lot of different options that we could try to apply to fix this problem. Uh,
160 towards the second half of the page - uh, page 17. Now, I'm talkin' about what
161 should we do about the Surel Mitchell work, live, create, overlay zoning
162 district. And like I said at the beginning, we could just repeal it and keep the
163 branding, or we could try to fix it. Legal department has no preference or
164 recommendation on that. Uh, I think the city can do either one of those things.

165 I do see there's - there's value added to the, um, Surel Mitchell District. And
166 so I'm not here to suggesting we should just get rid of all of it, but we do need
167 to fix it, or we need to repair or repeal it one of the two. So when we go
168 through this, and we have the discussion, uh, first thing is, is, um, what kind
169 of dimensional requirements, um, that should the city have that if the city's
170 gonna keep the Surel Mitchell overlay district? What dimensional
171 requirements should we have? Currently, we just have a - a dimensional
172 requirements on setbacks and on the size of the development. That's it for
173 dimensional requirements. Should we have more? Should we have less?
174 Should we have different? That's not for me to decide. Uh, but we - but as a
175 city, um, that is a decision that does have to be made. On page 18 of my
176 memo on the very top, uh, we talked about and I know there's been a lot of
177 discussion and probably the committee is aware of whether or not there should
178 be a 1-1 ratio in - in this overlay district one residential to one commercial.
179 Um, there's been testimony, there has been evidence, there's been things on
180 the record that that was the intent but our code currently does not say that. So
181 if that is the intent of the Surel Mitchell Overlay District, uh, staff needs to be
182 told that, and we will put it in the Code Amendments. So that is 83C3D and E.
183 Uh, and then the rest of the memo's really talking about parking and that is a
184 big issue that, uh, the city has to decide. What do we do about parking? That's
185 a big conversation. We're just starting to have that and that - that's not a
186 simple answer. And I know it's not a simple answer. Uh, and it's not a simple
187 answer for anybody. Boise - Boise's going through their Code Amendments
188 on parking. We have a lot of growth coming into the valley. It's a - it's a
189 question that I'm not sure I have an answer for right now, but I h- I know what
190 the questions are. And of th- and one answer is the way our code is currently
191 written is ambiguous, and it's been determined ambiguous. And so if we're
192 gonna fit- if we're gonna keep it, we need to fix it. So these parking
193 regulations that I'm talking about starting on page 18 are specific, uh, to the
194 Surel Mitchell overlay district. And currently, it says 83C3 and I know when
195 I'm done with my presentation, uh, Miss Thornborrow's gonna talk more about
196 parking. Um, 'cause she, you know, she lives and breathes it on a daily basis.
197 But my general legal concepts here are it's vague as it's currently written. Uh,
198 it does say one off-street parking for each living unit. I understand that. That -
199 that's easy, but where it gets complicated is where it starts talking about
200 working spaces over 500 square feet. Um, and then it talks about a
201 determination by the planning and zoning commission, but the planning and
202 zoning commission doesn't even look at these. And so, um, so it just gets all
203 muddled up, and we're tryin' to fix it. And we love the recommendations. Uh,
204 the one thing I do wanna point out though is if the Surel Mitchell overlay
205 district is repealed, then in that area we default to the general parking

206 provisions and that's 84D. And I start talking about that on page 20 in my
207 memo. 'Cause if we default to that, the, uh, just so everybody's aware that has
208 more parking regulations than the Overlay District currently does. So for an
209 example, as it was explained to me for one residential dwelling unit, uh, in the
210 general parking regulations, you would need anywhere from 1.5 to 2.5 parking
211 un- parking spots. But in the Surel Mitchell, you'd only need one. So we're
212 going back to if you want to repeal Surel Mitchell where there's less parking
213 regulation or do you - you wanna repeal that and go to the more, um, more
214 regulation of the general requirements or what? That's not for me to decide,
215 I'm just pointing out the issue. So then the rest of my memo is kind of
216 showing different examples of parking regulations from different
217 jurisdictions. And I think, uh, as I went through these, and I'm looking at this
218 as an objective standard Eagle's, I mean I liked Eagle's. Eagle's is just ratios.
219 And I like ratios 'cause I can understand ratios, and so I - I would make a
220 recommen- recommendation that we use ratios of some kind on these things
221 'cause they're easy to understand. So now I'm gonna look, and I'll show you
222 what ordinances could look like, and then I will stand for questions. So if we
223 could look at the Repeal Ordinance. It's called Option A in your packet. It
224 looks like that. And so this is the repeal of the Surel Mitchell overlay district.
225 We can go to page 3 of that. We have a table here. And before I get to the
226 specifics of the table, there's a bigger issue. Uh, should the city get rid of all
227 overlay districts? I mean, do we need overlay districts? You can see here, we
228 have four set up. We have four of them set up here. We got that one that on
229 repeal we take it out of the table together, and we have this one. And then
230 there's two more that I've never even been codified. So really, if we get rid of
231 Surel Mitchell, we only have one overlay district right here. And when I was
232 asking plan- the planners about the Surel Mitchell overlay district, I said,
233 "How many times has that even been used?" And it's only been used twice,
234 and one the city got sued on. So, um, we're - we're expanding a lot of work on
235 something that's only been used twice so far. Um, but the bigger topic is, do
236 you wanna get rid of all of them? I'm - I'm sure the council would love a
237 recommendation on that. On to page 6 of the ordinance, uh, towards the
238 bottom right here. A decision needs to be made about the - the pre-app
239 process. Um, when I was going through design review in the different
240 jurisdictions, it's interesting to me. In some jurisdictions design review just
241 goes to the Development Services Director, and it's an administrative decision
242 only. Some jurisdictions, the Development Services Director can go to the
243 Design review committee at her discretion. Other jurisdictions only do design
244 review in certain areas like, uh, or, you know, urban renewal area or the
245 downtown area. In Garden City, we pl- applied design review to everything as
246 far as I can tell on most.

247

248 Q: Un- unless otherwise designated and coded...

249

250 A: Right.

251

252 Q: ...as a staff (unintelligible).

253

254 A: So do we really want the design review on everything? That's a big issue. And
255 again, I don't have a recommendation on that. But what should we do about
256 the pre-app process? This is something that the judge called out and said,
257 "What - what is Garden City's process here?" As I understand it, currently,
258 there's two pre-app meetings and, Jenah, could correct me - Miss
259 Thornborrow could correct me if I'm wrong, but one's mandatory, one's
260 discretionary on the committee, is that right?

261

262 Q: Um, thank you, Mr. Wadams. And, um, what the city does is the pre-
263 application as it relates to design review is a required, codified, um, process.
264 However, the city does offer - and it is confusing that it's called the pre
265 application - um, for anybody that's wishing to do any sort of permitting
266 process, um, a free consult with those that will review their - their application.
267 And so it's typically, um, those that are wishing to say build a new building.
268 They would meet with the Fire Department, the structural reviewer, with the
269 public works department planners all at one time. Uh, and that is not a
270 codified, uh, requirement whatsoever. It's just a service that the city does to
271 help try to - for those that are trying to navigate the process.

272

273 A: Right. Thank you, Miss Thornborrow.

274

275 Q: Thank you.

276

277 A: So, again, what - what should that really look like? In an ideal world, uh,
278 trying to make everybody happy, trying to have nice development in the city.
279 What do the - what does the pre-app process look like? That's something that
280 the judiciary said we need to figure out. Um, page 7 of this ordinance. This is
281 what we had pr- proposed (unintelligible) remember those required findings
282 were all designed review applications. Um, (unintelligible). So, uh, for those
283 of y- us that may or may not know the ch- the things we were trying to take
284 out or crossed out, you know, so this - we're crossin' out what we think was
285 the bad or not the great. And then we're adding, you know, what we think
286 might fix it. But I - I'm here - I'm here to say that a- this is not r- ready. This is
287 not - I'm not comfortable with this yet because as you look at our fixes, I'm

288 not sure what all of it means. And so maybe it's just 'cause I'm a lawyer, not a
289 planner but, uh - uh, I do have - it does cause me some pause. So if you go
290 through some of this wording, um, we tried to fix it but again, we - we went
291 from like seven criteria now to eleven criteria and you can go through and see
292 what the recommendations are but I still have some concerns. Um, and I'm
293 hoping - what I'm really hoping is by the time this gets to the city council we
294 have great recommendations from design review, we have great
295 recommendations from planning and zoning and then we can have a great
296 finished product. I just don't think we're here quite yet. But this is where we
297 are right now and would love recommendations on this. And if you, uh, we
298 add the definitions, like I talked about in the memo. The definitions so we
299 tried to make it real clear. Uh, and again, things that we added are underlined.
300 Things that we have taken out or stricken through. And so I think that
301 probably pretty much summarizes, uh, Option A, the repeal. If you go to
302 Option B, the amend ordinance or the repair ordinance I was talkin' about that
303 really quick. Uh, one of our fixes is on Page 1 of the ordinance. Uh, right here,
304 this is where, you know, the council said that the intent was a 1 to 1 ratio in
305 this overlay district. And so we tried to pick wording that says it's a 1 to 1
306 ratio. But my question is - is that really what it says? Um, and - and would
307 love a recommendation on that. I'm not sure that really says 1 to 1 ratio. Um,
308 so maybe we can improve that one. So, uh, on Page 2 of this ordinance, we
309 tried to fix on the parking with the - the foot - the how many square foot so on
310 and so forth, we tried to say it's cumulative here. You know, it's - it's
311 cumulative 'cause there - it wasn't clear if it was a cum- cumulative or not. So
312 we tried to clarify that and then the rest of the changes are the same. Uh, well
313 that - that's not right. Um, the rest of the changes are (unintelligible) kinda fix
314 design reviews. Um, so on this Option B that we're lookin' at right now i- is
315 trying to repair Surel Mitchell overlay district trying to repair the design
316 standards applicable, uh, throughout the city. The other thing I wanna
317 mention, then I'll stand for questions are - let me get my reference real quick.
318 Okay. If - if we could go back to Page 19 of my memo for a bit. I neglected
319 something. The other issue, the last issue before I stand for questions, I - I
320 want everybody to be thinkin' about shared parking agreements and whether
321 we should even have shared parking agreements. So code currently talks about
322 shared parking agreements right here and then it says - and then it talks about
323 if you're gonna have a shared parking agreement - let me find it.
324 (Unintelligible). There we go. A- and it says this is what should be in the
325 agreement and all they specifically reference is, uh, what, you know A - A and
326 B. So - so I think we should probably have more in our agreements than just A
327 and B. Um, and so do we want to shared parking agreements? Uh, and if so
328 what - what should be in the agreement? Again, uh, I'm sure the city council

329 would love recommendations on that as well. So I - I think that's my plan
330 presentation and with that, I'll stand for any questions.

331

332 Q:

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

Um, and - and before we turn it over to questions for Mr. Wadams, um, he had mentioned that I did wanna address the parking, which, um, the standard 8.4 parking. 8.4 - I don't know the exact, um, reference off the top of my head. Um, D. The 8.4D parking is not a part of the potential changes but as he noted and as - as you have dealt with particularly over, uh, this past year that parking is, uh, quite an issue. Um, I did want to talk about that but just to summarize, um, Mr. Wadham's proposal. Um, there are two different options that he has proposed. One is to repeal the Surel Mitchell, um, currently qualified as Work, Live, Create. Um, and - and if it is - well I'll get to that. And then still, uh, address the design review required findings. Um, and in - there has been an attempt, uh, with those required findings to, um, make them clear and concise. Uh, well also relating back to that, which you review an 8-4, uh, all of the standards within eight uh, Title 8.4. Um, and as Mr. Wadhams noted, perhaps there's still room on that. Um, and then the second option would be to repair and get rid of any um, arbitrary language within the Surel Mitchell, uh, current code, um, as well. Um, and then one suggestion that, um, has not made it to these draft ordinances, if the Surel Mitchell, uh, work live create designation, um, is maintained and within code. Right now, the comprehensive plan as well as the branding is Live, Work, Create. And perhaps that might be a change right now to just change those where they match the same Live, Work, Create - Live, Work, Create instead of Live, Work, Create and Work, Live, cr- Create. And then with parking, I'll get into that now. Um, it did come up, and I had noted that I would work on a parking policy as noted in code and very similar, uh, to what, um, Mr. Wadams has suggested, I - I looked our code and said perhaps we can take, um, a table with all of the Garden City identified uses and add a ratio of parking, um, that we have applied to other locations, uh, other approvals such as Casino Beach or the Boardwalk. Um, as I got into that as well as, um, currently we have um methods on how to address, um, mixed juice or reduction in parking. Um, those might be things like auto disincentives that we've talked about, such as meters, um, or parking maximums unbundle in, uh, parking of residential units, um, auto reduction incentives. So provide car shares and no surcharge to the user of the amenity. Design incentives such as design storage not within the garage, uh, parking agreements. Um, but it is true that in looking at the parking agreements as spelled out by code, uh, there - there is room for improvement for sure. Um, the city isn't currently set up, uh, but perhaps it's paying into a public system. Um, transit incentives could be an option such as a transit pass per employee or resident. Bicycle incentives, multifamily, uh,

370 covered biking in conjunction with garages, uh, tenants who, um, participate
371 in some sort of a program or employees. And so there are a number of ways to
372 reduce or match parking. Um, uh, but as this committee's heard quite a bit too,
373 there's also a current, um, theory of, uh, just getting rid of parking altogether.
374 Um, and allowing the market to take care of that. So that would be another
375 option, uh, to look at. So if that is done, uh, there might be other, um, I guess
376 the things that the city would need to look at, would that be metered parking?
377 Um, would there be residential permits that, uh, would need to be granted, uh,
378 because there will be those that, uh, have lived in areas for a long time or have
379 businesses that have been in - in areas that may feel that redevelopment is
380 affecting, uh, their -their traditional ability to park on the street. Um, and one
381 of the things that, uh, was id- identified by planning staff if the city is to move
382 to a very strict parking requirement that has strict ratios, uh, that maybe, um,
383 difficult for the businesses to move in and out. So if you have any change of
384 use, um, how is that parking reviewed then? Are - are - would those new uses
385 be required to find additional parking or would they then have access to
386 parking, uh, that they wouldn't be required to have per code? Um, we've
387 talked to, uh, CCDC, the urban renewal district in the city of Boise. Um, and
388 they - CCDC does oversee a number of the parking, um, structures within the
389 city of Boise. And if that's a direction that you would like to recommend to
390 the city council, um, that would be a difficult, uh, recommendation just
391 because of the - the funding that would be required. Um, but we do have
392 information on that if - if you would like. Um, and then there's a number of
393 different, um - um, efforts that are going on within the city. Uh, for example,
394 the - the police department is working with Ada County Highway District to
395 try to address some of the areas that have been specifically pinpointed, um, as
396 having, um, problematic parking areas. And so 42nd Street is one of those and
397 so they're trying to work with ACHD to see if there's a way - if there's a
398 mechanism within, uh, the existing right away that could be addressed.
399 Perhaps one way streets with angled parking on one side instead of parking on
400 both sides. Um, And if on-street parking is maintained and that's part of this
401 issue, uh, I would suggest that discussions with the Fire department and
402 ACHD, as well as the Police department, uh, would - suggestions would come
403 through them t- prior to coming to this committee. Um, and then the - the
404 Galena Fund, uh, group, uh, that's doing a lot of work in the 40s and the -
405 numbered streets, um, redevelopment work is working with Urban Land
406 Institute right now. Um, they, um, have a panel advisory service through ULI,
407 uh, looking at what a master plan, uh, for that area might be. And so they have
408 already started that process and, uh, ULI will be, um, here in the next month
409 or so interviewing stakeholders. Um, But they are specifically one of their
410 biggest questions is what to do with parking and how to make parking a more

411 public, um, system versus on a case by case, um, property basis. Um, In
412 listening in on their San Diego - their initial panel a few weeks ago, um, that
413 panel does include a number of people that maybe, uh, larger city size, um,
414 than garden city. There was the Mayor of Pittsburgh for example, um, there
415 was somebody that had done quite a bit of redevelopment work in San Diego.
416 And that panel did te- um, tend towards just, uh, getting rid of the parking
417 regulations in their entirety. Uh, what we have asked, what - what garden city
418 has asked as they go through the process, if they can identify codes for
419 urbanizing areas that are sort - small - small communities still. So maybe not
420 having the funding that a larger community might have. Um, that may not
421 have a robust transit system. And so those are all the moving parts that I think
422 I can see right off, uh, the top and maybe directions that we can talk about, uh,
423 parking. Just note that this - this particular, um, code amendment that Mr.
424 Wadams has brought to the committee for recommendation does not include
425 changes right now, but he is looking for recommendations and direction. And
426 then also, um, Mr. Wadams can clarify upon rebuttal. Um, but it sounds to me
427 like he's maybe hoping for a continuance on this to give more time to review
428 the code.

429
430 A: Yeah, Ms. thorn- Thornborrow, I would rather, uh, measure twice and cut
431 once on this one. So if we need to continue things a few times to get
432 everything pinned down, that would be my preference. Uh, 'cause we are
433 talking about complicated issues affecting property rights. So yeah I'd rather
434 measure twice and cut once on this. Thank you.

435
436 Q: Ah, thank you. And then, uh, with that, this is a public hearing and you kind
437 of had a staff report and, um - and an applicant presentation all rolled into one.
438 So I'll go ahead and open the public hearing. Is there anybody on zoom who
439 wishes to testify? If so, uh, please utilize the raise your hand feature. All right.
440 Seeing none. Is there anybody in person? Oh.

441
442 Woman: No, there's two.

443
444 Q2: Um, there are two. Excuse me. I didn't see it quick enough. Um, Greg Hahn.

445
446 A1: Sorry. I'm gettin' my video started here, uh, so you can see me. Um, and I - I,
447 you know, I don't want to say much. I s- I wrote a letter to - I'm Greg Hahn, I
448 am the Executive Director of Surel's Place. Uh - uh, and, um, obviously this is
449 something we're very interested in, uh, following along. I'm really kind of
450 heartened to hear the conversation or even just laying it out today, which I
451 think makes a lot of sense. Uh, we sent our board approved, uh, me to send a

452 letter to the city council just to say how much we sort of, uh, think the district,
453 um, adds a lot of value to the area and it's something that should be preserved.
454 I do know that - that, you know, the question of, you know, whether we keep
455 the district or just keep the branding is - is fine, and I think that's good in a lot
456 of ways, but of course, a brand without substance isn't probably a really long-
457 lived, uh - uh, plan. So I - I think we certainly want to really encourage, uh,
458 finding ways to make it work. Um, I'll just quickly say it clearly needs to be
459 revisited and explored. I mean, like, doc- or Mr. Wadams says that the, you
460 know, lack of use, lack of clarity, um, plus it's a very different neighborhood
461 than it was a few years back when the district was created. I think you all
462 maybe know the - there was some question in the city council meeting, that
463 was Surel was on the planning and zoning herself when they created the
464 district, sort of, to encourage the kind of - the kind of, uh, development that
465 she had done. You know, if you've been to Surel's Place, it's a house and a
466 studio, right? So you could do that as an artist, you could do that as an
467 entrepreneur, you could do that, uh, in a lot of different creative approaches.
468 Now it's obviously things are more dense, there's a lot more, um, you know,
469 the land values are going up and as of the buildings get higher, the values go
470 higher, so, uh, that's just going to keep on going. So I do think it's definitely
471 time. It's a great chance to take a look at it, um, you know, and Mr. wa- I have
472 another - you know, Mr. Wadams pointed out the parking rules. My - those
473 rules work really great I think for more suburban neighborhoods, like those on
474 the other side of the fairgrounds and, uh, along the river out there. They
475 obviously don't work, um, in a place that's, you know, a pretty dense area in
476 the - right tucked into downtown Boise. It's funny, um, that you mentioned
477 the, uh, the bigger cities, I mean in some ways this a - this is a tricky one for
478 Garden City. This neighborhood can't kind of act like it's in a 12,000 person
479 town, right? It's right in the center of an 800,000 person now metro area. And
480 so the - it's a very different place. But yeah, I just think this is a wonderful
481 chance. Mr. Wadams I'm really happy to hear you say that maybe it shouldn't
482 be sped through. Um, I think it's a great opportunity for the city and for the
483 residents of this part of the city and the b- and the business owners 'cause I
484 don't live in the city, I live in Boise but work, um, you know, at Surel's Place.
485 But, um, it is just a really cool chance to - to take a step back and - and see
486 what it should be, um, and how to keep it, um, the kind of, the intentions
487 behind the idea that it could be an affordable and interesting and safe and, um,
488 walk-able and bike-able and creative area. So that's all I wanted to say, but
489 thank you for giving me a few minutes of time.

490

491 Q:

492

Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Hahn? All right, thank you. See, none. Uh,
we'll go Jason Jones.

493

494 Q1:

495

496

497

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

Hey everybody, Jason Jones here. Um, well since it was our lawsuit that is kind of the action that - that, um, instigated all of this, I think, you know, I think there's a whole bunch here. I mean, I - I - I'd like to see maybe more interaction between people who actually live in this neighborhood before the code is just rewritten or repealed. I feel like maybe there's a chance that we could have some actual work sessions where everybody could be invited to kind of go through 'cause - 'cause I think the problem is we don't even know what - what really should be changed. I mean, I know as part of our lawsuit, some of the stuff that came up was like the 1 to 1 ratio. You know, and again, I think it's gonna come down to whether the city believes they should have a 1 to 1 ratio. I think the truth of the matter is that the code as it is, doesn't have that ratio. It never had the ratio. The city council tried to enforce that ratio. But, uh, there's new city council people who are now - been voted in, and maybe they don't agree that it should be 1 to 1. I think if we add a 1 to 1 ratio to this code, it basically becomes unusable. And so even if you kept the code you, like - you know, I think of some of the projects that have come in the last year. Um, you know, there's a great one here on 33rd Street that has, like, four little residential units with a workspace, a two-story workspace on the front of it, that I think could have been submitted as a live work project. It didn't because of all the confusion of what was happening there. But to me, it shouldn't necessarily be 1 to 1 'cause some, uh, workspace uses might actually have more than two artists in them. You know, I think, uh, Derek, on this committee, has a space that's a workspace with bunches of artists. And so if he had a bunch of residential units for his workspace, I think it would be fine. I mean, I don't think they have to come in a 1-1 ratio to fit what the actual purpose of the district is. Um, you know, I think the market kind of determines how people design and build those things. So I think it's kind of dangerous to - to do that because then this is gonna get used even less than it has been used. And - and as (Charlie) pointed out, it hasn't - this code hasn't been used very often. And part of that is that - that the regular code is less restrictive than the live-work code. And so, um, I think it should be part of the goal of what we're doin' here should be to make the live-work code more usable. Um, while we're - while we're fixing it, if we make it where it's actually can be used, I think we can encourage an actual live-work neighborhood, um, goin' forward. And I think that's the - the real goal. I think - I wanna comment to the parking stuff. I mean, I - I think as part of the lawsuit the - we don't actually have the findings of that lawsuit and as part of the documents, but I think it would be useful for people to understand, um, what was really occurring. The truth is, the live-work parking is probably the most clear parking in the city's code. If the live-work is removed and repealed,

534 the other parking for the city code is also gonna have to be fixed. It - it
535 basically has the same problem that the live-work code has. So if you kind of
536 see how the live-work code is proposed to be changed, I think you're gonna
537 see that - that, um, subjectiveness, uh, for all the commercial parking exists.
538 Right now, there is no commercial parking. And I think what the judge
539 basically says, hey, you can't not have parking regulations. And you can't just
540 figure it out later based on something. And that's how the current code, not
541 just the live-work, but just all the code is currently written. And so I think, you
542 know, to me, the live-work actually does have the parking for workspaces
543 actually objectively laid out with one little exception, uh, to where it says, hey
544 - or the planning commission could decide. And that can be removed and then
545 the live-work code's actually better than the regular code. So again, you know,
546 I don't think, you know, we - that didn't actually apply to the lawsuit. I think
547 they just realized that - that basically, the lawsuit said, hey you have to lay it
548 out. And I think, you know, in my mind, the live-work code, the parking
549 already is there, and it works. But you know, again, I think the bigger picture
550 is hey, can we fix this live-work to make it more used because right now it
551 isn't being used. And that's because it - there's some other things within the
552 live-work, I think that make it more restrictive that right now we could kinda
553 clean up and fix so that, you know, I think at some point there was a code
554 revision after the live-work that made the regular mixed-use code less
555 restrictive. And so it's become way easier for people to just do a PUD and get
556 a bunch of variances and that's why we're seein' so many of that type of
557 application because a lot of the code all the way across the board is broken
558 and not usable. And so if you start to look at how many applications come
559 through as PUDs that really shouldn't be PUDs. They could just be a regular
560 submittal. Uh, I think what - what the reason for that is that there's a lot of
561 broken code, and it's not just the live-work code, it's all of it. And so, you
562 know, in my mind, like I said, just pretending to fix the live-work code doesn't
563 really fix the actual issue maybe that - that's happenin' here. 'Cause like I said,
564 the real reality is that had the City Council just follow the recommendation of
565 this body, the Design Review Committee, uh, which you guys on that
566 application, read the code, you said, hey, this is what the code says, and you
567 approved those applications three times. If the City Council hadn't been like,
568 well this is not what it says, but this is what it meant and interpreted stuff that
569 wasn't written there, then we wouldn't be here today. So again, some of it
570 really wasn't about the stuff that's written in the code, it was really more about
571 the City Council wanting stuff to be written in the code that wasn't there and
572 then denying an application for that reason.
573

- 574 Q: All right, thank you. Any questions of Mr. Jones? All right, thank you. Then
575 we'll turn it over to Hannah Ball.
576
- 577 Q2: Thank you. Hannah Ball 215 East 34th Street Garden City. And let me pull up
578 my notes basically just to follow on to everything that's been said so far. Um,
579 ultimately, the live-work code has highly inspired me to think about creating
580 smaller, uh, flexible, affordable, spaces in this unique part of town. I just
581 wanted to add that this is always - this section of town has always been
582 commercial in nature, so it's tough to blend in some of the uses, um, for the
583 commercial component and create new developments that are cohesive in the
584 area. So when I read this section of code, I think it has a lot of merit, and it
585 already really has a tone in the right direction. Also, I just wanted to remind
586 the Design Review Committee - and - and I'm sure everybody knows - but
587 The lots in the original town side are so small, they're only 50 x 150. Um, and
588 there's a lot of fragmented ownership. So assemblage has always been very -
589 very difficult in this area. And by over parking this part of town, uh, I think
590 we will lose the artist vibe, and we'll lose a lot of that branding and a lot of
591 those philosophies if we're forced to over park this section of - of town. Um,
592 also to (Charlie)'s point, the - if the live-work code goes away, we are
593 defaulted to the base zone on commercial parking count and that's the largest
594 deficiency I see is that we don't have a clear parking count. So maybe this is
595 the time to analyze what that parking count could be. Maybe it's a one parking
596 space per 2000 square foot. I know that we looked at adding a one per square
597 footage ratio - like (Charlie) had mentioned - previously in different
598 applications has been somewhat successful. The specific area plan had 1 to
599 1500. Um, so I just think it's really that commercial parking code that really
600 needs to be analyzed, and I don't know if it's during this, um, zone. I also - I
601 like the idea of having a neighborhood working group and then also just
602 having some more time to process what these changes actually mean and then
603 apply them through design for equality community. So those were my notes
604 and I appreciate everybody's time and energy in looking at this, especially
605 since it's our living and working district. So, thank you.
606
- 607 Q: Thank you. Any questions of Miss Ball? All right. Uh, Mr. Wadams, is there
608 anything else that you would like to say as the applicant?
609
- 610 A: Thank you, Miss Thornborrow. No, um, I am hearing everybody's mess-
611 messaging loud and clear. Oh, yeah, I had two mics going on. Excuse me.
612 Um, one mic. Back to one mic. Uh, I hear everything loud and clear, and I
613 don't disagree with any of it. Um, I'm here to, uh, raise the legal issues and -
614 but I'm not here to make the policy. So, um, I'm - I'm here to serve, and we'll

615 take whatever recommendations. Or if - if the committee would like to
616 continue this to a date certain and have us make some changes, that would be
617 perfectly fine. Uh, but I'm here to serve, so whatever is the will of the
618 committee is what I will try to do. Thank you.

619

620 Q:

621 Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Wadams? All right. I'm - I'm not seeing
622 any. And so before I, um, turn it over for discussion and direction, I do want
623 to note, uh, that the city is, um, currently in-house working on, uh, code
624 revisions. But the - the idea is to address Title Eight in its entirety, um, over a
625 course of time. Um, and one of the - the things that, uh, the Development
626 Services department has on the list of items to address in addition, uh, to
627 parking that's on there. Um, there are a couple of things that were brought up.
628 The planned unit development discussion is certainly one of those, uh, where
629 perhaps there are some reasons that this - this committee or, um, the planned
630 unit development is being utilized that could easily be addressed. Um, another
631 thing on that list that is suggested that the city review is it time to make des-
632 design districts that matched the comprehensive cl- uh, um, comprehensive
633 plan? And so, um, in - in many ways I think those that are looking at the Surel
634 Mitchell - um, I'm going to call it live-work-create district - um, there's a
635 desire that that is in a - a design district, what I'm hearing in its entirety for
636 that area versus, um, something that's looking at how do you address a one or
637 what the city has interpreted as a 1 to 1 ratio of living and working. Um, and if
638 - if that's the case, I think that there's direction from this committee that might
639 be warranted. What's the difference between that district and mixed-use?
640 Should the city be looking at design districts that address the comprehensive
641 plans, um, identify desires for the communities or the neighborhoods? Um, I
642 think - I think that that's all to- that I have before turnin' it over. Thank you.
643 Anybody wanna start?

643

644 Q3:

645 Oh, I'll make, um, a few comments. Uh, the on the parking, um, you know,
646 that's something that's come up quite a bit in our review of applications and,
647 um, for certain areas of the - the city, and - and, you know, I would look to the
648 comprehensive plan to kind of look at for those areas - the activity centers. I
649 don't know that we need, um, I think we need maximum parking, um, rather
650 than minimum parking. And, um, uh, but I - I think we, in exchange for some
651 of the parking, we do need to disincentivize auto-oriented, um, travel. So all
652 of those things that you were talking about you- I mean, I've brought up
653 several of them in the past. I would - I just - I hope that we continue to look at
654 that and, um, really look at how certain areas of the city where that could be
655 applied. Which kind of goes to the point that you were just saying as far as
really looking at, you know, our base zoning districts don't really reflect, um,

656 a lot of what the comprehensive plan is, um, division that's - that's outlined in
657 the comprehensive plan. So, you know, I'm not a - a fan of, hey, let's create
658 even more but, um, maybe take a look at the mixed-use, uh, take a look at
659 some of these overlay. Do we need the overlays? Maybe we just need more
660 options, um, related to, um, the desired land uses in those areas as reflected or
661 - or outlined in the comprehensive plan. And, um, and I think that also ties
662 into taking a look at the PUD because it's - we're getting application after
663 application. And, you know, from sometimes the way I look at it, they're just
664 askin' for a PUD because they don't want to meet the requirements. Rather
665 than what the intent of the PUD is which is to create something unique that -
666 that the existing requirements don't allow you to create this unique, um,
667 situation - unique development, you know, preserve open area, or you know
668 just do something different. And instead they just, uh, I don't really feel like
669 meeting the setbacks. Let me go for PUD. I'm not saying that's what people
670 are doing. It's just from my perspective it seems like that is what we're being
671 asked to approve. And - and I'm like no. We can't. I don't - I don't, you know,
672 I don't think our rules allow us to do that. Um, so I would rather push in that
673 direction, looking at that rather than, hey let's just repeal, um, the - the Surel
674 Mitchell. I think we can modify it and make it a little bit more usable and, um,
675 applicable and reflective of what the company's paying cost for in this area.

676
677 Q: Thank you. Other thoughts?

678
679 A1: You know, I think as a - as a big - big picture too I'm a - I'm a fan of fixing
680 rather than repealing. Um, and I'd like to - I'd like to see that happen. And not
681 only, like, I - I would say don't just fix it to make it legal and objective but fix
682 it to, like, create the intent. Look at - look at what the intent is, fix it - the
683 things that are wrong with it - but then look at what is - what are the
684 incentives of using it, right? 'Cause, maybe part of fixing it is making it so that
685 people are gonna use it because they're incentivized to use it, right? Like,
686 there's some - there's some small parking concessions and there's some small
687 setback concessions, and it's been used twice since it was invented. Right? So
688 can we have more parking concessions and more setback incentives and other
689 incentives perhaps that it's gonna be used 20 times since inception instead of
690 two times since inception? So that would be - that would be my goal in all of
691 this. And - and, um, you know, I'm glad - I'm glad the city and (Charlie)'s
692 open to kind of, uh, you know, this is kind of an introduction to it. We'll
693 continue it. We'll discuss it. We'll continue it. We'll discuss it, and we'll get it
694 to a place that is, you know, ultimately a - a usable, uh, usable overlay. And
695 something that, um, that - that developers are going to look at seriously and
696 consider. And I think, you know, personally, and how I r- I read this, it's - it's

697 looking to create more small spaces for artists and small spaces for living.
698 And I think that's one of in - in my mind and how I read it, um, you know, it's,
699 it's looking to incentivize that. So I think at the end of the day, we wanna fix it
700 and make it more of an incentive, so it's - so it's actually used. That's kind of
701 my - my initial broad brush stroke on it. And I have some more things we can
702 talk about, uh, in more detail now or later. But I'd like to hear from Brett, too.
703

704 Q4: Um, yeah. I - I guess I'd be in the same - in the same line with, uh, as far as,
705 uh, repair rather than repeal. Um, I think I also see some - some benefits into
706 having some work sessions where, you know, we get some, um, local
707 involvement and - and really kinda talk through some of the issues and - and
708 identify as - as you were saying, the, um, uh, incentives to utilizing this. You
709 know, if it's - if it's y- an overlay district that's only been used twice I think
710 there-in lies kind of, um, reasoning to - to take a look at it and - and see, okay,
711 well why is that? And if it's gonna remain, and we're gonna repair it, how can
712 we make it, um, how can we make some changes that really en- encourage its
713 use. And - I - and as far as the - the - the, uh, parking goes, I think that there
714 is, um, outside of the Surel Mitchell, just the regular parking, I think that's
715 been kind of an issue that seems to rear its head all the time as, you know,
716 variances to parking counts and, um, a code that really doesn't have a lot of
717 things defined and nor does it address some of the things that we always kind
718 of see an argument for, you know, um, covered or garage parking, uh, versus,
719 you know, driveway guest parking. I mean it just - h- it seems to me that there
720 could be a lot done there to - to set kind of a more, uh, solid foundation for
721 how the parking is, um, is reviewed and take - take the subjectivity out of it.
722 And you know, then offer incentives for doing, you know, for doing other
723 things to offset the amount of parking, and maybe that's a way to - to address
724 reduction in parking trade-offs of sorts. But it- I just - I think there's a lot in
725 there, and some - I - I think some work sessions would be helpful even if it's
726 just with, you know, with us and the city staff and kind of going through and -
727 and looking at that a little harder.
728

729 A1: Yep. And I - and I think there are, I mean, there's - there's people that have
730 bought property in the district in the last six months - eight months that, you
731 know, would be great to have at the table too. Because in their, you know,
732 they're - they're thinking about the future. They're gonna develop something
733 on, you know, how many of our parcels and if - if they're at the table and able
734 to say this would help me, this would incentivize me to make, you know, 25
735 little, you know, 500 square foot houses along with 20 little work spaces. You
736 know, I mean, if - if there's people at the table that are about to go through this
737 process, it might be helpful to have them have a - have a voice and people that

738 have done it and are in the middle of doing it. There's - I think there's a lot of
739 people that would, uh, benefit being at the table.

740
741 Q: One thing that I - I've thought about this code, um, is that it is trying to
742 perhaps identify something that's different than mixed-use, that's different
743 than just, um, a commercial or residential perhaps. As - um, and so, I've
744 wondered if there's not room within code for two things. One, to address when
745 you have somebody that lives and works within their same lot and how you
746 address that through design, um, regardless of the district that it's within. And
747 then also, um, a - a design district that becomes much more mandatory instead
748 of, um, an incentivized - it's - this is the direction, uh, that the community has
749 decided, uh, that this area should look like instead of being able to pick and
750 choose, um, whether they utilize the base zoning district or not for design. I'm
751 - I'm not, um, I haven't thought about that in use. It's strictly designed of the
752 use of your base zoning would still apply. I don't - I don't know if you have
753 any thoughts on that.

754
755 Woman: I agree with that first comment. I'm not sure. Um, I mean, you know, home
756 offices are already allowed, so why is it so difficult to allow them for work?
757 I've just never understood why it - I feel like we've actually made it more
758 difficult to do that rather than easier. Um, and, you know, plenty of people
759 already do live and work, and it doesn't have to be a studio necessarily. Um, I
760 mean, I think we need to think a little bit broader which is why I also like your
761 second point about, you know, if there's an area of the city that really wants
762 that direction of the, um, where it's mandatory. You know, it will be Live-
763 Work. It will - you will have these studios. We will have, um, smaller homes
764 and that kind of thing, then that becomes an area not just a zoning district that
765 you applied to this one little piece of property in the middle of other pieces of
766 property that are trying to do something different.

767
768 Q: So I - I think without additional discussion, um, please free - feel free to stop
769 me if you want an additional, uh, discussion. But I think I am hearing perhaps
770 the committee's recommendation at this point in time is, uh, to slow down, not
771 - not just with the committee, but to identify perhaps a work group, uh, to
772 work through some of these code changes at this point in time.

773
774 Man: Yes.

775
776 Q: Okay.

777

- 778 Q5: Yeah, is - is there any specific timeline that the, you know, the judicial order
779 or whatever it's called says you must change your code by such and such a
780 date or - or is this something, you know, is there - is there any action we need
781 in the interim while we're working on this?
782
- 783 Q: Um, I - I appreciate that comment. It - it was noticed up fast and furiously
784 because of - of, uh, the mandate. Uh, the mandate doesn't have a timeframe.
785 However, um, it would be advisable to fix what the judge has identified as
786 where the code - it specifically had some errors. And so perhaps there might
787 be a way to address the design review findings, for example, separate and a
788 little bit quicker because that's not redesigning an entire code. That's, um,
789 making sure that the findings make sense to that which you're looking at. Um,
790 and if that is the direction, um, Mr. Wadams has left, um, but I suspect it
791 might - it'd be a good idea to put a band-aid on the - the (unintelligible)
792 Mitchell, uh, Live-Work-Create parking, um, issue that was identified with the
793 recommendation to continue to look at it and address the planned unit
794 development, the design standards, the parking standards -- everything that
795 we've talked about, uh, with a work group. And - and that's just a liability
796 thing should somebody else come back through. Um, again he's not here to
797 weigh in on that, but I suspect that - that might be a good direction.
798
- 799 Q5: Were you suggesting that the - the band-aid beyond the Live-Work-Create
800 district and then the other ones are work group and the Live-Work-Create
801 district doesn't have a work group?
802
- 803 Q: Um, the - the band-aid would be to make a definable parking standard within
804 the - the Live-Work-Create district for the time being with the
805 recommendation that that's not the fix that's actually recommended
806 (unintelligible). Um, and then certainly, uh, the design review findings as
807 we're constantly dealing with those, um, I - I think that those probably should
808 have a fairly quick turn around on them.
- 809 Woman: Do you need a motion for that? Oh, sorry, Brett, go ahead.
810
- 811 Q4: I was just gonna - I was just gonna say can we make a motion then to continue
812 this to a date certain?
813
- 814 Q: Yes, please. And it looks like the next meeting and then we - we - we may just
815 continue it if we don't have enough ready for you in two weeks, um, but, um,
816 May 16 is the next meeting.
817
- 818 Q4: Okay then I'll - I'll make a motion to, uh, continue to a date certain of May 16.

819

820 Q5: And - and I'll be out the 16th, just as a reminder.

821

822 Woman: Oh, hold on - I might be out the 16th as well.

823

824 Q: Okay.

825

826 Q4: Well, then we might not be having a meeting on the 16th.

827

828 Q: We may not have that. Um, what is the next meeting then, uh, June 6. Then
829 June 6 would be the next meeting to continue.

830

831 Q4: Okay then I'll - I'll modify my motion to a date certain of June 6.

832

833 Woman: All right. And I'll second that, and I'll just add as a discussion that at that
834 meeting we would hopefully see the, um, short-term fixes to the design review
835 findings, parking for the Live-Work and recommendations on how to create a
836 work group and specific objectives for that working group to look at the
837 surround district, um, Live-Work-Create overlay. Does that make sense,
838 Brett?

839

840 Q4: Yep - yep. I accept those modifications to my motion.

841

842 Q: Okay, all in favor?

843

844 Woman: I.

845

846 Q5: I.

847

848 Q4: I.

849

850 Q: Thank you.

851

852

853 This transcript has been reviewed with the audio recording submitted and it is an accurate
854 transcription.

855 Signed _____