



UPTOWN PLANNERS

OCTOBER SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

DATE: 10/22/15

Call to order by Tom Fox at 6:02

In attendance: Gary Bonner, Mat Wahlstrom, Tom Fox, Bob Daniel, Kyle Heiskala, Michael Brennan, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney, Dana Hook (6:26) Roy Dahl (6:55)

I. Special Order of Business Uptown Community Plan – Review Of Draft Public facilities, services, and safety and implementation elements of the update of the Uptown Community Plan

Marlon's Presentation:

Slideshow handouts distributed to the board. This element identifies existing facilities and services, and addresses capacity and needs for future services. The Implementation element provides a menu of potential funding sources.

Cindy Corsen: Impact fees would be collected from developers, would there also be general fund expenditures? Answer: Yes, there will also be other sources for funding.

Ian Epley: Has there been a study of the Mills Act and the resulting impact to property taxes and the general fund? Answer no.

Sharon Gehl: Points out that we have facilities that are going unused or have unused capacity including transit, schools, etc. We should be able to build new facilities along with new development.

Berry Hagar from Mission Hills Heritage: There is a significant deficit of public facilities and new development will only exacerbate the problem.

Nancy Moors : The Mills Act has increased their property value along with other property values within the neighborhood. We need to demand facilities before density.

Ann Garwood: Developer impact fees – where has this money gone? Uptown needs a park, a place to grow vegetables and recreate. We should not take any more density.

Unknown speaker: Preservationists are concerned for the future. Sidewalks, curbs and streets should be taken care of now before we add any new density.

Tom Fox: Fire stations and libraries can be designed with visionary architecture and should be creative and innovative. Funding mechanisms should be identified in the element determining where the money comes from.

Ernie Bonn: (letter with comments distributed to the board via email) Summary: Teachers Annex could be adaptively reused as a new library. The Annex 2 next to Bernie Elementary could be used for the recreation council. The Normal Street School redevelopment should be used for only public purposes. The post office in Hillcrest is inadequate for the future. Undergrounding should make use of wireless technology. Maintenance Assessment Districts are before a new City subcommittee. Slurry sealing should include grinding down buildup of asphalt at gutters to allow proper drainage. Curb ramps should be addressed.

Gary Bonner: He appreciates Marlon's introduction to the public facilities element. He would like to see more data about unfunded facilities and deficits. We need concrete ideas of how to solve the existing public facilities deficits.

Bob Daniel: We don't see the marriage of proposed development and growth with adequate facilities. Joint use of schools – is this in lieu of a new park? Answer: This is a method to use public land and recreational facilities for residents during school off-hours.

Tom Mullaney: We cannot grow our way out of public facilities deficits. Simply listing parks in a community plan is not adequate. We have achieved Trolley Barn Park, some bike lanes, a new library, and a new fire station in 27 years. This is inadequate. In suburban areas there are mechanisms in place to make developers contribute to public facilities. We can achieve this in our urban areas. We have to take recreation seriously, 1 park within .5 miles of every home. Other communities have a facilities deficiency map that conditions development. Tait response: Recommends a parks masterplan and is open to suggestions for new parks and priorities.

Dana Hook: When you have new development you attract new facilities. There is a lack of trust in the City to make these investments. There is no tie in to connect infrastructure to new development.

Kyle Heiskala: Deferred maintenance and new development are the two main issues being talked about. They should be two different discussions with two different solutions. Suggests that a bond measure would be necessary for some of the deficits discussed. When will the board see an Impact fee study presentation? Answer: in December. Kyle: We should have input as a board on the impact fees. Transportation infrastructure is complicated with City and regional funding. We should make sure that new development provides adequate new facilities.

Michael Brennan: Identifies carshare as a way to accommodate growth without the additional demands on transportation facilities, possible easing of parking requirements. Identifies the two main issues that Kyle discussed 1) the existing infrastructure deficit 2) future development. Expresses that the solutions to both should not limit future growth. We should be able to identify as a community what our public facilities priorities are and tie them to specific funding mechanisms.

Mat Wahlstrom: We are already being underserved and cannot use developer fees to make up our deficit. What has happened to impact fees over the last years? No new public facilities have been built in Uptown in the last 27 years. The only proposed new facility is a library. There is no real funding mechanism for these improvements. Maintenance Assessment Districts and Business Improvement Districts are used interchangeably in the element, asks that Business Improvement Districts be removed from the update. The language regarding public facilities including police and fire lacks enforceability. He raises general CPOIZ concerns.

Roy Dahl: Raises the prospect of using Parking District money for public facilities such as Normal Street Linear Park. Questions why ambulances have to be sent at the same time as fire trucks.

Bonn: The sidewalk maintenance survey should be included in the impact fee study.

Tait responds: The impact fee study must only include new facilities, not maintenance.

Ian Epley: How can you use eminent domain to create new parks? Mullaney responds: There is an organization in LA that buys property at market value for conversion to parks.

Ann Garwood: States that the property at First and Robinson should be used for a community garden and dog park.

Motion 1:

Mat W. Motions to reaffirm Uptown Planners motion from May 4, 2010. Tom M. seconds:

“In order to promote a useful dialogue with the City officials in the Community Plan Update planning process about the kind of development that is wanted in Uptown, Uptown Planners states its opposition in principal to any substantial increase in density which exceeds existing development being incorporated into the updated Uptown Community Plan where necessary infrastructure improvements are not adequate to support the development. “

Discussion:

Kyle Heiskala: Suggests we separate out the two problems. 1) The facilities deficit which is a City wide issue and 2) Future development. We could strengthen future development of facilities instead of letting them stagnate.

Michael Brennan: Agrees with Kyle

Gary Bonner: Supports the motion

Motion passes with a vote of: 5-4-1

For: Ernie Bonn, Gary Bonner, Bob Daniel, Tom Mullaney, Mat Wahlstrom Against: Roy Dahl, Dana Hook, Kyle Heiskala, Michael Brennan. Chair abstains.

Motion 2:

Tom Mullaney proposes that Uptown Planners endorse page 2 of the letter from Mission Hills Heritage with a second by Gary Bonner:

[Mission Hills Heritage letter distributed to the board]

Mat requests an amendment: Resolved: Uptown Planners supports the position of Mission Hills Heritage that 'the concept of "incentive zoning provisions" should be deleted [from the City's draft CP Public Facilities, Services & Safety Element] as a proposed solution for addressing the infrastructure deficit.'

Tom Mullaney agrees to amend.

Roy Dahl: Proposes substitute motion: The City must define incentive zoning provisions before the board can make recommendations. Kyle seconds.

Discussion:

Kyle Heiskala: Developer impact fees cannot address the entire deficit. They can address certain specific needs.

Hook: Supports the substitute motion and expresses concern with endorsing page 2 of Mission Hills Heritage letter.

Bonner: Concerned about the deadline for review of this element.

Brennan: Supports substitute motion as it is solution oriented

Vote on the substitute motion fails: 4/5/1

In Favor: Roy Dahl, Kyle Heiskala, Dana Hook, Michael Brennan. Against: Gary Bonner, Mat Wahlstrom, Bob Daniel, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney. Chair abstains

Vote on Tom Mullaney's amended motion passes: 5/4/1

In Favor: Gary Bonner, Mat Wahlstrom, Bob Daniel, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney. Against: Roy Dahl, Kyle Heiskala, Dana Hook, Michael Brennan. Chair abstains.

Motion 3

Tom Mullaney proposed resolution provided to board and seconded by Bob Daniel:

WHEREAS:

1. Adequate public facilities are essential to the urban quality of life in Uptown.
2. The Uptown community has endured decades of infrastructure deficiencies. These include a lack of neighborhood and community parks, lack of recreation centers, outdated fire stations and libraries, and inadequate transportation infrastructure.
3. Expansion of public facilities has not kept pace with the growing demand since the 1988 community plan was adopted. In particular, parks have become increasingly overburdened, and traffic congestion has worsened.
4. A previous resolution from Uptown Planners on 5/4/10 stated the principle that substantial increases in density, over the existing development, should not be allowed where the infrastructure is inadequate.

RESOLUTION:

The Uptown Planners support the goals and principles of the General Plan relating to adequate facilities, in particular the following:

- a. Adequate public facilities available at the time of need. (PF-14)
- b. Require development proposals to fully address impacts to public facilities and services. (PF-15)
- c. Reserve the right and flexibility to use the City's police powers and fiscal powers to impose timing and sequencing controls on new development to regulate the impacts and demands on existing or new facilities and services. (PF-15).

Motion passes with a vote of: 8/0/2

In Favor: Gary Bonner, Bob Daniel, Kyle Heiskala, Michael Brennan, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney, Dana Hook, Roy Dahl. Abstentions: Mat Wahlstrom and Chair

Motion 4

Tom Mullaney proposes second resolution:

The updated Uptown Community Plan must provide the following:

- a. A phasing or threshold system which links the approval of new development to the adequacy of public facilities and services.
- b. Adequate public facilities means that the facilities and services meet specific thresholds or level-of-service, at the time of need.
- c. "At the time of need" means that the facilities and services must be in place to serve new development, or guaranteed, that is, planned, scheduled and funded.

d. The link between project approval and facilities adequacy could be accomplished by various procedures, for example, requiring relevant findings as part of the approval process.

e. Provisions which ensure that the community is involved in decisions about facility financing. An example is the use of Uptown DIF funds for storm sewer replacement, instead of parks and recreation centers.

Discussion:

Kyle: Expresses concern that a single development cannot fund the ill-defined facilities in question

Hook: Raises similar questions about the financing burden on individual developments

Brennan: Also raises questions about what a phasing or threshold system would look like? Tom's Answer: The city would be responsible for the details

Roy: Supports the tone of the motion

Motion passes with a vote of 8/0/2

In Favor: Gary Bonner, Mat Wahlstrom, Bob Daniel, Kyle Heiskala, Ernie Bonn, Tom Mullaney, Dana Hook, Roy Dahl, Abstentions: Michael Brennan and Chair

Motion 5

Bob Daniel: Proposes a motion then elects to table until next meeting.

Adjourned at 8:01