

Common Ground for Building Our City

Development Community and Civic Leader
Consolidation Workshop
January 27, 2010

Closing Plenary Discussion of Common Ideas

GUT WRENCHER: *Who Speaks for the Neighborhood?*

Goal/common ground principle:

(Group 1) Every neighborhood/community has one recognized civic group for others. It is their responsibility to convene all the groups (and individual voices and outliers) for project/ development review and related issues. Part of their job is education.

A caution: while it is important to help the underserved civic groups (and to help communities without civic groups), we must do so in a way that does not undercut established civic groups or communities with established groups.

Actions:

(Group 3) Disagreements within and across civic groups should be documented and sent to the ZBA, as well as agreements.

(Group 4) Similar to Group 1, but we weren't sure how to include upstart groups. Need a set of criteria for this.

(Group 1 and 4) City should create a way to recognize groups.

Build capacity of less sophisticated groups to match those of the more sophisticated groups

PCPC may have to take leadership responsibility for convening people in neighborhoods lacking civic groups.

GUT WRENCHER: *Which projects are reviewed?*

Goal/common ground principle:

(Group 2) If a project, whether "of right" or not, has impact on the character of the neighborhood, review it.

(Group 4) Public should have input into as of right project

Actions:

(Group 2) Civic groups and individuals participate in zoning mapping work

(Group 2) Need different types of triggers in different zoning classifications.

(Group 2) Overlay is modified zoning

(Group 4) New code must be predictable and respect character of neighborhoods

(Group 4) Need a mandatory waiting period after there is an application – should be sufficient time for community to meet and comment

(Group 4) Public input must be structured

(Group 4) Input/dialogue should begin right away

In the discussion, it became clear that there are certain principles that were common across groups: *early notification, transparency from the start and during the approval process, the “other side” has (both sides have) access to all information, explicit ethics (code of conduct) for commissioners.*

(Group 3) Community and developer work together to set up the schedule for input and approval process

(Group 3?) Audio recording for all developer and community meetings

(Group 2) Impact triggers review

(Group 1) Some combinations that impact neighborhood trigger review

(Group ?) Community petitions if they find impact.

(Group ?) Overlays are important

(Group ?) a recipe for a simpler code: early meetings

GUT WRENCHER: *How are projects reviewed?*

Goal/common ground principle:

(Group 3) There should be a separate commission/committee for design review – including facades, materials, etc.

Actions:

(Group 3) There should be a mix of neighborhood people and design professionals on the design review commission/committee

(Group 3) It should be city-wide with rotating seats for local neighborhood representatives, from civics in area of development

(Group ?) Neighborhood develops their own design guidelines

GUT WRENCHER: *Councilmanic privilege?*

Goal/Common ground principle:

Actions:

(Group 1) Timely submission of Council letters to ZBA

(Group 4) A transparent clearinghouse, perhaps run through council offices, facilitating when needed.

SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE REPORT:

- We may mix issues with input from various groups. That is, since transparency came up in various groups in addition to the one who had it as a LHF, we'll draw on what other groups said about transparency as well.
- We'll note areas of tension as well as areas of agreement.
- What help do we need with future advocacy?