SPECIAL JOINT MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2016
12:00 PM TO 2:00 PM

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
305 3RD AVENUE EAST
TWIN FALLS, ID 83301

PLANNING & ZONING WORK SESSION
&
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"A QUORUM OF THE CITY COUNCIL MAY BE PRESENT"

Anticipated Attendees

Planning & Zoning Commission
Danielle Dawson
Ed Musser
Tom Frank
Kevin Grey
Gerardo "Tato" Munoz
Christopher Reid
Jolinda Tatum
Ryan Higley
Steve Woods

City of Twin Falls
Renée V Carraway-Johnson, *Zoning & Development Manager*
Jonathan Spendlove, *Planner I*
Kelly Weeks, *Planner I*
Mitch Humble, Deputy City Manager

Advisory Committee
Dr. Cindy Bond, *CSI/Chamber of Commerce, Past Chair URA*
Kevin Dane, *Selection Committee/Local Businessman*
Brady Dickinson, *Twin Falls School District*
Nancy Duncan, *City of Kimberly City Council*
Ryan Higley, *City Planning & Zoning/AOI-County*
Greg Lanting, *City Council*
Laura Wilson, County Planning & Zoning staff
Kevin Mahler, *Selection Committee/Local Business Owner*
Nikki Boyd *City Council*
Tato Munoz, *City Planning & Zoning/Local Businessman*
Dan Olmstead, *Idaho* Power/SIEDO
Laura Stewart, *Chamber of Commerce/St. Luke's*
Brad Wills, *Selection Committee/Developer/URA Member/Builders Advisory Committee*

Consultant Team
Bruce Meighen, *Logan Simpson*
Megan Moore, *Logan Simpson*

Attendance

Commission/Committee Attendees:
Boyd, Dane, Dickinson, Duncan, Frank, Grey, Higley, Lanting, Munoz, Reid, Tatum, Wills, Wilson, Woods
Staff:
Carraway-Johnson, Humble, Rothweiler, Spendlove, Strickland
Consultant Team:
Megan Moore-Conference Call

I. Welcome Call Meeting to Order:

II. Approval of Minutes: December 2, 2015

Motion:
Committee Member Munoz made a motion to approve the minutes, as presented. Commissioner Grey seconded the motion.

Unanimously Approved

III. Comprehensive Plan Update

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson stated that Megan Moore from Logan-Simpson on the phone overhead. Ms. Moore will be reviewing a power point presentation today and then answer any questions.

Ms. Moore stated that Chrissy Gillmore is also available on the overhead phone too. She explained she will provide an update on the process, an update on the plans format and structure and then discuss one of the plan elements and review the hierarchy between the goals, the policies and the action items. For an example today the she will be presenting a section from the Parks & Recreation/Open Space that was provided in the draft plan packet.

Following the review an action item exercise will be completed in an effort to have the committee assist the consultants in prioritizing action plans and identify the need for additional action plan.

The last item of discussion will be the Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Moore stated part of the goal has been to streamline the plan and make it more directed. There currently are four chapters in the draft plan update: Introduction, Community Vision, Framework, Implementation.

Action Item Prioritization

Discussion Followed:
After the presentation the group used the sample Parks & Recreation action items and attempted to prioritize them.

PROST GOAL 4: Develop a neighborhood park within each square mile of the City's residential areas.

- PROST Policy 4.1: Continue to develop new parks within one half-mile of residents within the city limits.
    - *PROST Action 4.1-1:* Actively explore opportunities for public/private partnerships with school districts, businesses, and other public entities. Community parks will require the most effort to develop and will need the most lead time to acquire land and construction funding, so begin immediately to secure opportunities.
- PROST Policy 4.2: Continue collect impact fees for parks and recreation which can be used for planning and construction for new parks.

- Committee Member Munoz explained that creating partnerships would be low cost by highly effective. If the goal is to establish partnerships.
- City Manager Rothweiler explained that if the goal is to develop more parks the group needs to consider that there are two pieces to this process. The first peace is developing the park; the second piece is maintaining the park. Maintaining a park is not cheap and is ongoing. It costs the City 1 ½ employees, plus the equipment to manage and maintain 19 acres of turf. This does not include all of the things used to define a park. While the land may be provided it is the amenities that get piled onto the cost of the park. He would prefer the group to consider the life cycle cost.
- Committee Member Munoz stated he thinks that there should also be an action item regarding the maintenance portion.

- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained that a neighborhood park is approximately 3 acres and a regional/community park is approximately 10 acres per City Code.
- Committee Member Higley stated that the feasibility of maintaining the parks should be considered.
- Commissioner Munoz explained policy 4.2 refers to cost and funding to maintain the parks.
- Committee Member Frank stated that what may need to be considered is the definition of a park, maybe 3 acres is not appropriate anymore. Possible develop smaller parks making them easier to maintain. It is difficult to talk about things that are unfamiliar.
- Deputy City Manager Humble clarified goal 4 is to develop neighborhood parks. We don't collect impact fees for neighborhood parks to the policy to continue collecting impact fees for neighborhood parks is not valid and the City has no intention to start collecting for neighborhood parks. The development of neighborhood parks is handled through a platting process when the land is exacted through negotiations or fees are paid in-lieu of developing a neighborhood park. Goal 4.2 should probably say continue to work with the development community for development of neighborhood parks as a development requirement. Impact fees are collected for regional parks. Development of parks are required when the neighborhood develops.
- Committee Member Higley asked what happens after the park is developed.
- Deputy City Manager Humble explained then the park becomes City property to maintain. Perhaps the requirement in the code needs to be reviewed. The land is dedicated to the City and if there is already a park within the same square mile of the neighborhood being developed, fees are collected in-lieu of the park and those funds are used to add amenities to the neighborhood park. Essentially the City has a means for acquiring neighborhood parks but it might be a good idea to review the plan to ensure the parks are going in at the right locations and the city is not acquiring too much land to maintain. Currently there is no specific fee dedicated to maintaining parks, taxes are used to pay for the maintenance of the parks.
- Committee Member Higley explained that this could be part of the confusion for the public.
- Commissioner Frank explained that he pays taxes in another state where it is delineated on his taxes the amounted collected for park maintenance. The discussion of taxes needs to be had with the community, because the public assumes things that are not accurate especially about public infrastructure.
- Deputy City Manager Humble explained the goal is to develop neighborhood parks, the policy is to continue to work with developers, and possibly review the policy for acquiring the parks. The current process has been in place for approximately 10 years.
- Committee Member Frank agreed now would be a good time to evaluate the policy.
- Planner I Spendlove reminded the group that the goal being discussed today is one that was created from the input of the public not staff or this committee.
- Zoning & Development Manger Carraway-Johnson stated that parks and where they go should be part of this discussion that is a land use issue, the funding however is something that would be addressed under strategic planning or through City Council direction.
- Planner I Spendlove explained this will be the process for all of the action items listed in the plan, it is going to take some time, so as part of this process staff is asking the committee to review the information and make notes so that discussion can continue.
- Committee Member Reid stated it doesn't make sense to talk about something and not talk about the funding.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson stated the goals and plans expected from the community need to be documented. The funding part is not the responsibility of this group. This document will help guide the City Council in making their decisions.

- Planner I Spendlove it lets everyone know what the Community wants to happen. By breaking the goals up into high or low effectiveness and high or low cost effort it helps give staff direction.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained comments from the Committee are welcome throughout this entire process.
- Ms. Moore, Logan-Simpson representative stated she would like to refine the document more and have another draft available for review by June 3, 2016.

Future Land Use Map

Discussion Followed:

- Commissioner Frank asked what is different on this map when compared to the current map.
- Ms. Moore stated that a number of the categories are the same but in some areas they have tried to provide a little bit of flexibility. For example, the commercial areas along the major arterials like Kimberly Road, Washington Street, Blue Lakes Boulevard has changed to mixed use as a response to the community's feedback. The downtown area is basically the same as the current comprehensive plan but they are going to work on this area to expand the uses in downtown to encourage redevelopment in the area. The other item being considered is to expand the downtown designation across the boarding arterials. This should give someone the sense that they are traveling through downtown, in an attempt to bring some consistency to the street and entryways into the City. The highway corridor was left commercial because a lot of that area is still being developed. Town Neighborhood is a combination of the medium density residential and the urban village/urban infill into one designation. There is not a huge range of density throughout town currently so offering on designation with flexibility seems fairly simple. Rural residential/Agricultural areas have remained close to the same but follow the water boundary line on the current comprehensive plan. The rural residential/agricultural designations are outside of the water boundary. The Industrial/Employment/Flex designation is general along Kimberly Road and south to Rock Creek and southwest of downtown across Rock Creek. These areas have expanded quite a bit to address some of the concerns about preserving industrial land for future businesses. The idea of this designation is not to limit the development to just industrial it gives the plan room for flexibility. Airport designation is similar however the land use area has been reduced to just the area running east to west (between 2700 E to 3100 E) and the small section north of 3400 North towards town has been changed to rural residential/agricultural. The Open Space is relatively the same the smaller parks are not called out but the space along the Canyon and Rock Creek are shown. CSI has remained the same. A lot of the changes was to address the communities wishes and to help make the plan more flexible for handling additional development.
- Committee Member Frank stated his only concern is that the area along Rock Creek is designated for industrial uses and he would like to see it more protected.
- Planner I Spendlove stated protecting Rock Creek is important and zoning can't be changed along the Rock Creek as it is zoned today, however the Comprehensive Plan can identify some protection by the Open Space designation, maybe there is a way to determine how far from the Canyon the development has to be to protect the rim.
- Committee Member Higley stated protecting the bottom of the canyon without protecting the rim is not useful, the map needs to not be drawn right up to the rim.
- Committee Member Grey stated the zoning is guided by the Comprehensive Plan and this is a review of the Comprehensive Plan so this is the time to make the change, and

currently the public is saying what we have now is not what we want in the future, they want this area protect.

- Planner I Spendlove stated the current plan does not explain the open space for the Canyon, the suggestion is that language be added into the Comprehensive Plan to say open space along these areas should include. (ex. 100' from rim)
- Committee Member Higley stated he doesn't think the open space along the rim is protected enough from what he sees on the map.
- Planner I Spendlove explained there has to be a balance between what these properties are zoned and entitled to currently and what we want for the future.
- Jill Skeem, asked for clarification on the change to industrial along the southeast corner of the map.
- Planner I Spendlove explained the current entitlement is agricultural however if the Comprehensive Plan designates this area as industrial and a property owner wanted to rezone the property to industrial the Comprehensive Plan would allow that request to be made. A zoning change can only be made by a property owner and the change they want to make has to coincide with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Committee Member Duncan clarified that the point of the Comprehensive Plan is to determine what the Community wants in this area in the future it is not a zoning change.
- Committee Member Higley asked if the language within the industrial designation could allow for more flexibility if there seems to be a trend from development that shows the need for housing in these areas.
- Committee Member Wills asked if he could have some history on how the current zoning map was developed.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained sometime in the 1940's the first land use designations were incorporated in Twin Falls and for a number of years Cities were allowed to rezone properties, which is no longer an option. Rezoning now only occurs by property owner request. 2004 was the last amendment to the Area of Impact Agreement and at that is when the laws went into effect stating Cities can no long rezone properties, property owners have to make a request to rezone their own property.
- Committee Member Wills clarified the areas that are designated Rural Residential/Agricultural if the change the property owner wants to make does not match the Comprehensive Plan Map a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan Map has to be made.
- Planner I Spendlove explained the Comprehensive Plan limits what kind of rezoning can be approved.
- Commissioner Grey stated that is why this group needs to do its best to review the plan, and the public input to make adjustments to the areas that are a concern before this map and plan gets presented to the public. So if the plan is to present this to the public around June 30, 2016 this map that was presented today should be closer to what the public wants and what this committee is comfortable with presenting for approval.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained there will be another meeting before the public presentation so the committee can make sure the document is ready for public comment.
- Planner I Spendlove explained the new map will not be based on property boundaries allowing for more flexibility.
- Committee Member Frank asked for enough time to get this done correctly, he doesn't want to rush this process because it is a plan for the future.
- Committee Member Munoz asked when the next meeting will be to discuss this he doesn't feel a couple hours is enough. He thinks there needs to be more time to review and discuss the information.

- Committee Member Frank agreed, if the group goes through the plan step by step like they should a couple two-hour lunch meetings is not going to be enough time, and would like enough time to review the information prior to the next meeting.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained staff will work with the consultants on scheduling more meeting times.
- Committee Member Wills explained that if everyone does their homework that will help move the discussion along.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway-Johnson explained staff will get the information to the group as soon as possible and schedule a meeting accordingly.

IV. General Public Input: None

V. Adjourn Meeting

Meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Lisa A Strickland
Administrative Assistant
Planning & Zoning Department