

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL  
FAYETTEVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING  
APRIL 21, 2008  
5:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Anthony G. Chavonne  
Council Members Keith A. Bates, Sr. (District 1); Charles E. Evans (District 2)(departed 6:00 p.m.); Robert A. Massey, Jr. (District 3); Darrell J. Haire (District 4); Bobby Hurst (District 5)(arrived 5:05 p.m.); William J. L. Crisp (District 6)(arrived 5:45 p.m.); Valencia A. Applewhite (District 7); Theodore W. Mohn (District 8); Wesley A. Meredith (District 9)

Others Present: Dale E. Iman, City Manager  
Stanley Victrum, Assistant City Manager  
Kyle Sonnenberg, Assistant City Manager  
Doug Hewett, Assistant City Manager  
Karen M. McDonald, City Attorney  
Janet Smith, Assistant City Attorney  
Karen Hilton, Assistant Planning Director  
Kyle Garner, Planner  
Charles H. Astrike, Fayetteville Planning Commissions  
Mark A. Ledger, Fayetteville Planning Commission  
Debra L. Patillo, Fayetteville Planning Commission  
James M. Smith, Fayetteville Planning Commission

Thomas S. Speight, Jr., Fayetteville Planning Commission

Warren Copenhaver, Fayetteville Planning Commission

Jeffrey Brown, City Engineer

Jackie Tuckey, Communications Manager/Public Information Officer

Craig Richardson, Principal Clarion Associates VIC Group

Chad Meadows, Associate Clarion Associates VIC Group

Candice H. White, City Clerk

Andrew Barksdale, The Fayetteville Observer

Mayor Chavonne called the special meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**1. PRESENTATION BY CLARION ASSOCIATES, CONSULTANT, OF THE DIAGNOSIS ANNOTATED OUTLINE FOR THE NEW UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE AND DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Mrs. Hilton introduced Craig Richardson, Principal with Clarion Associates VIC Group, and Chad Meadows, Associate with Clarion Associates VIC Group. Mrs. Hilton stated Clarion Associates VIC Group was prepared to move forward with a working outline based on feedback following their presentation.

**A. Work Program and Schedule**

Mr. Richardson reviewed the work program and schedule and stated the draft zoning ordinance would be revised based on the input from citizens, City Council, advisory groups and committees.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Schedule</u>
1. Project Initiation and Scoping	January 2008
2. Code Diagnosis/Annotated Outline	April 2008
3. Draft Zoning Ordinance	
Module 1	July 2008
Module 2	October 2008
Module 3	February 2009
4. Public Hearing Draft	April – May 2009
5. VIC Code	2-3 months after adoption

## **B. Diagnosis – Key Themes for Improvement**

Mr. Richardson and Mr. Meadows began an overview of the six major Themes for Improvement.

### **Theme 1. Increase User-Friendliness**

Mr. Richardson suggested Theme 1. could be accomplished by consolidating the existing zoning ordinance, subdivision regulations and relevant code provisions. Mr. Richardson explained this would enhance structure and organization by consolidating procedures, zoning district use regulations, development standards, and landscaping and tree-protection requirements.

Mr. Richardson reviewed suggested improvements to the format and illustration of Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) and explained the improvements would establish a hierarchy of sections and articles, improve the referencing system, and illustrate and summarize key concepts. Mr. Richardson reviewed additional recommendations to consolidate, refine and update definitions; clarify review standards; consider use of an administrative manual; and computerize the UDO.

Mr. Richardson stated no comments were received from the Advisory Committee regarding Theme 1. and their proposal is for the inclusion of Theme 1. as presented.

### **Theme 2. Streamline Procedural Efficiency**

Mr. Richardson stated Theme 2. could be accomplished by establishing new common procedures to include pre-application conferences; neighborhood meetings; completeness determination or application review procedure; and basic rules for public hearing procedures. Mr. Richardson provided a brief overview of each suggested procedure followed by a review of procedural efficiency tables to consolidate, clarify and streamline review procedures and add new procedures.

Mr. Richardson stated the proposal is for the inclusion of Theme 2. to include administrative adjustment provisions.

### **Theme 3. Modernize Zoning Districts and Uses**

Mr. Meadows suggested Theme 3. could be accomplished by reorganizing residential districts to include the consolidation of R5, R5A and R6; limiting multi-family development in single-family districts; and removing zero-lot-line development by the implementation of a special use permit for zero-lot-line development. Mr. Meadows suggested nonresidential districts could be reorganized by consolidating and renaming the districts, establishing three-tier commercial district structures, allowing mixed-uses without conditional zoning, and adding a military reserve district. Mr. Meadows stated the objective is for a fast and easy translation from existing districts to new districts.

Mr. Meadows further stated the establishment of three planned development districts would achieve higher quality and better development with more flexibility and would utilize the same negotiating process outlined earlier.

Mr. Meadows reviewed neighborhood conservation overlay districts, the use standards approach and the removal of the pyramid approach. Discussion ensued regarding neighborhood conservation overlay districts; nonconforming uses; and mixed uses, accessory and temporary uses.

### **Theme 4. Improve Development Quality**

Mr. Richardson stated Theme 4. was one of the most important elements of the UDO as it would address and upgrade the City's appearance and image. Mr. Richardson suggested Theme 4. could be accomplished by the modernization of parking; reducing minimum counts; considering caps and maximums for some uses; alternating parking plans to increase flexibility; new locational standards; breaking up large parking lots; and incorporating transit and pedestrian features.

Mr. Richard further proposed upgrading landscaping standards by requiring species diversity/native plants, increasing parking lot landscaping requirements, performance-based perimeter buffers, screening of multi-family uses, new site landscaping standards and alternative landscaping plans. Proposals were also presented for tree protection standards, private open

space set-aside standards, new exterior lighting standards, revised fencing and wall standards, and incorporating signage standards.

Mr. Meadows proposed strengthening infill development standards to protect neighborhoods by limits on multi-family uses, compatible residential design, zero-lot-line by special use permit and design standards. Mr. Meadows stated during interviews, concerns were expressed that standards applied to current infill regulations are very general in nature, which presented difficulties for the developer applicant as well as the review board. Mr. Meadows stated although not recommended in the Diagnosis, he would invite thought towards the use of an administrative review process for multi-family development.

Mr. Meadows reviewed new design standards that identified issues associated with different kinds of development to include community form/design, commercial/office, single-family, multi-family and infill and transitional. Mr. Meadows stated the Advisory Committee requested more time to digest the new design standards and their feedback would be provided at a later time.

Mr. Richardson stated one of the things heard early on was the importance of commercial corridors. Mr. Richardson further stated with this in mind, the proposal was for the utilization of the multi-dimensional approach, sliding scale application of new development standards, potential reduction of commercial zoning, better access management, and incentives for preferred development.

#### **Theme 5. Establish a New Downtown District**

Mr. Richardson stated the New Downtown District was aimed at implementing many of the suggestions contained in the Renaissance Plan such as expanding opportunities for high density residential; basic form and design standards; more flexible parking, open space and landscape standards; and incentives for preferred development. Mr. Richardson provided a brief overview of each proposal.

#### **Theme 6. Incorporate Sustainable Development Practices**

Mr. Richardson provided an overview of sustainable development practices to include ways to remove obstacles, create incentives and enhance regulations where appropriate.

Discussion ensued regarding buffering between commercial/professional and residential zoning and addressing existing uses in the development code. Dale E. Iman, City Manager, stated the expectation of the UDO effort was not to solve the ills of the past but to primarily set new standards for the future.

In response to questions regarding the Low Impact Development (LID) approach, Mr. Richardson stated the recommendation is to utilize a development standards approach rather than the LID approach to development.

Mr. Richards provided a brief overview of the earlier meeting with the Advisory Committee and discussion ensued regarding the next steps. Mark A. Ledger, Fayetteville Planning Commission, asked for continued input from stakeholders so their ideas could be incorporated into the draft. In response to a question posed by Council Member Bates, Mr. Richardson confirmed the stormwater ordinance would be cross referenced so the UDO would not run at cross-purposes to stormwater standards. A brief discussion ensued about exploring options for existing neighborhoods and citizen stakeholders.

Consensus of Council was to move forward with the Sections 1-3 as proposed.

#### **C. Annotated Outline**

The Annotated Outline was provided in writing.

#### **2. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.