

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
WORKSESSION AGENDA
Friday, December 6, 2013, noon to 5 pm
281 N. College Conference Room A**

<p>Web users: Documents for the Consent and Discussion Items shown below can be found under the December 12, 2013 hearing agenda.</p> <p><u>DECEMBER 12, 2013 HEARING – 2 Hours</u></p> <p>Consent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Kechter Farm Annexation and Zoning (Ex) 20 mins.• Spring Creek Farms 4th filing (Holland) 20 mins• Link-n-Greens Community Commercial – Poudre River Zone District (Kadrich) 20 mins <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SPAR_FCC Integrated Technology Bldg (Gloss) 30 mins.• Foothills Mall PDP Major Amend Phase 2 (Levingston) 45 mins <p><u>STAFF UPDATES – 1 Hour</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bike Parking at MAX Stations (Belmont & Iverson) 15 mins• Lincoln Corridor Plan Update (Wray) 30 mins• Solar Code Revisions – Initial Draft Concepts (Gloss) 20 mins <p><u>BOARD TOPICS: 2 Hours</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Debrief of Nov 14 and 21 Hearings• Complete review of 2014 P&Z Work Plan document• January dates: Worksession 1/3 and Hearing 1/9/14 ok?• Two PZ Representatives to work with CPIO Office/Citizen Survey Results• December 17 CC names P&Z Members; set new member orientation date• APF – Adequate Public Facilities• Overview – NE Fort Collins Development: Master Street Plan, etc. (Kadrich)• Mountain Vista Subarea & E. Mulberry Corridor (Enclave) Updates (Kadrich)• Other (APU Subcommittee Minutes)	<p style="text-align:center">City Council</p>
--	--



**Communications & Public
Involvement**
215 N. Mason Street
PO Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522
970.221.6882
970.221-6586 - fax
fcgov.com

Dear Board and Commission members,

The City of Fort Collins wants to know what's important to you!

We want to gather input and feedback to inform strategic planning for a city government that is efficient and effective. In addition to our 2013 Citizen Survey, we are doing additional outreach to all segments of the community. Boards and commissions are an important part of that.

As engaged citizens, your responses will help City leaders assess public opinion as part of the strategic planning process.

Representatives of your board or commission are invited to the Boards and Commissions Community Conversation to share your thoughts on what should be the City's top priorities during the next three to five years. For those unable to attend, please visit fcgov.com/citizensurvey to provide your thoughts online.

Boards and Commissions Community Conversation
Wednesday, December 11, 2013
3 p.m. – 5 p.m.
Community Room
215 N. Mason St.

Please RSVP to Christine Macrina at cmacrina@fcgov.com



**Community Development &
Neighborhood Services**

281 N. College Ave.
PO Box 580
Fort Collins, CO 80522
970.224.6046
970.224.6134 FAX
www.fcgov.com

TO: Planning and Zoning Board

FROM: Laurie Kadrich, Community Development and Neighborhood Services Director

DATE: December 2, 2013

PROJECT: Addition of a Permitted Use (APU)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

On July 9, 2013, during a joint work session with City Council, the Planning and Zoning Board suggested that a citizen task force be developed to review potential improvements to the APU process or Ordinance. The Planning and Zoning Board appointed a sub-committee of the board to meet with residents and development community members on this topic to be chaired by Planning and Zoning Board member Jeff Schneider. The committee met twice, on October 16 and November 7, 2013. Several suggestions were made by those attending; see attached meeting notes.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the following options may be helpful to improving the process based on the input received thus far:

1. Adding an "Applicability" clause to APU and remove its application from RUL, UE, RF, and RL zones
2. Adding a Purpose Statement to the section
3. Requiring a second neighborhood meeting if the APU is requested in an existing neighborhood
4. Add some or all of the modification criteria to the APU requirements especially if the request is in or adjacent to an existing residential neighborhood
 - a. The one suggested was to require a community benefit: substantially alleviate an existing defined and described problem of city-wide concern or would result in a substantial benefit to the city by reason of the fact that the proposed project would substantially address and important community need specifically and expressly defined and described in the city's comprehensive Plan or in an adopted policy, ordinance or resolution of the City Council and the strict application of such zoning uses would render the project infeasible.

1.3.4 Addition of Permitted Uses

Purpose Statement: The general purpose of an Addition of Permitted Uses is to...

Applicability: This provision shall apply to all zones except RUL, UE, RF and RL

(A) **Required Findings.** In conjunction with an application for approval of an overall development plan, a project development plan, a final plan or any amendment of the foregoing, and upon the petition of the applicant or on the Director's own initiative, the Director (or the Planning and Zoning Board as specifically authorized and limited in subsection (B) below) may add to the uses specified in a particular zone district any other similar use which conforms to all of the following conditions:

- (1) Such use is appropriate in the zone district to which it is added;
- (2) Such use conforms to the basic characteristics of the zone district and the other permitted uses in the zone district to which it is added;
- (3) Such use does not create any more offensive noise, vibration, dust, heat, smoke, odor, glare or other objectionable influences or any more traffic hazards, traffic generation or attraction, adverse environmental impacts, adverse impacts on public or quasi-public facilities, utilities or services, adverse effect on public health, safety, morals or aesthetics, or other adverse impacts of development, than the amount normally resulting from the other permitted uses listed in the zone district to which it is added;
- (4) Such use is compatible with the other listed permitted uses in the zone district to which it is added;
- (5) Such use is not a medical marijuana dispensary or a medical marijuana cultivation facility.

(B) **Planning and Zoning Board Authority and Limitation.** In conjunction with an application for approval of an overall development plan, a project development plan, a final plan or any amendment of the foregoing, the Planning and Zoning Board may add a proposed use if the Board specifically finds that such use would not be detrimental to the public good and would be in compliance with the requirements and criteria contained in Section 3.5.1, and Section 2.8.2 (H) (2) provided that such addition of a proposed use by the Planning and Zoning Board must be specific to the proposed site and shall not be considered for a text amendment under subsection (C) below and provided further that such use is not specifically listed as a "Prohibited Use" in the zone district in which the proposed site is located, and provided that at least two (2) neighborhood meetings were held regarding the project plan.

(C) **Codification of New Use.** When any use has been added by the Director to the list of permitted uses in any zone district in accordance with subsection (A) above, such use shall be promptly considered for an amendment to the text of this Code under Division 2.9. If the text amendment is approved, such use shall be deemed to be permanently listed in the appropriate permitted use list of the appropriate zone district and shall be added to the published text of this Code at the first convenient opportunity, by ordinance of City Council pursuant to Division 2.9. If the text amendment is not approved, such use shall not be deemed permanently listed in the zone district, except that such use shall continue to be deemed a permitted use in such zone district for only



the development proposal for which it was originally approved under subsection (A) above.

(D) **Conditions.** When any use has been added to the list of permitted uses in any zone district in accordance with this Section, the Director (or the Planning and Zoning Board, if applicable) may impose such conditions and requirements on such use as are necessary or desirable to accomplish the purposes and intent of this Code, to ensure consistency with City Plan and its adopted components and associated sub-area plans, to prevent or minimize adverse effects and impacts upon the public and neighborhoods, and to ensure compatibility of uses.

Notes from Planning and Zoning Board Subcommittee on Addition of Permitted Use
October 16, 2013
3:30 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.

Members of Public Present: Mark Kenning, Michelle Haefele, Mike Knowles, Kathryn Dubiel, Paul Patterson, Dave Lingle, Craig Russell, Linda Ripley, Nick Hawes

Members of Board Present: Jeff Schneider, Gerald Hart, Jennifer Carpenter

Staff Present: Laurie Kadrach, Sarah Burnett

Welcome and Introductions:

Jeff Schneider welcomed the participants, and asked each participant to introduce themselves and to explain their interest in the Addition of Permitted Use (APU) process.

Jeff explained that after the Board received a number of comments the APU process, held an initial review of the APU on June 21, 2013, and discussed the APU process with City Council at a July work session, the Planning and Zoning Board asked a subcommittee to gather further public input. Today's meeting is intended to allow Board members to hear the participants' questions and comments about the process. The subcommittee would then take the discussion back to the Planning and Zoning Board for their consideration and recommendation on whether to maintain the APU process as it is, or to consider potential changes.

Comment Summary:

This is a summary of the comments and major themes that were discussed. More detailed notes are appear starting on Page 3.

- Purpose of this section of Land Use Code should be clearly stated.
- Several felt that it was important to have a code provision to allow flexibility in exceptional circumstances.
- Code is vague and does not provide clear criteria for applicants, neighbors and decision-makers; most thought it should be made more clear to increase predictability of interpretation.
- Controversial APUs were more likely to be in/near residential areas.
- Though staff may see APU as more protective to neighbors than a rezoning, neighbors often see an APU as adding a new use that is not permitted in the zone district and changes the character of a neighborhood.
- Several factors could be used for different types of APUs or excluding projects from the APU process. Possible ways to distinguish proposals could include:
 - Size
 - New construction vs. existing development
 - Greenfield vs. infill
 - In or adjacent to residential areas vs. in or adjacent to other types of uses
- The timing of neighborhood meetings is important; a second neighborhood meeting after the application is submitted may be helpful to provide feedback to neighbors following the initial neighborhood meeting.
- Some APUs were viewed as much larger changes to zone districts than had been anticipated when the APU code provisions were presented and adopted. (Major changes vs. minor "tweaks" to uses in a zone district)

- Some disagreement: City Plan calls for more density, but Zoning Map defines allowed uses. Does City Plan trump the Zoning Map? Developers/City Plan sees arterials and other areas as places for density. Neighbors see zoning map as a contract with the community.
- There is a concern that APUs allowing non-residential uses will gradually creep into residential neighborhoods and cause the residential areas to change in character and no longer be as desirable.
- (Comment received after meeting: conversion of homes to offices does not increase residential density, it does the opposite. Therefore, it really doesn't fall within the rationale of City Plan.)

Next Steps:

- Laurie will review information from meeting with staff, and look at ways to improve the APU process based on input from the meeting.
- Group will meet again.
- Group members will have the opportunity to review any recommendation that would go forward to City Council.

Background Information and Discussion:

Laurie Kadrich noted that some residents have commented that APU should not be used as a rezoning tool. Laurie commented that APU is a tool that is used in lieu of rezoning to get a specific use that would be appropriate on a site (whereas a rezoning could introduce the possibility of other uses that would not be appropriate on a site). Many neighbors are more comfortable with APU (sometimes known as a conditional use in other communities). A rezoning opens up everything allowed in the new zone district.

- Could a rezoning could be linked to a specific development proposal? Laurie noted that rezonings typically are not done at the Planning and Zoning Board level without a broader public discussion. (neighbor)
- Neighbors of the Regency multi-family project were clearly not comfortable with adding the multi-family use to the Residential – Low Density (RL) zoning on the site. In that case and in the case of the conversion of homes to offices in the Neighborhood Conservation – Low Density (NCL) zone district, APUs have been approved over the protests of the neighborhoods. (Laurie clarified her earlier comment, and said that the APU enables the community to react to a specific project/use.) (neighbor)
- After the Regency project was turned down at the Council appeal, there were neighborhood concerns that the whole 23 acres (the church property and the Lakeview property) could have been rezoned. He believes that some APUs make perfect sense, but others may not. (neighbor)
- When the Board first adopted the APU, it was supposed to be used only for minor tweaks. He asked if the process has now been used for more significant changes; another participant from the development community said that it has. (former P&Z member)
- A consultant stated that the vague language makes it hard to advise clients, as it is not easy to predict whether a proposal meets the standard. She noted that in the Regency appeal, several Council members also noted that they thought the APU was also for smaller changes to uses. However, she believes that a tool for something larger than “tweaks” is needed. (developer)

Language to Make APU More Predictable:

Jeff asked participants to suggest any language changes that could help make APU more predictable for all. Ideas/comments included:

- Evaluation of APU should be tied to the intent of the zone district (developer)
- Current language allows different people, acting reasonably, to reach different conclusions (he noted his concern with Regency related to the proposed density, not the multi-family use itself). Needs clarity (neighbor)
- Zoning is a contract with residents; increased restrictions/requirements are needed for APU in and next to existing neighborhoods (neighbor)
- Planning documents provide vision for the city and its growth, but also for neighborhoods; APU language should reflect that (neighbor)
- Purpose of residential zone districts should be reflected; people want to keep living in their neighborhoods, and they should keep a residential character. (neighbor)
- There may be compatibility concerns in non-residential zones too. As a board member, I’m very concerned about compatibility, but our community is changing and growing (cited Shields near CSU). (board member)
- City’s policies and plans will increase density. There are conflicting objectives between City Plan, subarea plans, and zone districts, which creates a tension. (developer)
- A benefit of APU is that more limits on heights, buffers, etc. can be placed on a project. (board member)
- Language for APU is vague; perhaps a set of criteria could help define more clearly. (developer)
- APU can be applied in any zone district when the usual rules don’t fit; as consultant, will be more cautious about using it in the future. (developer)
- Vague language is a problem. (neighbor)

- Several observations:
 - The initial Development Review Overview meeting (to describe the process) was frustrating because staff couldn't tell the neighbors much about the project itself.
 - From the start, the residents were behind the curve, as staff and the developer's consultants knew how the system worked.
 - The hearing, with 2-3 minutes for each public comment, but unlimited time for developers and the City felt very disempowering and disadvantageous to the neighbors.
 - Neighbors felt extremely lucky that we had the people we did in our neighborhood, and without the expertise in the neighborhood, they would not have prevailed. Other neighborhoods probably would not have prevailed - but the outcome of an APU shouldn't come down to luck. (neighbor)
- Inadequate communication and education may have contributed to the feelings of disempowerment. (board member)
- It might be helpful/more empowering to have the DRO meeting late, after the meeting with developers. (neighbor)
- Staff recommendations for approval are discouraging to those opposed to a proposal. (neighbor)
- Laurie explained staff is looking at whether a project meets the Land Use Code; if so, recommendation will be for approval. This needs to be explained better during the process. Staff is working on tools to more effectively impact proposals through neighborhood input. She also noted that infill proposals are much more contentious than proposals in undeveloped areas.(staff)
- APU for similar/identical use to past use not problematic, such as the conversion of a school to a day care center on Shields (neighbor)
- APU too vague to use in existing neighborhoods. Regency Lakeview, when first presented to the neighbors, was the equivalent of HMN density (later reduced to MMN density in RL zone) More specific APU language should have prohibited HMN density in the RL zone. (neighbor)
- Is there no problem with APU in greenfield situations? (developer)
- In an NCL neighborhood "peninsula" bordered by NCM, NCB, and a small MMN area, there is a fear that it will become an "island" if homes near Mulberry are chipped away to office and other non-permitted uses. (neighbor)
- Perhaps APUs could be allowed, but with conditions. For example, allow a four-story multi-family structure in a lower density zone district, but with buffers and height transitions beyond what is required in the code for zone districts where such structures are ordinarily allowed. (developer)
- When an APU is not successful, it may indicate that the process worked. The process can be risky for developers and contentious, but the client wanted to proceed (with an MMN-like project in the RL zone). Commented that it "could" have been zoned MMN and fit City Plan. Doesn't mind system the way it is. (developer)
- Without a unique set of people and circumstances, the Regency APU would have been successful; otherwise the neighborhood would have lost. (neighbor)
- City Plan calls for more density, and with infill projects, there will be more conflicts. Corners of arterials should have density, but it does conflict with neighbors. (board member)
- City Plan should not override zoning, which is a contract with the community. (neighbor)
- I'm concerned about overlays such as PDOD and TOD and their chipping away at lower-density neighborhoods. Considering moving to an area with HOA covenants. (neighbor)
 - APU being used for commercial property conditions. For the church office on Mantz, conditions were placed on the approval. For the State Farm (now Kevco) office on Mulberry and Shields, a condition not to change the exterior was placed on the approval (so as to appear as a single family house), but the property was sold and a large sign went up. (neighbor)

Need to Examine/Modify APU Code Provisions:

Jeff asked participants whether there was a need to modify the code.

- It is important to have a process like APU when existing conditions just do not work. I don't want to see more complicated requirements. One improvement might be to look at requiring some benefit to the existing neighborhood in exchange for the APU, e.g. meeting a neighborhood need; making something better. (developer)
- A better explanation of purpose/intent is needed. Using APU for tweaks seems ok, but it seems there may be a point where changes are bigger than envisioned for APU. (developer)
- I agree that APU is appropriate for tweaks, but there needs to be a better/stronger way to evaluate them. I also believe that there needs to be clear communication about how your input goes in, and what feedback there will be. I'm concerned more about the process than the APU itself. (neighbor)
- Laurie commented that at the neighborhood meeting, it is not always known what the proposal will look like when submitted. A missing part in the feedback loop is an additional meeting after the proposal has been submitted. Sometimes developers have another neighborhood meeting, but it is not required by code.
- Neighborhood meeting feedback is very important early in the process (board member)
- More criteria are needed – perhaps with different criteria for existing vs. new construction; look at public good vs. private good – does the project enhance the public good (neighbor)
- It is important to empower neighborhoods to understand and participate. If the process is against the neighborhood from the start, the outcome will not be accepted. If neighbors can actively participate, the outcome will be more accepted. (neighbor)
- The language is vague. Zone districts should define prohibited uses. Without that, the mention of prohibited uses in the APU code section does not make sense. During the review, the burden on residents is huge when confronted with developers who do this for a living. A citizen's guide to understand APU would be helpful. It would be good to leverage the experience the Regency neighbors had to help others. (neighbor)
- The language is vague; the code needs more specific language. This is a difficult problem. I believe there are issues with the code provisions for how the hearing is run, and the lack of a rebuttal opportunity for citizens. (neighbor)
- The process for our project (Buckinghorse) worked fine, though it was sometimes frustrating. Missing from the criteria is the opportunity to give something back, as is present with Modification of Standard (MOS) and PDOD. The criteria to meet a MOS is very clear; APU is not. (developer)
 - Laurie: if the decision on the APU went to the Planning and Zoning Board prior to the project as a whole, would that be helpful?
 - No, that would be too cumbersome.
- Would size help determine what should be an APU vs. a rezoning? (board member)
- I believe that we should go back to the original intent of the APU – for small things, like a bike shop on the corner of two arterials in a residential zone district. Some of those discussed today are very different animals from what was discussed when the APU was presented and adopted by the P&Z Board. (former P&Z board member, developer)
- Laurie: Because some very large APUs (Buckinghorse and Woodward) worked well, size may not be best way to distinguish projects appropriate for APU. The idea of looking at existing properties vs. undeveloped land may be worth exploring further.
- Excluding existing properties may be problematic. (Noted that Boulder and other communities have more subjective standards than Fort Collins.) (developer)
- Perhaps a different way of evaluating APU may be needed in residential areas (rather than excluding APU from residential areas). (neighbor)
- The idea of a second neighborhood meeting after the first round of staff comments is a good one. (developer)
- More education for neighbors about City Plan may be helpful – an educational component is missing to help people understand increased density. (developer)

Notes from Planning and Zoning Board Subcommittee on Addition of Permitted Use
November 7, 2013
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Members of Public Present: Mark Kenning, Michelle Haefele, Kathryn Dubiel, Paul Patterson, Diane Kenning, Nick Hawes

Members of Board Present: Jeff Schneider (Chair, APU Subcommittee), Gerald Hart, Jennifer Carpenter, Andy Smith (Chair, Planning and Zoning Board)

Staff Present: Laurie Kadrich, Sarah Burnett

Welcome and Introductions:

Laurie opened the meeting by noting that some may have expected a recommendation from her on possible APU changes to be presented at this meeting. She noted that the information gathered in the October 16 and November 7 APU meetings will instead be presented to the full Planning and Zoning Board. The Board can then determine what kind of recommendation or feedback will be provided to City Council.

She noted that there will be opportunities to keep the discussion going. Andy Smith, Chair of the Planning and Zoning Board, noted that the Board may make recommendations to City Council, instead of directing staff to create new policy without direction from City Council.

Andy noted that there may be an opportunity for more discussion at the December Planning and Zoning Board work session on this policy issue, as well as a discussion agenda item at the December Planning and Zoning Board meeting.

Because this was the first Planning and Zoning Board subcommittee in the memory of long-time board members, this is somewhat of a new concept. Much information has been gathered to share with the full board, and it was determined that the subcommittee will be providing the feedback to the board, rather than making recommendations to the full board.

Meeting Summary:

- One participant felt the notes from the October 16 meeting missed the point that zoning creates expectations among residents about developments near them. A board member noted that many concerns about APU are in single family neighborhoods.
- A question was raised about the applicability of City Plan vs. zoning in land use decisions. As an example, if City Plan encourages more intensive uses along arterial streets, how does that relate to the zoning? Laurie responded that City Plan is not a governing document; it is only for guidance. Therefore, zoning “trumps” City Plan in land use decisions.
- Another concern raised is about the potential for churches in residential areas to sell and convert the land to other uses through APU.
- Laurie noted that City Plan revision is scheduled for a revision, and noted that many of our codes were written for greenfield development rather than the infill that we are seeing now. In response to a question from a participant, she will check to see if the zoning map will be updated at that time.

- Another participant: for a church redevelopment, APU is not the only mechanism. Depending on the zone district, a variety of uses may be allowed without APU. (The earlier commenter was thinking about changing from church to other uses in the R-L zone district.)
- A board member noted that many proposals around town buffer uses, with fields by churches, etc. He noted a need to “feather” intensity and density from higher to lower intensity uses.
- Another board member believes that these concerns will be symptomatic of the next 15 years, and ways to minimize conflict should be explored.
- A resident suggested (1) eliminating APU from single family residential zone districts, or at least eliminating APUs for restaurant or commercial uses from single-family residential zone districts, and (2) having some concrete way to evaluate APU proposals.
- A resident noted that since the conversion of 1124 Mulberry to a commercial use, the County is taxing the property at a higher rate. While the conversion doesn’t serve residential interests, the government gets additional tax revenue, leaving the neighborhoods vulnerable.
- Laurie noted that moving services closer to residential areas is a goal of City Plan. She also noted City Plan has competing objectives. Staff considers mixed uses favorably. The resident responded that the 1124 Mulberry APU (which is now a real estate office) does not reduce trips or serve a neighborhood need like a haircutter or other service provider would, and believes commercial APUs should be limited or prohibited in residential zones which do not allow commercial uses. She would like the City to hold the line against developers/property owners who may use APU to increase the value of property for sale, thereby “chipping away” at the neighborhoods.
- A board member stated that uses at intersections of arterials could be viewed differently than those *in* a neighborhood.
- A consultant noted that lots of residential districts (LMN and “up”) do allow non-residential uses, but residential-only (with a few additional uses like schools, churches, and parks) zones do exist.
- Laurie noted that RL zones on the fringe of the city could have a different character than RL zones in the center of the city. Design standards for a zone wouldn’t necessarily work in all low density zone neighborhoods. (One resident was very concerned by this comment, as RL and NCL zones are already defined by their zoning.)
- A board member noted that RL came into being to preserve single-family neighborhoods that were already built (during the transition from the Land Use Guidance System to a prescriptive code). The board may need to look at places where these neighborhoods can be made more walkable while preserving their character.
- Another board member noted that RL uses include group homes, community facilities, and child care centers – uses some might not expect. He noted that the Mantz neighborhood (NCL) could explore historic designation.
- Laurie explained that a long term goal may be to have a resource when a map could show a parcel’s zone, subarea plan, possible uses, etc. so that residents could be more aware of possible uses.
- One resident felt they did their due diligence regarding zoning where their home is located, and suggested that instead of APU for uses not allowed in the zone district, developers could locate across the street where the proposed use is allowed. Zoning is meant to provide protection for single family neighborhoods; APU threatens that protection.
- Laurie noted that these sessions have provided an opportunity for staff and the board to really listen to neighbors, while respecting the rights of property owners to develop as allowed in zone districts.
- A board member noted that zone districts encourage change, including toward multiple uses. Zoning provides a range of predictability, but APU is not as predictable.
- Laurie noted that planning staff she visited with did not agree that APU was intended for small changes only (one previous board member believed that, when reviewed by the board, APU was intended for less consequential changes). Staff also did not think APU would be in the code forever, and that it might be replaced by another tool at some point.

Next Steps:

- Laurie noted some options that the Board might want to consider, such as:
 - Modifying the zone districts where APU could be used
 - Modifying allowed uses within certain zone districts
 - Implementing a threshold in terms of size of project (through size is not always the issue, with Buckinghorse and Woodward as examples of non-controversial APUs)
 - Developing a different standard/tool for use in existing neighborhoods (this would need to include an assessment of how many potential sites are around the city)
 - Prohibit APU in some zone districts
- A board member expressed a desire to better manage the APU process to reduce conflicts with neighborhoods.
- Laurie also indicated a desire to do something different to address the concerns. City Council has asked the Planning and Zoning Board for options (this could include recommendations for change or no changes). The Board will review the feedback received and make a recommendation.