



**LIFESTYLE COMMERCIAL CENTER (LCC)
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)**

MINUTES OF THE JULY 21, 2009 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Prepared by Timothy Sanford

Sixth Meeting of the LCC Subcommittee began at 2:05pm

A. Attendance

LDRAB Members:

Industry: Scott Mosolf, Jeff Brophy,

County Staff: Jon MacGillis, Bill Cross, Jan Wiegand, Monica Cantor, Timothy Sanford, Isaac Hoyos, Jorge Perez

B. Discussion

Monica started the subcommittee meeting by asking if anyone had comments pertaining to the 7/2/09 LCC minutes. Monica then proceeded to discuss the site layout for LCCs.

Isaac made a comment that the idea is to have a greater degree of flexibility with LCCs, referring to placing back in the live-work units, residential units, or a combination of both types being integrated into the development.

Jeff inquired about calculating the minimum required density. Monica replied that the density calculation is based off of the underlying Future Land Use (FLU) designation. Jeff felt that the language pertaining to PDDs is vague and was uncertain what the 50% requirement is based off of.

Monica recommended eliminating any ambiguous language by ensuring the language is clear for calculating density for vertical and horizontal integration. Bill suggested clarifying if the minimum density required was going to be the PUD density minimum or maximum. Planning agreed to include a statement to clarify that the minimum density required will be the maximum density of the PUD density table for the particular future land use designation.

Isaac stated that the Purpose/Intent is the only portion of the Code that can be written like a policy or a philosophy. Isaac offered some suggestion with language. On line 14 of the handout, he suggested adding commercial to the language pertaining to the type of development. He also recommended changing the word use to "uses" on page 11 of the handout. Isaac's additional comments related to the Purpose and Intent will be sent to Monica.

Jorge made a comment regarding the waiver table where he wanted to know if the waiver for gates could possibly be eliminated. Jorge was inquiring about the overall criteria for gates.

Jeff responded to Jorge by giving an example of gates being used in City Place. Jeff stated that the gates were mainly used to ensure residents' parking spots were secured.

Bill recommended clarifying certain locations on site where gates would be acceptable and identifying locations where gates would be prohibited.

Jorge spoke on certain uses of an LCC that would be permitted but not visible from the frontage i.e., banks with a drive-thru with drive thru and the waiver provision for the perimeter frontage standards. The waiver proposed to allow outdoor vehicular activities to be visible from the arterial and collector street were confusing more particularly why collector. Monica answered that the collector was included when the possibility of intersection location was presented. Jorge also spoke on the differences between arterial and collector roads.

Jon suggested taking some of the same waiver criteria used for the Green Architecture and apply it to the LCC.

Jorge stated interconnectivity and perimeter frontages are likely to be the most commonly requested waivers.

Scott asked about the bench requirements from Article 5. Jan replied that the requirement for benches and pedestrian amenities was relocated from Article 5 to Article 3. Jan also stated that there was a conflict provision in the language to determine what requirement would prevail, in this case LCC will do.

Monica spoke on limited parking in the front and main-street of LCCs. She also commented on the 10% parking requirement. Jon stated that the LCC was supposed to provide a greater degree of latitude than the TMDs. Jon asked if the 10% parking requirement is too restrictive. Monica clarified that the 10% is to be applicable for the parking spaces for the entire site.

Scott inquired about the sidewalk width of LCCs and that it appeared to be more restrictive than TMDs. The sidewalk width requirement for LCCs is 15 ft versus 8 ft for TMDs. Jan responded to Scott that the sidewalk requirement for LCCs was a response to large demand for outdoor seating. The 15 ft requirement would make it possible to accommodate outdoor seating. Monica indicated that the waiver provision to allow the reduction of the sidewalk to 10 feet in width was included, where it will be adjusted to 8' wide when no outdoor seating is needed.

Jon spoke on the Comprehensive Plan amendments likely being adopted in October. Jon asked Monica if she would be able to add Commercial Low (CL) to the matrix. Jon also asked Scott and Jeff to truth the LCC language with their projects and set up a meeting in late August to go over the results. Monica is going to contact other subcommittee members to get their comments too.

Jon set critical dates in order to move forward with the LCC.

August 18th would be the next LCC Subcommittee meeting starting at 2pm. The purpose of this meeting will be to focus on the comments from the Agent's after truthing the draft language presented in today's meeting on a site plan.

August 25th would be the final LCC Subcommittee meeting. The purpose of this meeting will be to get a final recommendation from the Subcommittee in order to send the ordinance to LDRAB.

Jon presented the following dates as the schedule for the LCC
September 23rd to be LDRAB presentation, December 3rd to be the permission to advertise, January 7th to be the first reading and January 28th to be the adoption of the LCC.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.