

TOWN COUNCIL WORK SESSION

MINUTES

May 24, 2012, 4:30 p.m.

Cary Town Hall
Executive Conference Room #10035
316 North Academy Street
Cary, North Carolina

Present: Mayor Pro Tem Gale Adcock, Council Members Lori Bush, Don Frantz and Jack Smith; Mayor Harold Weinbrecht arrived late, and his arrival is noted in the minutes

Absent: Council Members Jennifer Robinson and Julie Robison

Mayor Pro Tem Gale Adcock called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.

Adcock announced that Robison is unable to attend the work session and council meeting because her oldest daughter is graduating from high school. She also announced that Robinson is unable to attend the work session but will attend the council meeting.

Land Use Plan Update Work Session (PL12-032)

Consideration of initial recommendations for the scope, process and public engagement for the update of Cary's Land Use/Comprehensive Plan

STAFF REPORT

Town Council Work Session, May 24, 2012

Land Use Plan Update Work Session (PL12-032)

Consideration of initial recommendations for the scope, process and public engagement for the update of Cary's Land Use/Comprehensive Plan

Speakers: Jeff Ulma, Planning Director; Roger Waldon and Ben Herman, Clarion Associates and Jamie Greene, ACP Visioning+Planning

From: Jeffery G. Ulma, AICP, Planning Director
Prepared by: Scott F. Ramage, AICP, Principal Planner
Approved by: Benjamin T. Shivar, Town Manager
Approved by: Michael J. Bajorek, Assistant Town Manager

Executive Summary

The purpose of the work session is to present the draft recommendations for the scope, process, timeline, and community engagement and outreach program for the update of Cary's Land Use/Comprehensive Plan. Staff and consultants will be seeking feedback, concurrence and direction from Council in order to further develop the draft recommendations into a complete and refined work plan ("Project Charter").

Background

As presented at the January 2012 Town Council Retreat, the Town is utilizing a two-phase effort for the update of the Land Use/Comprehensive Plan. Phase 1 consists of development of a "Project Charter," or a "plan for planning." The Project Charter will fully describe the scope of the plan update, including essential topics to be addressed, selected methods and approach for community outreach and civic engagement, the recommended planning process, project timeline, and resources required. This first phase is estimated to last about six months.

Phase 2 of the plan update will consist of executing the recommendations of the Charter, and developing the actual plan, using the processes and engagement methods identified in the Charter. This second phase may take about 12 to 24 months, with the final timing to be recommended in the Charter emerging from Phase 1.

In December 2011, the Town engaged Clarion Associates for Phase 1 of the plan update, with assistance from ACP Visioning+Planning, to develop the Charter for the plan update. Three of the lead consultants from that team conducted a kick-off planning session at the Town Council Retreat on January 13, 2012 – Roger Waldon and Ben Herman from Clarion Associates and Jamie Greene from ACP.

Using feedback from the retreat, input from internal and external stakeholder meetings and input from an interdepartmental staff team, the consulting team has developed an initial draft of the Project Charter. The recommendations of the draft Charter have also been informed by best planning practices currently used by comparable and leading communities across the country, coupled with the consultants' professional assessment of Cary's existing Land Use Plan and related Comprehensive Plan elements.

Work Session Objectives

The work session will provide a critical “check-in” with Council at the mid-point of Phase One. The consulting team will describe the work that has taken place since the Council Retreat, and then present the recommendations of the draft Project Charter, including:

- Phase 2 project scope
- Framework and organization of the new plan
- Community outreach and engagement

Refer to the document titled “Charting the Course”, which is attached to and incorporated herein as **Exhibit A**.

Staff and consultants will be seeking feedback, concurrence and direction from Council regarding the draft recommendations presented at the work session. Council feedback will be used to revise the draft Charter into a complete and refined document.

Next Steps

Following the work session, the consulting team will revise and refine the Project Charter into a detailed set of recommendations and work plan for the plan update in Phase 2. It is anticipated that a second council work session will be held in July 2012 for Council to review and endorse the revised Charter.

Fiscal Impact

Phase 1 part of the project is fully funded. The general range of Phase 2 costs will be discussed at the work session, and amounts already budgeted or planned will be reported. However, specific costs and funding sources will not be finalized until the complete Charter is ready later this summer.

Staff Recommendation

Staff has worked closely with the consulting team and support the recommended draft Charter. Staff seeks feedback and direction from Council at the work session.

AGENDA

1. Work Session Overview

(5 minutes. Speaker: Jeff Ulma, Planning Director)

- Agenda review and work session objectives
- Recap of activity since Council Retreat

- Report on related findings from inter-city visit
2. **Report on Internal and External Stakeholder Meetings**
(10 minutes. Speaker: Roger Waldon, Clarion Associates; Jamie Greene, ACP Visioning+Planning)
 - Key messages heard from internal staff
 - Key messages heard from external stakeholders
 - Common themes from stakeholder meetings
 3. **Project Scope and Framework/Organization for Product**
(40 minutes. Speakers: Roger Waldon and Ben Herman, Clarion Associates)
 - Project scope options considered by consulting team
 - Recommended project scope
 - Optional project scope elements
 - Framework and organization options considered for the updated plan
 - Recommended organization for the updated plan
 4. **Community Engagement**
(15 minutes. Speaker: Jamie Greene, ACP Visioning+Planning)
 - Preparing for civic engagement
 - Civic engagement approaches
 5. **Funding the Process**
(5 minutes. Speaker: Jeff Ulma, Planning Director)
 6. **Wrap-Up and Next Steps**
(5 minutes. Speaker: Jeff Ulma, Planning Director)
 - Summary of feedback and direction provided by Council
 - July 2012 work session to review final Charter

Ulma reviewed the agenda, purpose and guidelines for the work session. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation, which is attached to and incorporated herein as **Exhibit B**.

Waldon reviewed Pages 12 to 14 of Exhibit B. He said the main external message from the March stakeholder's meetings is to convey a clear message of the overall project in an educational format. The main internal message is the need for framework and organization.

Herman stated they would like feedback on the assumptions and options outlined on Pages 15 and 16 of Exhibit B. He said the ultimate goal is to have more topics that will be addressed in a more integrated way within two years.

Herman said the built environment is well covered by the Town's current Land Use Plan as shown on page 17 of Exhibit B.

Weinbrecht arrived at this point in the meeting at 4:49 p.m.

Herman reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of the four plan options (Pages 18 to 23 of Exhibit B). He said Option A will only update the Land Use Plan; Option B (Page 20 of Exhibit B) addresses six of the topics shown on Page 17 of Exhibit B (Vision, Growth Management Plan, Historic Preservation Master Plan, Affordable Housing, Chatham Cary Joint Land Use Plan and Transportation); Option C will build on the integrated approach with additional topics that will be

determined in Phase 2; and Option D will provide complete coverage of all topics necessary for the Town to address within the next 20 years. He stated the Planning and Zoning Board recommended another option which is between Option C and D (referred to as Option C+), but they supported Option D to be done in phases, because they believe it will best meet the Town's needs.

Greene reviewed the main themes of a responsive process that council affirmed at the 2012 council retreat (Pages 24 to 35 of Exhibit B).

Greene presented four engagement options that escalate in complexity and effort, and can be mixed and matched with the framework and organization options outlined by Herman. He stated if the Town chooses Options C or D, then the engagement process will take more time. He explained there are two components of the community engagement process – preparation (four parts) and engagement (three parts).

Greene suggested a process committee be organized to provide details. He said council, staff, consultants and other boards and commissions should also be involved. He said a qualitative approach is recommended whereby people self-select to attend the meetings, with those who participate being tested for a basic demographic makeup of the community. He said they want people to feel good about the opportunity to be involved.

Greene stated communication planning is needed, but executing it with an outreach plan gets the job done. He said they will work with a process committee on affirming and executing the outreach plan in different quadrants of the city – geographic, civic and demographic. They recommend a big community kick-off, and want to build a learning mechanism into the engagement process.

Greene said Part 3 of the engagement process is more reactive and will start in Phase 2 of the project charter. He said council is not involved in this phase, because it leads to the adoption process.

Greene outlined the branding themes and initial ideas for project identity on Pages 36 to 38 of Exhibit B. He said branding should get people excited and energized about the community. He suggested having the citizens decide the project identity.

Ulma outlined the resources needed for this project, the management structure for Phase 2 and the budget considerations. He stated staff will work with the steering committee to develop the plan. The cost will be part of the final Phase 1 report to council in July (Pages 39 to 42 of Exhibit B).

Product Discussion

Ulma asked council which product is most appropriate for Cary to realize its potential. (Refer to Page 45 of Exhibit B.) He said staff recommends Option C, and the Planning and Zoning Board recommends Option D, but they also like the idea of an Option C+. Staff and the consultant believe a two-step plan will be beneficial, cost effective and strategic.

Frantz asked if staff will provide the cost after council provides feedback on moving forward. Ulma said yes. Frantz stated knowing the cost will help him provide feedback. Ulma said it might be possible for staff to provide an estimated range of costs.

Ulma said regular updating of various Town plans is expensive, so staff believes the proposed plan is more efficient. He said the proposed plan will be long term, and the cost will be spread throughout several budget years. He said some current planning projects are moving to the adoption phase, so staff is available for this effort. He stated some funding for the proposed plan exists in the current budget and in the proposed 2013 budget. He said three sources with

potential funding will have money that can be used for the proposed charter, and then be replaced in a future budget.

Ulma stated if Cary is being transformed, then the planning process also needs to be transformed.

Weinbrecht asked if amending a complex Comprehensive Land Use Plan is a difficult process. Herman stated amendments will be done with an integrated approach. Ulma said staff reports will be more robust with more land use information.

Greene said Cary currently segregates all their plans. An alternative is to integrate all plans.

Greene said Option B is closer to what most communities have done over the past 10 years, Option C is what most communities are doing now and D is the leading edge.

Smith said the demographics and trend lines have to be studied at the beginning of the process. He questioned whether the project charter can establish expectations. Adcock said part of meeting that expectation is getting a broad spectrum of citizens to participate in the process. Ulma said the early stage of any planning approach involves community engagement.

Frantz stated he wants to hear from different groups, not just people who always participate. He likes Options C and D. He said redevelopment and infill needs to be incorporated into the Town's Land Use Plan.

Bush likes Option D with less focus on some of the items, which would make it similar to Option C. Her concern with Option C is that citizens will not have a chance to give input on the non-required topics.

Frantz wants to see cost estimates for Options C and D before making a decision on how to move forward. He wants to know more about what topics would be included in Option C to make it an Option C+, as discussed by the Planning and Zoning Board.

Frantz asked about the impact of the charter plan on plan rewrites currently in process. Ulma said it would be fully integrated so that the work done would not have been done in vain.

Council consensus is for staff to bring information back to council on a combination of Options C and D, and the estimated costs.

Process Discussion

Ulma asked council about the appropriate level of outreach and engagement for Cary. (Refer to Page 46 of Exhibit B.)

Bush asked about the target group for outreach. Greene said the group will be diverse. He said the preparation stage will last about three to four months.

Bush asked the process difference in Options C and D. Greene said Option C involves less time and less cost.

Ulma stated it would be good for Mayor Weinbrecht to conduct a CEO Roundtable (see Part 3: Prepare and Execute Outreach Plan on Page 32 of Exhibit B) to discuss why businesses choose not to come to Cary. Frantz stated that type of information from all business sizes would be helpful to know.

Frantz stated a balanced membership (i.e., small and large business leaders) is needed throughout the committees (see Part 1: Establish Leadership on Page 29 of Exhibit B).

Weinbrecht said the educational piece is needed for an informed opinion.

Council consensus is for hybrid Option C-D approach with robust communication.

Adcock stated the money for this project will be spent in a segmented non-linear way. Ulma said about \$7 to \$8 million has been spent over the past 10 years on updating the Town's major plans.

Ulma said staff will come back to council in July with a final recommended Phase 1 program.

Adcock adjourned the meeting at 5:53 p.m.