1. PROPOSED CHARTER AMENDMENT ORDINANCE
As a result of the recent Charter Committee review and recommendations, a draft ordinance has been prepared for Commission review and discussion. Discussion continued from the February 1, 2010 workshop.

Referring to the vice mayor becoming mayor, Commissioner Williams voiced his opinion that it will be difficult to put commissioners in a position to have to make a choice between their seat and the mayor’s seat, because the vice mayor’s position is an honorary position. If a vacancy in the mayor’s seat occurs with six months or more left in the term, a special election must be held. Attorney Barnebey explained the concern of the committee is that the vice mayor would automatically become mayor. Pursuant to Section 12, it does not appear the position would be an interim mayor.

Discussion ensued on how a vice mayor would be chosen should the then-current vice mayor not want the mayor’s position. Mayor Bryant opined that it is imperative that the vice mayor be in a position to be able to fill the full time mayor’s position in order to attend all the external meetings. Commissioner Cornwell opined that there should be an interim mayor until an election is held, and that the individual serving as interim mayor should be justly compensated. Commissioner Lancaster stated the citizens should be able to elect their mayor.

Discussion ensued on the possibility of an interim mayor. Attorney Barnebey opined an interim mayor can work, so long as the term is not for a long period of time. He inquired what Commission considered a reasonable period of time. Staff was instructed to determine what the time frame would be to hold a special election.

Discussion ensued on an interim mayor retaining voting powers or, if commission powers would be suspended during the term a commissioner would act as interim mayor. It was also questioned what would occur if no sitting commissioner could assume the mayor’s position, and how the decision to fill the interim mayor’s position would be made if more than one commissioner was willing to serve in that capacity.

Attorney Barnebey was also asked to look at the proposed veto language.

Both topics will be returned to the Charter Review Committee for further review.

2. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW FEES
Review of the City’s development review fees vs. surrounding governmental jurisdictions. Mr. McCollum informed Commission the P&Z Board did not review in detail, as the board members were not sure it was in their realm of responsibility to fix fees. He explained this is not a critical issue that needs a decision, but as the economy returns, it may be a topic that can generate more revenue for the City.

Mr. McCollum was asked to review the data to amend or include the following:

- Accessory structures should be a minor fee; let real charges be for real development.
- Add postscripts to explain what the different symbols in the document mean.
- Fence permits need an established policy and procedure.
- Tree removal permits: Currently $50 per tree; recommended reducing to $10 per tree with maximum fee amount. In the case of natural disaster, requirements can be suspended by a city to allow for prompt removal of trees that endanger a property. Need criteria to protect the canopy in the City, but allow a property owner the right to alter their property. Need procedures to be developed.
- Review the fees to ensure that fees aren’t substantially increased.
- Review items where attorney fees may require a deposit.
- Need to ensure the City receives an agent authorization form completed with proper contact information from the property owner.
- Confirm the process for Commission’s review of Preliminary Site plans.
- Adult entertainment: Is a conditional use; staff will confirm the allowable zoning categories.
- Review all the items that are listed as NA or where no fee is listed.
- Proposed infrastructure inspections by city staff for projects of $150 per visit
- Earth moving and site preparation; need justification for why the City doesn’t charge a fee.

The topic will be brought back to next workshop.

Mr. McCollum requested that Commission contact him with their concerns or comments.

3. SANCTUARY COVE PROJECT ATTAINABLE HOUSING UNITS UPDATE (T. McCollum)

Mr. McCollum reviewed the historic approval information regarding the Sanctuary Cove project as provided in the staff report that is attached hereto and made a part of these minutes. His finding is that the attainable housing requirement is the same as any other condition for project approval and is required. He further stated that the applicant can request to be released from the requirement. He also confirmed that no additional bonuses under the then-current matrix were granted.

Discussion ensued on whether or not the existing attainable housing ordinance should be revised or deleted. It was consensus of Commission to consider the matter at a future date.
4. UPDATE: ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION BLOCK GRANT
The topic was moved to the 7:00 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 pm.

Minutes approved: March 1, 2010
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