

Presentation on Zoning Ordinance Update project

Chair Baugh read the request and asked staff to review.

Mr. Russ said I am happy to present some information on the progress that we have made so far with the Zoning Ordinance rewrite. I will start with some of the projects, context and history. Then I will discuss some of the different options staff explored and researched before moving on to the scope of the project today which is split into this current phase that is focused on addressing more general reorganization and modernization as well as substantive changes. Staff believes once this phase is complete the city will have a solid base zoning ordinance and map that can serve as a launching pad for some more specific and potentially impactful amendments in a subsequent phase. The groundwork began in November of 2018 with the adoption of the current Comprehensive Plan. The actual rewrite kicked off with consultants in July of 2020 right as Covid really made in person difficult for a lengthy period of time. Around that time the City began a housing study as well and received the results in 2021. The study provided some general guidance on zoning changes to explore but there has not been formal public engagement and input on how aggressively or modestly to implement those suggestions yet or where in the City they should be implemented. Staff view public input is really a key component of the next phase. The summer of 2021 we had a partial ordinance draft that consultants put together that was released and there was a handful of meetings and virtual open houses. Since then, staff have done leg work on researching a wide range of potential zoning changes looking at how other communities have implemented other policies with a particular eye toward particular by right housing options so things like allowing accessory dwelling units and duplexes on every residential lot. Significant changes or even eliminating parking requirements allowing multi story apartments and mixed use along major corridors and various other topics. Once we have compiled all of those aggressive options in one place staff took a step back and weighed a number of critical considerations that ultimately resulted in the refocused phased project that we are presenting today.

First and foremost, staff want to make sure the zoning ordinance does not get ahead of infrastructure. We want to make sure that growth is not outpacing water supply or school capacity and that we are looking at what areas the City can absorb growth without new infrastructure like road improvements or sewer ability compared to other areas that might require significant upgrades and investment. Second, we considered the value of the rezoning process itself. Currently, rezonings offer a crucial opportunity for public feedback. They also provide significant opportunity to identify impacts and receive proffers that addresses impacts. If the City expands by-right development aggressively, some of those public hearings would be lost and that is an important trade off to be considered throughout the process. Third, there were concerns about how to avoid unintentionally triggering a tipping point for excessive redevelopment in existing neighborhoods. There are a lot of portions of the City that have modestly priced homes or a range of home sizes and home prices and those all represent important housing options. We want to make sure that we do not unintentionally turn portions of the City into attractive redevelopment sites

where an investor could potentially purchase an entire block, demolish everything and construct new expensive housing that takes the place of those modestly priced homes.

After exploring those maximum options staff narrowed in to focus what we can successfully achieve right now. By breaking the rewrite up into phases, we can focus on fixing the foundation of the zoning ordinance and carving areas where there is alignment between the Comprehensive Plan and other studies the City has performed, infrastructure needs and feedback that staff have received. Some of these changes fall into different buckets. Like a lot of communities with older zoning ordinances, Harrisonburg's rules and regulations have been tweaked and modified many times over the years and not every amendment has an obvious place in that structure. Over time, the zoning ordinance can become increasingly difficult for the typical user to navigate. An important part of the process is improving that user experience. Providing more procedural details on how the development process works in general. Clarifying submission requirements, reducing what triggers different requirements in writing and organizing them all in a single streamlined location to hopefully assist users in navigating the development process. We are modernizing the language. The consultants that we worked with gave us a great set of new definitions. We have modified them a bit based on similar projects other Virginia cities and counties have undertaken over the last few years. The aim is more straightforward language over bureaucratic jargon and improving consistency and language use throughout the ordinance. Generally attempting to rely less on staff interpretations.

Finally, we are looking to realign the zoning map by restructuring all of the districts in the map it provides an opportunity to start fresh and really think about everything more holistically rather than being wedded to the history of the current zoning districts. Once that base work is complete, staff believe public outreach, education and input sessions related to more substantial changes to the ordinance will be ultimately more effective. That is something that we intend to tackle during the next phase. Really figuring out what policies have community support and buy in. That may be generated through the Comprehensive Plan update. It is also something that can be addressed separately or done in tandem with that Comprehensive Plan update.

As is common in older zoning ordinances the City's current zoning ordinance each district today has these rather long descriptive lists of uses. That list often contains additional regulatory information, so it has things like occupancy standards, special setbacks for places of worship. That can work well initially but over time as regulations have become more complex it starts to present issues. It is really difficult to keep your terminology consistent between districts with this sort of formatting. Almost any community's zoning ordinance if it is older like ours you will find a handful of terms that are used interchangeably. Multi-family housing, multiple family dwellings, apartments, there are an infinite number of ways that you can describe the same thing and that creates challenges both for the user and staff. Traditionally if you are using a different term in an ordinance, it should have a different meaning and so it can create confusion there. The more

modern approach is to just use tables with these. When the City wants to add a new zoning district it is just a new column in a preexisting table and then you select the appropriate uses. It also addresses the lengthiness and the repetitiveness of lists. Finding the information you are looking for can be significantly easier when it is in the matrix. It also helps keep the focus on one thing at a time. If you just want to know what you can do with your property, you go to the column for its district and look up and down. If you know you want to build an apartment and need to know where you can do that, you just go to the appropriate row and look across. Then if you want the rules for apartments or whatever use, you go to the last column which will direct you to the standards section that is relevant for the use.

How the districts are changing. I will start with industrial, which is where things change the least. Some language surrounding uses will change to reflect the state of industry today. Clarifying some distinctions between uses but by and large what is allowed today would be allowed under the proposal. The more substantive change here is really here with the map itself. Until the late 1970s Harrisonburg, like many other communities, allowed single family homes basically anywhere. Today we have a number of homes that are on industrially zoned land that are not designated for industrial in the Comprehensive Plan. One thing staff has done is make an intentional effort to identify those homes and look for where there is alignment between the actual current use and what we are planning for and just assign them a district that represents that. It has been handled one at a time as problems have arisen over the years and this will hopefully address that for a number of properties. For commercial, the current ordinance has three commercial districts; B-2, general business, B-1, Central business and then B-1A, a local business that is not mapped. The new districts do not necessarily line up one-to-one exactly, but in terms of function and purpose, staff recommends breaking up the B-2 general business district in two. First, we are calling it Auto Urban Commercial and this would cover areas like East Market Street. It is really designed for your large shopping centers that are key regional retail centers that drawing significant traffic from well outside of City limits as well as, some of the more intense commercial uses like an automobile repair shop. The second is Neighborhood Commercial. This district codifies a lot of the limits that are typically proffered during a B-2 rezoning, especially if it borders a residential area. Things like the auto repair shop and other potentially disruptive uses. The goal here is to allow neighborhood compatible commercial uses but not open the door to a massive sea of parking or noisy operations in that area immediately adjacent to those homes. For downtown today, it is zoned B-1 and it has that B for business or commercial, but since it is really the heart of the city's mixed-use environment, we are categorizing it as a mixed-use district. Most of the existing B-1 will be carried over. We are moving a few uses that are not appropriate for the scale or intensity of development that is intended downtown, things like single-family detached homes. We are also proposing some restrictions on parking locations that come up as conditions when people rezone today to B-1, essentially looking to ensure this space between a sidewalk and a building remains active and pedestrian friendly. We are introducing a Mixed Use Neighborhood district which will replace the existing M-XU, Mixed Use Planned Community. This will not necessarily be on the map to start.

The goal is to create a framework to guide future new mixed use development outside of Downtown. This might be used for something like redeveloping aging commercial centers, a way of incorporating a residential component into that older commercial center and transitioning the overall development of the site towards something more like a town center style development.

The biggest changes really occur with the residential districts. Today, we have a significant number of districts and we are shrinking them. We have a number of conventional residential districts. We have three of our Master Plan districts, two districts for manufactured housing and then there is an overlay district. We are proposing to replace those with four new residential districts that are intended to represent actual common types of development that we see across the City. Today a neighborhood zoning district is often as much a history lesson as anything else. That can create unusual situations where very similarly situated neighborhoods have very different zoning regulations. By realigning the map to match what has been built on the ground, grouping neighborhoods based on what is there rather than just the district that they happen to be in when it was constructed we can put these neighborhoods on more a level playing field and more importantly it give the community a more clear starting point to discuss how these different residential types should adapt and grow in the future. The first two residential districts cover developments that are exclusively garden apartments, those apartments that have the staircase in the center usually open to the air, twelve or so units off of the staircase then a bunch of those buildings laid out on a single lot. The other covers developments that are exclusively townhomes.

There are two apartment communities on the screen. With these apartment and townhome communities, they typically have private streets and drives, shared parking areas, some sort of shared amenities. There might be a clubhouse, pool or playground and they are also essentially self-contained. They generally function as their own communities. They are not integrated into the surrounding neighborhoods. Right now, both of these development types are largely in one of the R-3 zoning districts. There is a number in R-4, R-5 and R-8 as well. We are proposing that these instead be in districts that are specific for each of these types of communities. One for townhomes and one for apartments.

With townhomes, the rewrite will address the administrative headache where someone comes in, they apply to rezone for townhomes and then a few months later they return to get a subdivision variance once they have completed a little bit more engineering or consolidating it into a single step to eliminate the need for that additional trip to Planning Commission and City Council. With the garden apartments, staff are very aware of a lot of the community's concerns regarding off campus student housing. Because of this we are not proposing major regulatory changes at this change or density increases for these properties. Instead, we really view that as a prime topic for the phase two public discussions. There are a number of potential directions that the community might go from there. For some of these existing areas it might be worthwhile to consider incentivizing some thoughtful, phased redevelopment over time of aging student housing that

might transition them away from the four-bedroom four-bathroom layouts to something more suitable for a typical non-student household there being some additional density. Those are things that we can talk through in greater detail with the community during that second phase.

For the remaining residential areas of the City, we are proposing dividing these areas up into two buckets based on the neighborhood's development type. Harrisonburg has a lot of residential neighborhoods usually in older parts of the City that feature a mixture of single-family homes, duplexes, and sometimes townhomes and small-scale apartments. These are usually in areas that are on grided streets and they frequently have alleys. On the screen is a portion of West Water Street and many of these neighborhoods today are zoned R-2 but some are zoned other districts. Under the current rules in R-2, townhome and apartments they are considered nonconforming. We are proposing to place these areas in a new district that we tentatively named traditional residential. In this district, single-family homes and duplexes would be by right and we are proposing a special exception for townhomes and apartments which would do two things. First, it would allow new townhomes and apartments to be proposed in these areas of the City and it would also create a clear path for existing nonconforming townhomes and apartments to come into full compliance. The special exception process would ensure Planning Commission and City Council have an opportunity to evaluate proposals considering the context and hearing from the public before decisions are made. Finally, we have the areas of the City that are almost exclusively single-family homes. These are the areas that have your curbed streets and your cul-de-sacs. The homes all have individual driveways in the front. They are not alleys that you are accessing off of the rear. More generally these areas do not yet have a mix of housing types. These neighborhoods today are split across a number of different zoning districts which can create some strange results. A lot of them are zoned R-1 which requires a fairly substantial 10,000 square foot lot although in reality many of these homes are on lots that predate that minimum requirement and are quite a bit smaller. Many similar neighborhoods, usually a bit newer, are zoned R-3 which has a more realistic minimum lot size but the neighborhoods are still almost exclusively single-family homes. They are lumped into the same zoning district as most of today's student housing as well as medical clinics and professional offices. The goal is to put these very similarly situated neighborhoods on more equal footing by grouping them into one district. We are proposing some modest reductions in lot sizes and setbacks which will address the rezoning to R-8 so that you can have a front porch. For the time being, staff's proposal would require a special exception from Planning Commission and City Council for a duplex in this district. Although I will note, the General Assembly passed and the Governor signed an amendment to the Virginia Code that would require allowing accessory dwelling units in some capacity by July first of 2027. Unless something unusual happens and that is repealed in the meantime not long after staff hoped to have this project complete state law would insert into this district an option in between a full duplex and the more limited single-family detached home.

I do want to be clear that staff really do view this as a first phase, kind of a necessary technical upgrade. This does include a few practical tweaks. The main focus is on building a clean and functional foundation and once that structural work is complete we can launch into much more robust community engagement to tackle some bigger picture policy questions and really the meat of what the zoning ordinance should achieve. There are countless great examples of different policy options communities have adopted in recent years. Some of them modest and some grand rethinking of what a zoning ordinance should and should not regulate. As staff our role is to bring the community's vision for zoning to life but ultimately it is City Council and the public who get to decide what that vision is. We look forward to hearing from the community about what that is over the coming months and years before we complete these phases. Once this phase is complete I think the City really will be well positioned to have some robust conversations with the public about those different policy options. Then ultimately this body and City Council will decide how to proceed on those. If there is anything that City Council or this body identifies as something that is 100 percent a priority you want to rip off the band aid instead of dragging out the process you can find ways to accommodate things sooner rather than later. We are not wedded to anything in particular. With that, Ms. Dang will go over some next steps and process.

Ms. Dang said I am going provide a little bit more detail about our plan next steps and your role in this process as we get through the rest of the year. Last evening, Mr. Russ and I presented a very similar presentation to City Council. Then City Council took some actions. City Council had endorsed staff's recommendation to approach this project with fixing the foundation; modernizing the language and improving the organization of the ordinance and replacing the current zoning districts with the new zoning district framework that was presented. Council also accepted staff's recommendation to disband the Ordinance Advisory Committee and then also to designate you all as the primary review body for the zoning ordinance update project.

I do want to make it known that this was not a unanimous decision amongst the City Council members. There were two council members, Councilmember Dent and Robinson, who did not support the decision to disband the Ordinance Advisory Committee as they expressed concerns about transparency and equity in the process. Which, I believe are al valid concerns and my hope is that once Mr. Russ and I work further with our Department of Communications and Public Engagement on developing the public engagement plan, then we can present that back to you all and City Council. I hope that it will alleviate or address the concerns that were expressed. There was a lot of good discussion yesterday that we will take to mind and consider those.

Vice Chair Porter said I did not catch the meeting last night. Can you just speak a bit to the rationale leading up the request? I think it would be very helpful for context.

Ms. Dang said why staff had recommended to disband the Ordinance Advisory Committee... There are a couple of reasons that the Planning Commission made sense to be the body through which this goes through. You all are residents in the community. The role of Planning Commission is to

advise on land use and zoning; both short-term and long-term matters related to land use and zoning. I did not say this clearly yesterday and I wish I did earlier in the conversation. I feel that through a robust and good public engagement with the community that would be the way that the Ordinance Advisory Committee members would participate. Equally the same as other community members in that process.

Vice Chair Porter said I understand that you are sort of placing Planning Commission in this role as the review body but within that process I assume there would be the potential or opportunity for the community to have some input.

Ms. Dang said of course. That is the public engagement plan that we are working on to develop that will include a lot of public meetings and opportunities for the community to weigh in on. I want to be clear that all of the input and information that we have received over the years through this process, through discussions that this body has at their meetings, and through other work that we do, all of those things are coming into what is informing the work we are proposing now. I think the other piece I mentioned yesterday is a level of efficiency that we plan to use the work sessions that you all already have scheduled to work with you all through this process but also that if Council had wanted to keep the Ordinance Advisory Committee they would have needed to go through a process of evaluating the membership and either reappointing or appointing new individuals. I do not know if it would be an application process or something like that but we were just trying to quickly but thoughtfully get...being that we are not making major reforms with the ordinance we felt comfortable recommending what we did to get us through the year, build the foundation and then we will work on topical areas. Whether it is a university overlay idea that I had discussed with Commissioners on the site tour or reducing or eliminating off street parking requirements, those are going to be very challenging conversations I expect that really require dedication of time for a project and public engagement in and of themselves.

Vice Chair Porter said is the thinking that this would be the venue or would it be special meetings? Where does the rubber meet the road on that engagement?

Ms. Dang said if can I get through the presentation and then maybe you can ask those questions. I hope I will clarify some of those questions and then you can follow up with them. The four things that council did; endorse staff's recommended approach, disbanded the Ordinance Advisory Committee, designated Planning Commission as the primary review body, and they wanted us to report back to them about our public engagement plan which we will do. With Planning Commission, what we are proposing is to use the third Tuesday of the month that is in our bylaws described as our second regular meeting. We usually do not have that meeting because we can fit all of the agenda items into one meeting. We would like to use these dates and I will email them to you so that you can put these on your calendars. I ask that you hold all of these dates. For the June 16 date, Mr. Russ and I will be recommending , when you see that list at the end of our agenda

where I usually present what the expected items are next month, that we use June 16 as a work session to continue discussions with you about the zoning ordinance update. The remaining dates I ask that you pencil those in and hold them and then each month prior we will see what is coming up on the following month and we will go through those days. Our proposal is to use these dates for that and then separately from these work sessions will be planned public engagement which I do not have a full plan for that yet. Some ideas that we are talking about, there will be multiple opportunities and whether individual meetings will be focused on a particular topic or we do the same type of meeting three or four different times, but we have tables or stations that would be related to a topic so that an individual who is coming here might want to know about all four they might have something specific in mind they can go to that particular station and talk to staff about those changes and ask us questions. We are still working on those plans.

[Referring to the PowerPoint slide.] This is the project schedule generally moving forward. This week we have offered the updates to City Council and Planning Commission, received City Council's endorsement on the plan. Working through the summer on the Planning Commission work sessions and public engagement meetings. Our hope is that in the fall we would be at a point of public hearing. That might shift but that is our aim right now is to, in the fall, present to Planning Commission and City Council so that we would be implementing to the new Zoning Ordinance in 2027. Then in the future, in 2027, we would be considering further reforms.

I am sure a lot of ideas will be coming up through the discussion through 2026 that will make notes and continue to add to the list of what those further reform topics will be. We will also, pending budget approval, wanting to work on the Comprehensive Plan. The idea is that we would be a consultant to support our work with the Comprehensive Plan. We are looking at beginning of fall 2027 with something like that. The Comprehensive Plan work will also inform us further about what zoning and changes would be need. With that Mr. Russ and I are happy to answer any questions that you have.

Commissioner Kettler said the work sessions it sounds like that it could be some combination of work session or an open house or something.

Ms. Dang said I am thinking that the work sessions are just for you all. It would be open for the public to attend but they are really opportunities for you all to engage in discussions. Again, we have not worked out this detail but I have this thought is it a work session set up in this format [referring to the set up of Council Chambers] or do we want to move to a room where we have a table and/or are sitting around in a circle? The dialogue in conversation feels a bit differently when you are sitting around a table in that way. Mr. Russ and I would have an agenda or topics that we would sharing with you all for the purposes of discussion and sharing with you materials in advanced to review before we get to that meeting.

Commissioner Kettler said if it was more of the second option, I am wondering how to best facilitate the public to at least witness that both in person and on video.

Ms. Dang said we are still working through those details and unless someone else on staff has something they want to share at this point in time. That is a consideration that we are thinking through.

Councilmember Dent said what I did not hear last night that I think I just heard you say, I had not realized “consider further reforms” could be either after or concurrent with the Comprehensive Plan update which makes an immense amount of sense to me. I had thought earlier we ought to be doing the Comprehensive Plan first but now I see that the first phase is really just to clarify what we have now and then the later more substantive reforms could be more based on the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Kettler said I watched the City Council presentation last night too and initially I was disappointed in the fact that it would not have a more substantive things sooner and then the more I thought about it I thought in terms of effective communication and making sure the public is understanding what is going on, I think it does help to simplify this before those changes happen. You try to make a change without it being clear what the change is and folks will just say no, no matter what the change is because they just do not understand.

Ms. Dang said building on what you were saying, we had been challenged when we were trying to do all of the things at one time with how to engage with the public with 20 different topics and I am really comfortable with this approach we are going forward with.

Councilmember Dent said I also wanted to talk a little bit about the Ordinance Advisory Committee. I came on strong at first saying I do not support disbanding that because I saw the value of the expertise that was brought by that particular group but the more you talked about how you would have a robust public engagement process that the same people could participate in and you would have a more topic based set of meetings sure I can live with it. Likewise, Councilmember Robinson her main concern was the equity of who is showing up to the table. There was some discussion on that. Was the Ordinance Advisory Committee as constituted equity based, not necessarily. It is going to be more a matter of public outreach to make sure we hit that goal.

Mr. Russ said if members of the public are not able to attend these meetings, but they want to have a conversation with us or submit something in writing, I can make time on my schedule for anyone who wants to come sit down. We will chat about anything and we can figure out how to incorporate their input as well.

Councilmember Dent said one of the key purposes of the first phase is the efficiency. If we are already here and you are talking about mostly clean up and major simplification of the residential kind of zoning, then yeah I can see that we can get started June 16 if we decide to do that. We had a little bit of pushback on the idea of efficiency. Well, that is not important to kickstart it and keep going. It is not necessarily a goal in itself because we want to have the robust public engagement and knowing that will come in the next phase means that the efficiency for this first phase makes a lot more sense.

Ms. Dang said this first phase will also include public engagement.

Councilmember Dent said it is not just the major controversial topics we will have to hash through. Which there will be a better foundation of those if they are based on an updated Comprehensive Plan. I just wanted weigh in on it a bit more that I just did not want to let go of the expertise we had already gathered but I could see the point if we had to reconstitute the Ordinance Advisory Committee now.

Commissioner Kettler said by and large it is clarifying a lot of the things. It seems to me that there are three questions that you cannot get around in terms of them being substantive as part of the clarification of it. That is one minimum lot sizes, two accessory dwelling units and three how the districts are consolidated. Would you say that is a fair assessment in terms of the major substantive changes even if they are not large changes? There is going to be a change in minimum lot size as a result of this but it is an open question about how big it is.

Ms. Dang said we will also be exploring with you all the setbacks as well related to that.

Councilmember Dent said those are by definition substantive but it is more of a matter of the simplification we will bring up those topics and we will have some public comment on it I am sure.

Mr. Fletcher said at least one council member expressed interest in the height of buildings.

Councilmember Dent said I would agree with that. That was Councilmember Alsaadun that asked if we could remove those caps. I have said a couple of time some day we are going need ten or twenty story buildings.

Commissioner Seitz said I think this first phase makes a lot of sense. I do look forward to the public engagement even as we do this first step. Two questions I was going to ask; how can we function in a way that is more generative and less reactive? I just feel constantly we are being asked to consider complex things and I consider myself fairly literate in a lot of these issues but there always seems to be things that come out of these public hearings and discussions that in my

mind would bear further discussion or would have benefitted from a previous broader discussion that was not about this topic in particular. Tonight, two great ones. Where do we as a commission feel the community is on student housing in the abstract, not in reaction to a particular proposal? How do we protect some of the wonderful neighborhoods that we have that is very unique and eclectic? The one we looked at tonight and some other ones. I feel like in my ten months on the Planning Commission we are in a reactive mode not a generative mode. I think what you are proposing here is a step in that direction so that makes me feel good. Related to that though in terms of prep for whatever comes after this let's say the Comprehensive Plan does land end of 2027, in that spirit of being generative and not reactive how do we as a commission prepare ourselves for the range of issues and things that are going to come up and begin to even find places to engage to take the pulse of the community even before going into the Planning Commission? One of the things that has triggered that question and those are rhetorical questions which given the late hour I do not think we are going to have a bunch of discussion.

Being in Charlottesville last night the meeting opened up with every single commissioner reporting on what committee board or regional agency they were a part of. They structurally have engagement with all of the other things. When I read the 2018 Comprehensive Plan again, there is a lot of things in there that got done that was great and I had to do a lot of digging to find them. I am thinking if you are an active citizen you will go seek those things out and pay attention to them. As a Planning Commissioner I feel like I should be in some kind of routine or some kind of process whereby as part of my responsibility as a Planning Commissioner I am part of those things as an observer and as a participant to a degree. Maybe it is a simple question is: Councilmember Dent, you talked about attending Metropolitan Planning Organization meetings and stuff. Parks and Recreation has a plan, [there's the] Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan. There are just all of these different groups that are going on that some are staff led and some are staff and public led and stuff like that. How do we intentionally connect with those things so that we are not playing catch up going into the Comprehensive Plan process?

Commissioner Kettler said just to add on that a little bit by sheer coincidence both me and Commissioner Seitz both went to Charlottesville Planning Commission meetings and my understanding based off of our code is that Planning Commissioners are actually specifically prohibited from serving on other City commissions. You can look into that and correct me if I am wrong about that but just reading it, that is what it looks like. As you said in that case, in Charlottesville are right at the beginning given absolutely no more than a minute or minute and a half update from their respective groups. They also have a non-voting representative from University of Virginia which I thought was really interesting. We do not always have the strategic plan update from JMU. I think given just how big JMU is in relationship to the City I think that is an interesting aspect as well.

Commissioner Seitz said we have our other Tuesday nights booked for the foreseeable future I was hoping that we could maybe have one Tuesday night session to kick around some of these ideas because I have a whole lot of other questions that relate to them. I feel like we would do a better job if we were out in front of some of these things. I always enjoy the discussions that we have and the perspectives that are here but we go so far field because this is the only time we have to engage.

Commissioner Kettler said one benefit that we have over the zoning Ordinance Advisory Committee is we meet frequently and we have the capacity to meet more frequently and have these discussions. The ability of frequent meetings is not necessarily one of the great assets.