



**University Park Town Council - Module 3 Presentation
October 17, 2016**

1. Trust

- a. The PG Plaza vision includes a 1950s shopping mall. This plan was front loaded without public engagement and the mall/future mall was already established before the community could comment. This is one reason the community does not trust the existing public process.

2. Public Participation

- a. How will the public be able to participate and engage more in the process? How will it be easier to participate?
- b. What additional opportunities will there be to participate? When can the public participate in the process?
- c. How will the proposed process reduce public participation?
- d. How can the public compete with developers/lawyers who have a vested interest in the process?

3. Minor Site Plans

- a. How will the public be able to engage with the planning process for minor site plans and subdivisions?
- b. If a minor site plan is appealed to the Planning Board, is the Planning Board an appellate body? If so, how can the public submit testimony?
- c. A 10-day timeline for publishing minor site plan decisions is not adequate. More time is needed for the public to submit an appeal.

4. Pre-Application Neighborhood Meeting

- a. What information will the developer need to present during the proposed pre-application neighborhood meeting? How detailed will that information be?
- b. More information will be needed than just basic plans or renderings. The town has experience with developers over-promising on projects.
- c. The pre-application meeting process needs to be tested as part of the eight test-sites.



5. Procedures Manual

- a. When will the procedures manual be made public?
- b. The manual will be the funnel through which the public understands the process. It will enumerate all the steps and what is included for each process, which is why it is so important that the public have an opportunity to review the procedures manual.
- c. The procedures manual needs to be explicitly clear for development—especially by-right development, because there is no opportunity for public comment.
- d. The Town of University Park recommends that the procedures manual be drafted before the code is approved.
- e. The public must have an opportunity to review the procedures manual before it is made official. This is a substantial oversight.

6. APF

- a. The Transit-Oriented/Activity Center zones should not be exempt from transportation adequacy of public facilities determinations.

7. Future meeting

- a. The Town of University Park would like to further discuss the issues introduced in Module 3. Most likely, the Town Council will not be able to submit comments by the November 1 “best consideration” deadline.

A follow-up discussion was held with University Park stakeholders, including Mayor Carey and the town attorney, to address their questions above on Friday, November 4, 2016.