

# **Flour Bluff Area Development Plan Advisory Committee Meeting**

Monday, April 5, 2021 @ 5:00pm

## **Meeting called to order @ 5:05pm**

- Staff Attendees (4): Daniel McGinn, Keren Costanzo, Leane Heldenfels, and Bonnie McLaughlin.
- Flour Bluff ADP Advisory Committee Attendees (9): Flo East, Justin Green, Ben Polak, Chief Robert Rocha, Chief Dale Scott, Cliff Schlabach, Councilmember Greg Smith, Velma Soliz-Garcia, and Shirley Thornton.
- Other Attendees: Gordon Robinson

## **Meeting Notes:**

1. Agenda/Meeting Overview
2. General ADP Information
  - Current project part of ADP updates across the city following adoption of Plan CC Comprehensive Plan in 2016.
  - FB one of 9 areas, an ADP is already in place but nearly 30 years old.
3. The FB ADP is currently at the end of the process, looking at minor revisions and ultimately, adoption. Future steps are:
  - Collecting community survey results and feedback to integrate into plan.
  - Take through advisory committee's recommending action, then on to the Planning Commission and finally City Council.
  - Looking at two-month process.
  - Discussion with Chief Rocha about public comments and further opportunities for community to voice their opinions.
  - Outreach does not end with a draft plan; everyone will be included on steps as we move forward with adoption. Anyone signed up for FB ADP email updates will receive continuous updates on the adoption and public hearing process.
4. Future Land Use Map Revisions between February 22 Draft ADP presented to Advisory Committee and March 19 Public Review Draft ADP
  - See slide 7 of presentation for detailed revisions.
  - Discussion with Ben Polak about potential changes in low-density residential area near Waldron Field. Ben waiting on approval to share information on updated AICUZ study with City staff, approval anticipated within the next week.
  - Future land use maps are not zoning maps, they are used to guide direction of future development, not re-zone areas. Any zoning actions must still follow zoning procedures. The Future Land Use Map is used to guide staff and Planning Commission recommendations and City Council decisions regarding zoning cases.

5. Public Investments Revisions made between February 22 and March 19 Draft ADPs
  - See slide 8 of presentation for detailed revisions.
6. Other Document Revisions made between February 22 and March 19 Draft ADPs
  - See slide 9 of presentation for detailed revisions.
7. Open House Survey Results
  - Staff emailed Advisory Committee a PDF of survey responses as of 4/1/2021.
  - The survey remains open through April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021.
  - Based on survey responses as of 4 PM today, April 5, overall, there is strong support for ADP elements as well as plan adoption. Additional responses between the April 1 report emailed to the Advisory Committee and the April 5 responses are very similar.
  - Of the 97 respondents so far, 67% of agreed or strongly agreed that the Future Land Use Map reflected their vision.
  - Visions 1-3: Between 72%-80% respondents agreed or strongly agreed that those vision themes reflected their visions.
  - Fewer respondents to each section of questions as the survey progresses.
  - Public Initiatives (4): 66-67 respondents, very high support
    1. 91% thought that initiative 1 is very important or important.
    2. 68% thought that initiative 2 is very important or important.
    3. 86% thought that initiative 3 is very important or important.
    4. 81% thought that initiative 4 is very important or important.
  - Survey results for the Short-term projects (57 respondents total)
    1. (P5) Trestle Bridge Hike & Bike Design (31 respondents)
    2. (P6) Oso bay Hike and Bike trail (27 respondents)
    3. (P3) Parker Park Improvements (19 respondents)
    4. (P4) Wranosky Park (17 respondents)
    5. (S6) Glen Oak Drive Improvements (15 respondents)
    6. (S9) Mud Bridge Evaluation and (S7) Flour Bluff Drive Improvements (10 respondents chose each as top 5 projects)
  - Mid-term Projects (53 respondents)
    1. (S26) Flour Bluff Drive from Glen Oak to Yorktown (19)
    2. (S23) Yorktown from Flour Bluff to Waldron (17)
    3. (P12) Trestle Bridge Construction (16)
    4. (S22) Yorktown Blvd. from the Mud Bridge to Flour Bluff Drive (15)
    5. (S21) Mud Bridge (11)
    6. (P10) Ethel Eyerly Senior Center (11)
    7. (U9) Wastewater Treatment Plant (11)
  - Long-term Projects (49 respondents)
    1. (P15) Laguna Shores Hike & Bike Trail (34)

2. (P13) Dimmit Park Trail System (21)
  3. (P14) Laguna Living Shoreline (18)
  4. (P16) Glen Oak Drainage Hike and Bike Trail (18)
- 88% of respondents (50) were supportive or very supportive of adoption of the plan.
- Of the 52 respondents to answer the question about living and/or working in Flour Bluff, only 4 did not live or work in Flour Bluff.
8. Proposed Additional Revisions for Advisory Committee's Review and Approval
  - See slide 11 of presentation for detailed revisions.
  - No additional revisions proposed by Advisory Committee.
  - Advisory Committee members present did not object to staff's proposed revisions for incorporation into ADP prior to Planning Commission hearing.
9. Estimated Planning Commission and City Council dates of late April/May.
  - Flo East proposed that the Advisory Committee does not wait to vote on recommendation to council/planning commission.
  - Shirley Thornton stated that it is unlikely that results of survey responses and feedback will change significantly over the next week while survey remains open. Consensus that any future survey responses will be like the ones already collected.
  - Staff noted that any proposed changes between future draft ADPs will be detailed for Planning Commission and City Council. It is possible for changes to be made to the document as the plan moves through the public hearing and adoption process.
  - Question raised of absent committee members being able to vote. Keren will put together an online poll for everyone to weigh in that would not be anonymous and go to your email. Vote for, against, or abstain (with clarification space).
  - Ben Polak proposed postponing the vote for a week so he can provide information for future land use map before they vote on the plan. He does not think that the changes will sway anyone's mind one way or another but would like to avoid making changes after things have been approved by the group.
10. Advisory Committee decided to wait and aim for making the vote live 4/12/21 so that Ben can work with staff to identify any Future Land Use Map edits to present to the Advisory Committee as part of online poll. Poll will be sent out around lunchtime next Monday and will be live for two days.
11. Target 4/28 date for Planning Commission public hearing.

**Meeting concluded at 6:20pm**