

Suggested Edits to May Draft of Scottsboro/Bells Bend Detailed Design Plan

Throughout the document, maps and graphics have been updated to “officially” include Beaman Park within the study area boundary.

Chapter: Developing an Understanding

- On page 2, change 'community members' to 'New South Associates'.
Result: Done (page 2).
- On page 2 regarding the history of the area, change 'developers' to 'individuals' - all houses in this community have been built by individuals.
Result: Done (page 2).
- The Existing Land Use Table does not seem correct.
Result: The table has been updated and corrected (page 5).
- The descriptions of currently allowed construction seem to assume that all acreage is buildable, thus allowing one house for every two acres of land in the area. There is no discussion of other restrictions such as floodplain, stream buffer, and steep slope restrictions.
Result: Yes, the plan does include references to other restrictions, such as those mentioned above. Clarification language has also been added (pages 7-9).
- The area does not need sewer infrastructure. I would like to see that eliminated from the plan.
Result: Sewer section has been clarified and statement of not extending sewer has been included (pages 12-13).
- Regarding the demographics, there are Native Americans and Hispanic families and men renting homes in Bells Bend - Scottsboro.
Result: This table is derived from U.S. Census information and what is reported there (page 17).

Chapter: Exploring Alternatives and Designing a Solution

- Planning staff added a paragraph on Plan Intent (page 19).

Vision

- Don't think any of the values listed are in competition with each other as we have lived for the past two hundred years in the Bend.
Result: Clarification has been added that it is the extent to which these qualities are preserved that is debated (page 21).
- Clarify what is meant by property rights in the Vision section.
Result: Done; definition added (page 21).
- Add “majority” of stakeholders to the Vision of Preservation section.
Result: Done (page 21).
- Remove “prominent vision” from the Vision of Development paragraph.
Result: Done; it now reads “as an alternate vision” (page 21).
- Take issue with the statement in the Vision section that says “The preservation of large areas of contiguous acres of land is not feasible for all stakeholders.”
Result: Edited to say “may not be feasible” (page 21).
- The proposed plan implies that the only way to realize monetary value for land is for more intensive development. If these same residents realized they could secure their financial future while protecting the rural character, most, if not all, would do it.
Result: The Vision section has been edited to make this point clearer. The focus of the plan is on preserving the rural character, while allowing strategically located and thoughtfully designed development (page 21).

- Inaccurate to say “is the goal of this DDP to balance both these visions by preserving the rural character of the majority of the Scottsboro/Bells Bend area while allowing development opportunities in appropriate areas.” That may be the goal of the Planning staff but it was not the goal of participants.
Result: No change (page 21).

Goals

- Under Parks goals, add 'and between' before 'the Parks'.
Result: Done (page 23).
- After Farmlands add a section on woodlands. Objectives would include best management practices for timber harvesting, preserving habitat, conservation easements.
Result: Added as a goal under Natural Conservation policy. Preserving woodlands is already referenced in several sections of the plan (page 24).
- Concerns about the use of “wherever possible” in the goal statements for Historic and Archeological Resources and Farmland.
Result: Deleted “wherever possible” from both statements so that the statements are stronger (pages 24-25).
- Strengthen language to encourage use of rich farm land for farming rather than development.
Result: Done, several references throughout document including maps of prime farm soils (page 25, 43). Preserving prime farmland is also a condition to meet under the Alternate Development Area (page 42).
- Under Rural Residential add “connecting corridors for wildlife.”
Result: Done (page 26, 32, will be added to page 24 and where needed for consistency).
- For Parks, Goal 1, line 2 - add 'visit' after 'for people who'.
Result: Done (page 27).
- On Hwy 12, can a median around the crossroads be suggested that would give the appearance of a village.
Result: Added “and other measures to make the area safe and comfortable for focus on pedestrians” since this is more comprehensive and could include other things (page 28).

Detailed Land Use Policies

- When you list floodways and floodplains can you also include riparian zones.
Result: A riparian area is the vegetated area adjacent to a stream or other waterway. Riparian areas are considered a part of floodway/floodplain buffers and stream buffers, so they have already been mapped as part of the Natural Conservation policy. Since any rezoning requires a site plan, the review of the site plan will include locating any wetlands on that property. If wetlands exist, then preservation measures apply.
- Pg 31, first column, last paragraph, last line - add at end of sentence after floodplains 'grasslands and rich farmland and grazing pastures'.
Result: Added “which may contain prime farmland” (page 31).
- Need to have forested areas considered so we can consider best practices for managing timber. Clear cutting should not be an option under the Rural Conservation consideration.
- Under Natural Conservation mention best management practices for timber harvesting.
Result: Some timber management language has been added. The plan already discusses the importance of preserving woodlands and mature trees (page 35).
- All of the new development in the village center, village residential and rural residential should be sustainable.
- Under Rural Residential add sustainable design and construction practices.
- Under Natural Conservation add sustainable design and construction practices.
Result: The site design proposed in the plan encourages sustainable development and includes graphics illustrating some of these principles (pages 36-37). Planning staff did not feel, however, that “green” development” was a consensus vision for the area.
- Keep the rural residential zoning in line with current development – 1 house per 5 acres.

Result: The Rural Residential area is policy, not zoning. While it is true that most residential development is located on parcels larger than 5 acres, the area is zoned for 1 house per 2 acres. The plan tries to balance this, by including 1 house per 5 acres as an option. Also, planners have heard from several stakeholders who want to keep their zoning at 1 house per 2 acres (pages 39-41).

- Concerns about the use of “conservation subdivisions” since we don’t want subdivisions. Why can’t it be returned to 1 house per 5 acres and continued without sewers and there would be no subdivisions.

Result: There indeed can be subdivisions of 1 house per 5 acres. Meanwhile, there can also be conservation subdivisions that seek to be on septic. Clarifying language has been added as it is the intent of conservation subdivisions to preserve natural features and the rural landscape (page 39).

- Like to see it read “Gross density, however, will not exceed one house per two (or five) acres of buildable land.
Result: This section has been clarified but calculating the number of homes is not as simple as saying only count buildable land (pages 39-40).
- Could there be verbiage inserted that would not allow billboards or those horrible electronic signs.
Result: Done, added to Village Center and Alternate Development Area sections. These signs are not allowed in residential areas (page 49, 51).
- In the Village Residential Area, the plan currently allows for buildings up to 3 stories, although the Village Center could be no more than 2 stories. Why the difference? A 3-story home would seem to be out-of-character with the bulk of the area
Result: A note has been added saying that the current character of Village Residential is 1 to 2 stories (page 52). However, zoning regulations currently allow 3 stories for a single-family home.
- Does the phrase under District Impact policy, “transitioning from the impact use into adjacent policy areas” mean extending sewer?
Result: No. This is merely saying transitions from one building form to another should be considered (pages 54-55).

Detailed Land Use Policies: Alternate Development Area

- Remove the Alternate Development Area section from the plan.
Result: No change.
- Concern about form of buildings in the Regional Center and the number of people.
Result: The form of the buildings and the intensity/density of development will be significantly different from what is currently in the Bend. No change.
- Under the Alternate Development Area, what increments of the proposed development will be allowed until defined conservation goals are achieved?
Result: These details will be part of any subsequent rezoning application. Conservation easements are part of the requirements although there will be some flexibility as to when they are dedicated during the process (page 42 and various references throughout section).
- Under the Alternate Development Area, “add affordable and low income housing without time limitation.”
Result: The requirement of “significant housing choice” has been added (page 27, 42).
- Under the Alternate Development Area, can LEED standards be adopted?
Result: A condition of achieving 45 points within LEED for Neighborhood Development has been added (page 45).
- Under the Alternate Development Area, further define sustainable design and construction requirements.
Result: The inclusion of LEED ND requirements further defines sustainable design and construction requirements (page 45).
- Add that infrastructure placed for the development should not be allowed to serve areas north beyond the southernmost ridgeline.
Result: A statement has been added that it is not the intent of the plan to expand sewer in the area, with the exception of what might be needed in the Alternate Development Area (page 13).

- Under the Alternate Development Area, add that the developer is to provide bonding to the community / Metro to ensure that the conditions are met
Result: Bonding will be discussed and required as part of any subsequent zone change request.
- Disagree with using the word “balance” since there is no way to reconcile the May development with the rest of the plan.
Result: No change.
- Under Alternate Development Area, delete paragraph that discusses 2/3rds of the area would be preserved since that happens to be the land on which the developers couldn’t build anyway because of either unstable soil or the fact that it is in the floodplain. So the developer hasn’t given up anything.
Result: The emphasis in this section is permanently preserving the land in a conservation easement. While it is true that much of this land is steep slopes and floodplain, the property owner does have some development rights in these areas today.
- Appears the map showing the Alternate Development Area includes the Graves property.
Result: A note has been added to the maps emphasizing this is a general boundary and not meant to be specific (page 22, 26).
- While it’s agreed that one of the goals and conditions is the focus on preserving the area north of the Alternate Development Area, could the wording be changed to say “work to preserve” instead of preserve, simply because not everyone may choose to participate in the designated program for land preservation.
Result: Done, now says “work to preserve” (page 41, 42).
- Would it be helpful to include a minimum acreage number for the prime farmland that will be preserved?
Result: Yes, 200 acres is the minimum prime farmland that will be preserved. This is part of the 900 total acres for conservation (page 42).
- Does the tool for preservation have to be conservation easements or are other tools available?
Result: Yes, conservation easements are the best tool the community has available today to ensure preservation. Deed restrictions are not enforceable by Metro government (page 42 and various references throughout).
- If the Development were to occur what assurances are there for it actually being constructed in the manner it is proposed?
Result: The plan notes that zoning applications, including for May Town Center, to include site plans. The preferred zoning district is Specific Plan, which includes detailed site planning and conditions that a developer must meet (page 46, 48).
- Since the focus is on the form of buildings in this area, why are minimum and maximum heights applied.
Result: While the focus does remain on building form, it helps to clarify expectations regarding the building height. For a frame of reference the 600’ defined elevation of the continuous ridgelines is used. Language has been added to be more flexible on the heights of some focal buildings, provided that the building form remains true to the intent of the plan (page 44, 46-47, 48).

Achieving the Vision: Implementation Tools, Ideas and Examples

- No edits were suggested for this chapter.