

Victor Planning & Zoning Commission
Meeting Minutes
18 January 2011
(MinP&Z1_1811)

Present: Commissioner Mike O'Neil, Zach Smith, Jeremy Besbris and Lynn Bagley; Pete Linville absent.

The minutes for December 7, 2010 were reviewed. Zach Smith made a motion to accept the minutes, Jeremy seconded, the motion passed.

Mike O'Neil asked if the members had seen the mind map. Mike indicated that there would be two Envision Victor (EV) meetings this month, the 25th and 26th to formalize the community's acceptance of the developed values. Mike stated that a discussion concerning the future and utility of EV would be discussed. Mike commended Bill on his memo particularly as regards the approach of integrating EV into a comprehensive plan update.

Mike asked how to incorporate the value statements. Jeremy remarked that the first chapter, under Values Statements, would be an appropriate place to begin. Mike said that including EV's value statements could be added to the existing statements with the remark that it is the outgrowth of a two year process. He emphasized that they should be included.

Bill remarked that there are tangible things that we can do, such as firming-up the form of downtown development so that we don't wind up with inappropriate suburban/exurban/strip store design, for instance. Mike observed that the memo referring to "no substitute for quality design" is particularly relevant and that financial expediency is no justification for sub-par design.

Jeremy commented that objective explanations should be included in the plan, such as the cost of sprawl versus the more abstract analysis of its deficiencies and subjective design problems. Mike remarked that the post WWII design environment sacrificed quality and community and created an unsustainable maintenance and operating -cost situation. Mike commented on the impact area as an important planning area. He stated that not all lands within the impact area are appropriate for development.

Zach commented that the environment has changed significantly in the last five years and that there is a justification for a comp. plan update. Lynn mentioned that he feels that we aren't likely to go back to where we were in terms of development scale and momentum. Lynn further stated that he is a middle-of- the roader and feels that VARD, for instance, has many good ideas but some that are not so good. He cautioned that we should not follow their program.

Jeremy commented that Pete's objection to the existing plan was directed at the lack of its usefulness. Mike O'Neil agreed that there was a lack of substance to much of it. Zach asked if it is possible to include EV's input and then start on codes to implement those inputs. Zach remarked that it would be unfortunate to spend a lot of time on a comp. plan update and then not use much of it. He wondered if it wouldn't be better to spend time with code changes. Jeremy stated that we could include cross-referencing between the plan and various codes.

Mike asked how everyone felt about going through the chapters to insure that the comp plan reinforces the values and drivers that have been established by EV. Zach feels that the comp. plan should give a clear idea to developers as to what the city desires.

The discussion moved to what areas can be addressed to make a substantive change. Design under Community Design, page 9 and 10 is overly vague and contradictory. For instance, it would be inappropriate to “promote building design that is visually compatible with surrounding development;” there is clearly little in downtown Victor that is architecturally compelling to the point where new building design should conform. We are under-developed with substantial green fields and little remaining of period architecture. We can still encourage historical and economically relevant design that is at the same time contemporary and interesting.

Mike observed that there is further EV input to be developed and that we should, perhaps, develop our approach as EV’s product is refined and matures. The commission commented that we should utilize the Mind Map to the extent practicable and that there is nothing that isn’t compatible with discussed community design and planning principles.

Mike suggested that the commission make notes by chapter as an initial cut and review the plan. Zachary made a motion to adjourn, Jeremy seconded, the motion carried.

bk