



Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee

**Design Guidelines Manual Working Group
City of Tucson Planning Commission's
Infill Planning Subcommittee
Minutes**

Monday, January 23, 2006 at 5:30 – 7:30 P.M.
900 S. Randolph Way,
Tucson, AZ

Attending: Rafael Sebba, Lead Planner; Glenn Moyer, Principal Planner; Rebecca Ruopp, Neighborhood Infill Planner; Tracy Williams, NIC; Carolyn Classen, Sam Hughes Neighborhood Association; Paula Meade, Standard Pacific/SAHBA; Lori Lustig SAHBA; Ruth Beeker, NIC; Tina Lee, Ward 2 Council Office; Katie Bolger, Ward 3 Council Office; Bonnie Poulus, NIC; Bob Schlanger, Jefferson Park Neighborhood Association; Brett Janssen, Richmond American Homes.

Meeting Summary

The Design Guidelines Working Group meeting was the sixth in a series of meetings to foster more in-depth and focused discussion on several initiatives the Infill Planning Subcommittee has been exploring, including the Design Guidelines.

The meeting began with Rebecca Ruopp, Infill Planner, welcoming attendees, followed by introductions. Other city staff in attendance included Rafael Sebba, Lead Planner, Glenn Moyer, Principal Planner, and Michael McCrory, City Attorney's Office.

Discussion began by focusing on the Single Family Residential guidelines. Discussion also included general Design Guidelines issues and questions. During the meeting, participants raised questions, identified issues, and discussed possible additions and revisions to the guidelines, and city staff provided explanations and clarification. Following is a summary list of issues, comments, and suggestions as documented by city staff over the course of the meeting.

General Issues/Comments

Guidelines won't be effective without revamping LUC
Should be adopted as ordinance – similar to Marana

Is it a checklist (more prescriptive) or guidelines (examples/menu of options)? *Answer –*
Intended to be guidelines
If it is going to become prescriptive then every word is important

Design Guidelines Manual Working Group - Minutes

January 23, 2006

Page 2

Unless clearly stated, reviewers may use as checklist rather than as guidelines
If it is guidelines, look at ways to leave open ended
Get rid of “Implementation Methods” - maybe “Suggestions” - but don’t make too vague
Allow options/solutions that are not listed

Clarity

If you want to achieve meaningful safety, say that up front and clearly
If real intent is to couple with RCP, then do that

Subjective review process doesn’t work for either production builders or neighborhoods
Different projects get different interpretations in reviews

Don’t have architects in the group

Feb. 21st seems premature – need to see if guidelines & RCP etc. are complementary before moving forward
Looking at things piecemeal

Consider using design review committee/board

Residential Cluster Project issues

RCP originally supposed to be for cluster projects, in practice used more for setbacks and lot sizes rather than clustering - parking counted as common area
Proposed RCP changes include more prescriptive language
Guidelines could be used more like checklist for RCP’s
Should be a single reviewer in City for RCP’s

Single Family Guidelines

Not many 20 or 30 acre tracts left –Why have them at all? *Answer-* Implementation of Community Character and Design element of General Plan.

Going to the hamstring production builders
Guidelines should focus on infill
Potential for City to annex larger parcels
Guidelines originally intended to help innovation & flexibility – trying to achieve community where people want to stay
Need basic standards because neighborhoods are naïve

Need to differentiate between smaller and larger subdivisions

Under/over 5 acres
Guidelines read as if for bigger subdivisions
Can’t do one size fits all – separate production builder/subdivision/edge development criteria and infill standards
Get rid of word “subdivision” and change to something such as “new development” where guideline applies to both

Design Guidelines Manual Working Group - Minutes

January 23, 2006

Page 3

Rezoning already require environmental resource report

Modify I.A.1.a to reflect this

Mix of lot sizes not going to work in real world, doesn't work for production builder (maybe for 40 acres+)

Developers/builders are going to try and maximize density - land selling at \$175,000-\$200,000 in City

Intent is to create variety of lots and homes in new subdivisions, avoid monotonous and repetitive neighborhoods

End of Mountain Ave. along wash example of good development - setbacks vary and lot size shapes aren't just rectangular

Agreement that there is a need to get away from rigid setbacks

View fences around recreation areas results in loss of privacy - for most part people will buy away from recreation areas

View fences one option, can centrally locate recreation areas so that yards do not abut them

Site context

Where's parcel? What is it abutting? Etc.

Needs to be respectful to existing development

Needs to address that development does not impact neighbors

Big builders/SAHBA aren't necessarily those that have caused problems