



Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee

Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee
Minutes
Monday, August 22, 2005 at 5:30PM
Copper Room – 600 S. Alvernon Way
Tucson, AZ

Members Present: Thomas Sayler-Brown (Chair), Dan Williams (Vice Chair), Shannon-McBride Olsen, Sami Hamed

Members Absent: Frank Thompson

Staff Present: Andrew Singelakis, Sarah More, Michael McCrory, Craig Gross, Viola Romero, John Beal, Jaret Barr.

Guests Present: Tracy Williams, Warren D. Thompson, Carolyn Classen, Ruth Beeker, Michael Guymon, Rosemary Niemann, Byron L. Howard, Carolyn Poster, Carol Clark, Richard Studwell, Gail Schuessler, Lori Lusting, Beryl Baker, Tina Lee, and Bonnie Paulos.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Thomas Sayler-Brown called the meeting to order at 5:35PM.

II. APPROVAL OF JULY MINUTES

Motion made by McBride Olsen, seconded by Williams to approve the minutes of the July meeting with one minor modification. The motion carried unanimously.

III. UPDATE OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICE DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES

There was no report.

IV. REVIEW OF RCP MODIFICATIONS AND REFERRAL TO FULL PLANNING COMMISSION

Andrew Singelakis presented nine proposed changes to the RCP. The changes included:

1. Differentiates between RCP subdivisions that are 5 acres or less from those greater than 5 acres.

Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee – Minutes

August 25, 2005

Page 2

2. Adds standards found in the adopted General Plan as a requirement for all RCP subdivisions.
3. Adds additional standards to ensure that the “Multiple Use Concepts and Aesthetic Design Guidelines” found in Chapter IV of the Stormwater Detention/Retention Manual are incorporated into subdivision designs.
4. Addresses the RCP provisions that allow mass grading of sites with significant slopes.
5. Requires RCPs on sites 5 acres or smaller be subject to review by the Design Review Board (DRB) in accordance with the Limited Notice Procedure.
6. Allows applicants to seek modifications from design standards through administrative review by the DRB.
7. Expands the DRB to include an engineer or land planner with experience in subdivision and site plan design.
8. Eliminates RCP procedures from Sec. 23A-35
9. Eliminates bonus density provisions

Regarding the mass grading provision, Singelakis acknowledged that what was being proposed is a “Band-Aid” intended to close a loophole in the RCP code. Another approach would be to handle it through a comprehensive review of the Hillside Development Zone provisions.

The “Limited Notice Procedure” was used, as it was the closest fit for the type of notice necessary for RCP subdivisions. However, staff was limited to the existing procedures in Sec. 23A. Michael McCrory explained that last year the City underwent a comprehensive review of 23A and the express purpose was to prevent new review procedures for every time a new zoning provision is written.

V. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

A call to the audience was taken to receive input on the staff proposal. The following comments were heard:

- Gated two-way access from RCP to commercial sites should be clarified.
- Should trails be required when not identified in an approved trail plan?
- Modifications affecting the Hillside Development Zone should be addressed through a modification to the HDZ not the RCP ordinance.
- Unclear if the standards are requiring a masonry wall.
- Staff should know what is in the best interest of the neighborhoods and should fight to protect it.
- Neighbors want early neighborhood meeting and want the 150-foot notice.
- Open space standards should be added.
- Should density bonus provisions be eliminated?
- At what point in the process would DRB review be required?

Planning Commission Infill Subcommittee – Minutes

August 25, 2005

Page 3

- Neighborhood groups cannot afford the fee required to appeal decisions to the ZBA.
- How does this relate to the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan?

Motion was made by McBride-Olson, seconded by Williams to forward the RCP draft to the full Planning Commission. An alternative procedure should be forwarded that should require a neighborhood meeting and retain the current 150' notice provisions in 23A. The motion passed unanimously.

VI. PRESENTATION BY STAFF ON DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES

Sarah More gave a presentation on the draft design guidelines. The guidelines are in an early form so there is ample opportunity for input. There are four elements: 1) site planning; 2) architectural design; 3) signage; 4) lighting. They are broken into three types: 1) single family residential; 2) multi-family; and 3) commercial/mixed use. Over the course of the next several months, she will be meeting with various groups to review the guidelines.

VII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Singelakis stated that at the next meeting the subcommittee should begin discussions on a “Minor-PAD” process, the “Neighborhood Protection Overlay Zone” and also review of the design guidelines.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25PM.