PLANNING COMMISSION

Department of Urban Planning & Design P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, Arizona 85726-7210

Approved by Planning Commission on June 4, 2008 with corrections (added text in ***bold***, deleted text is ~~strikethrough~~).

Date of Meeting: April 2, 2008

The meeting of the City of Tucson Planning Commission was called to order by Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair, on Wednesday, April 2, 2008, at 7:01 p.m., in the Mayor and Council Chambers, City Hall, 255 W. Alameda Street, Tucson, Arizona. Those present and absent were:

1. ROLL CALL

Present:

Joseph Maher, Jr.	Member at Large, Ward 6
Shannon McBride-Olson	Member, Ward 2
Robert Patrick	Member, Mayor's Office
Daniel R. Patterson (Arrived at 7:08 p.m.)	Member, Ward 5
Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair	Member at Large, Ward 5
Sean Sullivan	Member at Large, Ward 3
James E. Watson	Member, Ward 4
Daniel J. Williams	Member, Ward 1
Craig Wissler	Member, Ward 3

Absent/Excused

Eric R. Cheney	Member at Large, Ward 2
Brad Holland, Vice Chair	Member, Ward 6

Staff Members Present:

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director
Craig Gross, Development Services Department, Deputy Director
Jim Mazzocco, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator
Chris Kaselemis, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator
Viola Romero-Wright, Principal Assistant City Attorney
Linus Kafka, Principal Assistant City Attorney
Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner
Rebecca Ruopp, Urban Planning and Design, Principal Planner
Ramona Williams, Urban Planning and Design, Secretary
Yolanda Lozano, City Clerk's Office, Recording Secretary

2. MINUTES FOR APPROVAL: March 5, 2008

It was moved by Commissioner Williams, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 8 to 0 (Commissioners Cheney, Patterson and Vice Chair Holland absent), to approve the minutes of March 5, 2008, with one correction as follows: Page 5, third paragraph, fifth line, add the word ***not***.

3. RECOGNIZING SERVICE BY FORMER PLANNING COMMISSIONERS HAMED AND EVANS

Chair Rex presented Grace Evans and Sami Hamed with Certificates of Appreciation for their efforts and years of service to the Planning Commission.

4. MIRAMONTE neighborhood PLAN (PUBLIC HEARING)

Rebecca Ruopp, Urban Planning and Development, Principal Planner, stated the presentation to the Planning Commission would be similar to the presentation from the Study Session because the presentation was for the public hearing. She gave some background information stating there were currently twenty-eight neighborhood plans and seventeen area plans which were created ten to twenty years ago and had been amended subsequently. They covered approximately three-quarters or more of the City with the area plans covering larger areas and the individual neighborhood plans covering individual neighborhoods. She stated that the plans were advisory and primarily used to inform rezoning reviews. neighborhoods had been voicing increasing interest in developing neighborhood plans and addressing issues. In 2006, Urban Planning and Development (UPD) initiated a neighborhood plan prototype project. The goal was to refine neighborhood plans to serve as advisory documents for rezoning, and also as strategic plans for active use by the neighborhoods themselves.

Ms. Ruopp stated two neighborhoods were selected for assistance in preparing plans which Miramonte was one. Miramonte was located in central Tucson and bounded on the north by Speedway Boulevard, on the south by 5th Street, on the east by Alvernon Way, and on the west by Country Club Road. The neighborhood was addressed in the 1995 *Alvernon-Broadway Area Plan*, which covered an area greater than Miramonte and went all the way to Swan and south to 22nd Street. She stated the planning process had gone from late 2006 to early 2008. There were a variety of key outreach steps: the survey, a variety of public meetings, workshops, notifications, and the Study Session held last month. Key preparation plan steps included the inventory of existing conditions, identifying challenges, creating a vision statement, establishing goals, policies and strategies, and a draft plan.

Ms. Roupp stated the challenges that Miramonte identified were similar to other neighborhoods, but had some of their own distinctive challenges which were: decline in owner occupancy and property maintenance, pressure on ranch house residential pattern, economic/demographic pressures from the University of Arizona, pedestrian environment deficiencies, increased traffic, increased crime, reduced civic involvement, creation of a unified neighborhood, and transitions between land uses and zoning. Ms. Roupp stated that the Miramonte neighborhood was very interested in a unified neighborhood. She

said the neighborhood on the west was single family ranch houses and to the east, multi-apartment buildings and multi-unit residences, but they were one neighborhood. What they were interested in was not having a division between the two sides and having a seamless neighborhood.

Ms. Roupp stated that the neighborhood began by developing a vision statement that focused on what they wanted to see in the future such as preserving the neighborhood assets, enhancement of the infrastructure, better transitions between their land uses, zones and districts, appropriate infill development and increased citizen participation. She said this led to focusing on goals, policies and strategies.

Ms. Roupp said the first goal, neighborhood Infill Compatibility, was to promote compatible infill development within the neighborhood. The policies for this goal were to preserve the character of the neighborhood by ensuring that future land use made a positive contribution to the neighborhoods through application of neighborhood values and work with the existing development procedures to be sure that neighbors had an opportunity to be active participants in decisions that affect land use in the neighborhood. She said in the first policy, the values were the measuring stick they wanted to use as developers came in. They would look at the values and encourage developers to consider them, such as increased homeownership in both low and higher density developments; a diverse mix of land uses that contributed to the traditional character of the neighborhood; carefully designed transitions between land uses; provision of functional open space in all residential zones; a safe, attractive, and functional pedestrian environment; green and sustainable development, the maximum use of native and/or drought tolerant plant materials; and full involvement of residents and stakeholders in the neighborhood decisions.

Ms. Roupp said the next goal, neighborhood Preservation & Rehabilitation, was to preserve the historic/traditional character of the neighborhood, protect the existing low-density areas of the neighborhood, and increase owner occupancy of residences. Polices for this goal were to: protect the historic architecture of the neighborhood; protect historic sites and landscapes in the neighborhood; and protect the residential character. She said the third goal, neighborhood Transitions, was to create transitions between different density residential districts and between residential and commercial districts to preserve the residential character of the neighborhood. The policies for this goal were to encourage good design to help make successful transitions between commercial and residential uses and encourage good design to help make successful transitions between low density and higher density residential development.

Ms. Roupp continued with the fourth goal, neighborhood Infrastructure Enhancement, which was to enhance the beauty and quality of life for neighborhood residents by increasing public amenities and creating a safe and enjoyable living environment. The policy for this goal was to include that the neighborhood would implement a master plan of public landscape and streetscape enhancements with a focus on vegetation, including shade trees, neighborhood edges and nodes, and traffic calming. The fifth goal, neighborhood Safety and Property Maintenance, was to protect the safety of all neighborhood residents and maintain the attractiveness of the neighborhood with the support of the City of Tucson. The policies for this goal were to support a plan for

neighborhood crime prevention that was developed in coordination with the Ward 6 Council Office and the City of Tucson Police Department. The final goal was neighborhood Involvement Opportunities which was to fully involve all residents and stakeholders in neighborhood governance and citizen participation, with the support of the City of Tucson, to ensure the success of neighborhood programs, activities, and improvements. The policy for this goal was to promote the involvement of residents, non-profits, businesses, landlords, and organizations in the governance and activities of the neighborhood.

Chair Rex asked if there were any questions from Commission members and then announced the item was open for Public Hearing.

William Harlow, Chairman of the Miramonte neighborhood Plan Steering Committee stated he felt Ms. Roupp had said it all and made a great presentation. He said he felt the Committee did an excellent job on the plan and hard work did not necessarily mean it would be a great document, but in this case, he felt it was a good document. He said a great deal of time was spent on putting it together. He said he hoped it would be moved forward.

Ruth Beeker shared with the Commission a letter from a member of the Steering Committee who could not attend the meeting. She read a letter from Marigold Love stating that Ms. Love, six years ago, bought investment property on Palo Verde Boulevard in the Miramonte neighborhood. She said although the property was rundown, the location made it a good investment. All income on this property had been invested back into renovations and repairs and the small six apartment complex was becoming an asset to the neighborhood. She stated that the creation of the well thought out plan gave her a great deal of assurance that her investment would be protected as the neighborhood continued to grow through infill and renovations. It meant that the property would increase in value and would attract tenants that were desirable neighbors and an asset to the neighborhood. The plan encouraged sustainable landscaping, provided direction to and potentially opened a dialog with developers, addressed safety issues where people and traffic interfaced, and strived to maintain the values that had historically made this a desirable neighborhood. The opportunities to participate in this process, with the resources and support of the City of Tucson, had been an unexpected bonus to the investment. Ms. Beeker said Ms. Love looked forward to the adoption of the plan and the testing of its effectiveness as a tool of good growth in the City.

Ms. Beeker said she felt Ms. Love said it extremely well. This was what the Committee was working for. Putting this plan together gave them an extension of the people who were normally involved in the neighborhood. The neighborhood Board traditionally had been single family residential people who basically lived on Hawthorne Street. By putting this plan together, they were able to reach out to property owners, apartment owners and managers, and were working hard to address the points Ms. Roupp made. They were trying to make this a united community. To do that, they needed the neighborhood Plan and certainly needed the Commission to move it forward as quickly as possible so that they could begin to use it in an effective way.

Rick Bright of Bright Design Associates spoke regarding the final draft of the Sustainable Design Assistance Team. Over the summer, the team met numerous times to come up with the final draft. He felt each member of the Commission should have a copy of the draft and asked Mr. Elias to hand them out. Mr. Bright said, in terms of the Miramonte Plan, he liked that it addressed a lot of sustainable issues, it recognized that their needs to be density increase, walkable communities, green architecture, good design, and all the green sustainable issues. The *Plan* had a positive tone. Miramonte was a very satisfied neighborhood. He said the *Plan* was probably one of the best he had read and recommended its approval.

Linus Kafka, Principal Assistant City Attorney, stated his office had reviewed the document in full with an eye for preservation of policies and promoting the policies. He stated they had some minor modifications they were looking at with staff as it went forward to clarify the City's position and to maintain and preserve the neighborhood Association's autonomy. The modifications would be minor, but he wanted to alert the Commission.

Chair Rex asked when the modifications would be completed.

Mr. Kafka stated they were working with staff, but definitely before it went to the Mayor and Council.

Commissioner Patrick said the modifications sounded like it was a reiteration of current status of relationships.

Mr. Kafka stated it clarified current status of relationships and did not change in substantive provisions. He said he hoped it would legally make the *Plan* document stronger. He said there was some strategic implementation language that confused or mixed the City's role and neighborhood Association's role. He said they wanted to delineate that in a clearer fashion. The changes were not in the goal or policy portions of the document and should not affect them at all.

Ms. Roupp stated she spoke with the City Attorney's office and had sent the Steering Committing an email explaining the situation. She said the way she looked at it was in the situation where a couple of places the word "will" was used and could be changed to something a little less dogmatic in terms of the City's ability. She felt it was a really good point. She said there was a couple of places where the neighborhood's autonomy was important and a few places, if you put things in the neighborhood's by-laws, they would probably have an easier time seeing them through. She said her biggest concern, on behalf of the Steering Committee and the neighborhood, was that the intent and spirit was not going to change in any way and she was reassured that was the case.

Commissioner Patterson asked the members of the neighborhood Association present at the meeting if they were in any way involved in the discussions about the modifications and if they were comfortable with them.

Ms. Beeker stated that if being talked to five minutes before the meeting was being involved in it, then yes, although Ms. Roupp did contact them. She said she would

support what staff members said and did not feel there was anything being looked at that was of a substantive nature. She said she did not want the Miramonte Plan being held up.

Commissioner Patterson requested staff to be sure they involved the neighborhood in the revisions so that no one was surprised. He also mentioned the changing of the word "will" to something less dogmatic. He asked if this meant changing it to "may". He said sometimes changing the wording, in his view, could be substantial.

Ms. Roupp stated that the changes would be in cases where they could not obligate the City to something they could not be obligated to. She also stated that this was a prototype project and everyone was learning for the future.

Viola Romero-Wright, Principal Assistant City Attorney, stated there were a few areas which had been identified, where it appears that the City is dictating to the neighborhood Association what they will do. It binds them in the document and also ***under minds*** ~~binds~~ the validity of the document if it went to court because that was not the purpose of a specific plan. She stated the changes that would be made would be minor and still include the opportunity for the neighborhood to be involved, but not bind the neighborhood association to specific positions that they would be taking and requiring them to do certain things. She said staff wanted to bring this item to the Planning Commission before it went to the Mayor and Council.

Commissioner Maher said, if this was a prototype project available to two neighborhoods, he wondered if it would be made available to other neighborhoods, as well, as a prototype.

Ms. Roupp stated that was their hope. They would evaluate the process, look at the lessons learned, and hope that the process could be refined so that other neighborhoods could use it as well as the product. She said that other neighborhoods were so anxious to get going that they had already taken some of what had been learned from Miramonte.

Layne Bogulas stated he was fine with the document as it was, but if there were going to be changes, while staff says they were minor, he was not sure they were. He said he would like to see the final document because he was not comfortable with what the City would put in it now. He said he was more skeptical now than he was when he first walked into the building on what had transpired after the fact.

Chair Rex asked if there were any other speakers from the public or comments from the Commissioners.

It was moved by Commissioner Williams, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0 (Commissioner Cheney and Vice Chair Holland absent) to close the Public Hearing.

Chair Rex asked if there was any further discussion.

Commissioner Williams stated it was quite obvious from reading the document, that staff, neighborhoods, and the Drachman Institute, spent a lot of time and effort to come up with a product that everyone could be proud of. He applauded them and said he thought that more of these types of documents were needed. With these documents, the neighborhoods themselves could take more pride in their neighborhood, participate more, and he felt, all in all, the City would be better off by it.

It was moved by Commissioner Williams, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0 (Commissioner Cheney and Vice Chair Holland absent) to forward the Miramonte neighborhood Plan with the proposed changes being recommended by the City Attorney's office and in cooperation with the neighborhood to the Mayor and Council for approval.

5. NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION ZONE (NPZ) LUC AMENDMENT: (PUBLIC HEARING)

Adam Smith, Urban Planning and Development, Principal Planner, stated this was a presentation for Public Hearing. He said he wanted to start by providing some background information. He said since February 2007, when the Planning Commission took formal action, the Mayor and Council in April 2007, directed staff to work with stakeholders on developing a pilot overlay for an area within two miles of the University of Arizona (U of A). Between June and July staff met with the NPZ Committee six times. The Committee was comprised of approximately 25 people and included neighborhood representatives, infill developers and for advisory purposes, people from the U of A's planning staff. The objective of the meeting was to reach a consensus on specific policy directions; however, they were unable to do that. They did reach consensus on major problem areas, but as far as specific direction, they were unsuccessful. On July 10, 2007, the Mayor and Council directed staff to focus on recommendations for the U of A environs. In August, the Mayor and Council endorsed concepts of historic preservation and sustainable infill in the U of A environs. They also directed staff to ask eligible neighborhoods if they wanted to participate.

Mr. Smith said in a previous presentation he shared some maps with the Commission that showed the starting point for the pilot overlay. Through the NPZ Committee there was a working group within the Committee that recommended the pilot overlay be extended to the neighborhoods that were touched by the two mile radius. Mayor and Council then further refined it and limited it to those neighborhoods that had National Register Historic Districts or were eligible for the National Register. There were approximately twenty-two neighborhoods within two miles of the university who had the National Register historic status. Based on direction from August, the Mayor and Council then asked staff to go out and ask those neighborhoods if they were interested in participating in the overlay. He said as a result, there were twelve neighborhoods that expressed a willingness to at least consider it. He said the Mayor and Council ultimately selected Feldman's and Jefferson Park as the two pilot neighborhoods for the NPZ.

Mr. Smith said on October 23rd, the Mayor and Council directed staff to revise the NPZ to: 1) focus on historically designated neighborhoods with initiation by Mayor and Council only; 2) prepare neighborhood design manuals through a staff-facilitated

process for which Feldman's and Jefferson Park will be the first neighborhoods to do so; and 3) require applicable new construction to comply with the neighborhood design manual. neighborhoods eligible for the NPZ are those that are listed on the National Register, include a National Register Historic District, or are eligible for the district and have completed a nomination form. He said the Mayor and Council must initiate a neighborhood for the NPZ process. Design manuals will be prepared with the neighborhood facilitated workshop process. The manual will consist of sections defining design characteristics (overall characteristics of the neighborhood); a neighborhood preservation zone district map; examples of compatibility review criteria; and privacy mitigation standards, which would apply to applicable development for multi-story structures that are adjacent to single-story residents. He said the manual may also contain dimension, spatial, and access standards.

Mr. Smith stated these are things that the neighborhood would like to recommend: standards that are more or less restrictive in areas of setbacks, building heights, and access to the proposed site. Once the design manual has been completed and reviewed by City staff, a rezoning of the neighborhood will be initiated. The design manual will be included as a condition of the rezoning. It will follow the same notification and procedures of a typical rezoning; property owners and neighborhood associations are notified of the rezoning; a public hearing is held by the zoning examiner; and the Mayor and Council would make the final decision.

Mr. Smith stated that assuming the Mayor and Council adopts the rezoning and a neighborhood is now in the NPZ, a proposed development is zoned RX-1 or RX-2, R-1, R-2 or R-3, requires a building permit and is visible from the street unless the design professional rules that visibility is minimal, and the project is subject to the design manual and the compatibility review criteria. He also stated if a multi-story structure was being built next to single-story residents, the application would be reviewed for privacy mitigation. He said some examples of the types of projects that would trigger the NPZ are new residential construction, addition of a second story, accessory building or enclosure of a carport. The NPZ does not apply to interior remodeling and repairs, maintenance, or minor alternations to exterior, such as painting or replacing a front door.

Mr. Smith said certain types of development within adopted NPZs would have to comply with the design manual and compatibility review criteria. He said the compatibility review criteria includes scale and proportion, architectural style, spatial relationships, and privacy mitigation. The defining characteristics of the contributing properties to a historic district in surrounding areas of the proposed project would used in determining compatibility. He said the compatibility review criteria raised a good question as to "what does compatibility mean?" He said since the new projects were going to be reviewed for it, it was very important to have a clear understanding of what the commission was talking about. He said compatibility, first and foremost, did not have to be a repetition or copy of those contributing properties within the development zone. It did have to be visually consistent.

Mr. Smith stated to assist with the process, the City would have to either hire or be in a contract with a design professional who is a registered architect with historical preservation experience. This person would work with the applicant or applicant's

architect in determining the applicable defining design characteristics and compatibility review criteria. He would also review the application for a building permit and then forward a recommendation to the Planning Director within ten working days.

Mr. Smith reviewed with the Commission the review and approval procedures for projects within adopted NPZs. He said if the proposed project meets the applicability requirements of the ordinance, it then goes into a pre-application conference with a design professional. If a satisfactory application were submitted, the City would accept it, and then it would go in for compatibility review done by the design professional, and a recommendation would be forwarded to the director within ten days; the director then approves or denies the application. If approved, the application goes to the building permit review process. If it is denied, there are two options: 1) the applicant can re-design and re-submit, which goes back to the design professional and starts right back through the cycle; or 2) the applicant can choose to appeal the director's decision to the design review board. If none of these items applies to a project, it goes directly to the building permit review process.

Mr. Smith said there were some important comments made by Commission members within the last few months. He said one was a general disagreement with the change of direction since February 2007. Another comment was that this was a very small step in protecting neighborhoods, should not be limited to neighborhoods with National Register Historic District status only, and should apply City-wide regardless of historic status. He said concern was expressed that the design compatibility should be extended to the exterior of the whole unit and not just to the portion seen from the street, and that the process would take too long to get protection for other neighborhoods.

Mr. Smith reviewed stakeholder comments. He said a member of the Committee stated projects should be reviewed by a neighborhood board. He said it was the Committee members' feeling that by requiring a review by a neighborhood board, it would bring a greater balance to the enforcement of the ordinance. Other comments were: prolonged development review time adds expense to the projects; dimensional requirements should/should not be mandatory, NPZ lacks incentives; more questions about what compatibility means; importance of getting something in place right away; privacy mitigation already covered in existing setback requirements; and maintain low-density development pattern in central city.

Mr. Smith said, in response to an e-mail he received from a Committee member who was interested in seeing revisions made since the January draft, there was a re-ordering of several sections to create more coherent links between the applicability of the ordinance, the design manual, and the review for compatibility. He said one addition to the ordinance was that it now allows neighborhoods to recommend privacy mitigation measures and access standards. Time frames for compatibility review have been added, and various clarifications including applicability of privacy mitigation, and the design manual would become a condition of rezoning to the NPZ.

Mr. Smith said in his overall assessment, the changes that had been made since January did not significantly differ in concept, approach, or applicability from what was communicated to the NPZ Committee. He said as far as the timeline, staff's hope was to

present the NPZ to the Mayor and Council in May, and in late May begin the design manual process with the Feldman's neighborhood. In August, the design process would begin for the Jefferson Park neighborhood. He said the reason for the later starting time for Jefferson Park was because they were in the process of contracting with a consultant, and still had to put together an inventory as part of their National Historic district application, which was anticipated to be completed by mid-summer.

Commissioner Williams asked a question about the design manual. He said not much discussion was held about what the manual would contain. He said an illustration was shown on what compatibility meant. However, the document did not have the pictures in it. He asked if it was the intent to have the pictures be part of the manual.

Mr. Smith stated that the design manual would be highly illustrative. The consultant that the City hired would be an architect with historic preservation experience and would put diagrams, illustrations and photographs within the document to show, not only the overall neighborhood character, but examples of the compatibility review criteria.

Commissioner Williams asked if the compatibility meant illustrations would be neighborhood-specific.

Mr. Smith stated it would be, to the greatest extent possible.

Commissioner Patrick said towards the end of the presentation, there were three slides that showed the Planning Commission and stakeholder comments, and responses to a phone call received by Mr. Smith. He said he wanted to know why Mr. Smith had not responded to the questions by the stakeholders or the Commissioners.

Mr. Smith stated staff felt most of the Commissioners' comments were more philosophical in nature, and in some ways, in directions that were contrary to directives given by the Mayor and Council. He asked if there were comments in particular that needed to be addressed.

Commissioner Patrick stated if staff was not going to respond to comments made by the Commissioners, then he did not understand why they were having a hearing at all.

Mr. Smith stated he would be happy to respond to each comment. He said in the first comment, change of direction since February 2007, the Mayor and Council gave staff direction over the last year on how they wanted the ordinance revised. He said the draft presented to the Commission reflected the change of direction.

Commissioner Patrick stated it has been a fairly strong concern of the Commission as to what the reasons were for the change in direction. He asked what the reasoning was as to why it was changed. He said he understood it came from the Mayor and Council, but that there had to have been some discussion.

Jim Mazzocco, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator, stated there was a spirited discussion about the 2007 draft ordinance that went before the Mayor and Council.

When it went before them, staff recommended approval of the document. He said up to that point, the public hearing before the Commission was pretty benign, with a lot of people showing up from the neighborhoods in support of it and maybe one person against it. He said that was a completely different dynamic in front of the Mayor and Council. Quite a few people showed up and were upset, mainly from the development community, and the charge that was being leveled against that particular draft was that it was more about an inappropriate development type of overlay. He said it could be applied very broadly and could be applied for new development. The Mayor and Council then had a discussion about what they were really concerned about such as the area around the university. The Council could have voted up or down on the 2007 ordinance, but made the decision to start looking at the area around the university. He said that was where the pilot overlay was created. It was a two mile area around the university. It was the area where all the oldest annexations of the City had occurred back in the 1950's and a couple from the 1960's. The other fact was that this was where all the oldest neighborhoods of Tucson were occurring. In fact, there were twenty-two neighborhoods that had some type of historic certification within the area. He said that was another issue that started to move it in a slightly different direction in that the Council now wanted staff to study that area and use it as the basis for creating the new neighborhood Preservation Zone. Those were the dynamics that started moving the process to where it was now and why it started focusing on historic preservation in a more focused manner than the last one which was much broader. It had historic preservation as one of the elements, but it was very broad as to what neighborhood compatibility analysis entailed. He said no one really new what that meant; it was assumed it had a historic sense to it. But when staff got the direction from the Council, it became more focused. There were neighborhoods who already had a lot of certification done on them, and that was why it took the direction that it did.

Commissioner Patrick stated he thoroughly understood the building and development community being concerned about being half-way through a project and all of a sudden you have a couple of people you sold houses to, that want to stop the entire project so that they can have vacant lot parks in the neighborhood. He said he felt what the Commission's concern was that there were a vast number of neighborhoods in the community that are not historic in nature, which to be in the historic register, the predominance of the structures have to be over fifty years old. There are neighborhoods that are becoming elderly and becoming long in the tooth and the people living there want to do something about preserving what the neighborhood had been for the last twenty to thirty years, but are not historic by the historic register standpoint. He said that was what the concern had been by the Commission and that the original ordinance was an extraordinarily good ordinance to protect the character of neighborhoods and to try and preserve them from the decline of what happens when they get to be twenty to thirty years old. He said he was disappointed when that concept was abandoned and went to a pure historic zone, which is effectively what this document is and not a neighborhood protection zone.

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, said staff recommended approval of the ordinance when it went to the Mayor and Council back in March 2007. He said it was clear the Council disagreed with the recommendation and since that time, they have continued to refine their direction. There has been five different discussions regarding this and in each of the discussions there were refining comments and further

direction given to staff to organize it around the historic districts, organize it around the university area and organize it around a design manual as opposed to broader concepts of compatibility. The Mayor and Council really asked staff to hone in on the design manual concept, look carefully at what the criteria used would be, and make sure they were crafted based on a specific neighborhood. He said none of that was in the original ordinance and felt it was an advancement that had occurred. He said this current ordinance, for which the public hearing was being held, laid out in a clearer way some of the minimum things staff wanted to get in a design manual and yet have an opportunity to interact with members of the neighborhood to try and find out what should be included in the manual.

Commissioner Patrick stated that the design manual concept was something that was appropriate for the preservation of the historic neighborhood. It was one of the central elements of the existing historic zone. The existing historic zone puts a totally wrong time in the process which was one of the reasons the ordinance did not work. He said it was not necessarily appropriate to a newer neighborhood. He said he felt the original ordinance was one of the best that he had seen and been involved in. He said that was his disappointment because of the amount of time put into it and was very carefully considered and recommended by the Commission. He said now they were doing something that he felt was not appropriate in designing an ordinance for one or two neighborhoods and calling it a city-wide ordinance. He said he thought it was extraordinarily valid, a valid historic zone, but did not feel it was appropriate in meeting the goals the Commission was originally charged with to do a neighborhood protection zone.

Chair Rex asked what was different or changes made in the staff's process to make sure that when they got to the Mayor and Council they did not end up in the same place as the last version of the NPZ.

Mr. Elias stated there had been quite a bit of clarifying discussions with the Mayor and Council. Many had been Study Session discussions, some at the sub-committee level, and some with individual Council members. He said in addition to those discussions, there had been discussions with the NPZ committee. He said there was also an emphasis put on the operational side of things. Collectively, he felt this helped guide staff in a way they believed they were trying to present an ordinance that was consistent with the direction given by the Mayor and Council. He said it also had an opportunity for discussion by community members.

Chair Rex asked about how the Department of Development Services (DSD) was going to execute the process in particular. She asked how the developer would know, when they came in for a project, that this particular neighborhood had an NPZ, or at the same time, how would anyone coming in to DSD know. She also wanted to know more about the mechanics and how the whole process would be communicated.

Mr. Mazzocco stated that the first step, after an NPZ was placed on a neighborhood, zoning maps would change so that anybody looking at a zoning map would know right away that there was something different than a regular R-1 zone. Anyone coming in for a permit will set up a system with DSD to refer that person to the

planning department to present their material either at a pre-meeting with the design professional and follow up with an application submitted to the design professional for that person to go over their materials and compare it with the design manual. The design professional would then write a report to the planning director with findings that the planning director could approve, deny, or send back. If it was approved, then it would be forwarded to DSD. When there were issues, staff would make sure they were in contact with DSD so that the applicant did not get caught in the middle.

Mr. Smith added once an NPZ was adopted, as a public education component, staff could meet with members of American Institute of Architects (AIA), Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA), and Tucson Realtors Association. He said the property owners in the neighborhood would be notified throughout the process, be made aware that the NPZ was in place, and invited to attend the neighborhood meetings.

Craig Gross, Development Services Department Deputy Director, said over the last couple of years, DSD, had created an extremely extensive mapping project that goes far beyond the zoning code maps. What currently happens, once a district is formed, DSD creates a shaped file. A shaped file outlines not only the outside but the individual parcels within it. He explained a name is given to it that becomes associated with each and everyone of those addresses and parcels within that particular district. The City uses a program called Property Records Online (PRO) which details out what the zoning is, what plan you are in, and what overlay is involved with that particular piece of property. Each one of those addresses, each tax code, each parcel would have this attached to it. Individual property owners can go in and see what they are in. The overlay will link directly to the particular neighborhood preservation zone.

Chair Rex asked if these were the same maps that showed up on the Pima County website.

Mr. Gross responded affirmatively and that it was all part of the PRO Project.

Commissioner Sullivan said it was stated that one of the reasons the Mayor and Council changed direction to focus more on the preservation aspect was because of opposition from the development community. He asked if staff had received any indication from development stakeholders that they would support or oppose this compromise once it went to the Mayor and Council.

Mr. Elias said to go back to that point in time when the Mayor and Council had those discussions at the Public Hearing. One of the things they heard that was quite disturbing was the anecdotal comments about how someone in a one year old subdivision could create an NPZ and prevent the neighbors next to them from building something if they wanted to. He said there were a number of concerns along those lines that were voiced. Since that time, as the scope of the NPZ has evolved, and now that the focus is on historic preservation, the nature of the comments by the development community has changed as well. He said staff was not hearing from the national home builders anymore, but from property owners in the historic districts. He said he did not want to lead the Commission into believing all the builders were in support of the NPZ, but did think the

nature of the opposition had changed. It was more appropriately being focused on individual property owners within the historic districts, while before, they were hearing from national home builders, mortgage companies, and realtor associations. He said that that had dropped off.

Commissioner Maher said he wanted to compliment a few of the issues. One was the timeline in terms of getting this expedited and in process. In addition, it was his impression, with some of the language, that some of the historic districts and neighborhoods did have a number of two-story homes, normal two-story homes that are stacked, unlike in the current zoning code, where you have to use a different set back for each floor which creates a pyramid affect. He said he assumed in the document that the language allowed this, with the director's consent, for the creation of normal two-stories, or if two-stories are next to two-stories. He said he was also happy that there would be extensive graphics in the upcoming manuals. Lastly he said, the neighborhoods being discussed around the university are beyond historic; they were in a more unique category. He said in his mind they were unique areas that needed to be saved for future generations and we were basically trading character for density. The traditions of those neighborhoods were what were being looked at. He said he did not believe this to be a limiting type of ordinance. He said he thought it would help celebrate the neighborhoods.

Chair Rex asked for further comments by the Commission. Hearing none, she stated that the Public Hearing was now open.

Rick Bright stated he had some real concerns with the direction the NPZ was headed. He said when he read through it, he got the sense that it was trying to maintain the current density in the neighborhoods which was, by and large, under what is permitted in the current zoning code. He said if the City was going to be sustainable, the City would have to accommodate some density because if it is not built in the inner-city it is going to be built out thirty or forty miles from downtown Tucson. He said the City needed to be realistic and consider that. His concern was that it was not sustainable, sustainable was not even mentioned, there were not any sustainable goals or policies mentioned in the ordinance. He said, as a practitioner, he had concerns on the way requirements were being layered on top of each other. He said a privacy mitigation plan needed to be done. He said if you read the current Land Use Code (LUC), the building set back, one of the purposes of it was privacy for adjacent property owners. He said now there was a prescriptive requirement that addressed privacy supposedly, layer on top of that a performance requirement that addressed privacy, then maybe we should be looking at the current requirement and ask the question, "does the current setback requirement really address privacy concerns instead of adding another layer." He said what he saw was layer upon layer upon layer of requirements. As a practitioner it looked pretty daunting. He said he did not know what would be accomplished by adding layer upon layer. He said it seemed to be protecting one group from another and if he looked at it from a neighborhood perspective, it was not a positive experience. He said the City was asking the neighborhoods to go through a lot of work to come up with all the design guidelines and policies and then just turn it over to staff. From that point, they would have no say in the process. He said he felt the biggest problem was that the development community typically did not talk with the neighborhood community. There was no process to do that. Hopefully, there was discussion with the neighborhoods before

project moved forward. It was just assumed it would go under the radar and try to get the project permitted and built. He said the development community should be going to the neighborhoods but there was no mechanism for it. He said they were all fearful that their project would be delayed for a year or two and it was completely uncertain as to what would happen as soon as they approached the neighborhood. He said there was no trust between the development community, city staff, and the neighborhoods. He said he felt there was a need to get rid of the overlay of requirement upon requirement upon requirement and focus on a process that got the development community talking to the neighborhoods. He said maybe one way to do it was to look at the proposed design professional. The way it was currently written, he was not quite sure how it worked into the whole process; was it a full time position or a consultant and what if the consultant had a conflict with a particular project, would another consultant be hired. He asked how much authority and discussion the design professional had. He said maybe the design professional should facilitate a process where the development community was talking with the neighborhood. He said he felt the City was headed in the wrong direction, trying to protect one group from another, isolate one group from another, when in actuality the groups should be talking with each other and working on the issues.

Brad Rollings, Board of Directors, El Encanto Estates Homeowner's Association, stated he was not representing the association, but was emailed by one of the members with considerations and concerns he had and felt he should be present at the meeting to voice them. He asked if there was a problem for El Encanto Estates to participate in the NPZ. He said they were not formerly constituted as a neighborhood in the view of the City, but asked if the Mayor and Council would ignore it and was it important for them to rectify it if they wanted to participate in the NPZ. He said the association had opted in as one of the areas that were nationally recognized as a historic district. He said another comment was that the design professional had almost total power once the design manual has been formulated. Neighbors are essentially excluded and have little time, ten to fifteen days, to assess a development proposal. He said no avenue for expressing their views, except perhaps informally to the design professional. He also stated the decision of the design professional could be usefully appealed except by the applicant. An appeal procedure ending with the Board of Adjustments was of dubious value, except for the applicant. He said it should be possible to bump an appeal up to the Mayor and Council in the case of a numerically strong neighborhood complaint. He said he did not see that neighborhood organizations or residents have a standing for an appeal. He said there appears to be no mechanism for review and re-write of the design manual. He said the NPZ seemed to be narrowly targeted at architectural style and spatial relationships, scale, and open spaces. He said he did not see that the NPZ and design manual enter into rezoning decisions. The design manual would be relevant to a rezoning and the NPZ should offer more protection than after the fact mitigation. He said he hoped these considerations were relevant, not only to the El Encanto neighborhood but to others as well.

Bob Schlanger, Vice-President of the Jefferson Park neighborhood Association, stated he sat in on the NPZ's stakeholders committee. He said he had two things he would like to see changed in the ordinance. He said both issues were brought up at the last NPZ stakeholders meeting. One was that the O-1 zone was left out of the NPZ. He said he thought that was a very critical point to include. In Jefferson Park, the

predominant use of property, predominant zoning along Grant, was R-1. All the houses are residential and there was very little commercial use along that stretch of Grant. He said O-1 was a pretty good use and has to maintain residential character. He said the association felt it was good use and that not many people would want to live along Grant, especially when the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) got done with it. He said he felt the O-1 needed to be included; otherwise they would have to fight any potential rezoning to O-1 because it would fall outside of their control as far as keeping the historic nature of those houses intact. He said the other item he wanted to discuss was that the association needed some input in the design process. The association could not sit there and wait to see what comes out of the ground to see what it would look like. He said, with everything the association had been fighting for the last six years to maintain the integrity of their neighborhoods, to ask them to trust them, was a stretch. Somehow he said, the association needed input into the review process. The association was not looking to prolong the process and realized time was of the essence for anybody that was building. He said it was a pilot project for the two neighborhoods and he for one was willing to put together a committee from Jefferson Park who could, on a moment's notice, couple of days, maybe somewhere in the ten day period between when the review is done and brought forward, to meet and have input. He said this was not a perfect plan, but it was something that had been under attack for quite a while. He said he could not watch his neighborhood continue to erode the way things were going, they needed some tools to help protect them. He said as imperfect as the NPZ was, he recommended passing it as quickly as possible.

Dyer Lytle, a representative of Jefferson Park neighborhood, stated he recommended that the Commission support the NPZ and as Mr. Schlanger said the association had been working on it for quite a while. He said it needed to be moved forward or there would not be anything to preserve.

Alice Roe stated she lived in the same house for thirty-two years and she had seen a lot. She was also on the stakeholders committee and attended all the meetings last summer and in January. She stated she has spent many years volunteering in her neighborhood association to nurture and maintain the sense of community that makes for a stable neighborhood. There were many changes over the years and some were quite positive as people upgraded their homes. There were also changes due to the expansion of the University of Arizona (U of A) and lack of student housing on campus. She said they have remained a quiet neighborhood until recently. They were seeing more undergraduate occupied homes now. She stated she believed that the NPZ, even as it was truncated from its original inception, may help their neighborhood which she said they needed. She said over the last year, she has seen an out-of-state investor purchasing the smaller homes, eleven hundred-twelve hundred square foot homes. She said the neighborhood was seeing, as fast as permits could be pulled, the investor double or more the sizes of the homes. So far, there were seven properties purchased from this investor within her neighborhood. She said the same investor had bought three properties in Catalina Vista, two in Sam Hughes and four in Jefferson Park. She said, in her neighborhood, the investor was now advertising the homes for student rentals with four to six bedrooms or with a rear house, not yet built, that would make for a total of five bedrooms. In Jefferson Park, she said there was one property advertised that would have eight bedrooms between the two houses on the property. She said her fear was that they

were loosing the advantage of being the owner/occupier of a historic district. She said these were all historic district contributors. Property tax breaks were only available to the owner/occupier of a national historic contributing property. She said she believed that home ownership lends stability to her neighborhood and the City. The evidence so far is to the outside investors does not keep the homes' historic integrity and with their plans to renovate, upgrade, and convert to student rentals.

Ms. Roe said this was a loss to future owner/occupied homes. She asked what family, in this day and age, would want a six bedroom home on a relatively small lot when the investor decided to sell. She said she had no illusions. She said the NPZ would not prevent rentals nor would it prevent the transit nature of their student neighbors. She said she hoped that they could at least maintain a neighborhood that would continue to be relatively stable and a good place to live for those that were well beyond their student years, but appreciate their proximity to the U of A and to the center of Tucson. She said she urged the Commission to try to get the NPZ passed.

Chair Rex asked if there was anyone else wishing to speak on the item. She asked if there was further discussion from the Commission.

Commissioner Williams stated he heard various concerns on the ordinance and also had one of his own. He said he spoke to Mr. Mazzocco about written findings being provided by the design professional. He said he felt it was an important aspect of the NPZ. He said the design professional would be using the criteria list to come up with recommendations as to what needed to be done. He said, when it was all said and done, there were no requirements for written findings of what he finds in order for the DSD director to make any decisions. He stated on page 4, last paragraph, it talked about "upon a finding by the director" and he was not sure what a finding meant. He asked if that meant the design professional could make a decision based on one criteria.

Mr. Kafka said he did not know if on page 5, Item 2.11.8 of the NPZ, addressed Mr. Williams' question. Section 2 of the provision specified the design professional shall submit a report with findings and recommendation to the director.

Mr. Mazzocco stated the issue about findings was very common in zoning language and that all singular references are plural and vice versa, so it was not really an issue.

Chair Rex said on the bottom of page 4 of the ordinance, it made reference to 2.8.11.7.b.2.a and that there was no such thing.

Mr. Smith stated it was a scrivener's error and should read refer back to 2.8.11.7.b.1.a.

Commissioner Maher stated he felt the communication and dialogue from the neighborhood was the design manual stating what they liked in some sort of process. He said with the design professional trying to implement those elements, he assumed that at some point a talented design professional would probably ask the neighborhood how he

should handle some of the items should he make a presentation to the neighborhood board.

Mr. Mazzocco stated he felt Commissioner Maher was correct. He said when this was directed by the Mayor and Council, they requested that there be a facilitated workshop process with notification to the neighborhood allowing them to participate in the creation of the design manual. He said there was a balancing act going on of participation and a streamline process and having a neutral party make the decision was part of that, a party who had historic background, had design background, and would make the decision. He said any decision that person and the director made was still appealable if it was not in compliance with the design manual. A neighborhood representative or property owner in a neighborhood could appeal the decision. He said there was not a complete removal of appeal from a neighborhood on any building permit. He said that was not something new, that it was there today.

Commissioner Patrick asked if there was a problem in having the association or associations within a district notified at the same time the design professional was notified so that the neighborhood could respond to the UPD director. He said that way the director would have the neighborhood's input and the design professional's input and could make a decision to either approve it or tell someone to do a little bit more work on it.

Mr. Mazzocco stated it was possible. He said they did a study for Feldman's in 2006. He said there were approximately ninety-three permits out there, not just replacements of primary structures, but all the permits. He said the question was did the Commission want a process where everybody in the neighborhood had to know about who was building a carport or something of that nature. He said hopefully the City had set the standard and now had a process to implement them.

Commissioner Patrick stated that the design professional's function was not to approve what was being submitted. The design professional's job was to determine the consistency with the design manual already in place.

Commissioner Sullivan asked if there was a legal barrier in providing an additional layer for an appeal process that would go to the Mayor and Council.

Mr. Mazzocco stated staff created a process of appeal first to the Design Review Board, which was a board of architects, to review the director's decision on an item. That could also be appealed to the Board of Adjustments. He said staff felt the first level of appeal should be to a group of designers and that was how it was set up. He said to include the Mayor and Council in the process was a statute issue.

Mr. Kafka stated he was not sure there was a barrier, but said he thought the way it was designed and set up was that it ***tracked*** ~~attracted~~ the other review procedures in the procedures ordinance so that there was some equity between different types of review processes. He said he thought the intent was for it to mirror the other review processes and track them equally.

Commissioner Patrick stated he thought it was appropriate to do it that way. He said the purpose of the Board of Adjustments, by city ordinance and State statutes, was to review and make decisions on compatibility issues with the zoning code. He said when the NPZ and its design manual is adopted it becomes zoning ordinance and the conflict or question really becomes a conflict or question over the word zoning. He said that was why the Board of Adjustments was set up.

Commissioner Williams stated he felt Mr. Bright had an important point as well. He said Mr. Bright mentioned when it was all said and done and set in a neighborhood, when a developer came in wanting to do some adjustments on houses, there needed to be a dialogue process between the development community and the neighborhood to try and get something that was compatible. He said he knew that the document was all set and done, drafted with illustrations, but it was always helpful when the developer could come in and talk with the neighborhood and explain what was going on to get their buy in. He said that way there were not two sides butting heads against each other in the process. He asked if anything of this sort could be incorporated.

Mr. Elias stated he agreed with Commissioner Williams' comments. He said it was always more productive when area residents and a builder or developer could have dialogue early on before they even design anything to hash things out and get a sense of expectations. He said what staff tried to do with the draft ordinance was establish a framework. He said he liked to refer to it as a peer review, where a design professional, representing the implementation of the design manual, which basically came out of a community process, works with a design professional for the applicant. The idea was that an architect would be talking with an architect most specifically about how to translate what the design manual said about the design esthetic of a particular area to a particular project. He said that was a bit different than having what everyone was more familiar with, developers and neighbors talking about a specific project. He said he thought staff was trying to go for something a little bit different. He said there was not anything in the ordinance that would discourage that, and we were not mandating that type of thing that would typically be found in a rezoning process. He said it was because there was heavy emphasis during the NPZ on the whole idea of compatibility and making it driven by facts. He said he talked with design professionals, who stated they had nothing against him personally, but said he was not an architect. They wanted to have architect to architect dialogue if the City was going to look at their project from the perspective of the design characteristics of an area. He said that had been their approach. It was good to have that type of dialogue, but it was not mandated in the ordinance because what staff was trying to require was design professional to design professional type of peer review.

Chair Rex stated that it was not necessary to have an architect on a residential project and it could be conceivable that the applicant would have a drafting service and would be representing themselves. She asked if ***the latter*** ~~that~~ was anticipate.

Mr. Elias said he probably should have used the term design professional to design professional because there were people who were not registered architects but had considerable design expertise and who he would consider design professionals. He said with regard to the design professional, as referenced in the ordinance, staff was

specifically identifying the individual who would work on this for the City to be a registered architect with background in historic preservation and historic compatibility issues.

Commissioner Patrick asked about O-1 zone. He said there was a comment about not having an O-1 zone. He said it seemed to him it was a valid comment and should be included as one of the applicable zones.

Mr. Elias stated one of the reasons the O-1 zone was not included was because it was a non-residential land use. He said if you looked at the O-1 zone, there were already some criteria in the O-1 zone that said you could only use this zone if you had a residentially scaled office. He said the second point was that an O-1 zone was almost always a rezoning. He said the City has not had someone demo a home on an existing O-1 zone lot and redeveloping it with a residentially scaled office. He said what they did see were residentially zoned homes on major streets being rezoned to the O-1 zone and converted into office use.

Commissioner Patrick asked if a house that was already in a neighborhood protection zone would it not already apply. He said the issue was the compatibility of a residentially appearing office building. He asked what the difference was between that and a residential appearing residence with having the same architectural controls that came out of the NPZ. He asked if it would not be appropriate to include the O-1 zone.

Mr. Elias stated he did not feel it would be problematic. He said he was trying to explain what staff did with the O-1 zone years ago when it was adopted.

Mr. Mazzocco stated if there was a rezoning to O-1, there could actually be a rezoning condition that would comply with the design manual.

Commissioner Patrick said one other question he had heard from the comments was that there was no provision for revising the design manual.

Mr. Mazzoco stated he heard that and there was a provision in the ordinance that allowed for modification of the NPZ which would include the design manual. He said it did not go into a lot of detail, but it was there.

Chair Rex asked, as a follow-up to the question on the O-1 zoning, could it be in the design manual that any rezoning would have to have, as a condition, that the overlay continue to apply regardless of the zone it was rezoned to whether O-1, Commercial, or others. She asked if it could be part of the design manual.

Mr. Elias responded affirmatively.

Commissioner Maher asked, on the same subject, would a NPZ rezoning also cover property along a major boulevard. He said there were a lot of houses on major arterials that really should not be residential, and should be rezoned.

Mr. Mazzocco stated, as it currently stood, it applied to nationally historic registered districts. If the property were in that district, they would be included. If they were rezoned, it could still be a condition that they comply with the design manual.

It was moved by Commissioner Patrick, duly seconded, and passed by a voice of 9 to 0 to close the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Patrick stated he would like to make a motion. He said the motion would be justified on the concepts discussed. He stated the ordinance before the Commission was really a historic zone ordinance, and he did not consider it to be a community-wide preservation ordinance. He said he did not think the existing historic zone in the Tucson Code had been used in almost twenty years. He said the reason was because it was a bad ordinance and it did not work well. He said he had experience with it professionally and it was awful.

It was moved by Commissioner Patrick, seconded by Commissioner Patterson, to: 1) recommend to the Mayor and Council that they abandon current section, 2.8.8, of the Land Use Code which is the existing Historic Preservation Zone and replace it with the ordinance presented to the Commission but change the name to a historic preservation ordinance, 2) recommend that the Mayor and Council adopt the ordinance recommended to them in February 2007, as section 2.8.7 and add a requirement that it would be an amendment and a qualifying element for an area to be considered a neighborhood protection zone and that the majority of the residential structures in a proposed neighborhood protection zone be at least ten years old and that eighty percent of the property within the zone was already developed.

Chair Rex asked if there was any discussion. Lengthy discussion ensued by the Commission on the exact wording for the motion.

Commissioner Patrick revised his motion with the approval of Commissioner Patrick to read: 1) Adopt the current version of the neighborhood Preservation Zone (NPZ) and rename it to the Historic Preservation Zone (HPZ), 2) Remand the version of the NPZ approved by the Planning Commission on February 7, 2007, for reconsideration, 3) Amend the February 7, 2007 draft of the NPZ to require that eligible neighborhoods must be at least eighty percent developed and comprised of housing stock that is at least ten years old, and 4) Remand the existing HPZ ordinance which is currently 2.8.8 of the Land Use Code (LUC), to the Planning Commission for possible deletion from the LUC. The motion passed by a voice vote of 9 to 0 (Commissioner Cheney and Vice Chair Holland absent).

RECESS: 9:18 p.m.

RECONVENE: 9:30 p.m.

Chair Rex called the meeting to order and those present and absent were:

Present:

Joseph Maher, Jr.	Member at Large, Ward 6
Shannon McBride-Olson	Member, Ward 2
Robert Patrick	Member, Mayor's Office
Daniel R. Patterson	Member, Ward 5
Catherine Applegate Rex, Chair	Member at Large, Ward 5
Sean Sullivan	Member at Large, Ward 3
James E. Watson	Member, Ward 4
Daniel J. Williams	Member, Ward 1
Craig Wissler	Member, Ward 3

Absent/Excused

Eric R. Cheney	Member at Large, Ward 2
Brad Holland, Vice Chair	Member, Ward 6

6. SOUTHLANDS PLANNING UPDATE (INFORMATION ITEM)

Chris Kaselemis, Urban Planning and Design, Planning Administrator, gave an overview of the Southlands planning issues. He spoke about:

- two regional planning issues that were currently going on:
  - Pima Association of Governments regional planning effort
  - Water Infra-Structure, Supply and Planning Study
- Southlands Foundation Study being conducted by students at the University of Arizona (U of A).

Carol Evans spoke about her part of the Southlands Foundation Study student project. Three students from the program; Vince Vasquez, Aaron Ling, and Ronnie Olson, gave a Powerpoint presentation and detailed information on the study.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Mayor and Council Update

Albert Elias, Urban Planning and Design, Director, stated the Santa Cruz Area Plan Amendment for commercial land use along Silverbell was approved at the Mayor and Council meeting held on March 25, 2008.

b. Other Planning Commission Items (Future agenda items for discussion/assignments)

None

8. CALL TO THE AUDIENCE

9. ADJOURNMENT: 10:06 p.m.