

Meeting Notes from June 10, 2019 Stakeholder Meeting related to the proposed UDC Text Amendment to allow for a Concurrent Plan Amendment / Rezoning Process

The Stakeholder Meeting began with each attendee introducing themselves and then a brief presentation by Staff to provide some background information related to the issue. Staff's presentation was organized into the following sections:

- Background information related to the issue
- Existing Process for Plan Amendments and Rezonings
- State Statutes related to Plan Amendments and Rezonings
- Data related to how many Plan Amendments and Rezonings we have had since 2010
- What is done in other municipalities
- Potential Options moving forward and some pros and cons of each
- Example of how a previous case would work under the concurrent process

Comments received from the stakeholder group were the following:

- The proposal given to Mayor and Council is not truly concurrent. For it to be concurrent, the neighborhood meetings should be combined where the Plan Amendment and Rezoning can be discussed together.
- It was stated that there is precedent for combining meetings – for example, the Blind Tiger was a combined meeting.
- Important to have the same amount of public hearings – this is critically important after the state change related to the tabulation of protests and the super majority trigger.
- It is important to provide education as many residents don't know what an area or neighborhood plan is. Neighborhoods need more time in whatever option to research their specific plan.
- It is important that this is optional - maybe there should be a staff approval of the proposal.
- When this was presented to the Planning Commission last time, it was the developer who had the option. Neighborhood needs to be informed and be a part of the decision.
- Pima County has made it more concurrent – I prefer taking option 1. No-one really wants option 2 - Option 1 doesn't take away any options from the neighborhood - costs are a big deal for a developer – we need to consider this.
- Area and Neighborhood plans are really only about Rezonings - Guidance in that plan - Having people to have the ability to have a say – these are the only protections in the Zoning Code - make sure we keep the ability to protect people from.

- TRRG has put together a position paper on this. Not against this idea, but concerned about neighborhoods. Have in here a sequence of neighborhood meetings. First informational, second the community comes back and has a conversation.
- Can the informational meeting be conducted by staff - would like to have staff at the meeting. First meeting could be held by the staff - making people aware of what is going on - what is their plan. People don't feel they got an accurate picture of what they. Look at what Oro Valley does for neighborhood meetings.
- Like that the current pattern is being held - build in checks and balances to the process. WE should keep both reviews as the two boards are entirely different skillsets. The process should be staggered and should have two neighborhood meetings. Have a trigger for the second meeting. Understand that the zoning may expire, but not the plan amendment. No less than 30 days to stagger – addresses the problem with the appeal period. Give time to fix things that may not have been addressed the first time. All these meetings would be helped if city staff is present. Look at a process that looks at the worst case scenario. Speed it up, but allow for meaningful neighborhood meeting.
- We need for education of the neighborhood and residents.
- What happens if PA is approved and RZ is denied? In this one unique situation how do we deal with the PA on this. Can we create a way to revert the PA if the RZ is denied?
- Initial meeting is a difficult public meeting. Any process added adds cost is a problem too that extra cost comes out of a potentially better design.
- There are actually rezonings that are not controversial - even in those we generally have multiple meetings. Caution against regulating extra meetings. Option 1 provides an extra level of scrutiny. Study Session be a joint meeting between the ZE and PC -
- Option 1 seems like the best option. Need to be cautious with what we do. There is the opportunity for staff to educate the public and neighborhoods, for staff to be more proactive with neighborhood liaisons. May be good options for this - may want to look at Oro Valley. Have a whole complete process. Most developers don't want a contentious process.
- Would like to have the ward office at meetings.
- I agree with a lot of the comments that have been made - have worked with developers over the years - good understanding that neighborhood meetings are important. While at sun corridor - speed to market is a big issue for big companies. Would think twice if the process was not a sure process - have pre-meetings set-up.
- Agree with Ruth - educational meeting beforehand - it is a complicated issue. As much communication as the developers may have helps to provide. Like the idea of streamlining.
- Personal experience with Plan Amendments and Rezonings is not good. The real action is behind the scenes. Hesitant to ask staff go to more meetings. Not sure what can be done to

make the neighborhood process useful. Summary doesn't lead to constructive. Hesitant to recommend more meetings.

- If this is an option that speeds things up, why can't we ask for something in return.
- Ultimately neighborhoods don't have a solid team to go and deal with this – need time to understand.