



COUNCIL MINUTES

September 24, 2020

The City Council of the City of Mesa met in a Study Session Meeting via a virtual format streamed into the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, on September 24, 2020 at 7:35 a.m.

COUNCIL PRESENT

John Giles*
Mark Freeman*
Jennifer Duff*
Francisco Heredia*
David Luna*
Kevin Thompson*

COUNCIL ABSENT

Jeremy Whittaker

OFFICERS PRESENT

Christopher Brady
Dee Ann Mickelsen
Jim Smith

(*Council participated in the meeting through the use of video conference equipment.)

Mayor Giles conducted a roll call.

1-a. Hear a presentation, discuss, and provide direction on proposed text amendments to the Mesa 2040 General Plan including Chapters 7 (Community Character Areas) and 16 (Plan Implementation and Amendment).

Planning Director Nana Appiah introduced Senior Planner Rachel Prelog who displayed a PowerPoint Presentation. **(See Attachment 1)**

Ms. Prelog provided a recap of the basic goals and purpose of the General Plan. She explained the City is required to complete a comprehensive review of the General Plan every three years to evaluate the efficacy of the plan, to make recommendations to the plan, and alter implementation tools. She added when staff evaluated the plan, two areas were identified for improvement. (See Pages 2 through 4 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog highlighted one of the recommended areas of improvement: Chapter 7 – Community Character. She commented rather than focusing on parcel specific land uses, this area focuses on the look and feel of an area to establish character and create a sense of place. She indicated Chapter 7 highlights concepts of zoning to guide what character areas should look like. (See Page 5 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog commented on the eight different character areas throughout the City and that each has a list of primary and secondary zoning districts. She explained the primary zoning districts are intended to be the main zoning districts used to establish the character; and the secondary zoning districts are for supportive uses. She stated one of the challenges within the General Plan is that it does not specify how much of the zoning district needs to be used within a character area, and as a result staff has been challenged by the development community when they want

to develop a project based on the secondary zoning. She added when projects are considered individually, this is not a problem; however, taken over time these projects can end up changing the character and feel of an area. (See Pages 6 through 8 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog highlighted an existing land use graph and pointed out the increase in residential land from the mixed-use character areas within the City. (See Pages 9 and 10 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog explained staff is recommending refinements to text to better define the character areas and propose establishing minimum percentages of primary zoning and land uses of some of the character areas. She commented mixed-use communities are master-planned communities, like Cadence and Eastmark. She stated a plan is specified with the types of uses that will be within the community; in essence, creating their own zoning. She added staff is recommending 40% of the land be designated for commercial use to maintain those areas over time as mixed-use communities seek amendments to make smaller changes which incrementally can have a major effect. (See Page 11 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog outlined the second recommendation which is to Chapter 16 – Plan Implementation and Amendment. She explained that this chapter describes the implementation tools, restates the goals and policies, provides for the review and update of the plan, and covers the process for General Plan amendments. (See Page 12 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog outlined some of the issues identified during the comprehensive review of Chapter 16, specifically the General Plan amendment criteria, and discovered room for improvement. She explained the criteria is vague and does not consider the context of the City, such as the fact that Mesa is very different on the east side than in the downtown area. She added the document also lacks approval guidance. She commented that staff created a set of proposed amendments: first, to better refine the text to describe the amendment process; second, to propose context specific requirements; and third, to provide approval criteria for staff to consider before going to Council with recommendations. (See Page 13 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog reviewed the amendments to the benchmarks and stated as part of this task staff looked at the process for minor and major amendments for surrounding communities. (See Page 14 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog highlighted the recommendations to create two benchmarks. She stated the first is specific to downtown and the transit district to capture the difference of the environment; and the second is for other character areas. She explained downtown has fine grained development so an average block size is used as a benchmark for what would be considered a major change to the downtown and transit districts, which is 10 acres. She commented in all other character areas the benchmark recommendation for a major amendment is 160 acres, that it is currently 320 acres, and that the recommendation is the largest benchmark or designation of any community. (See Page 15 of Attachment 1)

Ms. Prelog explained the various outreach efforts which included departments such as Economic Development and the Development Advisory Board, as well as a special projects webpage. She added an open house was also held in August along with a virtual open house that remained open for two weeks which provided additional time for feedback. (See Pages 16 and 17 of Attachment 1)

Councilmember Thompson expressed concern related to mixed-use in District 6 and added when this term is used the result tends to be apartments and fast-food restaurants. He commented that

he would like to explore the possibility of the multi-family piece as a separate zoning with mixed-use activity and employment, another for residential, and one for multi-family as its own category. He added mixed-use is a grey area, open for interpretation, and that 40% is not enough when you are looking at 120 acres of multi-family. He inquired about whether 40% dedicated to commercial and retail is enough and asked if this number can be increased.

Vice Mayor Freeman concurred with Councilmember Thompson and stated over the last two years he has met with developers over the mixed village concept and they expressed interest in building apartments. He explained there seems to be a disconnect within the development community and he voiced to them that there needs to be commercial and retail-type zoning as well, not just multi-family. He said it is up to Council to have due diligence in creating areas that will connect neighborhoods to retail, food, and employment.

Mr. Appiah indicated the current zoning ordinance does separate apartments and multi-family uses, categorizes them in specific zoning districts, and has commercial and other uses as a separate category for residential developments. He commented there are zoning districts such as limited commercial, general commercial and neighborhood commercial, and those are the ones that are deemed to be mixed-use and have specific percentages for commercial and minimum residential that can be developed. He provided the example that within the limited commercial zoning there must be 40% minimum commercial and the ground floor of every vertical building is required to have commercial uses.

Mr. Appiah explained a major issue is the mixed-use activity of a neighborhood village which has a general concept; however, these do not have a specified primary zoning. He added the only way residential is developed is through the residential zoning category. He commented the character area does not provide a percentage of the zoning that has to be developed for commercial, so staff is recommending separating that out and maintaining the primary concept for a place of gathering to be more commercial. He remarked the commercial zoning would be 70-80%, which would form the nucleus of the area, and medium residential zoning would be 20% to create the character of neighborhood. He stated staff used the percentages in the General Plan and then used the zoning designation to achieve the character of the area.

Mr. Appiah addressed Councilmember Thompson's other question regarding mixed-use communities. He explained these are planned community districts that begin as a blanket discussion between staff and the developer. He stated staff is proposing to increase the commercial percentages if that is the direction from Council; however, currently there is not a base of commercial that is required. He provided the example of Cadence and Eastmark, which are planned community districts, which have no base minimum commercial. He said with this change there can be a proportion of residential to commercial that is developed.

Mayor Giles pointed out that 40% of master-planned communities are commercial. He highlighted Eastmark and Cadence saying that both appear to be exclusively residential and requested information on the mix of commercial in both of these communities, as well as in Dobson Ranch, and why commercial to residential has not been an issue in the past?

City Manager Chris Brady explained that developers say there is no market for commercial, but what they mean to say is more money can be made in less time with residential than commercial.

Mayor Giles commented developers prefer not to have their feet held to the fire for a percentage of commercial because they prefer to build rooftops for easy money and not engage in community planning to the extent Council and staff would prefer.

Mr. Brady stressed the importance of making it clear upfront with developers what the requirement is for a percentage of commercial. He expanded by saying what happens is staff negotiates a master plan and then a few years later the developer wants to change the plans. He stated developers make a lot of money on multi-family and the City is struggling with holding out for commercial, manufacturing, office, etc. He commented when staff thinks of planning, it is in terms of 5-10 years and a developer has a much shorter view. He remarked these percentages will help to create expectations at the beginning of a project and are necessary because over time the City loses commercial and has a higher number of residential developments. He advised in order to have a vibrant community that is resilient there needs to be a mix of commercial as well.

Mayor Giles pointed out the other concern from Council is the market pressure to develop multi-family housing. He commented on the housing and apartment shortage, that the occupancy rates for multi-family units is 100%, and that currently there is money in building multi-family units. He stated that while he would be supportive of that in the light rail corridors and urban areas where the City needs more vertical density, there are concerns being expressed by Council in the more suburban parts of the City that there is too much emphasis on multi-family.

In response to a question from Councilmember Heredia related to building vertical in downtown, Ms. Prelog explained the intent of having a lower benchmark is to preserve these areas and provide more oversight for the City so when proposals come in staff can review them and provide a recommendation to Council.

In response to further questions from Councilmember Heredia, Mr. Brady remarked if these types of proposals meet the threshold, the impact would be more extensive hearings, processes, and review time. He added based on the current code, a change of a 10-acre area does not trigger any of these requirements and a 10-acre area along the transit corridor could have a substantial impact on remaining portions of a development.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Freeman regarding a lease/rental development versus an owner-occupied development, City Attorney Jim Smith referred to a State Statute that says apartments cannot be treated differently than condominiums during the zoning process.

Councilmember Thompson commented on existing land uses which have remained consistent, except residential. He reviewed comments from the Council Strategic Planning Session earlier in the year, and that one thing Council agreed on is to move away from being called a bedroom community, and more toward an employment community. He cautioned Council to pay attention to the existing land use that the Maricopa Association of Government (MAG) provides as it shows Mesa as a bedroom community, so if there is a way to reduce residential and add more commercial and manufacturing, Mesa residents would benefit long-term.

In response to questions from Councilmember Duff related to the processes for major and minor amendments, Mr. Appiah explained based on current code a minor amendment requires a review in connection with a rezoning and can be submitted throughout the year. He added when a request for rezoning is received, a major General Plan amendment can be requested and will be reviewed as part of a rezoning and is not required to be submitted during a specific time of the year. He stated these still go through the Planning and Zoning Board for recommendation and action from Council.

Mr. Appiah further explained State Statute requires a major amendment to be submitted once a year, be transmitted to other jurisdictions within 60 days prior to the change, and conduct community meetings at different locations. He commented these steps gives the jurisdiction time

to evaluate the changes, gives surrounding cities and organizations the ability to evaluate how the changes affect them, and ensures residents are well-informed of the change. He explained overall the changes provide the legislative body the ability to carefully evaluate the amendment, while minor amendments can be treated with rezoning.

Councilmember Duff expressed the opinion that the City has many challenges including the need to increase commercial enterprises while at the same time deal with an affordable housing shortage. She commented that the City needs to increase ownership because it is an insulator to the escalation of rental prices and stabilizes neighborhoods. She requested information from staff related to zoning that can deal with these issues and if there is anything more staff or Council can do to incorporate elements into the housing plan to deal with these issues.

Mr. Brady responded by saying one of the land use rules is that we can encourage different characters and types of uses, sizes, and densities, but cannot consider costs. He commented staff can work with developers to improve the quality of developments; however, part of the mandate from Council is to improve the quality of higher density developments which also increases costs.

Mr. Appiah explained that while staff does not look at cost, the development review process is streamlined to reduce the processing time, which is directly related to cost. He stated staff is working with Transportation and various other departments to come up with a well-designed quality development to reduce the cost of development. He added most of the time infill areas already have infrastructure which reduces the cost.

Councilmember Thompson commented there is only so much a city can do to lower the cost of the materials that go into building a home, that the cost is more than development fees, and a majority of the cost is labor.

In response to a question from Mayor Giles regarding direction on the text amendment, Mr. Smith indicated staff brought this to Council for direction before presenting to the Planning and Zoning Board. He added it will come back to Council at a later date.

Mayor Giles commented there is Council direction to move forward with the amendments and thanked staff for the presentation.

1-b. Hear a presentation, discuss, and provide direction on proposed text amendments to Chapters 67 and 69 of Title 11 of the Mesa Zoning Ordinance including the procedures for site plan reviews and the administrative approval for certain initial site plan reviews.

Mr. Appiah displayed a PowerPoint presentation (**See Attachment 2**) and commented as part of the plan evaluations, one task is to look at land use implementation tools to see what is working and what can be streamlined to ensure the City is headed in the right direction. He explained one of the implementation tools that has been discussed with the development community and the Planning and Zoning Board is the site plan review and how to streamline the process to address some inefficiencies.

Ms. Prelog described the site plan review process as a review and approval of the development of a site, which includes ensuring there is adequate infrastructure and that the development meets the requirements of the code. She added through this process staff tries to promote the goals of the General Plan and ensure a high-quality development. (See Pages 3 and 4 of Attachment 2)

Ms. Prelog explained the site plan review process has a public hearing and is approved by the Planning and Zoning Board or the City Council. She highlighted the first review of the project entails staff meeting with the applicant and completing revisions on the site plan to ensure compliance with the code; and the second review is scheduling public hearings and submitting to the public bodies for consideration. (See Page 6 of Attachment 2)

Ms. Prelog stated staff looked at the processes for neighboring communities and found that several have minor site plan authorities to allow them to be approved administratively by staff. (See Page 7 of Attachment 2)

Ms. Prelog recommended that staff create another procedure within the site plan review process for administrative site plans. She stated these would include uses that are permitted within the zoning district, do not require a deviation from the code and would allow administrative approval by the Planning Director. She remarked that the standard site plan review process would mimic the process followed today and plans that require a deviation from the code or require a Council Use Permit would go through the public hearing process. She added the notification process would be similar to what is required for public hearings and the baseline is a 500-foot radius. (See Page 8 of Attachment 2)

Ms. Prelog commented on the benefits of this change, including a time savings in terms of reviewing and approving plans. She displayed a chart of the review times and added the processing time can be reduced by 20-50 days, depending on the number of reviews needed. She explained the administrative review provides more flexibility and that the current process is limited by the noticing requirements as required by State law. (See Page 9 of Attachment 2)

Ms. Prelog provided an overview of the public outreach efforts and the timeline for upcoming hearings prior to returning to Council for consideration. (See Pages 10 through 12 of Attachment 2)

In response to a question from Councilmember Luna, Mr. Appiah explained staff is suggesting if a developer presents a proposal for a permitted use that meets all of the requirements, the plans could be approved administratively and staff would notify residents. He added staff would ensure all residents are notified and provide comments to the developer so any issues can be addressed early in the process. He concluded by saying it is critical to know that staff has the ability to refer a case to the Planning and Zoning Board or the City Council.

Councilmember Luna expressed his support for the administrative approval process, especially if a project is timely, is an allowed use, has met the requirements, and staff has done the public outreach.

Mr. Brady commented the process creates an incentive for the developer to stick to the original plans as it could save the project weeks and/or months.

Councilmember Thompson expressed concern related to the changes and commented there are times when a development may meet permitted uses but does not meet the characteristics of the community. He provided the example of a developer that wants to put a storage facility or a carwash on a major corner right next to a major development. He stated there have been numerous times when this has happened and even though the use is allowed, it does not meet the characteristics of the community or the neighborhood. He pointed out that he gets a little hesitant on the administrative site plan process because each Councilmember has a vision of what we are trying to accomplish in each district.

Mr. Brady commented the approval would not be automatic and that staff understands Council's concerns.

Councilmember Thompson remarked on another concern that both he and Councilmember Luna have expressed to the Planning and Zoning Board and the legal department about assisted living, self-storage, and car washes that pop up on corners. He asked about an ordinance that would limit the number of locations where these facilities could be built.

Mr. Appiah explained there is a presentation on an upcoming Study Session agenda to address Council's concerns regarding assisted living facilities, mini storage and RV and boat storage locations. He commented these uses will require a Council use permit to allow Council the opportunity to review these types of applications and address questions and concerns.

In response to a question from Vice Mayor Freeman regarding the notification process within the 500-foot area, Ms. Prelog stated this is exactly why staff has the discretion to enlarge the notification area. She stated in some instances there are larger lots, and 500 feet will only reach one or two property owners, so staff would use their judgement and increase the notification area.

In response to an additional question from Vice Mayor Freeman regarding a 1000-foot notification area, Mr. Brady explained there is not a lot of response on these notifications and 500 feet is the current requirement. He reminded Council these are site plan reviews not zoning changes, so unless they are a result of a controversial project, they would not get a lot of attention.

Mr. Appiah clarified that the notification is just one process; there is also a neighborhood meeting before the application is submitted, the property is posted, and major community groups and Homeowners Associations are notified.

In response to a question from Councilmember Heredia regarding the bar graph for the number of days it takes for the approval process, Mr. Appiah explained approximately 55% of the workload will be reduced with the administrative review process since staff will not have to prepare the extensive staff report and hold multiple meetings for approval.

In response to additional questions from Councilmember Heredia, Mr. Brady explained that many of the delays are a result of scheduling meetings, sending notices, as well as Mr. Appiah responding to the Planning and Zoning Board members. He added staff is trying to find an efficient way that does not take away from the notification process and the opportunity for public comment. He concluded by saying staff review will continue and the major change is the need for multiple approvals.

Mayor Giles explained expediting the administrative review process provides some relief to the development community for the tremendous amount of time it takes to develop a project.

Mr. Brady clarified that the Planning and Zoning Board and the Council would not approve site plans.

Mayor Giles expressed mixed levels of comfort and commented that occasionally the community is upset about a project and Council needs to subject those to additional scrutiny. He asked if there is a trigger for Council review if a project has community concern?

Mr. Brady remarked very few site plans come to Council and most of what Council reviews is the zoning case and the conditions and stipulations.

Mr. Smith explained many times a site plan will include a rezoning, but rarely will a site plan come to Council; and when it does, it is because of an original stipulation on the zoning ordinance that future site plans have to go to Council.

Mayor Giles thanked staff for the presentation.

2-a. Acknowledge receipt of minutes of various boards and committees.

2-a. Transportation Advisory Board meeting held on July 21, 2020.

It was moved by Councilmember Thompson, seconded by Vice Mayor Freeman, that receipt of the above-listed minutes be acknowledged.

Upon tabulation of votes, it showed:

AYES – Giles-Freeman-Duff-Heredia-Luna-Thompson

NAYS – None

ABSENT – Whittaker

Carried unanimously by those present.

3. Current events summary including meetings and conferences attended.

Councilmember Thompson: Oakland Athletics American League West Champions

Councilmember Duff: Virtual Art Walk – Guerrero Park Project

Councilmember Luna: National League of Cities Western Division Panel to encourage citizen involvement

4. Scheduling of meetings.

City Manager Christopher Brady stated that the schedule of meetings is as follows:

Thursday, October 1, 2020, 7:30 a.m. – Study Session

Thursday, October 1, 2020, 8:00 a.m. – Audit, Finance and Enterprise Committee

5. Adjournment.

Without objection, the Study Session adjourned at 8:54 a.m.



JOHN GILES, MAYOR

ATTEST:


DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Study Session of the City Council of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 24th day of September 2020. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.


DEE ANN MICKELSEN, CITY CLERK

jg/dm
(Attachments – 2)



General Plan Amendments

Nana Appiah, Planning Director
Rachel Prelog, Senior Planner

OUTLINE


- Purpose of the General Plan
 - General Plan Comprehensive Review
 - Recommendations
 - Next Steps
-

GENERAL PLAN'S PURPOSE

- Expressions of the community's goals and priorities
 - Official policy guide concerning desired physical development of the City
 - Fulfillment of legal state law requirements
 - Fulfillment of City Charter requirements
-

GENERAL PLAN COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

- Required every 3 years – 2020 review
 - Identifies, major successes, challenges and provides recommendations for amendments
 - 2 areas identified for improvement
 - › Ch. 7 - Community Character
 - › Ch. 16 - Plan Implementation & Amendment
-











CH. 7 COMMUNITY CHARACTER

PURPOSE

- Land use guidance
- Focuses on the character of an area (i.e. the looks and feel)
- Supports GP goal of creating a greater sense of place
- Combines concepts of zoning, land use, building form, and intensity


CHARACTER AREAS

-  Neighborhoods
-  Neighborhood Village Center
-  Mixed Use Activity Districts
-  Mixed Use Community
-  Downtown
-  Employment Districts
-  Specialty Districts
-  Parks/Open Space




CHARACTER AREAS

- Neighborhoods
- Neighborhood Village Center
- Mixed Use Activity Districts
- Mixed Use Community
- Downtown
- Employment Districts
- Specialty Districts
- Parks/Open Space



MIXED-USE




OPPORTUNITIES

- Allows for a mixture of uses
- Efficient use of space
- Encourages alternative modes of transportation

CHALLENGES

- General Plan doesn't specify how much of a mixture is required
- Result - development proposals heavily focused on supportive uses without primary uses



Change in Future Land Use Designations





RECOMMENDATION

1. Refine text to better describe the intent of the character areas
2. Establish minimum percentages of primary zoning & land uses

MINIMUM USE OF PRIMARY ZONING

NEIGHBORHOOD VILLAGE = 80%

MIXED USE ACTIVITY DISTRICT = 70%

EMPLOYMENT

- Business Park = 70%
- Industrial = 75%
- Employment Core = 80%

SPECIALTY DISTRICT

- Medical Campus = 80%

MIXED USE COMMUNITY = 40% of land dedicated for commercial use

CH. 16 PLAN IMPLEMENTATION AND AMENDMENT

PURPOSE

- Describes implementation tools (i.e. CIP, zoning ordinance etc.)
 - Goals, policies, and strategies
 - Process for review and update of the Plan
 - Process for Plan amendments
-

AMENDMENT CRITERIA

CHALLENGES

- Vague criteria
- Doesn't consider the context of an area
- Insufficient approval guidance

RECOMMENDATION

1. Refine text to better describe the amendment process
2. Create context-specific amendment requirements
3. Provide approval criteria



JURISDICTION		MAJOR AMENDMENT REQUIREMENTS	
Mesa	>320 acres	Proposal not consistent with character area	
	>160 acres	Change from residential to another residential or non-residential classification	
Chandler	>40 acres	Change from non-residential to residential or non-residential to mixed-use	
	>320 acres	Any aggregate change in land use classification	
	>160 acres	Any increase in residential density	
Gilbert	>40 acres	Any change in land use classification	
	≥5 square miles	Area Plan	
Phoenix	>3 square miles	Proposal with no land use designation	
	>10 acres	Change in zones A1, A2, B (south of Frank Lloyd Wright & west of Pima)	
	>15 acres	Change in zones C1, C2, C3, D, E1, E2, E3 (east of Pima & north of DoubleTree Ranch)	
Scottsdale	>15 acres	Change in zones C1, C2, C3, D, E1, E2, E3 (east of Pima & north of DoubleTree Ranch)	

AMENDMENT BENCHMARKS

DOWNTOWN & TRANSIT DISTRICTS

- Minor – 10 acres or less
- Major – More than 10 acres

OTHER CHARACTER AREAS


- Minor – 160 acres or less
 - Major – More than 160 acres
-



PUBLIC OUTREACH

- City Council - February 2020
 - Planning & Zoning Board - March 2020
 - Developers Advisory Forum (DAF) - June 2020
 - Planning & Zoning Board - August 2020
 - Special Projects webpage - June thru current
-

PUBLIC OUTREACH



GENERAL PLAN & ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT OPEN HOUSE

- August 18th
- Live via Zoom
- 27 participants

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

- August 18 - September 1
- 157 views
- Feedback forms available

<https://sway.office.com/ECuPBrwdvxydxlyn>

NEXT STEPS

Planning & Zoning Board	November
Planning & Zoning Board	November
City Council Consideration	12/8/20




Questions?

mesa·az



SITE PLAN REVIEW AMENDMENTS

Nana Appiah, Planning Director
Rachel Prelog, Senior Planner



OUTLINE

- Purpose of Site Plan Review
- Project Goals
- Current Process
- Recommendations
- Next Steps

PURPOSE

- Compliance with the General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Engineering Standards
- Provision of adequate infrastructure
- Ensure high-quality development
- Provide safe and efficient traffic circulation
- Mitigate adverse impacts on surrounding properties

SITE PLAN REVIEW PROCEDURE

- Approves the physical organization and development of a site
- Provides for the coordination of site design and infrastructure requirements
- Projects must meet development and engineering standards or have deviations approved through other mechanisms
- Projects must meet Site Plan Review approval criteria

PROJECT GOALS

Improved Process



EFFICIENCY



PREDICTABILITY


Current Process



Staff Review



Public Hearing



Jurisdiction	Complete Administrative Authority	Minor Administrative Authority	No Administrative Authority	Size Criteria	Use Criteria
Chandler			X		
Fountain Hills	X				
Gilbert		X		Building <5,000 sq. ft.	
Glendale	X				
Phoenix			X		
Queen Creek		X		<10 acres	Use By Right
Tucson	X				

RECOMMENDATION

SITE PLAN REVIEW




Administrative Site Plan

- Permitted Uses
- 500 ft. Radius Notice Required
- Administrative Approval



Standard Site Plan


- Uses Requiring Public Hearing
- 500 ft. Radius Notice Required
- Planning & Zoning or City Council Approval



PUBLIC OUTREACH

- City Council - February 2020
- Planning & Zoning Board - March 2020
- Developers Advisory Forum (DAF) - June 2020
- Planning & Zoning Board - August 2020
- Special Projects webpage - June thru current

PUBLIC OUTREACH



- August 18th
- Live via Zoom
- 27 participants

VIRTUAL OPEN HOUSE

<https://sway.office.com/ECuPBrdvxydxlyn>

- August 18 - September 1st
- 157 views
- Feedback forms available

UPCOMING HEARINGS

City Council Study Session	9/24/20
Planning & Zoning Board	10/28/20
City Council Introduction	11/16/20
City Council Consideration	12/1/20

NEXT STEPS