

TRRG-PDS Meeting Report

Dec. 8, 2018

Compiled by Ruth Beeker

Members in Attendance: Colette Altaffer, , Oscar Gandy, Ronni Kotwica, Diana Lett, Ian Wan, Ruth Beeker, ex officio, Bonnie Poulos, ex officio

Members Absent: Chris Gans, Joan Hall, Josephina Cardenas

Action: City of Tucson land use public hearings

- * Continue monitoring Zoning Examiner by committee members, Colette, Joan , Ian
- * Focus on ZE cases which are controversial to see how and what solutions are reached
- * Read ZE documentation on-line to make assessments if no one has attended the hearing
- * Make request for M/C to take measures to improve Planning Commission function at Dec. 18 call-to-audience by Ruth, speaking for TRRG-PDS
- * Reminder that Peter Gavin is willing to meet with TRRG to discuss concerns; perhaps he could be of assistance to the City to improve Planning Commission, help with neighborhood plans

Action: TRRG Initiative: Sustainable Neighborhoods through Planning

- * Bonnie and Ruth will meet with PDS staff to turn over compilations of data gathered at the Nov. 5th Workshop on Dec. 19, 2018. This will shift primary responsibility from TRRG to PDS; TRRG will continue to work with PDS, but in a support role. They will share the ideas expressed below with PDS staff.
- * TRRG-PDS supports clear designation of those area and neighborhood plans which have been updated. 3 means to do so: reference to them as “new editions” ; creation of a unique cover sheet which will be affixed for immediate recognition of any plan as having been updated; and a new Credits page which will recognize those community members, Mayor and Council, and COT administration which have vested interest in the new edition.
- * TRRG-PDS selected the following items from the neighborhood representatives’ brainstormed ideas of how to proceed which should be given top priority by PDS:
 1. Make a registered NA an official party who can initiate writing a new plan or up-dating an existing plan - PDS staff provides the administrative steps to be taken: NA takes responsibility for drafting the test, contact with the community, conducting neighborhood meetings, etc. Since NA’s are recognized by the City, there would be no application fees to process the new document.
 2. Provide common “definitions” applicable to all plan, if there is found to be a discrepancy between neighborhood, area, and general plans.

3. City provides workshops to give guidance to NA projects—at first session, provide the rationale and benefits of plans for participants to use to recruit others to become actively involved in the updating. Provide a well-crafted template which can be used as a model for other neighborhoods. Provide uniform guidelines to follow, perhaps a “Neighborhood Planning Kit” such as the City of Flagstaff has. Provide a tiered approach to revisions which NA’s can choose from, identifying simple changes to complex overhaul.
4. Potential Sources of Assistance to NA Reps:
Volunteers to assist a given NA might be experienced citizens from other neighborhoods, retired PSDS staff or planners.
City employees from PSDS or Ward Offices
5. Financing the Plan Updates:
Fund raising using on-line means, such as Crowd funding or GoFundMe. (In addition, the suggestion was made the NA’s be encouraged to check the Main Library for assistance).

Action: Other Topics for TRRG-PDS Committee attention

- * Better COT process when a project requires both a plan amendment and a P-A-D- rezoning
- *Community discussion on how the Planned Area Development zone has evolved from its original intent to being a means to avoid using the UDC zoning today; what are the ramifications of current usage?
- * Should PSDS staff make reports vs. recommendations to Planning Commission and Zoning Examiner?
- *Residents who attended TRRG’s Initiative workshops are potential candidates for appointment to BCC’s, enlarging that pool interested in land use issues.