

# TRRG-PDS Meeting Report

**February 2, 2019**

**Compiled by Ruth Beeker**

**Members in Attendance:** Colette Altaffer, Chris Gans, Joan Hall, Ronni Kotwica, Diana Lett, Ian Wan, Ruth Beeker, ex officio

**Members Absent:** Josephina Cardenas, Oscar Gandy, Bonnie Poulos, ex officio

**Action: Refinement of Concurrent Plan Amendment/Rezoning Process Proposal Document**

Ideas and concerns discussed:

- Accelerating the process makes sense when the process results in better public input and a better product
- Who represents the neighborhood? The neighborhood voice as reflected in any meetings should be given significant attention by the developer and COT. Neighbors should sign off that the summary submitted to PDSD (by the developer at this time) is accurate.
- How can a neighborhood be engaged from the very start, when robust public engagement could be meaningful? (Ft. Lowell NP has language addressing this.)
- Should a concurrent process be restricted to PAD rezoning or available for any rezoning requiring a plan amendment? If used, other than PAD, the neighborhood must agree to that procedure.
- How could any improvements in public process for this circumstance impact other procedures, such as IID and Grant Rd. Incentive Grid?
- How will the Public Hearings (Planning Commission, Zoning Examiner, Mayor and Council) be addressed if a concurrent process is used?—the public should not lose any opportunities to address the decision-makers. Will PC and ZE both still hold hearings, and, if so, are they sequential or concurrent hearings? If the hearing process is compressed to one M/C meeting, time should be scheduled for 1 hour for plan amendment input and 1 hour for rezoning input. Currently, a M/C rezoning hearing must be requested; does this change for a concurrent process? Diana Lett points out, “It is critical that we preserve separate votes for the Plan Amendment (easier for neighborhoods to defeat) and Rezoning (hard to defeat because the State Legislature has altered the Protest Zone and the formula for calculating a supermajority of M&C). If the votes are conflated, the legislature’s Rezoning map and supermajority rule will apply, thus diminishing meaningful public input. Not only must the votes remain separate, but the City Clerk must calculate protests separately for each and must report the correct total before each vote of M&C.”
- What happens at the PDSD Pre-Application Meeting—is that too late for meaningful public input if 60% of the project is defined at that time? The impacted neighborhood should be invited to that City meeting with the developer.

*Colette Altaffer, Joan Hall, and Ronni Kotwica volunteered to work with Ruth Beeker to refine the draft she had produced.*

---

**On-going Accumulation of Other Topics for TRRG-PDS Committee attention**

Continuing monitoring of the Zoning Examiner processes and decision-making

Community discussion of the implementation of Flexible Land Development (FLD)—role of area/neighborhood plans as mandated in Unified Development Code.

Community discussion of 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? How does current practice align with the role of area/neighborhood plans as mandated in Unified Development Code?

Should PDSD 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. Planning Commission lacks members.

More information on how NoticeMe is being used—need for educational public forum on topic