



**SCOTTSDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
KIVA-CITY HALL
3939 DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA**

Approved 3/11/2009-fc

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2009

STUDY SESSION MINUTES

PRESENT: Michael Schmitt, Commissioner
Kevin O'Neill, Commissioner
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner
Steven Steinke, Commissioner

ABSENT: David Barnett, Chairman
Eric Hess, Vice Chairman
Michael D'Andrea, Commissioner

STAFF: Connie Padian
David Richert
Joe Padilla
Lusia Galav
Erin Perreault

1. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Padian called the study session of the Scottsdale Planning Commission to order at 4:07 p.m.

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Ms. Padian noted that the first order of business at the regular meeting would be to elect a chair in the absence of both Chairman Barnett and Vice-Chairman Hess.

Ms. Padian noted that cases 30-UP-2008 and 31-UP-2008 were to bring into conformance existing heliport facilities.

Commissioner Schwartz noted a conflict with cases 13-TA-2008, 13-ZN-2008, and 17-AB-2008, and recused himself from the discussion.

Commissioner O'Neill inquired about the current condition of the Palmeraie cases. Ms. Padian explained that the zoning administrator had issued an interpretation that would allow the project to go forward, including the five additional acres located within the Paradise Valley portion of the property because the entire property is under a single ownership. The application will stay active during the 30-day time period allowed for appeal. If the application is not withdrawn or continued prior to the Planning Commission hearing, the zoning case could be allowed to move forward based on the zoning administrator's interpretation; if the interpretation were then appealed prior to March 15, the zoning would revert to the original zoning.

5. **DISCUSSION-**
Downtown Plan Update Staff Presentation and Status Report.
Ref: 3-GP-2008

Verbatim transcription of discussion on this item

MS. GALAV: Good afternoon, Commissioners – should I wait for Commissioner Schwartz to return? There he is.

I'm going to introduce this item and then I'm going to turn it over to Erin Perreault, who is the project manager for the Downtown Plan Update.

If you recall back in the late fall of 2008 we had a series of study sessions with the Planning Commission and the City Council. And we've gone back and prepared a team to work on the comments that we received back from the City Council and the Planning Commission from those study sessions. And the team was comprised of members of the Current Planning staff, Steve Venker and Dan Symer and the Current Planning Staff Tim Connor, Ryan Stee (phonetic), and Erin Perreault as the project manager, and me as well.

So since that November time frame when we met with you last, the team has met weekly to go over the comments and prepare what you have in front of you, which is the second draft of the Downtown Plan update. And Erin will review the key components that you're looking at right now, keeping in mind that there will be additions to that final document that will go forward for public hearing at the Planning Commission and then to City Council

And what we're going to do is we'll give you that presentation now, as Connie said, at the study session and then we will be able to have that dialogue with you at the regular meeting. And also in case and in the event there are members of the audience who might want to address the second draft that's been out; it is out public, it is on our website, so there may be some comments that you might want to entertain from the public at that time.

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL: Can I interrupt you for one minute?

MS. GALAV: Yes.

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL: I meant to ask this before we got started. This being, at least in my eyes right now, one of the, if not the singly most important thing that the Commission and staff are working on, I have just a little bit of a concern that there are three very important members that aren't here today and wondering how we're going to address having this discussion again. Because I think it absolutely needs to be had with the entire Commission. And so I just didn't know what thoughts were out there as to how we're going to – if we're just going to do this whole show again at another time or how that might work.

MS. GALAV: Commissioner O'Neill, I do have comments – brief comments, from Chairman Barnett, who has given us some favorable responses back to the update in general. But I don't have comments from any of the other members. And we'll just have to take that under advisement and see what we will do in terms of bringing it back for another study session. If we do bring it back for another study session, it just delays the eventual adoption process.

So I think what we had in mind today, not knowing that we would not have three members until today – I was unaware – we're just going to go forward, because we put a lot of effort into this document and this presentation at this time, and then just take your comments and then we'll have to go back and reevaluate how we will meet with the other Planning Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER O'NEILL: All right. That makes sense.

Erin, are you going to go over the timeline and what happens from here on? Okay. Thanks.

MS. PERREAULT: Good afternoon, Commissioners. As Lucia said, we will do a review and then further discussion on the revised Downtown Plan update.

Just going over the last six months or so, a brief rundown of the recent history of the plan. In July 2008, the first draft of the Downtown Plan Update was released to the community and to the Commission. The Commission and the City Council held study sessions last fall on that first draft. At that time City Council requested that staff take it back to you, the Planning Commission, to review and do further work on the plan. That's what staff did, conducted those work sessions with Planning Commission both in October and November, and then City staff, as Lucia said, has been working on it since then, culminating in the revised draft that you have in front of you this evening.

I'm going to walk through some of the general Commission comments as well as more specific comments on certain content of the first draft plan, and then what is in front of you this evening in terms of the revised draft and how staff has responded to the Commission comments that we received.

With regard to general Commission comments, the first draft was too expansive and needed to be condensed. There needed to be a clearer, stronger vision statement,

there was a need for an executive summary, a glossary, and new infrastructure goals and policies. In terms of the revised draft, we have condensed goals and policies; we have eliminated two chapters, that was the history and community involvement; neither one of them had goals and policies previously within them; we have a revised vision statement thanks to the work Commissioner O'Neill put in with City staff and value statements as well incorporated into that. We will be including an executive summary that will include any discussion you have this evening. And then there is a new glossary and a new infrastructure chapter as well in front of you this evening.

Getting into specific content and what we heard from the Commission: with regard to urban neighborhoods, there was a request to clarify the intent of the urban neighborhoods that we know about today such as regional, medical, Civic Center, those urban neighborhoods that exist already. And then general Commission support for this concept in the plan, which we retained in the revised draft.

What that is, is promoting Downtown as a collection of mixed-use urban neighborhoods. This aligns with the mixed-use General Plan designation for Downtown, it maintains the core specialty districts in Downtown and encourages a mix of land uses in all the different various urban neighborhoods.

The next specific content discussion the Commission had included the Downtown land use map. And we got some specific direction from the Commission to really delineate the most important areas only on that land use map. So really, make a change to the map that was existing to keep the established specialty districts such as Old Town, 5th Avenue, Main Street, that we all know. Not to add other districts: there was a discussion both on adding a specific arts district and also adding a specific entertainment district. Both the community and the Commission really didn't have overall support for adding these two new districts, really with the intent that seeing Downtown overall as an arts district and overall as an entertainment district and not one specific area. And then of course, supporting rollup of all land uses into those most important areas only. So we went ahead and did that. We eliminated the Downtown district zoning labels off of the policy map and consolidated the land use into Downtown medical, regional, Civic Center, Downtown core, which is the specialty districts, and then multiple use.

In terms of the difference in the two maps, the map to your left is what was in the first draft, the map to your right is now that consolidated map including Downtown regional north of the canal, Downtown core areas or the specialty districts in the center, multiple use Downtown, Downtown Civic Center, and Downtown medical.

In terms of development types, not much change from the previous draft, in that you supported maintaining a Type 1 or lower scale in the Downtown core and maintaining a Type 2 higher scale.

You also supported some limited conversion of Type 1 to Type 2, which I'll show you on the next slide and then the elimination of a Type 1.5, which has really not been used very regularly over the last 20 years or so under the 1984 plan.

So what you see here is the previous version showed north of 5th Avenue and just south of the canal, some limited conversion of Type 1 to Type 2 areas; we maintain that. This

piece here we realized is already Type 2, that's why you see a slight difference there; so we just corrected that on the map.

And then in terms of the Civic Center land use that you saw on the previous land-use map, there was slight expansion of the Civic Center area out toward the Buckboard alignment. So that in turn we aligned the Type 1, Type 2 map with that slight expansion area.

In terms of the edge transition buffer, the previous draft really had that transition buffer only adjacent to single family residential neighborhoods. And what we heard from the Commission was to expand that transition buffer for all of the downtown boundary; so that's the main change here that you see in the revised draft. But we did also maintain development flexibility in that transition zone where height can be shifted away from the Downtown boundary, perhaps through transfer of development rights; so that's maintained in the text.

In terms of the boundary expansion, this is the major change from the previous draft to the revised draft that we heard from the Commission and also to some extent from the previous City Council last fall. There was not a lot of support for specific boundary expansions at this time and actually a recommendation to delete the boundary expansion map out of the draft plan. However, the Commission recommended maintaining general text that would allow for future boundary expansions. And then a recognition on the Commission's part that expansion criteria for future expansions would need to be developed.

In terms of the revised draft, we did eliminate specific boundary expansions, eliminated the map, we maintained the general text that you were looking for in terms of supporting future boundary expansion. And then as part of the developing criteria, that would be associated with an implementation program following the policy document. Just as a reminder, this was the previous map that was eliminated for both the Commission benefit and the Community benefit as well.

In terms of community benefits and development flexibility, sort of the tradeoff discussion that we've had with the Commission, there was an intent to retain both in the revised draft, but to really delineate the community benefits first before considering development flexibility; so we have switched that in the text itself.

And then in terms of community benefits listed that the City may be looking for in order to consider development flexibility, the Commission recommended housing diversity, shared parking facilities, expanded public realm, and expanded open space beyond that list. In terms of the revised draft, we've included those items as well as additional items that you see on the expanded list to the right.

And then finally, kind of wrapping up the discussion in terms of some of the other elements, there was general support for the other land use policies such as housing, redevelopment, and reinvestment. And of course we retained and maintained anything the Commission was supporting from the previous draft.

In terms of mobility, we maintained the pedestrian focus that the Commission supported, we ensured that there is consistent goals and policies with the Transportation Master Plan, in particular with high-capacity transit and what those recommendations are.

There was a suggestion by the Commission to add a key access in through traffic routes graphic, which we will do in the final draft document.

And then in terms of arts and culture and economic vitality, there was overall general Commission support for those two elements as well.

So basically what we have, we've maintained a land use element, the urban design element, mobility, arts and culture, and economic vitality in the revised draft. We have added an infrastructure element, so those are new goals and policies that you have not seen before as well as a new glossary.

In terms of the next steps with regard to the draft Downtown Plan Update, what we will do is take your recommendations and/or input this evening and compile that into a final draft plan package, which would have any revised goals or policies based on your input this evening, an executive summary, final graphics will be included in that package, and then also a draft implementation program to give you and the community an idea of what the next steps would be following a policy document adoption.

Taking that package forward, we would then proceed to a Planning Commission hearing, a City Council hearing. The community has opportunities at all of those junctures to go ahead and provide us with continued input. And then of course then it would be rolling it right into an implementation program immediately after the policy document is adopted.

In terms of planning and development services, I know we're already looking at the team that would be going right into the Zoning Ordinance updates at this point in terms of the Downtown Ordinance and the Downtown Overlay. So there is some thought internally as to what would come first in that implementation program.

So that's a basic overview based on the previous draft, your comments, and your working sessions, and then what you have in front of you tonight in terms of the revised draft. I understand I think we're probably going to move on and then we'll have our discussion. And any questions we'll be here to answer in the regular agenda.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARTZ: So it sounds as though you answered our previous question about timing. You're not expecting us to move this forward tonight. You're going to get some comments and you're going to bring it back to us at another hearing and then we're going to be moving it forward at that point. So that will give the other Commissioners that aren't here the opportunity to review and discuss?

MS. PERREAULT: Yes, they would have opportunity to still get comments back to us. We do have time to do that and then get those into a final draft package for you to see.

MS. PADIAN: That's all we have for the study session. And again we'll let you break for dinner and then continue with the discussion on the item after we hear the other public hearing item. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Connie, I just have one quick question. When we get into the regular session and we have the discussion on this, what level of detail are you expecting? I mean, as I've read through this I've made dozens of comments; do we want to go through all of those, do we want to just talk about high points, the major issues? You know, like when we've had those work sessions just outside of this

hearing, that's gotten into a lot of minutiae and important things, but a lot of detail; is that where we want to go this evening?

MS. PADIAN: Commissioner Schmitt, I guess I would look to the rest of the Commission in terms of the level of detail. If you have some items that you think might just be more pertinent for staff and maybe there are some minor corrections, we'd be happy to take those as redlines.

We are looking for some understanding of at least what the consensus is from the Commission. As we've spoken before, we are looking eventually for a vote so we can help you if you want to split out certain items if there isn't consensus on any particular item. But if you would like to continue a discussion on the broader policies, we would like to have that occur tonight.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: And is the idea that you would like us to vote on a recommendation this evening or at a subsequent hearing?

MS. PADIAN: Commissioner Schmitt, that might have been misunderstanding. This is just a discussion item for tonight, there is no action that has been agendized. And so what we're looking to do, as has been noted on there, is we will have a public hearing. And I don't know that we have a date yet for that? We don't have a date, we don't have that advertised, but we would finalize the plan and get that onto an agenda. And it's at that point that we're looking for the actual vote and recommendation.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: All right. Thank you.

6. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the study session of the Planning Commission adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc