

Notification Text Amendment Stakeholder Meeting Minutes 8.8.19

The Stakeholder Meeting was held on August 8, 2019. Planning and Development Services Department (PDSD) staff gave a presentation to attendees explaining required notice area measurement standards and laying out what options exist to include an abutting right-of-way in the notice area calculations. Attendees were invited to share their opinions, observations and suggestions regarding the proposed amendment. Below are the shared opinions, suggestions and observations gathered at the meeting.

COMMENT (C): Preference to err on the side of too many people being told than not enough.

(C): Almost the same anyway because of the ability to actually make a final determination.

(C): Other tools, like Notice Tucson: Cost for City for mailing/postage costs, if you start going significantly larger amount of parcels and properties a greater cost to the City of Tucson.

(C): DDO impact is really the adjacent properties, usually 3 sides, not the right of way.

(C): This is true, however, currently DDO notice skips over right of way and notices parcels on the other side of the right-of-way, there are some processes that might have some impact across the right of way, so we want to take that into account

QUESTION (Q): Required to accommodate the right of way, we are required to do that, correct?

ANSWER (A): Only for the protest calculations.

(C): Then we should accommodate the size of the right of way.

(C): It's difficult to determine the appropriate distance b/c right of ways are differently sized throughout the City of Tucson.

(C): Make its way across the typical residential right of way and that would be the appropriate distance, there are some really wider right of ways in residential areas

(C): Wide rights of way, allowed to add inclusive language of neighborhoods within a mile, is there a way to add inclusive language such as if properties opposite a right of way are not notified discretion to notify.

(C): One-mile buffer for notification of neighborhood associations, the proposal is to keep one-mile buffer the same.

(C): If we were to include the right of way for the one mile there is the potential for Neighborhood Associations that barely touch the one-mile radius to not get notified. Opinions? One mile and 100 feet would be difficult and make the code complicated.

(Q): Is there a requirement to include rights of way within the 1 mile?

(C)/(Q): Streamline process. 1 mile from actual rezoning area. Would a Neighborhood Association that is over one mile away need to be notified of that rezoning?

(C): Particular example and information regarding Palm Shadows project. "I don't have a dog in this fight", different from in the neighborhood next door to mine I have a vested interest. I wouldn't have missed being noticed on this one.

(C): Add language to the effect of-- PDS at its discretion can notify a tangential neighborhood association when appropriate, sole discretion, sometimes PDS might want to hear from the other neighborhoods.

(Q): What about automation?

(C): I think John is talking about if you are a project manager and there is some pertinent neighborhood then it would give you the opportunity to notice them. The goal here is to automate it to where there is a project it kicks out labels to 1 mile.

(C): Example, short portion of neighborhood boundary allowed Armory Park Neighborhood Association to be noticed in the Welcome Broadway PAD, and Armory Park's input has been helpful.

(C): NoticeTucson, the more people that know and understand the projects early on in the process the better. Maybe we put in the option for the project manager to notice pertinent Neighborhood Associations.

(C): To say 1 mile 100 feet is just crazy, it should just be one mile. We have NoticeTucson and other ways of notifying Neighborhood Associations. If they are truly interested they will know.

(C): Discretion because you will not want to come back, option without it being illegal to do so.

(C): I vote for 400, 100.

(C): Next steps, is another stakeholder meeting needed? General Consensus, another stakeholder meeting is not needed.

(C): The goal is to save time and money for City staff at the same time not decrease notification to the neighbors, you guys are smart enough, no need for another meeting.

(C): My understanding that Mayor & Council were leaning towards 100 and 400 foot notification.

(C): Mayor & Council direction is to maintain notification at current levels or above and streamline the process.

(C): Add a slide that distinguishes between protest and notification. Do we go across the street on a DDO or not? Many neighborhoods rely on their neighbors, such as older people, will look to neighbors for assistance, extending distance to 100 rather than 75 makes more sense. Allows more neighbors to be looking out.

(C): It seems mean to tell someone this is going on, but you cannot complain, we're just telling you

(C): Right you can't protest but you can have a conversation with Council member/representative because you have been noticed.

(C): Feedback does get incorporated into public hearing, etc.

(C): Maps identify people within the notification area and the protest area, which may have different weight on triggering something, but have equal weight on those evaluating it.

(C): I may not be able to swing the big bat in protest but I can at least swing a whiffle bat.

(C): I've written in anyway and it changes the decision on the outcome of the project

(C): Just because it doesn't have legal protest it does get included and does have influence on decision.

(C): All done via mailing, so the mailing should spell out which property is in the protest.

(C): An option to go online and submit comments/protest rather than just mailing in form, and would inform you if you are in protest area or just noticed area.

(C): Keep both options.

(C): We are not proposing to get rid of mail in option. Online submittals help geocode and helps with process when calculating the protest and it would be an additional option for people to utilize.