

**CITY OF PHOENIX PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014**

I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL/INTRODUCTION: Chair Summerhays called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. In attendance were Chair Micki Summerhays, Vice Chair David Lewin, Commissioners George “Ike” Eisenhower, and Judy Grillo. There was a quorum. Staff in attendance was Interim Planning Director Laurel Samson and Assistant Planner Steffen Roennfeldt.

II. CHANGES TO THE AGENDA: COMMISSIONER LEWIN REQUESTED THE WORKSHOP ON LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REVISIONS OCCUR AFTER PLANNING DIRECTOR’S REPORT.

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

THE SUGGESTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR:

A. Approval of Minutes from January 13, 2014 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER LEWIN, AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GRILLO, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 13, 2014 WITH THE FOLLOWING MODIFICATIONS: ON PAGE 2, ADD “IF THEY HADN’T GOT TO PHASE TWO WITHIN 3 YEARS, THEY’D HAVE TO RE-SUBMIT.” ON PAGE 4, A TYPO: “ATTANDED” SHOULD BE CHANGED TO “ATTENDED”

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

B. Approval of Minutes from March 25, 2013 Regular Planning Commission Meeting

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER LEWIN, AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER EISENHAUER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 13, 2014

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

- C.** Final Order for SP12-02 for 4557 and 4585 S Pacific Hwy – Creekside

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER GRILLO, AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER EISENHAUER TO ACCEPT THE FINAL ORDER FOR SP12-02 FOR 4557 AND 4585 S PACIFIC HWY – CREEKSIDE

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

- D.** Final Order for CUP12-01 for Bear Creek Bridge Replacement

MOVED BY COMMISSIONER EISENHAUER, AND SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GRILLO TO ACCEPT THE FINAL ORDER FOR CUP12-01 FOR BEAR CREEK BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

ROLL CALL VOTE AS FOLLOWS:

Ayes: 4

Nays: 0

THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

IV. NEW BUSINESS:

- A.** Downtown Traffic Flow - Recommendation to City Council on which traffic flow option – Concept 4 or Concept 6 – the Planning Commission Prefers

Ms. Samson stated this recommendation will go to City Council and Urban Renewal District. She said two open houses were held, and about 100 people attended and were invited to fill out a questionnaire. She summarized the two proposed concepts: Concept 4 involves a single lane on Main Street and a single lane on Bear Creek Drive. Concept 6 involves a single lane on Main Street and two lanes on Bear Creek Drive. Several plans were included in the meeting packet.

Commissioners discussed and responded to each other's perception of a "best" concept. Ms. Samson paraphrased Commissioner Lewin's idea: On Bear Creek Drive

there would be one through lane from Highway 99 to Second Street. A turn pocket would be provided for the vehicles turning left at First Street. There would be two through lanes from Second Street to the north junction with Highway 99.

In listening to this discussion, Ms. Samson said it sounds as though the Commission needs more information regarding what the transit company (Rogue Valley Transit (RVTD)) needs. Chair Summerhays said that RVTD had given their recommendations, but the commission needs to look at those again. Chair Summerhays said Concept 6 gives the buses protected turns without waiting for an opening in traffic. Ms. Samson will contact RVTD to retrieve information on their preferences. Commissioner Lewin said another issue with one lane traffic is delivery trucks who customarily stop in the middle of traffic to deliver their packages. Chair Summerhays said in past meetings, she remembers discussion of designated pullovers. Ms. Samson said she will check on all this and bring back information to answer the commission's questions.

Chair Summerhays said she sees a person in the audience and asked if they wanted to comment. He identified himself as Dale Shaddox representing Rogue Valley Association of Realtors. His comments were: Concept 6 maximizes traffic volumes and circulation. One way streets limit economic development, limit access to properties and the incentive to develop them, limit numbers of customers. He said economic development should be any government agency's highest priority.

V. OLD BUSINESS: None

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

VII. WORKSHOP BEAR CREEK VALLEY REGIONAL PROBLEM SOLVING (RPS)

Ms. Samson said the Planning Commission is very familiar with this project. Past and present Planning Commissions did twelve years of work before adoption.

According to Ms. Samson, PH-5 has possibilities for industrial development; two thirds of the land is so designated. This land will not be used for commercial businesses unless they relate to employment centers. No "big boxes." Ms. Samson has been meeting with planners in other communities to hear their ideas. There are strict standards of what the density needs to be in the residential areas. This pertains to the Urban Growth Boundary and Urban Renewal Area. She said that we have already adopted buffering standards for agricultural land in the Land Development Code. A group is meeting on housing strategy and Ms. Samson will bring back a report. If Phoenix is going to expand beyond the UGB, the City will have to look at URA lands first. And with those lands, a few major planning concepts need to be in place.

Ms. Samson said it's the job of Council to set priorities as far as URA's. Once Council says it's time to deal with URA's, the City needs to determine what kind of land we'll need for approximately the next 20 years. The City probably will not be able to bring in all of PH-5 at once because one will not be able to justify the needs for all of it. The City is going to have to pay for some expensive studies: for example, a housing strategy and an economic development strategy. Land use and transportation concepts can probably be done in-house.

The City has to report its progress on RPS, but Ms. Samson is not aware of any time limits.

There was discussion about whether public hearings were held or not when the RPS Comprehensive Plan update was adopted. Ms. Samson said she would find the Planning Commission meeting minutes relative to this. She knows that there was an agreement between the County and the City regarding the URA & UGB relative to a property owner's intent for development and bringing it up to code. Ms. Samson said our agreement was called the Urban Reserve Management Agreement which the Council adopted with Ordinance No. 940. Ms. Samson said she would bring a summary of how this occurred to this commission.

VIII. COMMENTS FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Eisenhower said he recently viewed the City website and saw much outdated information. Assistant Planner Roennfeldt gave a brief statement about the new website and updated information. He said before the website "goes live," he will send a link to the commissioners for their comments.

IX. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ms. Samson reported the department may be talking further to a developer who is interested in doing a multi-family project. Dutch Bros. and the gas station have started construction. ODOT sent out postcards about an upcoming open house on the Fern Valley Interchange project.

X. WORKSHOP ON LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REVISIONS

Ms. Samson said she had previously distributed a list of items regarding the Land Development Code that either need to be corrected, moved to another section, removed, or clarified. She said that if the Planning Commission resolves everything on the list, it could get to the Council by next fall.

The City does have to give a 45-day notice to DLCD for any changes to the Land Development Code. Then one has to give 20 day local notice by posting it or putting it on the website - not necessary by mail. Ms. Samson then gave a Power Point presentation which identified several topics to be addressed.

The commission decided to discuss Wireless Communication Facilities: Ms. Samson said currently in the Development Code, there is a Section to allow for Wireless Cell Towers, either attached or freestanding, in various zones.

After discussion, the Commission decided that Cell Towers should be allowed in the City Center by a Conditional Use Permit and could be attached, but not freestanding.

Towers should be allowed in Commercial Highway zones with a Conditional Use Permit, and one of those conditions will be a mandatory "stealth" design.

Towers should not be allowed in residential zones R1 or R2. R3 should be allowed as a conditional use, which means it would come before the Planning Commission. On

apartment building, towers should be allowed as long as they are attached and not freestanding.

In Industrial Zones, no Conditional Use Permit is required but towers must be of a “stealth” design.

XI. ADJOURNMENT: Chair Summerhays adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Micki Chair Summerhays, Chair

Laurel Samson,
Interim Planning Director