

**DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY FORUM**  
**July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2006 - 7:30 to 9:45 AM**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Item #	Discussion Item:
7.12.06.I	<p><b><u>Welcome:</u> Terry Williams</b></p> <p>Terry welcomed the group and introductions ensured to familiarize the group with staff and development community representatives.</p>
7.12.06.II	<p><b><u>Titles 4 &amp; 9 Update:</u> Terry Williams</b></p> <p>Title 9 changes were adopted by Council on 7/5/06, and will become effective on 8/4/06. The Title 4 proposed changes were removed from consideration due to an omission (Section 4-1-4-A) of three school districts from permit exemption (EVIT, Queen Creek, and Higley). This correction will be made, the changes will be re-introduced at the 7/12/06 Council meeting, and if adopted, the changes will become effective 9/13/06. Terry reviewed the presentation made to City Council, which provided an outline of the changes including: complete replacement of Section 4-1, the creation of a new designation – R-5 for Single-family residences; Building Board of Appeals (BBA) recommendations (i.e., service sinks and drinking fountains), to reinstate the authority of withholding permits and/or Certificates of Occupancy (CofO) for sales tax delinquencies to the Building Safety Director, and other minor changes.</p> <p>Terry highlighted the Title 9 changes including: Title 9 definitions, enhancing Development Services Department Manager’s discretion on unique site situations, and to add options in applying City standards on parcels involving demolition of reconstruction. The changes also align the City Code more closely with the recently revised City Engineering Standards.</p> <p>A City of Mesa, Fire Department (FD) – Hal Key spoke briefly about the recently Council-adopted ordinance requiring commercial development projects to submit electronic drawings (CD format) to the Building Safety Division for integration into their on-truck computer operating systems; this became effective 7/5/06.</p> <p><b>Questions/Comments:</b></p> <p>Does the City require “stamping” of sewer lines? Staff present will confer with the City Engineer, provide feedback to the Development community, which shall be conveyed via email as soon as possible.</p> <p>Will any changes to the Title 9 requirements be retroactive to existing projects? No, the effective date of Title 9 changes is 8/4/06; any projects already approved will not have to meet the new requirements.</p>
7.12.06.III	<p><b><u>Annual Facilities Permit (AFP) Program:</u> David Harding</b></p> <p>The Building Safety Division – Inspections workgroup is piloting an expansion of the current AFP program, which involves extending “permit by inspection” (PBI) to first time tenant improvements. The pilot will permit building management the opportunity to improve tenant space without submitting for full, core plan review. The program is not designed to reduce fees (full permit fees remain intact), but instead is meant to reduce a project’s approval timeline. The pilot parameters are limited to business (B) and mercantile (M) occupancies 3,000 square feet or less without the approval of the Deputy Building Safety Director – Inspections.</p>

<p><b>7.12.06.IV</b></p>	<p><b><u>2006 Code Adoption: Steve Hether</u></b></p> <p>An internal review of the 2006 potential code adoption has been completed. Draft documents were distributed, which include staff recommendations on potential amendments to the 2006 Code to satisfy local requirements. The transition to the 2006 International Code Council (ICC) Family of Codes will be much easier than the 2003 adoption process due to the minimal amount of changes, to staff's familiarization with ICC codes, and the limited amount of review required. The previous review required an exhaustive review of the 2003 ICC codes, a review of the NFPA 5000, and a comparison of the two.</p> <p><b>Questions/Comments:</b>  Why go to the 2006 Code? Staff and the developers have just grown accustomed to the 2003, and the City of Mesa has only been operating under the 2003 Code for a year? The changes from the 2003 to the 2006 are minimal, and the Division had made a commitment to remain Code current. Currency ensures consistency in the valley, and ensures the City of Mesa requires and enforces current construction standards.</p>
<p><b>7.12.06.V</b></p>	<p><b><u>Expedited &amp; Large/Complex Project Turnaround Times: Steve Hether</u></b></p> <p>The Building Safety Division – Plan review workgroup is proposing to amend the turnaround times on expedited and large/complex projects. It is difficult to manage a workload that remains undefined. The largest, uncontrollable variable for expedited projects is resubmittals. Previously, management accepted projects and attempted to meet turnaround times with scarce resources without any definitive commitment from the applicants. In addition, the established turnaround times for commercial projects (12/22 days) were also unrealistic for larger or more complex projects (e.g. a new hospital). To resolve both these issues, the Division is suggesting a modification of the turnaround times. Both types of projects will require a commitment of specific submittal and resubmittal (schedule) requirements, and active communication and coordination between Division staff and the applicant.</p>
<p><b>7.12.06.VI</b></p>	<p><b><u>Development Review System: Laura Hyneman</u></b></p> <p>The Development Review System is not a stand-alone process. There are numerous variables that will directly and indirectly affect it: technical requirements, Code requirements, staff space, meeting space, customer service considerations, and organizational structure. The Planning Division has been working on improvement opportunities for processes to run concurrently that in affect, reduces overall project timelines.</p> <p>Laura Hyneman posed one of the Planning Division's survey questions to the group – what issues are you facing in the Development Review process?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boards are not able to change the project “to work”.</li> <li>• Feedback is not timely.</li> <li>• Lines of authority between the Boards are blurred.</li> <li>• Information transfer (board to staff, staff to staff) is inefficient to non-inclusive, which requires applicants to “re-justify” approved items.</li> <li>• Amount of information provided at the Presubmittal phase is too much; the development community is seeking generalities and “fatal flaws”, not code requirements.</li> <li>• Oft times comments are not project-specific and confusing (e.g., a Industrial project getting refuse comments).</li> <li>• Civil (Development Engineering) comments are just the opposite – not enough information; the developers wants it all and timely.</li> <li>• Impact study is signed off along the way, but Permit Services area does not accept the sign-offs.</li> </ul>

7.12.06.VII	<p><b><u>Zoning Ordinance Update:</u> Gordon Sheffield</b></p> <p>Gordon presented a PowerPoint created by the selected consultant that will perform the Zoning Ordinance (ZO) update – Dyett &amp; Bhatia. The ZO is a tool utilized by the general public, developers, City, and staff. The existing document is over eighteen years old, and it is difficult to apply to current development needs. The update will align the ZO with the 2025 General Plan, State requirements, and the City Charter, as well as consider other development challenges including: infill, mixed-use, transit-oriented development (TOD), and streamlining review processes in a more user-friendly format. There will be numerous public-participation opportunities: forums and workshops, surveys, selective one-on-one interview sessions with the consultant, and “roadshows”. Some regular Planning Division customers will be contacted by staff for the one-on-one interview sessions. The selected consultant has national expertise in many arenas. Examples of other cities the consultant has worked with were provided including similar concerns – density, setbacks, and open space. The update will likely take approximately eighteen months with the initial draft ZO being releases in four modules. The four parts will then be assembled into a draft document for public review. Public hearings will be held by the Planning &amp; Zoning Board before eventual consideration of the draft ZO update by City Council.</p>
7.12.06.VIII	<p><b><u>Planning Division Miscellaneous Items:</u> John Wesley</b></p> <p><b>Site Plan Process</b> – the requirement for Council approval of site plans will be back on the 7/12/06 agenda for consideration. If adopted, the Planning &amp; Zoning Board will be the final approval, which will shave weeks off the applicant’s review time.</p>
7.12.06.IX	<p><b><u>Building Safety Division - Miscellaneous Items:</u> Terry Williams</b></p> <p><b>Survey</b> – a survey was distributed and is available online, which is intended to evaluate existing and potential new services at the East Mesa Service Center (EMSC), and to consider the viability of a new service center in southeast Mesa when developing increase in that area.</p> <p><b>International Code Council (ICC)</b> – Dave Nichols, ICC Regional Manager, provided some information on a joint project between ICC and International Association of Plumbing and Mechanical Officials (IAPMO), which will unite the organizations under one plumbing code in 2009.</p>
7.12.06.X	<p><b><u>Open Discussion:</u></b></p> <p>No items were offered for general discussion.</p>
<p><b>The next Development Advisory Forum is scheduled for October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2006.</b></p>	