

DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY FORUM
January 11th, 2005 - 7:30 to 9:30 AM
Meeting Minutes

Item #	Discussion Item:
1.11.06.I	<p><u>Welcome and Introductions:</u> John Wesley</p> <p>John introduced the new City of Mesa, City Manager – Chris Brady.</p> <p>Chris introduced himself and gave a brief background. He iterated his comfort level within the development community and relayed his opinion of its importance to the City. He offered to meet with developers and/or development groups to ascertain what things are working, and if any parts of the process require improvement. He toured the Municipal Building, which is under renovation, and suggested that the building condition will improve and any process deficiencies should also be reviewed and improved. Lastly, he stated that if the development processes were impossible to navigate, developers would look elsewhere.</p>
1.11.06.II	<p><u>Underground Facilities (Blue Stake):</u> Burt Williams (Utilities Department)</p> <p>Burt provided some highlights regarding the recent changes to the underground facilities law .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All new and active underground utilities installed in any real property after 12/31/05 require a detectible underground device unless the facility is detectible by an above ground electronic device. 2. Requires an underground facilities operator that is an operator of a sewer system, municipality or political subdivision to locate and mark the underground sewer facilities owned by another person if the underground facilities are installed after December 31, 2005, and they are in the public street, alley, right-of-way dedicated to the public use or utility easement. 3. Requires building officials to administer and enforce the requirement that a detectable underground location device be included in the installation of new underground facilities except for those that are installed for a public utility or municipal corporation. 4. Establishes a civil penalty not to exceed \$5,000 for any person who does not include a detectable underground location device with new underground facilities. 5. Requires any penalties received by the building official be deposited in the municipality's or political subdivision's general fund. 6. City of Mesa – responsibilities within the ROW, instead of the 'old' Mesa Detail (M-24) we will be referencing / enforcing new MAG Detail, 440-1, Note; other Cities may utilize the 'others' that are options available, i.e. 440-2, 440-3, 440-4 <p>Burt further iterated that the law places a greater burden on the system operators (City of Mesa) to locate laterals from the system hookup to private property and not necessarily the homeowner. It will however affect the requirements for non-traceable underground facilities in commercial, industrial, and various apartment complexes. The horizontal-directional drilling that usually accompanies development provides challenges, including the disturbance and/or damage of existing underground utilities; the law changes are meant to mitigate these instances, and provide increased accountability. The Building Safety Division is striving to keep the application of the changes as simply as possible until more definitive direction is received. Two Mesa City Code amendments have been drafted to amend chapters three and seven of the code, and bring the City into alignment with the State law. This law only applies to new underground facilities installed after 12/31/05.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>Are there any exemptions, by size or use? The law states irrigation lines less than two inches.</p> <p>Is there additional information on termination points? Terminate above ground; it was suggested to utilize a sleeve and to tie wire ends above ground.</p>

	<p>Are there any manufacturers looking to install detectible products? Yes, research and development companies are developing product improvements as they relate to better detection of plastic products. Also available is the use of detectable warning tape.</p> <p>Two websites were provided: Blue Stake – www.azbluestake.com & www.mag.maricop.gov</p> <p>Handouts were also provided on the proposed code amendments, the blue stake handbook, and the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) details.</p>
1.11.06.III	<p><u>Municipal Building Renovation:</u> Steve Hether</p> <p>The Municipal Building renovation is in its 2nd phase. The majority of the Plans examiners have been move to the completed 2nd floor (south wing) including Screening temporarily; the completed work looks good. The east primary east entrance is still under construction, and all customers must still enter the building on the far east side. Staff asks for the development community's patience as the renovation proceeds.</p>
1.11.06.IV	<p><u>Building Safety Division – Fee Simplification Update:</u> Steve Hether</p> <p>The fee simplification has been approved by Council and goes into effect on 2/21/06. The simplification removes the requirement for much of the tedious actions such as counting electrical receptacles. There is additional information on our website, and a link in the next Development Services newsletter.</p>
1.11.06.V	<p><u>Planning Division Workplan:</u> John Wesley</p> <p>John provided a one-page handout including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fee increase – approved by Council on 1/9/06. • Condominium conversion ordinance – going to Planning & Zoning Board in January, and potentially Council in March 2006. • Planning Hearing Officer – approved and selection in progress. • Site Plan Review – will be applied to future cases only, and staff is working on ordinance and changes to stipulations. • Elimination Introduction of Ordinances – May ballot, but will likely not shorten process. • Zoning Ordinance Update – request-for-proposals to review and amend this ordinance though an external vendor is due 2/7/06. • Turn Around Times (Planning applications) – two reports provided, which depict Oct. – 91%, Nov. – 100%, and Dec. – 95%.
1.11.06.VI	<p><u>Development Review System:</u> Laura Hyneman</p> <p>Laura discussed this Planning Division part of the system and provided some futuristic information including some potential questions and outcomes: is the development review process efficient, are staff accessible, are the development standards reasonable, are projects managed effectively, and is the organizational structure correct – are roles, responsibilities clearly defined and is accountability apparent. Lastly, Planning is working with Building Safety to implement a Planning module of the Tidemark automated system.</p>
1.11.06.VII	<p><u>Presubmittal Planning & Zoning and Design Review Board Applications – Submittal Requirements:</u> Laura Hyneman</p> <p>Revised application checklists were presented. They depict submittal requirements for acceptance in to the system. They are intentionally similar in nature to depict that frequently the same requirements are necessary. The checklist for Overview Submittal is very simple because this review is intended to respond to basic Planning and infrastructure issues.</p>

<p>1.11.06.VIII</p>	<p><u>Presubmittal. Planning & Zoning, and Design Review Board Applications - Screening:</u> Laura Hyneman</p> <p>The Planning Division is proposing a screening process of Presubmittal, Planning & Zoning (P&Z), and Design Review Board (DRB) applications, which could facilitate an improved submission and review process. For Pre-Submittal applications, they will be screened, and staff will contact the applicant to schedule the conference date and time. For P&Z and DRB applications, one alternative is to provide a four-five hour window on the day of submittal deadline with staff blocking out the time period to applications with the customers.</p> <p>Questions and Comments:</p> <p>As long as this does not add time to the process, the development community is not against it.</p> <p>Why doesn't the Planning Division notify the development community about the Design review Board and the Planning and Zoning Board cutoffs? These cutoffs are posted.</p> <p>Will projects only be accepted during these four-five hour timeframes? Yes, there is no additional staff time to accept submittals at other times, and earlier submittals can be place in a corner and forgotten. Some developers are concerned that any problems or missed cutoffs would delay the project a month. Another option is for the Planning Division to dedicate a Planning Assistant periodically during the month.</p> <p>How many projects can be review during the suggested four-five hour period? Allocation of ten minutes (average) per project.</p> <p>Some developers are discouraged over one-day availability, and the potential for a "logjam" at the counter during this cutoff period.</p> <p>Would the Planning Division consider setting appointments? Yes.</p> <p>All participants are encouraged to forward input to Laura Hyneman or John Wesley, and also partake in the Development Process survey jointly created by Building Safety and Planning.</p>
<p>1.11.06.IX</p>	<p><u>Sign Permits – Deposit Application Fees:</u> Laura Hyneman</p> <p>Effective 1/21/06 there will be a sign deposit fee. The fee is intended to preclude speculative sing permits that requires staff review time.</p>
<p>1.11.06.X</p>	<p><u>Open Discussion:</u></p> <p>Deputy Director – Terry Williams Tammy Albright has been named the third Building Safety Division Deputy Director.</p> <p>ISO (Insurance Services Office) – Terry Williams Over the last eight months the City of Mesa, Building Safety Division has coordinated with the ISO to evaluate its Building Division. The ISO provides a professional evaluation of Building Departments to ascertain effectiveness, and subsequently makes recommendation to the insurance industry on setting area rates. The ISO rates municipalities on a one (1) to Ten (10) scale with (1) being the highest. The City of Mesa, Building Safety Division's previous rating was six (6) in both Residential and Commercial areas. The current rating improved to a four (4) – Residential and a three (3) – Commercial.</p>
<p>The next Development Advisory Forum is scheduled for April 12th, 2006.</p>	