

# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee



October 30, 2024 | 2:00 PM  
201 N. Montezuma Street  
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor  
Prescott, AZ 86301

### AGENDA

The following Agenda will be considered by the **General Plan Review Committee** at their meeting to be held **October 30, 2024**. Notice of this meeting is given pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes, Section 38-431.02.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **ROLL CALL**
3. **DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS**
  - A. Approval of the July 31, 2024 and August 21, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.  
**Recommended Action: MOVE to approve the minutes as presented**
  - B. Presentation & Discussion Regarding the Review of Comments Submitted During the 60-Day Public Comment Period.  
**Recommended Action: This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.**
4. **UPDATES FROM STAFF**
5. **ADJOURNMENT**

Upon a public majority vote of a quorum of the Board, the Board may hold an executive session, which will not be open to the public, regarding any item listed on the agenda but only for the following purposes:

- (1) Discussion or consideration of personnel matters (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(1));
- (2) Discussion or consideration of records exempt by law (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(2));
- (3) Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the city's attorneys (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3));
- (4) Discussion or consultation with the city's attorneys regarding the city's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation, or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid litigation (A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(4));
- (5) Discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations with employee organizations (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(5));
- (6) Discussion, consultation or consideration for negotiations by the city or its designated representatives with members of a tribal council, or its designated representatives, of an Indian

reservation located within or adjacent to the city (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(6));

(7) Discussion or consultation with designated representatives of the city to consider its position and instruct its representatives regarding negotiations for the purchase, sale or lease of real property (A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(7)).

### **CERTIFICATION OF POSTING OF NOTICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Prescott City Hall on 10/23/24 at 8:30 a.m. in accordance with the statement filed by the Prescott City Council with the City Clerk.

*Sarah M. Siep*

---

Sarah M. Siep, City Clerk



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA: October 30 General Plan Committee  
DATE: October 30, 2024  
DEPT: Community Development  
ITEM #: 3.A  
SUBJECT: Approval of the July 31, 2024 and August 21, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.

## ITEM SUMMARY

This item is for the approval of the July 31, 2024 and August 21, 2024 General Plan Committee meeting minutes. Staff recommends approval of the minutes as presented.

## BACKGROUND

None.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact regarding this item.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

MOVE to approve the minutes as presented

## ATTACHMENTS

1. July 31, 2024 General Plan Committee Minutes
2. August 21, 2024 General Plan Committee Minutes



# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee

---

July 31, 2024 | 2:00 PM  
201 N. Montezuma Street  
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor  
Prescott, AZ 86301

### MINUTES

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Sapio called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Terry Sapio, Chair  
Don Michelman, Vice-Chair  
Andre Carman - Excused  
Thomas Davis  
Mary Frederickson  
J.D. Greenberg  
Ralph Hess  
Jim Huffman  
James McCarver - Arrived 2:07 p.m.  
Rod Moyer - Excused  
Tom Reilly

**3. OPEN CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

None.

**4. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS**

- A. Presentation, Discussion, Review & Possible Action Regarding Proposed Language From the Martin Luther King Committee Regarding Proposed Anti-Discrimination Language in the Introduction of the Charter.

Jim Helbling and Robert Shegog, members of the Martin Luther King Committee presented and spoke on the topic. They provided a presentation on updated wording to be used in the General Plan that they discussed with the Martin Luther King Committee, Member Carman and Member Hess.

Member Frederickson commented that she feels the words of "gender expression or identity" should be removed, she feels it can cause more problems and does not do anything positive.

Mr. Shegog responded that the words should be included since they are hot button issues, they should not be ignored and it shows it is being embraced.

Mr. Helbling commented that the General Plan contains goals for the city, if the list contains something that a person can identify with then they will feel included

and welcome and that the city does not condone discrimination.

Chair Sapio asked if the research results and surveys showed that youth that have gender reassignment surgeries have high suicide rates.

Mr. Helbling responded that those youth probably, unfortunately did not or do not have a good support system or people in their corner.

Chair Sapio asked how it would be possible to make everyone feel comfortable in the City of Prescott, don't want to move backwards when trying to make improvements for everyone.

Mr. Shegog commented that he has experienced discrimination in the City of Prescott and is aware of others who have said they have, too. Adding the updated language would help those who feel discriminated against, he would like an anti-discrimination ordinance but knows that can be an uphill battle.

Mr. Helbling stated that this should be put out there for the people to decide for themselves what they would like to include.

Member Reilly asked what is it about the statement that is not positive. All words can be hollow, different people can take the words as different meanings, it is difficult to make sure all citizens are happy, but stated that it is not the job of this Committee to decide what is and is not discrimination, they need to decide the language to be used in the General Plan.

Councilman Gambogi compared the current situation to the creation of the Declaration of Independence and emphasized the importance of rational debate and civil discussion. He urged everyone to avoid emotional arguments and focus on preserving the neighborly and friendly spirit of Prescott, known as "Everybody's Hometown" and encouraged everyone work together to reach a resolution and to collectively accept the outcome once the debate is over.

Vice-Chair Michelman commented that he is in support of the statement, highlighting two key points: the city's commitment to valuing quality of life and its stance against condoning discrimination. He emphasized that the statement is a general expression of values which aligns with the purpose of a General Plan.

Member McCarver added that words are emotionally charged and mean different things to different people.

Member Hess commented that the plan is not a legal document, it is what the city values.

Mr. Worley added that the public has the 60 day comment period to let Committee know if they agree or disagree with the language.

Member of the public Leslie Grady commented that she serves on the steering committee for the Prescott Peacebuilders and shared their goal statement, and added need to make Prescott a visible example on how a community should

openly respect and support all people living and visiting our city.

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO APPROVE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION LANGUAGE OPTION 3; SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR MICHELMAN: PASSED (6 - 2). MEMBERS FREDERICKSON AND MCCARVER DISSENTING, MEMBER DAVIS ABSTAINING.**

- B. Presentation, Discussion & Review of the Draft 2025 Prescott General Plan.

Due to timing, Ms. DeWitt requested the Committee Members provide her their comments and edits and this topic will be further discussed at a future meeting.

**This item was for discussion only. No formal action was taken.**

- C. Presentation, Discussion, Review & Possible Action Regarding Language for Major Plan Amendments.

***Item C was discussed before Item B.***

Planner Tammy DeWitt introduced the updated version of major plan amendments.

Member Hess commented that he wants to look at the options available and the effects they may have.

Member McCarver commented he believes the major plan amendment has never been triggered since there may be few, if any, parcels in the city that would meet the acreage criteria. He understands changing the criteria may bring additional work but it can also allow managed growth.

Chair Sapio commented that the Committee changed the threshold for triggering a major plan amendment from a quarter-mile to a half-mile radius to avoid making every rezoning request a major amendment. He emphasized that requiring a supermajority vote for minor rezonings could give undue power to a few council members, potentially disenfranchising voters, he believes all council members should have an equal vote on rezoning decisions.

Member Hess commented since the major plan amendment has not been triggered that it can benefit developers. He wants the public to see different options.

Mr. Worley added that the current wording and triggers were established by a prior Committee.

Member Greenburg asked for examples where a change would have been helpful and made a difference in the outcome.

Member Hess responded that his understanding is that the public is displeased with the current wording.

Member Reilly commented that he sees unintended consequences possible with

the proposed changes.

Member Greenburg asked if something can be incorporated for the welfare of the community.

Member Reilly commented that the land use guide is what the Planning & Zoning Commission uses to review zoning changes. City Council can then look at all aspects of the proposed change to make their decision.

Mr. Worley commented that the Committee is deciding today on a possible alternative for the public to consider.

Chair Sapio stated that a proposal which lacks size criteria for projects would require even small projects to go through a major plan amendment. He supports the existing half-mile radius criteria and suggested sticking with it unless adjustments are needed. He added that 40 acres seems to be an appropriate threshold for requiring a major plan amendment and questioned if anything smaller should qualify.

Member McCarver added that he sees the restrictions as a plus to manage growth and have another set of eyes to review the proposals.

Mr. Worley explained that both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council review land use and zoning changes, with the City Council making the final decision. The key difference in proposals is the time and voting requirements of a major amendment, including a 60-day review period and a supermajority vote. Large developers can afford to wait, but small infill developers often can't, due to financing constraints. An acreage limit, whether 10 or 40 acres, could offer flexibility, allowing smaller developers to avoid the prolonged process and the need for a supermajority vote.

Member Hess proposed that both options for the major plan amendment criteria—his suggestion and the existing option modified to increase the radius from a quarter mile to a half mile—be presented for public comment. He emphasized that since the committee's consensus was close (6 to 4), both alternatives should be shared with the public to gather feedback. He stressed the importance of public input and indicated that the final decision would ultimately be made by the City Council after reviewing public comments and suggestions.

Ms. DeWitt clarified that if a project is under the five-acre limit but doesn't comply with the land use map, it still requires a minor plan amendment, which goes through a public hearing process similar to a major amendment. The major amendment adds a 60-day comment period and requires a supermajority vote. Previously, major amendments were only heard once a year, but now the process is less restrictive. She suggested setting an acreage threshold, like five or ten acres, for triggering major amendments to avoid delaying small, beneficial infill projects, as smaller rezonings are more common in the city.

Chair Sapio and Member Reilly commented that the proposed change would kill close to 90 percent of infill.

The Committee Members discussed and debated if an alternative is needed and what the effects would be if a change was implemented.

Member of the public Deborah Thalasis commented that after two years, the group still lacked key data and examples from other communities to make informed decisions. She supports Member Hess's suggestion to delay final decisions until more information was gathered.

Member Reilly asked what the data is that Ms. Thalasis is referring to, what would be an example.

Ms. Thalasis responded that one set of data would be looking at all parcels 40 acres or larger that can be found through the GIS database.

Mr. Worley said it is not a problem to get the data and map.

Member of the public Truly Bracken commented that she agrees more data is needed and alternatives need to be considered.

Committee Members each commented on their thoughts of what acreage number is appropriate, responses ranged from 10 - 40 acres, a response that a number is arbitrary without more data, and that the density designation also has high impact.

Member Reilly commented that he would like to see the data before a motion is voted on.

**MOTION BY CHAIR SAPIO TO APPROVE MAJOR PLAN AMENDMENT LANGUAGE SUGGESTED BY RALPH HESS AND A 20 ACRE SIZE; MOTION DIED DUE TO LACK OF SECOND**

The Committee decided to defer a decision to a future meeting after additional data is reviewed.

**D. Presentation & Discussion Regarding Input for the 60-Day Public Comment Period.**

Ms. DeWitt let the Committee Members know how the public comments will appear for the public to see. All comments received prior to the 60 day comment period will be available to view via a PDF document. Department heads will also be commenting when the draft is shared with them. Comments from the public will be reviewed with the Committee Members.

Member Hess suggested that the public commenters have an option to be able to identify themselves if they are part of a group and are providing comments from their area of expertise.

**This item was for discussion only. No formal action was taken.**

**5. UPDATES**

Ms. DeWitt requested the Committee Members provide her their comments and edits. The final draft should be back to the members in time for them to review for the August 28th meeting.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Sapio adjourned the meeting at 4:19 p.m.

---

Terry Sapio, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Board Secretary



# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee

---

August 21, 2024 | 2:00 PM  
201 N. Montezuma Street  
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor  
Prescott, AZ 86301

### MINUTES

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sapio called the meeting to order at 02:00 PM.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

Terry Sapio, Chair  
Don Michelman, Vice-Chair  
Andre Carman Member  
Thomas Davis, Member  
Mary Frederickson, Member  
J.D. Greenberg, Member  
Ralph Hess, Member  
Jim Huffman, Member  
James McCarver, Member (Arrived 2:10 p.m.)  
Rod Moyer, Member (Excused)  
Tom Reilly, Member

#### 3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

- A. Presentation, Discussion, Review and Approval Regarding Language for Major Plan Amendments.

George Worley, Planning Manager, introduced the topic for discussion. Examples from other municipalities, definitions, and maps were displayed for review and discussion. Background was provided on major plan amendments and the criteria associated with them. Three options were presented: one generated by staff after reviewing example plans, another recommended by Committee Member Ralph Hess, and a third open for discussion and potential hybridization by the Committee. The Committee had previously discussed what triggers a major plan amendment, focusing on an acreage trigger. Staff expressed concern that focusing solely on acreage might overlook community impacts. They suggested considering variable acreages depending on the type of change, as different jurisdictions use different criteria. Mr. Worley covered the distinction between land use and zoning, and the types of amendments that can occur in the General Plan: text amendments and map amendments. He emphasized that only these two types can be amended. The discussion also highlighted the importance of having criteria to determine what triggers a major amendment, ensuring that map designations in the General Plan are not confused with zoning.

Tammy DeWitt, Community Planner, continued the presentation and explained which zoning districts align with each land use designation, emphasizing that the

general plan uses land use designations, not zoning. For example, recreational and open space designations align with natural and recreational zoning districts. Mixed-use designations include light commercial and various residential categories. Commercial designations allow residential uses without requiring rezoning, though rezoning to higher density could trigger a change. They reviewed various residential densities and noted that land use maps use designations, not zoning, to reflect current and planned uses.

Mr. Worley continued that land use and zoning designations don't perfectly align and discussed the need to update the criteria for triggering major amendments, as they were created for different circumstances over a decade ago. The process used to be more complex, but recent changes have diluted its impact. Additionally, Committee Member Ralph Hess proposed revisions to better align with the staff's recommendation format, which was discussed in the last meeting.

Member Hess added that the goal was to make the information more readable and accessible to both the public and the Committee. He also modified the original proposal, adding a note about changes in the land use map from residential to other designations, except for open space or recreation space, which had not been included in the earlier text.

Mr. Worley stated that the staff alternative for major amendments was more complex, as it considered the impacts of changes between land use categories more thoroughly than previous methods. Major amendments required additional scrutiny and a city council review. The difference between requiring a majority versus a super majority vote was significant, as a super majority required more support but could be easily vetoed. The staff believed that not all amendments should need a super majority and that factors like parcel size and impact should be considered. They raised concerns about Ralph's broader proposal, which didn't account for density increases within residential uses. The staff's matrix aimed to address these issues with detailed criteria for different land use categories.

The Committee reviewed the pros and cons of the options available.

Member of the public Mike Fann expressed concern that Prescott is becoming an elitist community, losing families and its workforce. He urged the committee to consider the long-term vision for Prescott, emphasizing the need to support families and workforce housing. He cautioned against adding more hurdles that could hinder affordable housing development and warned that if developers face too many obstacles, they might choose to build outside of Prescott, leading to increased traffic and crime without the benefits of local economic growth.

Ms. DeWitt added that there are multiple hurdles developers face when seeking approval for projects in Prescott, particularly for multifamily housing. After receiving zoning approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission, developers must also obtain a water allocation recommendation before the City Council can give final approval. Financing for multifamily projects is currently difficult, causing delays and potential loss of water allocations, which are only valid for one year. She also emphasized the need to avoid additional obstacles that could hinder essential infill projects aimed at making Prescott a more family-friendly

community.

Member of the public Deb Thalasis addressed the frequent use of "affordable housing" as a buzzword, reflecting on her experience in cities with housing authorities and affordable housing programs. She questioned why, despite 21 years since the 40-acre regulation was implemented, Prescott still struggled with affordable housing and argued that the issue isn't due to restrictive regulations but the lack of financial investment and subsidies. Ms. Thalasis emphasized that focusing solely on regulations and lowering impact fees hasn't yielded the desired results. She also suggested a need for an "Institutional use" category in Prescott's zoning, particularly for areas like the airport, which are currently designated as open space but aren't used for recreational purposes.

Member Reilly commented on the need to protect neighborhood quality rather than just focusing on parcel size. He critiqued Member Hess's proposal for allowing high-density residential changes without major plan amendments, which could harm neighborhoods. He supported the staff's alternative for its more nuanced approach and thorough scrutiny, cautioning against an elitist attitude that resists change. He argued that the staff's proposal is crucial for making balanced decisions and ensuring the plan's effectiveness.

Member Hess stated he is willing to amend his proposal to align with staff's recommendations on upzoning in residential areas, requiring major plan amendments for density increases. He emphasized that quality projects would likely gain the necessary approval and highlighted the importance of the 60-day public comment period for community input. He believes his amended proposal best reflects the committee's consensus.

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO APPROVE THE MAJOR PLAN AMENDMENT LANGUAGE AS: STAFF'S ALTERNATIVE; SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIR MICHELMAN: APPROVED (7 - 0 - 3) MEMBERS HESS, GREENBERG AND HUFFMAN DISSENTING.**

**4. UPDATES**

Ms. DeWitt stated the Committee will receive a copy of the current draft to review and will vote on it at the next meeting.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Sapio adjourned the meeting at 03:37 PM.

---

Terry Sapio, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Board Secretary



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA: October 30 General Plan Committee  
DATE: October 30, 2024  
DEPT: Community Development  
ITEM #: 3.B  
SUBJECT: Presentation & Discussion Regarding the Review of Comments Submitted During the 60-Day Public Comment Period.

## ITEM SUMMARY

The 60-day public comment period for the revised General Plan started on September 23, 2024 and will end on November 21, 2024. Comments have been provided by the public and can be viewed in the Virtual Meeting Room located on the Plan Prescott Website located at <https://s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/kollabspace.prescott.general.plan/index.html>.

Staff will be reviewing them with the General Plan Committee to see if there are any items that need to be addressed or updated.

## BACKGROUND

None.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.

## ATTACHMENTS

None