

# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee



November 13, 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 **November 13, 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 August 28, 2024 and October 30, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.  
**Recommended Action: MOVE to approve minutes as presented**
  - B. Presentation & Discussion Regarding the Review of Comments Submitted to Date During the 60-Day Public Comment Period.  
**Recommended Action: This item is for discussion only. No formal action will be taken.**
4. **UPDATES**
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 11/8/24 at 10:45 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: November 13 General Plan Committee  
DATE: November 13, 2024  
DEPT: Community Development  
ITEM #: 3.A  
SUBJECT: Approval of the August 28, 2024 and October 30, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.

## ITEM SUMMARY

This item is for the approval of the August 28, 2024 and the October 30, 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 minutes as presented

## ATTACHMENTS

1. 8.28.24 General Plan Minutes
2. 10.30.24 General Plan Minutes



# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee

---

August 28, 2024 | 2:00 PM  
201 N. Montezuma Street  
Council Chambers, 3rd Floor  
Prescott, AZ 86301

### MINUTES

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Michelman called the meeting to order at 02:00 p.m.

#### 2. ROLL CALL

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

#### 3. OPEN CALL TO THE PUBLIC

None.

#### 4. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of the June 26, 2024 and July 17, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO APPROVE THE JUNE 26, 2024 MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY MEMBER HUFFMAN: PASSED (7 - 0), MEMBER DAVIS ABSTAINED.**

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO APPROVE THE JULY 17, 2024 MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY MEMBER HUFFMAN: PASSED (7 - 0), MEMBER MOYER ABSTAINED.**

B. Presentation, Discussion & Review Regarding Draft of General Plan and Next Steps (60-day Public Comment Period and Public Hearings).

Tammy DeWitt, Community Planner, displayed the "Introduction" of the General Plan for review. She then moved to the next section of "Resiliency and Sustainability".

Member Hess suggested replacing "encourage" with "incentivize" on page 27, Strategy 1.2.

Ms. DeWitt responded that since the city currently does not have incentives, they suggested adding "Encourage the creation of incentives" to Strategy 1.2 to look into incentives the city could offer.

Member Hess responded that the word "encourage" does not have any effect or enforcement.

Member Reilly suggested using "develop incentives" as an alternative wording.

Member Hess agreed.

Member Reilly asked if Goal 2, Strategy 2.2, on page 34, is the appropriate place to include a recommendation to create a regional water advisory committee.

Ms. DeWitt responded she will work with Water Resources on how to word the recommendation and placement.

Member Davis commented he would like the water discussion to be a little easier for the public to understand.

Member Moyer agreed.

Member Hess stated that more information is needed in Strategy 2.3 on page 34 from the city water staff regarding the intentions for the Big Chino Water Ranch pipeline.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed they will look into that. She moved the Committee on to the next section for review, "A Community Connected".

Member Reilly commented that on page 53, the open space property zoning may need to be reworded for clarification. Additionally, on page 55, Strategy 1.7, he asked if the commission could be changed to a committee.

Ms. DeWitt reviewed a revision request on page 56, Strategy 2.4 that questioned if a charter amendment was the best approach. Therefore, "investigate" was added as it needs more review into the pros and cons of all the available options.

Member Greenburg expressed concern about protecting open space in perpetuity and how to word that to be effective in the plan.

George Worley, Planning Manager, said to keep in mind that this is a draft of the General Plan, which will soon enter a 60-day public review period. After that, the public's comments will be returned to the Committee for their evaluation.

Member Hess supports initiating a charter amendment to protect city-owned open space permanently, as previously suggested 21 years ago but never acted upon. He stated that using eminent domain is for acquiring, not protecting, land. Member Hess is skeptical of the term "investigate," fearing it leads to inaction, and stresses the need for a definitive charter amendment. He noted past

successes with protected areas like Acker Park and believed the amendment would require public approval, which could also repeal it if necessary. He would like to keep the plan's language focused on concrete action rather than vague investigation.

Ms. DeWitt reminded the Committee that this General Plan would have an implementation section to keep track of the needed actions.

**MOTION BY MEMBER HESS TO MODIFY STRATEGY 2.4 ON PAGE 56 OF THE DRAFT 2025 GENERAL PLAN TO STATE "INITIATE A CHARTER AMENDMENT TO PROTECT IN PERPETUITY CITY-OWNED OPEN SPACE AS IT IS ACQUIRED THROUGH DEVELOPMENT, PURCHASE OR AGREEMENTS"; SECONDED BY MEMBER MOYER, PASSED (9-0)**

Ms. DeWitt moved the Committee on to the next section for review.

Member Reilly recommended removing the word "wide" on Strategy 1.1, page 58, since the word is subjective.

Vice Chair Michelman provided an alternative of "functional" instead of "wide".

Ms. DeWitt suggested using "encourage developments where appropriate to evaluate" and they can further review when the report from Game & Fish is received.

Member Reilly accepted.

Ms. DeWitt moved the Committee forward to the next chapter of "Great Places and Neighborhoods".

Member Frederickson asked for clarification on the "aggregates" portion in this chapter.

Ms. DeWitt responded that the State statute requires that it is in the General Plan and the city has very little jurisdiction over mining.

Member Hess raised a question regarding the distinction between recreation space and open space, noting that in previous discussions these were treated separately. He observed that the table now uses "recreation in open space" instead of distinguishing between the two. He proposed a broader definition of open space to clarify this distinction, suggesting that "recreation" should refer to active uses, while "open space" implies passive recreation. He mentioned using the city's terminology and proposed reviewing this further with Parks and Recreation.

Member Greenberg commented that under "Residential Home Lighting", Prescott should become a Dark Sky community.

Mr. Worley, Planning Manager, responded that there are many requirements to meet to become an official Dark Sky Community, some of which may also cause

some problems. The city does have some Dark Sky attributes and reminded the Committee that the public can provide their thoughts on becoming a Dark Sky Community.

Member McCarver asked what the process is after public comments are received.

Mr. Worley responded that the statute requires a 60-day public comment period, after which the committee, Planning Commission, or City Council will review and decide on implementing the public's feedback. Ultimately, it's the City Council's decision whether to adopt these comments. The process includes periodic meetings during the 60-day period to share received comments with the committee and gather input, ensuring that public feedback is carefully considered.

Member Hess suggested a stronger word other than "investigate" to effect actual change.

Ms. DeWitt proposed using "review existing" since some plans may no longer be needed and leaves the option to eliminate plans no longer applicable and relevant.

Member Hess inquired about the archaeological resources reference.

Mr. Worley responded that an update to the Historic Preservation Master Plan is underway, and it will include a new chapter on archeology, which is currently missing. This updated plan, eventually adopted by ordinance, will likely be in place before the General Plan goes to a public vote. It will strengthen enforcement related to archaeological preservation, incorporating language similar to other regulatory requirements.

Vice-Chair Michelman asked about a reference to Firewise in the Tree City paragraph.

Holger Durre, Fire Chief, responded that they now use the term "Fire Adapted Community" which is far more comprehensive.

The Committee moved on to the next chapter of "Economic Competitiveness and Prosperity".

Member Frederickson asked if the statistics mentioned in the "Workforce Characteristics" contain just workforce age people or the whole population of Prescott.

Mr. Worley responded that the date is from a combination of sources, but it is very likely that it refers to the working age, usually defined as those under age 65.

Member Hess recommended removing "burdensome" from strategy 4.1, on page 87. The committee agreed that was a good idea as all regulations are

burdensome.

Member Frederickson asked if overlapping or duplicate strategies would appear on the implementation table once or twice.

Ms. DeWitt responded that there would be duplicates on the table with the same action and group.

Member Hess commented that this section discusses ways to enhance transaction privilege tax collection to fund city services. However, relying solely on this tax isn't sustainable, as it can't increase indefinitely. Other revenue sources will need to be considered, which would require amending state statutes and potentially the state constitution. The question was raised about where these suggestions should be incorporated.

Mr. Worley responded that it could be placed in this chapter and tasked to another department besides Economic Development, possibly City Council, and be a collaborative effort between a few departments.

Member Hess asked when the Implementation table would be updated.

Ms. DeWitt responded that once the Council confirms what goals are decided on, then they will be added to the implementation table.

Member Frederickson asked for clarification on the Major Plan Amendment.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed that portion is being updated.

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO MOVE THE 2025 GENERAL PLAN DRAFT FORWARD FOR 60-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD; SECONDED BY MEMBER FREDERICKSON: PASSED (9 - 0)**

Ms. DeWitt discussed the tentative timeline going forward and introduced the virtual meeting room, which is interactive for the public. Comments can be added and seen at any time and can be liked or disliked.

Member Frederickson asked if there is any limit to comments online, such as a length limit.

Ms. DeWitt responded there is no limit.

**5. UPDATES**

Vice-Chair Michelson thanked the Committee members for contributing to the process.

Ms. DeWitt thanked Kimley-Horn for being great partners in putting the plan together.

Member Reilly thanked staff.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chair Michelman adjourned the meeting at 03:52 p.m.

---

Terry Sapio, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Board Secretary



# City of Prescott

## General Plan Review Committee

---

October 30, 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, Member  
Thomas Davis, Member  
Mary Frederickson, Member  
J.D. Greenberg, Member  
Ralph Hess, Member (Excused)  
Jim Huffman, Member  
James McCarver, Member (Arrived 2:03 p.m.)  
Rod Moyer, Member  
Tom Reilly, Member

#### 3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of the July 31, 2024 and August 21, 2024 General Plan Committee Meeting Minutes.

**MOTION BY VICE- CHAIR MICHELMAN TO APPROVE THE JULY 31 MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY MEMBER REILLY: PASSED (9 - 0)**

**MOTION BY MEMBER REILLY TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 21 MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY MEMBER HUFFMAN: PASSED (9 - 0)**

B. Presentation & Discussion Regarding the Review of Comments Submitted During the 60-Day Public Comment Period.

Tammy DeWitt, Community Planner, reported that the 60-day public comment period started on September 23 and will end on November 21. The draft plan and virtual meeting room went live on September 23 at [planpreset.com](http://planpreset.com). Two open houses have been held: one on September 23 at the Adult Center with 28 attendees, and another on October 24 with 22 attendees. Attendance was lower than expected, likely due to fewer city projects and election fatigue. Public comments have been incorporated into the plan throughout this transparent process, resulting in minimal additional feedback.

Ms. DeWitt stated that one topic that comes up in the public comments is the Rodeo property. Residents want the Rodeo property, which is currently shown as

a recreation area, to require a major amendment for any rezoning. If kept as open space, any zoning changes will need a major amendment. If labeled as residential, only rezoning over 10 acres would trigger this, allowing smaller adjustments without the full amendment process.

Member McCarver asked for clarification on the current zoning.

Ms. DeWitt responded that it is zoned high density residential, but we are looking at the land use map which is different from the zoning map. If the Rodeo property remains designated as "Recreation," any rezoning request would require a major amendment. However, if reverted to "Medium-High Density" like in the 2015 General Plan, only rezoning over 10 acres would need a major amendment. Smaller rezoning requests would only need a minor, or simple, map amendment. The Rodeo property is a city-owned special use park, like the dog park, skate park, and Antelope Hills Golf Course. Although a rezoning proposal was submitted for it, it's currently on hold, but there is ongoing discussion about potential changes to the property.

Vice Chair Michelman commented that the property is owned by the city and would be the ones asking for the rezone.

George Worley, Planning Manager, highlighted a concern with the 10-year plan: if the city decided to sell part of the Rodeo property that is not used for the rodeo, a smaller portion (under 10 acres) could be sold and developed with only a minor amendment, which involves a simpler public process than a major amendment. Minor amendments still require public hearings with the Planning Commission and Council but lack the extended 60-day comment period and additional notices.

Ms. DeWitt asked for consensus on whether to designate the Rodeo Fairground property as "Recreation" or revert it to "Medium-High Density Residential" on the future land use map. She clarified that this map is not a zoning map. Development under the current residential zoning wouldn't require changes, public comment, or a major amendment—only a rezoning request would trigger review using the land use map and potentially require a major amendment.

Vice Chair Michelman clarified that if the Rodeo property remains designated as a city park but zoned for high density, high-density residential development could still proceed. However, if the zoning were to change to commercial, it would require a major plan amendment.

Ms. DeWitt added that public comments currently indicate that citizens want any change to the rodeo property to be a major plan amendment.

Member Greenberg commented that the Rodeo property holds great importance to the community and should be protected as much as possible, even if this requires a major plan amendment.

Member Reilly added that designating the Rodeo property as open space on the future land use map won't ensure it requires a major plan amendment for rezoning because the property is currently zoned for multifamily use. They

explained that changing the map color to represent open space won't affect the amendment process, as any zoning change to commercial or other non-residential uses would still require a major amendment regardless of its designation on the land use map.

Member Davis asked for clarification that the General Plan is the city's primary land use policy document, with zoning intended to align with it. Any future rezoning requests must match the General Plan or go through an amendment process. If someone wants to develop the property as it's currently zoned, the Planning and Zoning Commission may or may not recommend approval if the zoning doesn't align with the general plan.

Ms. DeWitt responded that the Planning and Zoning Commission likely wouldn't review development if it aligns with existing zoning, as it's permitted "by right." The land use map and major plan amendment table are only referenced when there's a rezoning request. If the property is already zoned for a particular use, development can proceed without further review or amendment.

Councilwoman Fruhwirth mentioned a group working on a potential charter amendment to permanently protect open space and wondered if the Rodeo property was part of those efforts, as designating it as open space might safeguard it in the long term.

Member Moyer added that since the property is city-owned, the city could proactively rezone it as open space before any discussions about selling portions of it arise.

The consensus of the committee was to leave the Rodeo property as recreation on the land use map.

Councilman Gambogi commented that the 2015 General Plan recommended certain areas, like the stretch of land on Willow Creek and Pioneer Parkway, to be designated for business use. While the general plan outlines land use recommendations, it's up to the Planning Commission and City Council to decide on zoning changes.

Member Greenburg added that many people are working to protect open space permanently, whether through the city charter or other methods, and believes that goal should be reflected in the plan.

Ms. DeWitt responded that there is a goal and strategy in the plan to protect open space potentially through a charter amendment.

Ms. DeWitt displayed a summary of additional comments received through the virtual meeting room. Some suggestions are statutorily not an option due to state laws. At the next meeting, the Committee will be provided the full comments, and department heads will review them to determine if they can be addressed in the plan or if they will be handled through other processes.

Member Moyer commented that many of the comments focus on how specific

departments carry out their work, and emphasized that the General Plan should not include such detailed operational matters.

Ms. DeWitt acknowledged that many public comments, like those from last year's survey, are about specific issues (e.g., snow plowing or fire hydrant meters) that aren't relevant to the General Plan. However, they emphasized the importance of addressing all comments as part of the public hearing process.

Member Greenburg suggested a change to remove "acquisition" from the open space advisory commission to include maintenance oversight in the purview of that commission.

Mr. Worley added that today's discussion focuses on the list of comments received. These comments will be reviewed, and changes to the plan will be proposed where possible. For comments that can't be addressed, information will be provided to allow for decisions on potential changes in the next draft submission.

***This item was for discussion only, no formal action was taken.***

**4. UPDATES FROM STAFF**

November 13th - Next meeting

November 21st - End of comment period

December 11th - Committee meeting

January - schedule a meeting to start the General Plan Ambassador Program

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Sapio adjourned the meeting at 2:51 p.m.

---

Terry Sapio, Chair

ATTEST:

---

Board Secretary



TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA: November 13 General Plan Committee  
DATE: November 13, 2024  
DEPT: Community Development  
ITEM #: 3.B  
SUBJECT: Presentation & Discussion Regarding the Review of Comments Submitted to Date 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. Attached are the comments that have been received up to November 4, 2024.

## BACKGROUND

None.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

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

## ATTACHMENTS

1. Comments Received During 60 day Comment Period

60-Day Public Comment Period Comments

Resiliency and Sustainabilty	Encourage clean up of the lakes, i.e. Watson and Willow to allow more use of lakes for swimmers and more lake recreation through through efforts of groups like Prescott Creeks- support of more riparian areas.
------------------------------	--

Planning: Addressed on PG 31 Goal 1