

#### **City Council Pending Requests for Information**

ID 24-082 City Manager's Office April 16, 2024



#### **Work Session Process**

- Up to seven requests will be reviewed per meeting (one per Council Member)
- Staff will introduce each request
- The requesting Council Member will have up to two minutes to describe and justify their request
- Remaining Council Members will then have a maximum of one minute each to provide feedback and indicate their support for the use of City staff time to respond to the request
- Staff will respond to all requests where a consensus of at least four elected officials is established
- A consensus of six (6) Council Members is required for a resolution or ordinance to be placed on a future City Council agenda prior to a Work Session on the request.

#### **Work Session Process - Continued**

- The Agenda Committee will assist in scheduling items receiving consensus based upon priority offered by Council Members, Work Session availability, and readiness of the item.
- As guidelines for Council Members to note and offer their priority while supporting an item, the following general categorization could be used to indicate any Council Member's support to assist staff and the Agenda Committee:
  - **High** Time-sensitivity of the item is significant; the item is critical to the community or organization; and/or the item is of such importance that it should take precedence over other scheduled priorities, projects, or items.
  - **Moderate** The item is somewhat time-sensitive; the item has a valuable impact to the community or organization; and/or the item is important but should be integrated into work plans accordingly.
  - **Low** The item is not time-sensitive; the item has an impact, but it is limited; and/or the item should be scheduled into work plans where possible but should not affect or delay other scheduled work.



**Requestor:** Council Member Paul Meltzer

**Council Member Request:** "What if more land use cases coming before council were like some in recent memory where neighborhood members showed up to thank council and praise the proposed development?

One potential tool to encourage neighborhoods and incentivize developers to get on the same side could be an opt-in community benefits ordinance.

An opt-in CBO would offer developers a potentially faster approval process if they come to the table with a signed community benefits agreement.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "To qualify, these private, civilly enforceable agreements between the parties would have to be with duly constituted HOAs or neighborhood associations. It would have to be inclusive: All residents within their jurisdictions would have to have been notified of the process and any proposed agreement, with an opportunity to give input. The benefits would truly have to be for the community in general—not payoffs to individual neighbors. The agreements would have to have durable "successors and assigns" language so the terms of the agreement go with the property if there's a change in ownership.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "But if the agreement meets these requirements, that project would qualify for this potentially faster approval process.

This potentially faster approval process can be accomplished by allowing developers—if they choose—to submit their zoning compliance plans (what used to be called site plans) and their civil engineering plans simultaneously instead of in sequence, potentially saving as much as six months.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "This approach wouldn't be right for every area and every situation, but could having such a tool be a win-win for Denton? Intrigued but have lots of questions about how this would really work? Great! Let's talk about it in a work session."



**Staff Information:** On February 2, 2024 staff issued a memorandum evaluating the feasibility of granting a "fast-track" for review of development applications to the Mayor and City Council. On January 12, 2024 an Informal Staff Report was issued on the practice of Community Benefit Agreements.

Date Requested: March 29, 2024

Format for Response: Work session



**Requestor:** Council Member Chris Watts

**Council Member Request:** "I am requesting a two-minute pitch for a workshop to discuss guidelines for self-governing of council members who have one on one conversations with developers and economic development prospects.

On March 25, 2024, in a public political forum discussing food deserts and grocery stores, Council Member McGee reported he had talked with someone at HEB and was told they are not coming to Denton because of Council infighting.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "On April 2, 2024 during Concluding Items of the regular City Council Meeting, I asked the City Manager to request from Council Member McGee the contact information of the individual he spoke with at HEB. Once obtained, city staff could contact said individual and assure them and the company that the city stands ready to welcome them to our community.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "Pursuant to the Friday Status Report dated April 5, 2024, paragraph H, when the City Manager requested the contact information from Council Member McGee, his response was no comment.

Council Member McGee refused to provide information of a conversation he had with one of our city's most desired business prospects.



**Council Member Request (cont.):** "The City Council and professional city staff are a team working together for the betterment of our community. Responding with no comment to a reasonable request does not further this goal."

**Staff Information:** Staff provided the referenced response to Council Member Watts' request in the April 5, 2024 Friday Staff Report.

Date Requested: April 10, 2024

Format for Response: Work Session

