

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, January 19, 2016 - 5:30 p.m.

1. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE

Chair Losoff verified the meeting had been properly noticed.

2. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt, Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer. Vice Chair Kathy Levin was excused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Justin Clifton, Karen Daines, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Sandy Moriarty, Vice Mayor Mark DiNunzio and Councilors Scott Jablow, John Martinez and Jessica Williamson.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS & STAFF

No announcements were made.

4. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

- a. December 15, 2015 (R)
- b. January 5, 2016 (R)

The Chair requested a motion to approve the December 15, 2015 minutes.

MOTION: *Commissioner Cohen so moved. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion.*
VOTE: *Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chair Levin was excused.)*

The Chair then requested a motion to approve the January 5, 2016 minutes.

MOTION: *Commissioner Klein moved to approve. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion.* **VOTE:** *Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chair Levin was excused.)*

5. PUBLIC FORUM: (This is the time for the public to comment on matters not listed on the agenda. The Commission may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.)

Chair Losoff opened the public forum and, having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

6. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:

- a. Discussion/possible action regarding the January 12, 2016 Draft Community Focus Area Plan for the Western Gateway (CFA's #1 and #2)

Chair Losoff introduced the agenda item and indicated that the Commission had heard this item several times, so his goal is to have some resolution before the end of the meeting.

Presentation, Mike Raber: Mike stated that it is agendaized for the Commission to forward a recommendation to Council on the adoption of the plan, and staff believes the new draft reflects the Commission's direction based on previous discussions.

Mike explained that the Community Focus Area (CFA) Plans are specific plans to provide more detailed direction than the Sedona Community Plan, and provide guidance for future development in the area. The Western Gateway encompasses the area around the high school, the Yavapai College, the former Cultural Park property and the Sedona Medical Center.

Mike indicated that the Staff Report provided more background on the planning process and public outreach. He then summarized that the planning process was started in May of 2014 and a working group was established through the Citizen Engagement Program. That group met throughout the planning process and public meetings were conducted, as well as focus group meetings and meetings with property owners, stakeholders and professional planners. The Commission began reviewing a draft of the plan in April of 2015 and had several work sessions.

Mike explained that the draft plan addresses land use, circulation, environment, sense of community and sense of place, plus three character areas that provide more detailed development guidelines -- the Cultural Park, South Side and Medical Center areas. Since the December 9th draft, the design guidelines have been added and the implementation section was expanded. In the last two work sessions, the comments and concerns have been focused mostly on the development guidelines in these character areas.

Mike indicated that the Staff Report outlines those concerns from the Commission, representatives of the former Cultural Park and others. The report then summarizes the key changes in response. First in response to concerns regarding the guidelines being overly prescriptive, the overall language has been revised and the ratios between residential and lodging, as well as other ratios that defined a balance of uses, have been removed.. The Commission also did not want to overly restrict the number of lodging units in the Cultural Park Character Area and did not support any new lodging on the south side of the highway, so in response the new draft doubled the lodging unit limit in the Cultural Park area north of the highway bringing that to 300, and the new draft does not support any new lodging south of the highway. Staff also removed references to a proportionate mix of uses in project phases and provided for consideration of alternative development proposals to address a concern that the guidelines were too locked-in to one type of proposal versus another.

Mike continued to say that in the Cultural Park area, the Open Space guidelines no longer include a specific buffer to the timeshare development and the open space area in the southwest corner can allow for potential development where a significant architectural statement is being made. We still point out the things that we want to preserve within that area, but it doesn't say there can't be any development there. The plan also includes options for city participation in implementing an official visitor information site, including the possible offset of costs for purchase, and that was in response to other concerns that there wasn't enough emphasis on a potential standalone site versus one being incorporated into some other development.

Mike stated that staff believes that this January 12th draft plan reflects the direction of the Commission based on the previous work sessions and staff is committed to getting closure tonight; a sample motion has been provided for your consideration as well. Mike then indicated that he wanted to go over some of the comments received, including comments from Commissioner Brandt that were forwarded to the Commission. The Commissioner's concerns were mainly that the existing vista trailhead location is a major community benefit, and the draft

allows too much flexibility in its possible relocation. The vista point offers a 360° view at the current trailhead and should be integrated into future development as a public space area. Priority locations for visitor information and orientation should be clearer, and better pedestrian connections across the highway between the Cultural Park and the high school are needed, plus the idea of complete streets should extend to the highway as well as the Navoti Drive area. We also need good options for public permeability for all modes and all parts of the plan.

Mike indicated that with the consensus of the Commission, staff will add more specifics regarding what needs to be retained at the trailhead and provide a stronger statement on the location. We can make those changes to move this forward tonight, if the Commission is in agreement. We also would relook at the land use examples as part of that and how they are portrayed, and staff would provide a more general strategy for pedestrian connections across the highway. Currently, it is linked very closely to a couple of specific areas, and we can make that more generalized to encompass a number of different possibilities. Additionally, we will explore possibilities to add complete street goals with ADOT for the S.R. 89A area.

Mike stated that staff also just received comments from residents in the Rimstone Subdivision and those concerns are focused on traffic from future development and potential ways for the CFA Plan to address that. We also had a comment from a Foothills property owner regarding National Forest trails and their proximity to residential lots. Those comments have been distributed to the Commission tonight and staff can address most of these issues, as far as the CFA Plan addressing potential impacts on Navoti Drive that are outside of the planning area by adding some language that makes that clearer.

Commission's Questions of Staff:

Chair Losoff stated that staff did an excellent job of giving back to the Commission many of the Commission's recommendations and making the changes requested. He hopes the Commission's questions are to address anything new that came up in Mike's report or tonight without rehashing previous issues.

Commissioner Klein referenced the initial draft plan for the CFA that said 150 lodging units and pointed out that it is now 300. He then asked how Mike arrived at 300 versus 150, and Mike responded that staff did that based on the direction from the Commission. A majority of the Commissioners felt that we shouldn't overly restrict the number of units on the north side of the highway. Commissioner Klein then stated that if you look at the Tennyson proposal, there is a proposal for a hotel and a wellness center that would include lodging. He then asked if the 300 units would combine both of those, so there wouldn't be more than 300 units for both. Audree Juhlin clarified that there is not a proposal on the table; we are doing a CFA Plan and not addressing a proposal.

Chair Losoff then stated that the number of rooms were discussed at length and there was a strong Commission recommendation not to limit it to the initial recommendation, but increase it to at least 250 and staff went further than that to 300, so he doesn't know if there are any more issues on that. Commissioner Klein then asked if the 300 would be a maximum total number of lodging units in the whole Character Area and Mike Raber stated yes and no additional is being proposed in the South Side area.

Commissioner Klein then asked about Mike's comments regarding "standalone", and Mike explained that in the discussion about a visitor information site, we had discussed integrating that into some type of commercial or mixed-use development, but staff didn't talk about tools the City might have to become involved either in support of a site that was only for visitor information or for potential purchase of land to do that. All we acknowledged was that the City could look into that. The Commissioner then asked why the language was removed regarding the buffering between the Cultural Park area and the timeshare development. Mike explained that there was a request from the property owner, and the Commission also seemed to affirm that it could be an issue better addressed through the zoning review process as well.

Chair Losoff explained that when the CFA Plan is in place, the Commission is still governed by zoning laws and other criteria, so as things are developed, the Commission still has processes and procedures to modify, change, etc.; the Plan is not etched in stone. Mike then stated that the Plan sets the stage for a lot of things, but the zoning can provide more of the detail by looking on a project-based level rather than at the bigger picture level that we are looking at here, so that is often the appropriate place to get into those details. The question becomes at what point do we have good guidance for Development Review and Zone Change requests?

Commissioner Klein noted that the newest draft of the CFA removes references to phasing and asked if that means a developer could build a hotel and conference center first without building anything else. Mike stated that staff removed the language that required a proportionate number of uses within each phase. We aren't saying that you can't have a phased development, but either through a Development Agreement or Conditions of Approval, the development would have an outlined progressive system of bringing different uses online. For instance, we are saying that in the Cultural Park area, to ensure we get mixed use, we still want the whole area planned as one entity, but they wouldn't have to have 33% housing, 33% commercial, etc., in each phase. The Commissioner then confirmed the developer couldn't submit a plan just to build a hotel and conference center, it would have to be a plan for the entire area.

Commissioner Klein then asked about staff's position on Commissioner Brandt's letter indicating that the vista point should be retained in its current location, and Mike stated that if the Commission agrees, staff can craft language that will strengthen that. One of the concerns was that it makes it sound like the trailhead could be moved anywhere, so we may need to strengthen that language to indicate what we want to retain. That is not to say whether or not that specific location is the best, but if the Commission thinks it is, then that can be demonstrated. Mike then summarized that there are two things; one is describe in more detail what we want to retain with the trailhead and the other is the location of the trailhead itself and how flexible that should be.

Chair Losoff asked about the implication of keeping it there, in terms of the Forest Service, the landowner, etc., and if that is impeding on anybody's property rights. Mike explained that if it is part of a development proposal, it would be different than a proposal that might say that we will contribute to how it gets relocated on National Forest land, but he believes Commissioner Brandt is saying that there are reasons why that is a good location for a vista point and that is part of what the community benefit should be in that area, aside from the trailhead itself.

Commissioner Klein then referenced the Marriott and its 110 units or so, and the 300 units at the Cultural Park, and stated that you are adding 400 units and the average number of daily trips for a hotel is eight, so if you have people staying at full capacity at a 300-unit place and the Marriott, you are going to have 3,200 extra trips a day, and everybody talks about traffic, although we haven't dealt with it much in terms of this CFA. He then asked if that is something we should be concerned about in that we could potentially be adding 3,200 trips a day. Mike explained that is where a traffic study would be part of a future rezoning submittal and where any potential mitigation would be addressed. Once we had that study, we would have a better idea of what that contribution would be.

Chair Losoff stated that we have talked around it in this CFA, but it is a significant issue and our hope is that when the traffic study is done, it will give suggestions as to how to handle the projection for this area. Commissioner Klein then asked if the traffic study would be done prior to the approval of any plans for the Cultural Park area, and the Chair indicated that he didn't think so; however, Mike Raber clarified that it would be done in conjunction with a rezoning submittal, so it would be part of that approval process.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he is having a major problem trying to understand how this CFA fits into the objectives of the Community Plan in terms of traffic flow. Three hundred units

at 60%, which is average for lodging, gives 1,800 cars, that is not trips as Commissioner Klein stated, so if we do that we have quite a bit of traffic flowing on S.R. 89A. When he first came to Sedona and S.R. 89A between the library and Uptown was totally congested, someone told him about Thunder Mountain and it was terrific, except it now has speed bumps and it is a horrible alternative. The only alternative presented in the plan is Navoti and we are building a hotel, wellness center, conference center, apartments . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that is being proposed, but there is no proposal on the table. The Commissioner then asked if we are overbuilding, because the density in that part of town already makes it hard to get from one end of town to the other, and he is concerned about this. One of the objectives or recommendations had to do with circulation and the reduction of traffic congestion, and he doesn't see how that is going to happen with all that is proposed and the number of trips that will take place. He understands that part of the plan calls for a village in that area, so it might cut down on some travel to go to other places, but people come here to hike in various places, and people move about and will want to see Uptown, so he is very concerned that there is too much in this CFA for the City of Sedona to manage.

Chair Losoff repeated that traffic is a significant issue, but he doesn't think the CFA Plan can address it specifically. Even with the letters received today about public highways, Navoti, etc., once the plan is approved, we would get into some of the details through rezoning and development, etc., but the CFA Plan is general and any development entertained at this point will have a traffic impact. At one point he suggested having a moratorium on development until we could get the traffic study in place, but he was told that is not possible legally, so as much as we are concerned about traffic, we can't hold this up for a traffic study, and the CFA Plan cannot address all of the specifics like walkways, roadways, etc., that will come during the development stage, but it is a legitimate issue and the residents are concerned about the impact in their developments.

Commissioner Cohen stated that his point is the density of the CFA as it is proposed, because it will create problems for the people who live in that area and want to move through. He is concerned that we are over-projecting building in that area, for that reason. Mike Raber indicated agreement with the Chair's previous comment and stated that we are trying to achieve a mixed-use environment and that will have a certain amount of density. We do have a traffic situation in this part of town that is much better than in other parts of the denser commercial corridor of the City, and focusing on that and ensuring we have good traffic control will be key to anything that happens . . . Chair Losoff interjected that without rehashing everything, we discussed this at length in previous meetings and got to the point of wanting more density here, so he doesn't know that we want to go back and restructure it again. When it comes time for a motion, if the Commission is not happy with the overall plan, we can address it then, but to keep going back to the same issues will get us on a treadmill, which he hopes to get off of tonight.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that we haven't really addressed specifics of traffic and density; we talked about all of the pieces to it; however, the Chair noted that the Commission has talked about density at length. The Commissioner then stated that we didn't talk about traffic, and the Chair stated that we can't solve a traffic issue until the traffic study is completed through rezonings, Land Development Codes and redevelopment, when we have options to deal with those things. The plan is not going to solve every issue; the plan is a guideline and a blueprint. At one point he thought the plan should be as specific as possible, but the more we got into it and listened to everybody, he doesn't think that is possible and the more flexibility we build into it, as developments come in, we will have the ability to see what is good at that point.

Commissioner Cohen stated that he is in favor of the project, but his doctor tells him that if he builds up cholesterol in his arteries, then he won't have the proper blood flow. If we build up cholesterol in traffic with people going in and out and moving around, we won't have good blood flow on our street. The Chair then noted that every project that comes in has a problem with traffic and until that traffic study is completed, we can't solve it, so let's move on from there.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that we just touched on making complete neighborhoods where you don't have to do all of your driving to go to other parts of Sedona to make those trips that you are talking about, but if that is key, we do have multiple uses, recreation and education there; we have all those things that make it its own neighborhood to take that pressure off of going somewhere else, but to get there, the question is if there enough direction in the CFA for mitigating Commissioner Cohen's concerns with transportation shuttles and transit. Mike Raber stated that the plan definitely has a circulation component that is heavy on the need for pedestrian circulation, so in any future development proposal in these areas, we will want to see not only how they are treating their vehicular circulation, but the pedestrian flow as well. Commissioner Brandt then asked if there is enough in regards to shuttles and transit, so people don't have to get into their cars and can get on a shuttle or transit to get to other parts of Sedona, and Mike stated that the draft focuses quite a bit on that. Commissioner Cohen agreed, but noted that it didn't talk about who is paying for it.

Mike Raber explained that the first step would be to do a full transit study and find out what we need to focus on that addresses residents' needs as well as visitors'. We have strategies in the plan that get at one of the keys that perhaps we were missing in the previous one, and that was the link between lodging and the different public locations around the City that transit needs to serve, which has a big place in a planning area like this and was maybe lacking in the previous transit. There also needs to be something that the residents benefit from with transit, so yes, we are advocating transit, but there is a lot of details that need to be decided, although the bigger picture is the lodging and the visitors.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that one thing that was revised after the last meeting was the open space at the southwest corner and the modification to allow potential development to make a significant gateway statement, and in the language of the CFA within the open space page, there is the potential for development. He then asked if that is suggesting that development is okay in open space and what does that imply for other development in Sedona, when there are places dedicated as open space and this suggests that some development might be okay in open space. Mike stated that there are two things connected with that issue -- one is that we have a need to protect a large amount of natural vegetation within this area; it also blocks and screens views on the other side of the hillside, so our language talks about that and says that maybe it needs to be flexible enough so if we have another land use that is encroaching into the graphically-shown area, that may be okay and if there is architecture that makes a good gateway statement for the area as we heard from the property owner, we possibly should entertain those kinds of structures as well. We don't necessarily have to retain everything in the triangle, but there are key elements within that triangle that we want to preserve, which will depend on a development proposal that we can evaluate. Additionally, staff made these revisions based on the direction we felt the Commission was moving in. Chair Losoff thanked Commissioner Brandt for his letter that was very well thought out.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he is very happy with this draft. It has everything in there that we discussed at length and to go into specifics is a little bit ahead of time. The developers of the various mixed-use projects will have enough time ahead of them to meet all of the zoning requirements, the specifics, and the traffic study, etc. He doesn't want to go through everything again and again and again; he is very happy with what there is in the papers. It has everything in there that we discussed and gives the developer enough flexibility to work all of those things out when it comes to the specific development, whatever is going to be in that whole master plan. It is going to be hard work and it will go through another scrutiny, so he is set.

Commissioner Barcus stated that he would like to echo those prior remarks; that is exactly where he is. He is pleased that the staff listened to the public and the Commissioners and incorporated our recommendations in this plan. He is very pleased with the draft and thanks the staff for working extra on this, so we can get to this point. Chair Losoff then summarized that the pending issues are the vista location; traffic, traffic and traffic, and the open space issue.

The Chair opened the public comment period at this time.

Peter Fagan, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Fagan stated that he is a 60-year resident of Sedona and a 6-month resident of Rimstone. At their HOA meeting last week, a number of items were discussed regarding the Western Gateway Plan. It appears that some of the plan was drafted before the City was incorporated and certainly way before the Rimstone Subdivision or its former name Cor D'Amor was in place. The Plan contemplates two main vehicular intersections with S.R. 89A -- Foothills South Drive at the medical center and Cultural Park Place. Recently, Navoti Road was cut through to Calle Del Sol and in turn to S.R. 89A. Using this as an access point to S.R. 89A violates the intent of the plan for the two major intersections and now GPSs are leading visitors from Summit down Navoti to Calle Del Sol, an unintended consequence of opening that road up. Navoti is not a real arterial road; it runs from Cultural Park Place to Calle Del Sol -- that's it, so it goes a little over one mile. We are concerned about three items -- traffic, noise, safety; all of you are concerned about those. The plan contemplates a buffer for the development north of Navoti Road, and depending on where you stand in Rimstone, you are either north or east of Navoti; in fact, a number of homes are south of Navoti, so the plan doesn't really recognize Navoti Road now with the Rimstone Subdivision. Right now, there is no traffic control at all on Navoti; there are no stop signs. There is some signage that says S.R. 89A behind the medical center, but that is about it, so we suggest that as the traffic study is done that the intersections be looked at, especially the one at Foothills South Drive -- that and Navoti should at least be a three-way stop to slow the traffic down. There are also stop signs on each end of Rimstone Circle and maybe stop signs should also be considered on Navoti at Rimstone Circle to take care of that traffic. They also suggest that the vehicular traffic be controlled as much as possible, as the plan says, to promote bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

David Murrill, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Murrill stated that he lives on Navoti Drive in Sedona in the Rimstone Subdivision and as he read the CFA for the Western Gateway, he noticed that it included a number of goals and objectives about how new development in the CFA would affect traffic in adjacent and existing single-family neighborhoods. Those goals and objectives include, but are not limited to: Provide significant buffering to adjoining residential areas, Ensure good pedestrian flow in the CFA, Provide safe and smooth traffic flow, Promote safer off-highway bicycle routes, Make sure existing neighborhoods retain their character when nearby areas are developed, Establish or maintain controlled access to S.R. 89A at Foothills South Drive and Upper Red Rock Loop Road, and not to support any additional highway access from the area except at these intersections. What he noticed is missing from the plan is the fact that the Rimstone Subdivision now exists and that the eastern three blocks of Navoti Drive is now a fully built-out and occupied residential neighborhood. The plan talks about buffering residential areas to the north of Navoti Drive, but does not mention residential areas east of Foothills South Drive where Rimstone is. The plan also does not address increased traffic flow into residential areas from new development in the CFA. He assumes this is because it was not anticipated that a lot of traffic from the CFA would travel on Bristlecone, because those neighborhoods did not provide any outlet to recreational or commercial activities; however, this is not the case for Rimstone. Rimstone already is experiencing a significant amount of traffic passing through the subdivision to access S.R. 89A at Calle Del Sol by driving east on Navoti Drive. They think the majority of the traffic is coming from Sedona Summit timeshares. Because of the width of Navoti and the hill going down to Calle Del Sol, this traffic all too often is moving too fast for a residential area and views their street as a way to get to somewhere else rather than as a community-orientated residential street. As new development occurs in the CFA, this will only get worse as traffic volume increases. The amount and speed of the traffic accessing S.R. 89A at Calle Del Sol from Navoti is contrary to the stated goals and objectives he mentioned earlier. Numerous speeding cars do not make the area more walkable or more bike-friendly; nor do they provide significant buffering to existing residential areas or help them retain the character of their neighborhood. They also create an unsafe situation by allowing additional access at an uncontrolled intersection to S.R. 89A, which is contrary to the plan. For these reasons, and others, he proposed a few language

changes to the plan that he believes are necessary in order for the plan to more fully describe and implement its goals and objectives now that Rimstone Subdivision is built-out and occupied.

Chair Losoff pointed out that the three minutes were up.

Mr. Murrill then stated that he provided his list to Mike Raber and Mike said he gave you a copy, and the Chair confirmed they had received a copy of the list.

Michael Mongini, Flagstaff, AZ, representing Cultural Park landowners SATHCUPA and Mike Tennyson: Mr. Mongini thanked staff and the Commission for the last two years of work on the CFA. He knows it was pretty laborious and sometimes tiring. He thinks the plan as proposed in this final draft should be endorsed, voted on and moved forward. It is 2016 and closer to the next Community Plan than the start of this last Community Plan, so he would encourage the Commission to approve the CFA as proposed.

Jennifer Burns, Sedona, AZ, and Recreation Staff Officer for the Red Rock Ranger District of the Coconino National Forest: Ms. Burns stated that she wanted to thank the Commission for its hard work on this Community Focus Area and clarify some of the positions of the Forest Service related to several issues presented in the draft plan. The Forest Service did provide a Letter of Comment, which you all have seen, and we also have some editorial comments on the draft that have been provided. First is the road to the pit; this is an active materials pit and will continue to be one into the foreseeable future. It is important, because it is the closest materials pit to the National Forest land near Sedona, and it serves all of the roadwork on National Forest land in this area. Public access on this road has been reserved by the United States Government for its use on behalf of the citizens of the United States. The next thing is about trails and trailheads in this area; there are currently two trailheads. One is the Girdner Trailhead, which is a hub trailhead, so a very large trailhead and what Commissioner Brandt talked about in terms of its scenic attributes. This trailhead was part of the rezoning for this property initially, and it was also paid for by a grant from Arizona State Parks, which has a 25-year tenure attached to it, so that is important to keep in mind. It is an important place and it hasn't been fully developed as a hub trailhead, which would mean more parking, a toilet and visitor services, etc. The other trailhead is south of the road and it is associated with the land that was conveyed originally to the Forest Service for the high school development, and that is the Schuerman Mountain Trailhead, and that reservation comes with that land, so the high school always has to have a trailhead somewhere in there, and right now, it is on the south side of the high school. Both of these trailheads receive a moderate amount of use and it is quite a diverse type of use, particularly with the Girdner Trailhead. They don't want to go backwards regarding these trailheads as to what happens in the future, and there should be no net loss in terms of the public's opportunity here. This area is a crossroads for trails; there are trails to the north -- the Girdner Trail and the Centennial Trail and the Centennial Trail is the only wheelchair-accessible trail on the National Forest in this area.

Chair Losoff stated that the three-minutes were up.

Loraine Coutin, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Coutin stated that there were a couple of things that she had to speak up about. Commissioner Cohen voiced her concerns very eloquently about traffic, and she understands that you are pushing this through, but it is premature without having traffic studies. You specifically stated that there will be no more hotels on the south side, and therefore, you doubled from 150 to 300 the amount on the north side, but you are ignoring the fact that as Mr. Raber said, the Marriott has 121 units, and they also have a second hotel in mind in the same area, and none of you have mentioned that, and that is on the south side. There is going to be more development on the south side, although you doubled it on the north side. Those are her concerns; the traffic study that has not been done, with you pushing this forward without having adequately researched that.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.

Chair Losoff asked Mike Raber about the comments from the Rimstone development. Mike agreed that there are a couple of different things that we can do, and one is to be more specific about the areas we are trying to buffer with the open space and also acknowledge that traffic is also a potential impact that could affect the area outside of the planning area on Navoti Drive. It was nice to get a very specific list; some of them we don't agree with necessarily, but several of these suggestions in the list can be changed in the plan.

The Chair confirmed that Mike was referring to Mr. Murrill's comments, and then stated that we don't want to minimize the traffic impact; that whole area will be significantly impacted, perhaps even more than S.R. 89A. With the hospital expansion, etc., that whole area will be very dense with traffic, so we will have to see what the traffic analysis comes up with. Mike Raber explained that the focus is the main outlets to the highway that are within the planning area, not outside of the planning area, so Foothills South becomes a signalized intersection at some time in the future, along with Cultural Park Place.

The Chair then restated that even if the plan is approved, if a development comes in for this area, the developer would have to provide a Traffic Impact Analysis, and if there is an impact, it could put a stop to or have an effect on the Commission's decision going forward, so it is not automatic. If this plan is approved, it is not automatic that a development would get automatically approved. Mike Raber agreed and stated that basically these CFA Plans don't do traffic studies. We get those when we get to development proposals, so it sets the parameters and guidance, and zoning is the way to execute that when we look at those details. Additionally, the Marriott going in will have 121 units, but we don't have a proposal for another phase, and we are hearing from the Commission that we shouldn't have any more lodging units south of the highway. All lodging goes through a rezoning process, so that is the point at which you would consider that, and if there is guidance in the plan that says no more units there, then that is what the zoning would look at.

The Chair highlighted the sources of feedback the Commission has heard from and indicated that it is time to see if we want to make a decision tonight, so he would open it for discussion.

Summary Discussion:

Commissioner Brandt stated that when we started the intensive review of a draft in July, we heard from the owner's representative, Mike Bower, an in-depth review of transit and how the Cultural Park property might become a part of that, and it was a fairly lengthy presentation, and he would like to hear more from Jennifer Burns as far as the other goals of the other landowner, which would be the United States of America, as to what their position is and not cut that off at three minutes. We have given other landowners and stakeholders the ability to talk, so he would like to hear more about that; the other Commissioners agreed. Chair Losoff noted that there is a letter on file, and asked Ms. Burns to speak again and the Commissioners if they had any specific questions.

Commissioner Klein referenced Ms. Burns comment about the public access to the vista point being reserved by the U.S. Government and asked what she meant.

Jennifer Burns, Sedona, AZ, Recreation Staff Officer for the Red Rock Ranger District of the Coconino National Forest: Ms. Burns clarified that she said that the road to the pit is basically reserved and the trailhead itself was developed using Arizona State Park Grant Funds, and when funds come from State Parks, it is a Trails Grant Program and there is a certain amount of time that you are required to protect that investment for those functions, so that has a 25-year life on it. The Commissioner asked when the 25 years started running and Mike Raber stated in 1996. Ms. Burns explained that the Federal Government does not have a reservation per se on that property; the functions that trailhead provides and the development, because of the monies used to develop it, has strings attached.

Commissioner Klein then indicated that the developer stated in a letter at the last meeting that the proposed trailhead location in the draft was not acceptable to their client, which is the current location of the vista point. He then asked about the Forest Service's position on that and Ms. Burns stated the Forest Service likes a bird-in-the-hand, which this is in a way. The Forest Service is under budget constraints and the budget is going down. Developing new trailheads is very expensive and it would take additional surveys, planning, etc., if a new trailhead was to be developed on the National Forest land. Here we have something that already exists and is functioning to a certain extent. People who have been to that trailhead have noticed that there is a lot of activity going on north of that trailhead and slightly west in an area on the National Forest where people are also watching the sunset, playing Frisbee and walking their dogs. The things that people are doing out there are not completely confined to that vista point, but right now everything is working that way to provide public access and activities. They have a very good history of collaborating to provide for community benefit for trails and trailheads around this community, so the Forest Service would say that there may be some opportunities to collaborate again to make this something better than it is today. Certainly, it doesn't have any sanitation and that is not a good thing, but it is a bird-in-the-hand.

The Chair asked what happens at the end of the 25 years, and Ms. Burns indicated that she is not familiar with what State Parks does; they don't tend to come back and inspect, but they would expect that the things and functions that they paid for would last that long.

Commissioner Cohen stated that the CFA document talks about additional trails going north, south and east or west, and his issue is traffic so what is this going to do in attracting more people to that particular area for hiking, watching sunsets and riding horses, etc. Ms. Burns stated that in the existing Forest Plan, this Girdner Trailhead is identified as a hub trailhead, which would accommodate equestrian use, hiking, mountain biking, etc. Right now it does, because it is kind of combined on the private land with the National Forest, and there are a few trails going north. Currently, we are asking for public comment on the expansion of that trail system, and she provided Mike Raber with the letter from the Ranger to the public that describes that proposal. It shows a number of trails that could be developed in that area that would be accessed from the Girdner Trailhead. When you look at the map and see what is proposed, there are a lot of trails out there now that aren't official system trails, so part of their motivation is that people are using the area right now, but they are using routes that were beaten in by foot or ridden in by horse, and they are not necessarily the best thing on the land; they could be going through cultural sites, etc., so they are looking at a trail expansion to the north. To the south, they are building about five miles of new trail now -- the Skywalker Trail, the Scorpion Trail and the Pyramid Trail. The Skywalker Trail goes south of the Marriott and runs east-west. They are all connector trails, and again, a lot of routes already exist there that people are using, but they are trying to create sustainable routes for people. As far as more people coming, they see this as an area where they would like to relieve some of the crowding in some of the other areas that are trail hubs and have people use this area. They would also like to see a shuttle system that would serve this trailhead.

Commissioner Cohen then asked, with 421 proposed lodging units in the area, what it would do in terms of bringing more people to the trails and what it is going to take to keep the trails in that area upgraded. Ms. Burns explained that they already have the Summit there with lots of people who are using the non-trails, but yes, they have a big concern about maintenance and they look to their partners to assist with that and the community benefit from developments to help with maintenance assistance.

Chair Losoff indicated that one comment that stuck with him was in the past the Forest Service has been very collaborative with the City, so he would imagine that whatever goes forward, we will be talking with each other to see how everything can be better than it is today and to project in the future to see what we can do with that. Ms. Burns indicated that some of the editorials they suggested were for that purpose, to try to strengthen the language within the CFA so the Forest Service would have more opportunity for collaboration

Chair Losoff noted that the Forest Service is one of the landowners of the area, in addition to the private developers, so we have to work together and they do a good job of that. Ms. Burns thanked the Chair and reminded everybody that it is the citizens of the United States that are the landowners; she is a trustee of sorts. Commissioner Brandt asked Ms. Burns if she completed what she wanted to say earlier and she indicated yes.

Commissioner Klein stated that the Commission should discuss the issue of if we want the vista point to be moved or not. He read Commissioner Brandt's letter and agrees with a lot of what he said. This is one of the two most spectacular vista points in Sedona and if you give this up, you are giving up something that is spectacular and can't be replaced. When he goes to watch sunsets, he goes to the Girdner Trailhead. When it snowed eight inches a couple of years ago, he wanted to take pictures and he went to the Girdner Trailhead. The developer doesn't like the idea of keeping the vista trailhead, but his proposal . . . He is always conflicted because we have no proposal in front of us, but we are still always talking about the developer's proposal and he never knows how much weight we should give it, but their proposal is to move the trailhead next to the Summit timeshares and what Commissioner Brandt said in his letter is accurate. The road that would be provided would go down into a pit area and you would have no view from there; people would not be able to park their cars and look at the spectacular view. In order to get that view, you would have to walk out to the Centennial Trailhead overlook, which would be close to a two-mile round trip from the Summit timeshares and a lot of people won't be able to physically do that. He would not be in favor of moving the vista trailhead, and we should have stronger language in the draft of the CFA Plan in that regard.

The Chair then asked if he is supporting Commissioner Brandt's recommendation and Commissioner Klein stated yes. The Chair then asked if anybody is not supporting it and there was no response. Chair Losoff then stated that it was discussed before too and there was a pretty strong feeling that it should be kept where it is. Mike Raber stated that the only issue would be that there are two different things -- the vista point is a public focal point and the other is the trailhead itself, because if we are talking about a major hub trailhead, it could be that additional land might be needed for that. One way to maybe address that in the language would be that we talk more about the things we want to be sure we retain in that area as part of a trailhead and maybe a preferred location, but if there is a need for some flexibility in moving the actual trailhead, we could leave that language somewhat in the plan. Having a recommendation for the site and making sure we retain all of the amenities, such as the ramadas, picnic tables, parking, etc., but if there is a need to beef up that trailhead, there is the ability to be flexible in moving that.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that makes sense and the Chair then indicated that he sees agreement, so the Commission wants that incorporated into the plan language. Commissioner Brandt then added that there is language on page 59, which was the old page 48 in the last meeting, so his letter referenced page 48, but now on pages 59, 63 and 88 there is wording that the vista could be moved, so he would like all of those to be addressed, so the direction is clear. Chair Losoff asked if the final draft would include that, and Mike Raber stated that if that is part of the motion to forward it to Council, staff would make those changes.

Commissioner Cohen stated that the medical center is the emergency room and it is very important, as well as the physician and laboratory sites there, and he is concerned about people getting to the emergency center. He read this document three times, and every time he turned a page, traffic and bringing in more people jumped out at him. Bringing in more people means more cars. Nobody goes on vacation around here just to walk from the Cultural Center to Uptown Sedona or wherever; they are going to drive unless we provide public transportation that is in the document, and there is no specific proposal on how that is going to happen, so he is concerned about access to the medical center. The other major emergency area is the Urgent Care which is also on S.R. 89A, and then if you have to get to the hospital in Cottonwood, you still have to go through this area, so he is concerned about all of those hotel rooms bringing in all those lodgers, plus apartments that magnify the number of people.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he looked for a number as to if developed according to the plan, how many more people would be put in that area. Mike Raber stated that under the original scenario, we were looking at about 300 additional, in general. The Commissioner then stated if you had 300 hotel rooms that is about 450 to 600 people in there, so he is not sure what that number means. Mike explained that the 300 would not be necessarily counting assisted living and independent living in association with a specific project around the medical center that is kind of autonomous and its own project with internal commercial and amenities, so that might be in addition to that 300, and that is just residential units. The Commissioner then stated that this is not a zoning proposal, but it is the guideline being more specific than the Community Plan, so whatever we approve on this CFA will set the stage for zoning proposals and parameters for the area in terms of growth, number of people, etc., so he is concerned.

Chair Losoff asked if he had a recommendation and Commissioner Cohen stated yes, we are proposing overbuilding. The Chair then asked if he had a specific proposal for the plan and Commissioner Cohen stated that he knows he was part of the conversations around some of it, but there is too much lodging and the advantage to apartments is that we provide alternatives for people who can't afford homes, so he is not in favor of cutting back on that necessarily, but we have to be careful about how much stuff we are building. He is very concerned about the traffic flow, because he doesn't think Navoti is going to do the job. He then repeated his opinion about Thunder Mountain and added that people coming in from the Village on occasion could spend at least an hour coming down S.R. 179, and he thinks this is going to have the same issue.

The Chair stated that the Commission has gone through density, housing and lodging he doesn't know how many times, and we agreed that is what we wanted. You can disagree, but we've gone through that and that is why staff came up with a new plan. On the issue of traffic, he agrees and he would love to put a stop to everything until the traffic study is done, but that is not going to happen and every development will have to have a Traffic Impact Analysis, and we will have significant control as to what happens after that, so he is comfortable that even though we may not have a comprehensive traffic analysis at this time, traffic studies when a proposal comes in should give enough information to make good decisions.

Commissioner Brandt stated that regarding traffic it helps to remember where the Cultural Park came from and where it started, and the traffic impacts that the amphitheater with 5,000 seats or something like that, the performing arts center, the arts-related housing, and the theatres and museums, etc., were going to have, and the amphitheater put out a lot of traffic at one time, where the other developments were more like a trickle, not all of a sudden. When they ran that, there was a concert about every two weeks, so in the Sedona Community Plan, there is the Appendix that talks about the resolution from 2007 that established that having lodging uses there on the Cultural Park property to allow for the other types of arts and public uses could go hand-in-hand, and they could help the other, because it didn't seem like the Cultural Park by itself was working. It closed and that was it, so four years later, they came up with the resolution, so there is a lot of traffic that will be generated by what is going on, but there is also a lot of traffic already planned for that area. Ultimately, we do have to deal with traffic and one way to look at it is if the City wants to buy some of this property to keep it from being developed, that is about the only way we can keep it from being developed. Otherwise, if we plan for it and make sure there is transit, park-n-ride and walkability, then there won't be as much traffic as if it was not planned, so we are on the right track.

Chair Losoff then asked if Commissioner Brandt was satisfied with staff's response about the open space issue, and Commissioner Brandt stated that just because he had questions, doesn't mean that there are not issues that need to be discussed, so there may be other things that need to be put on the board. It wasn't that long ago that Mike was saying don't look at the specifics, just discuss the big picture and how the whole thing is coming together, so let's talk about that for two hours, and then it was time to talk about specifics, but you said that however long it takes, we are going to do it, so we are going to do it or continue it to the next meeting.

Commissioner Brandt then stated that as far as the open space, he thinks what was being said was if it was right on the edge and that line blurred, that is okay, but we need more language that might suggest that the line isn't set, not that we can put something right in the middle. What might be a beautiful entry to some people might be the Taj Mahal to somebody else; the language there kind of leaves the barn door open for anything to move in. Some people think that solar panels make a good entry statement, and the owner said he wanted a better entry statement, so you didn't look at the solar panels. Let's try to look at this from the big picture and not set a precedent by suggesting development in open space. Mike Raber indicated that he would like to know how the Commission feels about that.

Commissioner Klein stated that the draft before this one said to leave the whole southwest corner as open space, and now it is saying maybe we would allow building, but he is not sure how we got to that point. He then asked why that change was made, and Mike Raber explained that it was part of the correspondence from the property owner, and they presented that in the last meeting. They thought it would be an opportunity to have a statement within that area if it was really in sync with the idea of a gateway entry into Sedona and some architectural statement wouldn't be totally out of the question, nor would some encroachment into the area that is graphically depicted, because we haven't done a detailed analysis on where that ought to be, and we felt the Commission also was in support of that.

Commissioner Barcus asked if when a developer brings in a development, they are going to have to make the case of consistency with the guidelines, and at that time, staff would provide their assessment of that consistency, and we would make suggestions and alterations. Mike Raber confirmed that is the process and explained that we would use this plan as the basis to start that discussion. The Commissioner then stated that if the proposal has some architectural statement that the Commission likes, then that is permitted by these guidelines, but if that architectural statement is something that we don't like, we can provide that information at that time. Mike agreed and stated that the question is if we need language that is more specific.

The Chair stated that page 61 pretty much says that significant natural open space should be preserved within this area, particularly on the hilltop, etc. He guesses if there are any structures, they should exhibit high quality architecture, so that says what you are saying; it is open space, and if a developer comes in with something more specific, it still has to meet our standards. Commissioner Barcus indicated that was his point.

Commissioner Cohen asked if the CFA says something and a developer comes in with a zoning proposal, does this limit the Commission's ability to say no, yes, maybe, change it, etc., or limit the City Council in any way. Mike Raber indicated that is one of the reasons you need to be careful when you get into specifics and detail and that is why there is sometimes a little bit of a line there, but it is a guide for future zoning; it is not cast in stone that you have to abide by it like Conditions of Approval in a rezoning -- it gives more latitude.

Ron Ramsey added that statutorily the significance of the CFA, and as further developed with a basic General Plan, is that a rezoning has to be consistent and conform with those layers, so you are developing parameters. Commissioner Cohen then asked if calling for more open space is important if we want more open space and calling for less means less in the future, and Ron Ramsey indicated that is true.

Chair Losoff pointed out that the plan doesn't call for less open space; page 61 says to preserve open space generally speaking. Mike Raber explained that previously, we had this called out as an open space preservation area, and now we are saying that there are things within that area that need to be preserved and those are what we want to focus on. A rezoning proposal would give specifics as to exactly where they want to do that. Commissioner Brandt added that it does say "significant" natural open space should be preserved, so that kind of opens the barn door a little. In rereading this, the language will work as written, because it says "significant" natural open space should be preserved, but small areas could be developed.

Chair Losoff stated that since the last meeting, we have had several comments, including Commissioner Brandt's letter and we heard from the public as well as our own questions. The three major ones are listed. He then asked if the Commission was ready for a decision or if there was anything more to discuss.

Commissioner Klein referenced Commissioner Cohen's point about overbuilding and stated that the 2007 resolution passed by the City Council for the Cultural Park area called for a maximum of 210 lodging units, and although the Commissioner thinks we have hashed this to death, before he received the materials for tonight's meeting he had never heard the number 300 before. We have never discussed 300 units . . . Chair Losoff recognized Audree Juhlin who stated that at the last meeting there was extensive discussion about the number of lodging units. We talked about the proportion between residential and lodging and we had a balance; however, the Commission did not like the proportion idea and really talked about setting a maximum number of lodging in the area. When you did a straw poll vote amongst the Commissioners, 300 was the number that came up as a result. Commissioner Mayer confirmed yes, it was, and Donna Puckett stated that it is in the minutes of the January 5th meeting. Commissioner Cohen then stated that he remembers it that way too, but he doesn't like it any more now. Commissioner Klein indicated that he was going to say that if we are concerned about overbuilding, the developer, in the letter of December 29th, said they would like to see the units increase from 150 to at least 210 and preferably 250, so if we are concerned about overbuilding, we should set the limit of 250 for the area.

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission needs to decide if we are concerned about overbuilding. Up to this point, he felt we weren't, but we can revisit that. He then asked the Commissioners how they felt about overbuilding and if 300 was too many. Commissioner Mayer stated not at all; he would like to see more density, especially around the village core, and more residential as well. Commissioner Barcus stated that he agreed and one of the reasons that density is critical here is you are not going to have walkability and a viable mixed-use capability if you don't have enough people, and then you are going to have all of those people on the road driving into West Sedona rather than people in West Sedona driving out to this vibrant, active, walkable, entertaining area, so he is concerned about under-building, and he thought we hit a correct and proper balance to give developers an option to justify a level of lodging activity along with other mixed uses that they felt could pass the business test.

The Chair indicated that we had this discussion last time and he believes the four Commissioners are pretty much in agreement with that, and there was a pretty strong agreement that is what we wanted to do, so he doesn't know that we want to rehash it again. Commissioner Cohen stated that he is just trying to balance some things in his mind -- the difference created between residents who live here and what they need with what the City needs in terms of tourism to support us and what the City needs in terms of infrastructure to make things happen the right way for tourists and residents. We have over 10,000 people who live here, and he has never heard a number that says what an optimum size for the City is, what is an optimum size for the number of tourists is, and what the infrastructure needs to look like. He hasn't heard an infrastructure conversation related to the water treatment or sewage. He is focused on the road, because we live that daily. When it is off-season, it is not too much of a problem, but in season, it is a big problem. He disagrees with Commissioner Barcus, because if you are driving in from Uptown, you have to drive back to Uptown, so those are his issues. He is not thrilled with the density of the development we are proposing.

Chair Losoff stated that we have a final draft and have had some discussion about modifications regarding the vista location and trailhead, and we are okay with the open space the way it is written, so he will entertain a motion, and once a motion is made there could be more discussion. He would entertain a motion for approval, disapproval or continuance.

Commissioner Klein asked, before making the motion, what we are going to do about keeping the vista point in the CFA, and the Chair explained that the motion should include the suggested motion amended to include the vista language, and staff has language for that. Commissioner Klein suggested taking a break so someone can write it out before making the motion. Mike Raber stated that he wrote a couple of things; however, Commissioner Klein suggested that Commissioner Brandt should write it.

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission would take a break and in the meantime, an amended motion should include the vista, and Mike Raber added, the section about traffic on Navoti Drive, plus strengthening the collaboration language with the U.S. Forest Service.

The Chair recessed the meeting at 7:10 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

Mike Raber read suggested language for the three areas discussed before the break, starting with the vista point as follows: "Authorize staff to include stronger language to retain the vista point and trailhead needs. "Authorize staff to include language to address potential traffic impacts outside the planning area on Navoti Drive." And, "Authorize staff to include language to strengthen collaboration with the Forest Service and clarifications regarding references to the National Forest and Forest Service." Mike noted that there were some other clarification items received from Jennifer Burns.

Commissioner Cohen asked if he could make an amendment before the motion was made and Ron Ramsey stated that there was no motion. Commissioner Cohen stated that he wanted to cut back on the number of lodging rooms. The Chair indicated that there wasn't agreement with that; however, Commissioner Cohen stated that was okay, he wanted to be on record. The Chair then stated that we will entertain the motion first, and if we want to not approve it, you have the right to not approve it for that reason.

MOTION: Commissioner Mayer moved to recommend the adoption of the Western Gateway Community Focus Area Draft Plan of January 12, 2016 to the City Council and authorize staff to make additional format, editorial and typographical changes/corrections and insert additional photos and illustrations to provide additional clarity in the document. I include also the amendments to authorize the staff to include stronger language to retain the vista point and trailhead needs; authorize the staff to include language to address potential traffic impacts outside the planning area of Navoti Drive; authorize the staff to include language to strengthen collaboration with the U.S. Forest Service and clarifications regarding references to the National Forest and Forest Service. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion.

AMENDED MOTION: Commissioner Cohen moved to amend that we reduce the number of lodging units from 300 to 250.

Motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Klein stated that he would prefer 250 instead of 300, but it is not going to prevent him from voting for it.

VOTE ON THE MOTION: Motion carried five (5) for and (1) opposed. (Commissioner Cohen was opposed and Vice Chair Levin was excused.)

Chair Losoff thanked staff and indicated that he is comfortable, given the fact that we have certain outside controls, so no matter how the CFA Plan is stated, we still have the right to decide a specific project. It also scared him when someone said we could end up getting to the next revision of the Community Plan, if we didn't finish it pretty fast, so he didn't know how much more it could have been discussed. It won't solve every problem or make everybody happy, but the plan is a good plan.

7. Discussion regarding the future update of the Sedona Land Development Code.

Audree Juhlin stated that there is no update since the last meeting. This is a regular item on the agenda at the request of the Commission, in case items come up as we amend the Land Development Code. The Chair asked about a consultant coming in, and Audree stated that a RFP would be prepared for certain sections of the Land Development Code that we either simply don't have time for or the expertise to make those amendments. We will hopefully have something in the spring, and we will be contracting with a consultant to amend the Wireless Communications section of the code in the very near future. We are finalizing that contract now.

8. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

a. Thursday, January 28, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)

b. Tuesday, February 2, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)

c. Thursday, February 11, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)

d. Tuesday, February 16, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)

Audree indicated that January 28th is a work session for Sedona Off-Road Adventures Conditional Use Permit and the public hearing for that item will be on February 2nd. Commissioner Brandt stated that he would not be available on the 28th. Commissioner Cohen stated that his plans had changed, so he will be available. Audree noted that there currently is nothing for February 11th or 16th. Chair Losoff suggested having a discussion about Community Development's objectives in the 2015 Annual Report, as well as the City Council's. Audree then suggested an item to talk about the CFA process to kind of debrief this Western Gateway process and analyze what worked and what didn't. The Chair then asked if the Commission could critique the Commission's own process, and Audree indicated yes, she could expand that. Commissioner Brandt noted that he would definitely not be available on February 11th.

Commissioner Barcus then indicated that the City Council has been discussing parking meters in Uptown. They gave a verbal vote on that, and they are going to be forming a sub-committee to evaluate that. He then asked if we could agendize whether or not someone from the Commission might want to be on that committee, because of the implications it has on traffic and public safety, etc. Audree Juhlin suggested that perhaps a more appropriate way to handle that is as the City Manager is putting together that task force, we indicate that there was a desire from at least one Commissioner to participate. The Chair then requested a brief update on the 28th. Commissioner Barcus clarified that he wasn't volunteering; he just wanted to discuss it as an agendized item, and we also might want to discuss the implications associated with a single trash collection agency at that time. Chair Losoff asked if that was within the Commission's purview.

Ron Ramsey explained that he was nervous about the Commission trying to upstream what is on the Council's agenda. Under the guidelines and rules for the Commission, the Council can certainly reverse this and ask that you participate or agendize it, but to have items like this that are very controversial and close to when they are trying to make a resolution is probably premature. The Chair agreed and indicated that is getting into territory that we don't want to get into. As part of P&Z 101, we don't want to be an influence on the Council on some of these items, just as we don't want them to influence us outside of the meetings, so we have to be careful. Ron Ramsey added that he doesn't see how that is an issue that has been assigned or normally would be assigned to the Commission. That is something the Council would have to decide in terms of a Franchise Agreement and it might even be up to a citywide election.

Commissioner Barcus explained that to discuss them at all, they have to be agendized. Ron Ramsey agreed, but added that these aren't appropriate agenda items for the Commission. If you look at our ordinances concerning the role of the Commissions in Sedona, one of the particular areas is that they can take whatever agenda item that the Council asks them to do, so if the Council says that it wants P&Z to put on your agenda a discussion like that, you can do that, but to reverse it, no.

Chair Losoff indicated that the way that something like this could be handled is that periodically we have a joint meeting with the City Council once or twice a year, and during those meetings, we could ask for clarification or information. The Chair then asked if the Commission could receive an update under announcements or a summary of current events in terms of where we are with the traffic study, and Audree indicated that could be brought forward in the next meeting to update the Commission on the progress. Also in the future, we would like to bring back the Community Benefits Policy; we've done an analysis on past projects, so we will bring that forward on a slower meeting night. Commissioner Mayer added that he would like an update on the Green Building Code.

9. EXECUTIVE SESSION

If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- a. **To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).**
- b. **Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.**

No Executive Session was held.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 7:32 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on January 19, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date