

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, April 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, Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt, Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer.

Staff Present: Audree Juhlin, Cynthia Lovely, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey

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

Audree Juhlin announced that the Council approved the Soldiers Pass CFA, accepting the Commission's recommendation with one significant change – a reduction in the lodging area to no more than 10 acres, so kudos to the Commission. Then, the Council discussed the Western Gateway in their work session, and they are close to taking formal action, so that is scheduled for May 24th if you are available and want to attend. The Chair then reminded the Commissioners that they also can watch the meetings on their television or computer.

4. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

a. March 17, 2016 (S)

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he would have to abstain since he missed that meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Klein moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Mayer seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Brandt abstained.

b. April 5, 2016 (R)

Commissioner Klein stated that he was absent from that meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Cohen moved for acceptance. Commissioner Mayer seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and (1) abstention. Commissioner Klein abstained.

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. Discussion regarding the process for future CFA (Community Focus Area) Planning.

Chair Losoff noted that the Commission had been through a couple of CFAs and the last one was frustrating with the Commission all over the board on various occasions. The Council seemed to be

in the same boat periodically, so as a result of that and some of the issues raised with the first CFA, Audree suggested having a general discussion about what we expect of the CFA planning process, how we can make it better, what suggestions we have for improvement, etc. Staff spends a lot of time and energy on it and ends up doing a very good job, but how can we make it easier for them?

The Chair indicated that Audree did a very good job of putting together seven discussion points and, to keep the discussion focused, he would suggest taking one point at a time. She also gave the Commission a map of the various CFAs for reference. Audree Juhlin then added that in the materials is the overall planning process by phase, and the first question asked is at what point in time does the Commission want to be involved in the planning phases?

Commissioner Mayer indicated that it would be great for the Commission to be involved right away, because that is when we get the information, and in Phase 2 or 3, we didn't know what was going on with the Community Plan. Everybody should be familiar with the Sedona Community Plan before then and be involved in every phase.

Commissioner Cohen agreed with Commissioner Mayer, because there are certain questions that the Community Plan brings to mind as we look at the various CFAs. The Community Plan is very strong on sustainability, so it would be helpful in the beginning to get staff's feeling and direction on what staff is looking for in sustainability, not just for the CFAs, but how that fits with in all the rest of the City. Looking ahead, we are also going to have to deal with two things the legislature is toying with -- one is going to be voted on as Arizona 123, because that could affect land around Sedona, and as Justin stated, one of the problems we have is that we could lose lodging and other taxes while keeping all of the traffic, if there is more development outside of the City, and the other is the ADUs, which they want to eliminate, so these thoughts might help us focus as we begin each CFA.

Commissioner Barcus explained that it depends on how you define "involved". Are we becoming involved as a body of Commissioners from the very beginning or are we attending data collection and community participation meetings separately? You know we've been instructed on what we can discuss and what we should not discuss related to these kinds of issues. Someone needs to define what "involvement" means and we need to be really strict in our interpretation of involvement. When he read it, he read it literally and thought that he wanted to be involved in Phase 4. He doesn't want to be involved in data collection and community participation, because he might form some opinions individually, and he doesn't think that is a good public process for the Commission, so if we are just going to participate and listen to these various things and have a loose definition of "involvement", then that is great, but if you want it tightly defined as a body, then he doesn't know.

Commissioner Brandt agreed with Commissioner Barcus in that Phase 4, according to the flowchart, is where participation should start unless any of the members want to be involved in the community participation. With that said, the Commission has already been involved, because of the work done with the whole Community Plan; however, he also thinks there needs to be more direction and focus given on what each CFA and the Community Plan state as the goals for the CFAs, and that is what would guide the whole process. Chair Losoff often stated that there needs to be something that plans for all of them and do we want this or that in all of them; we need to have some overarching plan, but he thinks the Sedona Community Plan already does that to a big extent and it guides what happens in the CFAs.

Commissioner Mayer stated that there are a few that were involved in creating the Community Plan, so the groundwork has been done. He considers that as Phase 1; all the research is done on what the community wants and what they desire to have in all of those CFAs, and the implementation is what we are involved in. That is how he sees it and in order to implement something or make recommendations, we all need to be educated on or study the Community Plan in a little bit more detail, to see what the community wants and how to implement all 13 of the CFAs. Not every one of them is going to be conducive to all that the community wants; only certain areas are going to be conducive to certain things, so if we don't get involved from the ground up,

then most of us might not know what is conducive to one area and not conducive to another area, and education would be a good thing for all of us, to follow what the community wants. So again, he would like to be involved in Phase 1. After 3½ years, it is almost like part of his DNA, but even the new members need to educate themselves on what is at stake for the community.

Commissioner Klein indicated that when Commissioner Mayer made that statement about getting involved from the beginning, his was assuming that Commissioner Mayer was talking about getting involved in Phase 3 as staff starts to prepare a draft plan, because as a Commission he doesn't think we should be collectively getting involved in Phase 1 or 2, and even getting involved in Phase 3, he kind of agrees with Commissioner Barcus that it would be more appropriate for the Commission to get involved in Phase 4, unless we had another CFA like the Cultural Park. On that one, it would have been a good idea to get involved with staff before they did a draft plan, but he doesn't think there will be another one like that or close to that. So given that, he kind of agrees with Commissioner Barcus that Phase 4 is where we should get involved as a Commission.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he still agreed with Commissioner Mayer on Phase 1. He then asked how staff determines the data to be collected, because that would determine which direction in planning he would go. Understanding the process and establishing what data would be collected, we would get a direction as to where the CFA planning is going and without knowing that, we wouldn't know what staff was thinking. Mike Raber explained that one of the reasons for that phase is to figure that out, so each one would be different as far as the kinds of data we would want, although there is some basic stuff – transportation-related, all the maps and land use information, etc. Commissioner Cohen stated that you have to have questions to get the data, so the questions are the first thing, and would it not be helpful for the Commission to be involved in listening to the question development, even if it is just a report?

Audree Juhlin explained that staff has to have a solid understanding of the current conditions for the background information and all of the initial data collection provides that, so we're going to be on foot, knocking on doors, doing research on previous land uses, understanding vacancy rates, etc., to get a good understanding of the area. Cynthia added that as we are gathering all of the information we can, it also comes to light that there may be certain topics that we don't have enough information on, so that may be another important piece in terms of finding out what we don't know or need to know more about. Commissioner Cohen stated that those are good answers, but like with any good research project, you start with research questions and those are the questions that would be helpful for the Commission to understand before the process – we don't have to walk with Cynthia door-to-door, etc., but it would be helpful to know what the research questions are and why that particular data is being collected. Audree explained that this is more of a bullet-point list of what we do. There are a lot of steps that go with each of the phases, but we could give the Commission a snapshot of what those steps look like in general; they are going to change based on the CFA, but we could give you a more in-depth understanding of what we do as part of the planning process.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she would want to have a foot in Phase 3 or maybe just a toe in the water there, but she would squarely want to begin the Commission's process in Phase 4. Going back to Phase 1, it wouldn't hurt just as an FYI to P&Z if staff just reported to the Commission once a month or whatever is appropriate that this is the information received – not for discussion, just updates. Then, a Council Member, Barbara Litrell, and Chair Losoff were involved with the Citizens Steering Committee's planning process for 3½ years, so that gave them the ability to see the day-to-day work before it moved to their respective areas of responsibility on the Commission and Council, so perhaps we could designate a Commission member to be in the workgroup, just as a Councilor and Commissioner were in the City's working groups for the Community Plan. So, that is one thing to perhaps consider to see if there is value or risk there. She never thought there was a risk involved with their participation, because they became voices for the Plan, champions and had a richer understanding of all of the layered data that was coming through the pipeline, but that is just one suggestion, and then start with Phase 4.

Chair Losoff stated Phase 4, and it is five of us versus two, so he thinks there is overall consensus that we want to start in Phase 4, but having said that, as you get into items 2, 3 and 4, there is room before Phase 1 to discuss as a group items 2, 3 and 4 to have an overall perspective of what we want to do in terms of major policy concepts as the process begins – not in the data collection stage or participation, because we are a Commission and kind of administrative; we're not hands on and we're not to micromanage staff's role, and he is very conscious of that, so he would be more interested in having, before Phase 1, a general discussion with the Commission and/or Council as to where we are going and what we see in terms of overall concepts, be it traffic, lodging, etc., and then staff would get into it, so we would set some parameters initially.

Audree Juhlin noted that the Chair has just led the group into question #2, and the Chair continued to say that he would say Phase 4 as well, and given that there are at least four Commissioners if not five, we can just close it at that.

Commissioner Mayer stated that there are three of us that know a lot more than the other Commissioners, so shouldn't they go through how this Community Plan came about? Chair Losoff indicated that they could, but they don't have to go through the . . . , Commissioner Mayer interjected that they don't have to go through a phase, but somehow, they need to be educated; they are fairly new to this whole process to judge or make some sort of . . . , going into something in the midst of a process that you aren't as familiar with is tough, and he would see a benefit to the Commission to freshen up or be educated on the Community Plan. He would really like to see that, and if the staff educates us, then we all don't have to go through Phase 1 as long as there is an understanding among the rest of the Commissioners as to what this is all about. When we went through the Cultural Park, he assumed a lot of them were not familiar with the whole Plan, so we were dissecting one CFA -- first Soldiers Pass and then this one, and it is a string of pearls, so he would like to see the Commission be a little more aware of where it all came from, the momentum and the 3½ years.

Chair Losoff stated that he is pretty confident that all of the Commissioners have read the Community Plan, and not everybody is going to know it like Commissioner Mayer, himself and staff, but we have to rely on each Commissioner to work with staff if they aren't familiar enough and find out more of what is going on, but as we get into the process, maybe there needs to be a little orientation. The Chair then referenced question #2 that asked if a joint visioning session should be held between the Commission and Council at the beginning of new CFAs.

Vice Chair Levin asked for clarification on what staff means by "visioning session" at the beginning of the process, and Audree indicated that as an example for the Western Gateway, there were different ideas about what the Western Gateway would be like, even amongst the Commissioners; would it be more residentially-focused or more lodging-focused. Then, when we got to Council that same discussion happened, so as we are beginning the draft plan maybe it is better to have an agreement as to where we are going to jump off from – if we are going to build around this base or that base as the main focal point. The Vice Chair then confirmed that we would start with community expectations for that CFA and have a visioning process around that, and Audree added that the point is that we want to ensure that what we are bringing forward is really in line with the ultimate expectations of both the Commission and Council. If staff has it all wrong to begin with, we don't want to waste all that time preparing a draft; we want to know we are on the right track.

Chair Losoff stated that the Community Plan lays everything out, but not every CFA mirrors the Community Plan exactly, so what is good for this CFA is not necessarily . . . , so the visioning maybe overall, and then where we are going with it? Do we want this one concentrated on X and that one on Y?

Vice Chair Levin indicated that the "beginning" is a word that could cover a lot of time, so she wanted to better understand when you think that would be most helpful to staff. Would the visioning be after the data collection? Audree pointed out that the data collection phase might help formulate a better understanding of the visioning stage. Chair Losoff then again stated that maybe it is not

listed as a phase, but before we start the data collection, we could come up with parameters as to what the general concepts are. Vice Chair Levin clarified that her question is where does the “beginning” begin, as staff stated, there are millions of steps behind these boxes.

Commissioner Cohen agreed with Vice Chair Levin and indicated that he trusts the staff and supports them, but if the visioning is first, that would help Mike and Cynthia determine the questions to ask that would determine what kind of data to collect. Vice Chair Levin stated that she also sees that the community engagement process, through the CFA workgroups . . .; for instance, when Cynthia was heading up the Master Planning process for Brewer Road, all of those comments came to the Commission, and then they needed to be synthesized and they were given categories, and that is also data; and that is what the community is saying after the Community Plan was adopted, so again where is the beginning? Where do you slot the visioning, is it after you have done your data collection?

Commissioner Mayer stated that the visioning would be after you collect all of the data, and then you can come up with a vision. You cannot have a vision without the data. Chair Losoff noted that the vision is already in place in the Community Plan, and Commissioner Mayer added that they somehow need to be coordinated; it can't be way off of the vision from the data, because it is all based on the data. Donna Puckett noted that purists in research would not set parameters before doing data collection, because if you put restrictive parameters around the data you are going to collect, it could steer the research into a certain channel and you may not get the breadth of information that you would otherwise. Chair Losoff noted that is true, but on the other hand, as we saw with both CFAs, the data collection was almost identical to the Steering Committee's data collection with the same lists, same issues and about the same people, but there were a few modifications and changes here and there; however, Commissioner Mayer noted that we don't know that and the Chair agreed.

Mike Raber indicated that he also hears Vice Chair Levin asking if you should be considering what the community is saying as part of that next step in your visioning process, not just the hard facts and things like that, but where does this seem to be going from what you are hearing so far. Vice Chair Levin indicated that she would feel a little more comfortable having that kind of background. Cynthia indicated that an example of data collection, which she sees as numbers, research, etc., as opposed to community participation, which she sees as what is their vision? That is the kind of data we would get from them, whereas, an example of the data collection that she did for Soldiers Pass was looking at the types of businesses, how many and where they are located, and that wasn't an easy thing -- you can't just go to a computer and print a list, but that is one concrete example of some of the data.

Chair Losoff then stated that it goes back to staff's feelings too. Using the Western Gateway, we spent seven or eight meetings and we were all over the board; we talked about residential versus commercial versus lodging, and we were back and forth several times. We ended up with the recommendations and we almost had unanimous agreement in four areas – the trailhead issue, the number of lodging units, both sides of the street versus one side and the ratios. Council got the information and went through it all and they were kind of going back and forth on different things; in fact, one Councilor said that he thought we were frustrated and so was the Council, and finally, Audree asked the Council what they wanted – tourism, housing, etc., and they basically said tourism, and then things fell into perspective. He then asked if that should have been upfront to save time and energy; he doesn't know the answer, but that is kind of what this question is asking, and they could have probably even skipped some of the focus groups or other meetings, but it did put things into perspective at that point.

Commissioner Klein stated that he had mixed feelings about #2 and he is not really clear as to what is meant by “joint visioning session.” His concern is if you are going to have the City Council affect the Commission's independence. If we know what they want, should we vote on what we think or vote on what they want, so he is wondering if a joint meeting would potentially color what the Commission wants to recommend. He doesn't know the answer, but he would be potentially

concerned about that – not to raise the pickleball subject again and it is fine with him that the Council voted to allow it, but if we had known their thoughts in advance, would we have said that even though we didn't want it, we were going to vote to put it there, because they want it. Then, you are losing the Commission's opinion, so that is his concern about #2.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that Commissioner Klein brought up part of what he was thinking, and none of it had to do with pickleball. It is that the CFA processes take a while, and he came in as the new guy, and what is going to be complicating is that we know that we will have turnover on the Commission from time to time, and every two years we have the potential for turnover on the City Council, so he was thinking if we have the joint visioning session and it would work if there is no turnover, but if the Council changes, things could get messy. Vice Chair Levin added that it has always been that way. Commissioner Barcus then indicated that his sense was that we have a Community Plan and we are supposed to be developing CFAs consistent with the Community Plan. The Community Plan is changed on a lot less frequent basis than the participants on Planning & Zoning and City Council, so it isn't a good idea to have a visioning session where we would make a decision. Maybe having a work session together might be useful, but recognizing that we could have a new slate of people involved who have different views when we get to the end.

Chair Losoff asked if anyone disagreed with Commissioners Klein and Barcus' observations. Commissioner Cohen indicated he agreed with what Commissioner Barcus just said, but there is one more piece in that the most consistent group is staff, so visioning of the staff is important, and maybe they could share some of their thinking with the Commission before we start working on a CFA. Audree indicated that everything being said is very valid and those are questions staff has been asking internally as well. Let's use the Western Gateway as an example. The community expectations provide for education, research, arts, events, land use options to remain flexible, coordination between property owners, access to the National Forest, preservation of open space, visitor information, parking at the gateway, transit links and main highway access to the Cultural Park and the Upper Red Rock loop area, but it doesn't talk about housing, lodging or tell us the basis for where we are going to start our planning efforts. As the professional planning staff, we can come forward with what we think are the best land uses to build on the CFA, we could get the Commission's input and start from there or start with a joint session, but going back and solely relying on the Community Plan to guide the direction is not really going to give us clear direction. Commissioner Mayer commented that it was only meant to be a guide, and Audree agreed, but pointed out that it doesn't get into the specifics of where we want to begin the land use planning effort.

Chair Losoff stated that we probably don't want to have a joint session with Council, but probably some early-on discussion as to what we think the concepts should be in terms of the particular CFA. Do we want it to focus on X or Y or a combination and that could be early-on in the process. Commissioner Klein indicated that depends on the CFA, because it wouldn't have been necessary for Soldiers Pass to have any meeting with the City Council. Then, Commissioner Mayer added that all of the CFAs need to be somehow connected; we have to think about the next one and all of the others. It is almost like whoever comes first gets to choose or the landowners get to say they like this and that, and then the rest gets whatever is left in the Community Plan. It has to be all together somehow, so there is a symbiosis rather than individual CFAs taken out of context, and then move on to the next one and plan something there; it needs to all be considered as a string of pearls. Chair Losoff then noted that takes us to #3.

Commissioner Brandt stated that he likes the idea of the string of pearls and each pearl has the potential to be its own neighborhood, where you don't need to drive to get somewhere else. Each one acts as its own neighborhood and within that neighborhood there should be lodging, commercial, housing for those two things and housing for people who want to retire and hang out, so each one should act as its own neighborhood. At the same time, we don't want to be too flexible in our planning; we want things to be able to be adjustable, but putting a ratio on those items in the land use seems to be really rigid, and in the middle of talking about the Western Gateway, we were suddenly talking about which ratios are best – the Uptown ratio, West Sedona ratio, but it is like

wait, why, what? That just came out of left field and it seemed like it directed a lot of the discussion and, at the same time, it didn't seem to make sense. You've got to be flexible and talk in generalities, but let's talk about a very specific ratio – what, that doesn't make sense, so how does it apply to #2, his notes say yes we should do that and then he hears people say no we shouldn't do it – so maybe. We need to get an idea of where we are going as far as are we going to be rigid and define where roads are or are we going to be loose and relaxed and let the developers come up with a plan with these notions in mind.

Chair Losoff asked which way Commissioner Brandt is leaning – flexible or rigid, and Commissioner Brandt responded that is what the vision meeting needs to be about. The Chair then stated that he is hearing that we don't necessarily want a joint visioning session, because of the various issues. We do have to be independent, but at some point in time probably have some roundtable discussion about what we want for a specific CFA and how it coordinates with the overall Community Plan and what we want to put in there, etc.

The Chair then read #3, "Should major policy concepts, such as lodging and housing be discussed prior to drafting the plan?" Commissioner Cohen asked what "major policy concepts" mean in terms of the CFA? Audree explained that this was presented based on the City Council's experience when we took the Soldiers Pass CFA forward. In order for them to have a more in-depth discussion, they needed to have some discussion on lodging in general, which kind of goes along with the comments about the string of pearls and what the other areas are doing, so we gathered a lot of information for Council and presented that in an in-depth discussion, then they were able to give us direction on the policy for lodging in the Soldiers Pass CFA.

Chair Losoff noted that we have the Marriott going up, the Sedona Rouge expanding, we approved Sky Ranch Lodge, and there is the potential for two or three other developments to include lodging, so at a point in time, should the Commission discuss the overall and if we want to put limits, if we can, or say that this particular CFA should not have any more? Commissioner Mayer stated that it is a matter of sustainability; how much can the City take and how much is it impacting the traffic, and the residents, and how is it going to impact all lodging? We have a pie of X amount of tourists, but is it still 10,000 per day or double the amount of people that live here? Audree indicated that at any time, it could be two to three times -- getting up to 10,000 population with 10,000 to 20,000 more. Commissioner Mayer then asked how much we can absorb in terms of impact on the community and the tourists too. If you put lodging everywhere in every CFA, we are going to suffocate eventually. Commissioner Cohen noted that from a couple of meetings ago, Commissioner Mayer said something about quality as well as quantity in lodging.

Commissioner Klein stated that for both #3 and #4, it would probably be a good idea, for certain CFAs, to discuss with staff those issues before they prepare the draft in Phase 3. Chair Losoff indicated that he is sensing agreement on #3 and #4, but another concept that we haven't discussed is there are 13 CFAs -- should a couple of them be combined or extended, etc.? We haven't gotten into those conceptual discussions and we saw Soldiers Pass with Mariposa just outside of that CFA. Should it have been included? How far do we want to take some of this? It would be helpful to have some roundtable discussion on these concepts, and staff knows better than we do what those concepts are that you might want to discuss so #3 or #4 would be something worthwhile.

Vice Chair Levin commented that density might be one of the planning concepts that would be helpful for the Commission to better understand, but the CFA will probably dictate those discussions, and she is guessing that is going to come up pretty soon.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he would like to get some information from the Chamber regarding lodging -- how much more. Vice Chair Levin noted that the Commission has a great table of existing and proposed lodging; however, Commissioner Mayer indicated that he is sure they have a lot of research, and how much more lodging should we have or can we absorb? The pie is only so big and the slices get smaller and smaller, then some of the lodging is not going to work anymore,

so maybe it is a good thing, because then the cheap ones may kind of collapse and make room for better ones.

Audree indicated that she is hearing yes, these philosophy-kind of discussions would be valuable to the Commission, and the Chair agreed, but added that we have to be careful; there is a line and we are not the City Council, so we don't want to get into issues that are beyond our jurisdiction. Like in our last meeting, we had a presentation about what Parks is doing and that was good, because we do get issues coming before us, and those kinds of concepts will make us more effective.

The Chair then referenced #5 that asks how we address areas when there is a lack of consensus between Commissioners and the Commission and staff. Commissioner Klein suggested having a simple rule that the Commission is always right. Chair Losoff then indicated that sticking with the Commission first, he tries to get a consensus and if we don't have one, it goes back to staff to try to determine what we think, but he doesn't know if that is effective. He doesn't know if the Commission needs to come to a consensus each time; we discussed that we don't want minority reports and that was pretty unanimous.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that having been the minority on at least one vote, his position is that once the Commission has taken a position, even if it is five to two or four to three, then his job is to go along with what the Commission is saying and represent it, because that is who we are and in the document given to us, before we were appointed, it says what the responsibilities are. It was clear that is the philosophy to follow and it makes great sense to him, even when he might disagree. Chair Losoff stated that he didn't know if that has been an issue with the Commissioners; we vote and it could be 7-0 or 6-1, etc.

Audree Juhlin clarified that staff isn't coming from the vote perspective; it is clear at that point, but it is when we are seeking direction on a concept from the Commission, and we have two, three and one, so we don't have clear direction as to what to move forward, and that is what we are hoping to get better clarity on.

Commissioner Barcus explained that on a previous board, one of the approaches was if they had an issue with five different pieces, and one or more people were uncomfortable with each of the five, you could never get a consensus, so they would often have a general motion and then amendments, and that is very Robert's Rules of Order specific, but it gets you through the process. It has the downside of not trying to force that consensus in some kind of compromise, which is a really important public policy that we do. We actually voice our views and differences, and then say maybe we could all agree on this, so if you go to a strict reading with amendments on each of the five pieces, you can get through it and the advantage that gives, to whoever bothers to read the minutes of the meeting, is that you understand that it was 6 to 1 on this issue, 5 to 2 on that issue, etc., so you approve all of the amendments, and then you might have a unanimous vote, because everyone got their opportunity to vote on each element.

Chair Losoff stated that if it is okay with everyone, we can try it. We've been trying to go by general consensus, but he can see a lot of unnecessary discussion if we did that, and what he sees as a problem is when we ask what you think about this, and we get questions like, how do you define this, and we never get to a straight answer; we get off on tangents, so we have to figure out the best way to do that. .

Commissioner Brandt stated that it is tough when it is two, two, two and someone is on the fence, but then maybe it needs to be discussed more to find out what the differences are, because we are talking about trying to get direction, not say yes or no on a project being presented, so it just needs to be discussed more to see if there is a way to do what Commissioner Barcus said but in a more informal situation for the CFAs.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she liked the idea of multiple alternative land use scenarios that might be just bubble concept plans; like with Soldiers Pass, you could move the puzzle pieces around a

little bit – lodging, retail, mixed use, etc., in a very simple approach, which would then engage the Commission in a discussion of where we would want to place our emphasis. We did that in a much more detailed way in the Western Gateway, with so much data coming to us, and it hopefully would be much easier on a smaller scale. She likes the idea of a bubble concept plan that would just circle 60% of the site and just put in housing to see how the discussion comes forth about that CFA and its relative integration with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Chair Losoff then asked Vice Chair Levin if the Commission should come to a consensus informally or more formally through the Robert's Rules of Order approach. Vice Chair Levin stated that she couldn't support Commissioner Barcus's suggestion. Commissioner Cohen then stated, "What Kathy said", but he would point out that this doesn't talk about consensus about the Commission, but consensus between the Commission and staff, and we haven't talked about that. Chair Losoff explained that the Commission would get to that, but this is about the Commission itself, and then Commissioner Cohen repeated, "What Kathy said."

Commissioner Klein stated that he is neutral, and Commissioner Barcus explained that he just threw that out as an example. He was not advocating, but it was a solution in that rare instance, and it would apply to both lack of consensus between Commissioners as well as trying to give clear direction from the Commission to staff. We don't want to be here until 10:00 p.m. arguing over definitions.

Commissioner Mayer stated that is tough and he is split. Commissioner Brandt stated it is a CFA process and it should be more informal to try to get a consensus, and then it becomes a formal presentation. Chair Losoff then stated that the Commission would try that approach and experiment as we go along, and as Vice Chair Levin stated, sometimes staff comes to us and ask what we think. Maybe it would be more effective to say here are five alternatives, and we could try something like that. Vice Chair Levin added that two to three alternatives would be ample.

Chair Losoff then asked about when there is a lack of consensus between the Commission and staff, and Vice Chair Levin stated that is always going to be the case. The Chair then noted that it hasn't been much of an issue until recently; the Western Gateway created an issue. Audree agreed that 85% to 90% of the time, there is pretty much agreement between the Commission and staff, but there are going to be times when staff will have a different opinion based on our professional opinions, training and experience. We are going to differ and that is okay; that is part of the process, but we want to resolve how we handle the differences in the future. We have learned some lessons on how to better handle that, but we wanted more input from the Commission about those instances when we do disagree. Commissioner Mayer added that the City Council can then have a different opinion and Audree stated absolutely, it starts all over again.

Chair Losoff indicated that he thinks we all understand that when we make a recommendation to the Council, it is a recommendation and they can do anything they want with it. His issue on the Western Gateway was that we had a unanimous consensus on some of the areas, and when staff took it to the Council, they had disagreements with us and presented their observations or recommendations to Council, and we as a Commission didn't get that formal report. We knew that they disagreed with us in some areas, but we weren't aware of the extent to which they disagreed, and they made a full report to the Council, so his concern was that maybe we should have a discussion with staff and staff should let the Commission know they don't agree and their position that they are going to take to Council, just out of courtesy.

Commissioner Cohen stated that we might need his report to Council on that; he was very clear that the Commission felt this way and staff felt that way, but it would have been helpful to know that was going to be the report. Audree agreed and indicated that is where staff will do a better job when we are getting closer to the end and know that we have areas of less agreement. We will be more vocal in saying that these are the areas that we will be taking forward with a different alternative to the Council for consideration, and explain why. Chair Losoff then suggested that staff could even have a debate with the Commission in a work session; it could change points-of-view.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he would prefer that before it goes to the City Council, because we discussed it for hours and hours and went through the whole process, and then it goes to the City Council, and he feels like why should he be sitting here? It is kind of frustrating.

Audree Juhlin stated that staff understands your frustration 100%, but we also have to understand that we are coming from different perspectives and we just need to respect those perspectives and move them forward. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he understands and Commissioner Cohen commented that the Commission respects staff's perspectives, but sometimes the Commission just needs to know what it is. Audree Juhlin stated that staff will fix that and it won't happen again. Chair Losoff then noted that the Western Gateway was one of the most complex that the Commission will see, so it was a good learning experience, and 90% of it was pretty much done with consensus.

Chair Losoff read #6 asking at what point in the planning process the Commission wants to see a draft plan, and Vice Chair Levin stated when it is ready. Audree Juhlin then asked if when staff has a more formalized draft. With the Western Gateway, we brought forward a really conceptual draft and we wanted input from the Commission to refine that further, but it seemed to be cause a lot of confusion, so should we skip that initial phase after some preliminary discussions, and then bring what we think we heard and what we recommend as a draft to the Commission? The Vice Chair stated right, because you are the experts and you have the experience and educational training, and she would underscore that twice. Staff could bring it to us fully draft-ready to go.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he would say it would be like 75% complete, like the outline is done and a lot of the major points are filled in, but there are some questions as to how this is presented, and do we have enough in there or not enough, but there needs to be enough bulk to see the overall framework, for the Commission to be able to respond.

Commissioner Cohen stated that when Soldiers Pass was presented, Cynthia presented it before it was a fully done draft and did it in such a way that the Commission was able to relate to the plan and add some input then step back, and Cynthia finished it. It was a very good process, so he doesn't know if it was 75% or 80%, but what Commissioner Brandt stated seems to make sense.

Chair Losoff indicated that it sounds like the Commission wants a two-step procedure for the draft; the preliminary draft should be fairly well complete, and then the final draft. Commissioner Barcus stated that he worries a lot about how we make choices, which is called guidance, and if we are leaning one way or another, and he worries about unintended consequences, so using Commissioner Mayer's example of when is there enough lodging, there will never be enough lodging, because if we start restricting lodging development in Sedona, it will occur in Cottonwood and in Camp Verde, etc., and we would have no control. We have things we can control and things we can't control, and if you think you can control traffic by not putting lodging in Sedona, you need to think about other Commissions to serve on . . . maybe you should be in the State Legislature putting in toll roads, etc. His point is that in that draft, draft plan, he would like to see those things aired before getting a draft plan to work through. He wants to be able to provide constructive feedback rather than get all the way through the draft and say you didn't include any of this discussion. We all want to be helpful, because we all come from different backgrounds and viewpoints, and yes, we don't have the professional training, so we respect that 100%, but we also want give that citizen input as a Commission and Commissioners.

Commissioner Klein stated that given Commissioner Barcus's comment maybe he should resign from the Commission, because he totally disagrees with the statement that we can never have enough lodging in Sedona. We do have a traffic issue and he disagrees that we can't control traffic by limiting lodging. At some point, there may be too much, and he has a buddy who speaks before the City Council and he showed him a statistic from ADOT that they measured traffic between 2010 and 2015 along S.R. 89A, and between Andante and Coffee Pot, the average daily vehicles went from 18,000 to 26,000, which is an 88% increase. He also told the Commissioner that when that study was done, there hadn't been many lodging units added, so that traffic was just from day

visitors and who knows how much that is going to increase, so to say that we can never have too much lodging, because it won't control traffic is something he disagrees with, and he would be very concerned about having a philosophy that we could never have too much lodging.

Commissioner Mayer commented that eventually you are going to kill the goose that laid the golden eggs with more and more lodging. Chair Losoff indicated that as a Commission, our major responsibility is to make sure projects coming before the Commission correspond to the Community Plan, and we also are appointed to represent parts of the community, so not everyone of us agrees with each other on all issues, and what we are hearing reflects the community. Part of the community thinks we should develop no more lodging, but for other parts, that is the golden goose, and then there is a group in the middle that would say maybe some here and some there, so none of the comments we're hearing are outrageous, but that is who we are as a Commission, so we can take each issue and come from different points of view to see how it fits with the Community Plan; the Community Plan does not state a limit on lodging. Mike Raber clarified that the Community Plan limits lodging by location, but not by units. The Chair then stated that when we get into the CFAs that is where we get into some restrictions, and as a Commission, that is how we can deal with it. If an issue comes in and we think it is going to create too much, we vote accordingly, etc.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that it is kind of shortsighted thinking to think that we are going to solve the traffic problem by not allowing lodging, and he has gotten this drift through the last two CFAs. We've already got a reduction in lodging by the limits, but let's reduce it some more, because we have too much traffic. Commissioner Klein just stated that the traffic went up 80% and lodging went up maybe 10% at most, so it is not that we are going to control traffic with lodging. We need to control traffic; that is the problem. You restrict traffic and you encourage lodging to have people who come here and not just traffic passing through, so it is shortsighted to say that we should restrict lodging, and it is appropriate for CFAs, because that is what has been happening.

Chair Losoff indicated that when we get into another CFA, # 3 and #4 are when we can talk about these concepts – lodging and traffic, etc. For #6, the Commission stated that we want to see a draft and Audree clarified that staff heard a two-step procedure, and when we are about 75% to 80% done with that draft, we would bring it forward to ensure we are on track and get comments, and then bring the final draft forward.

Commissioner Cohen stated that if we go through the steps before that, by the time we get to that 75% draft, we will have covered a lot of the issues. Vice Chair Levin added that this is a really important question to answer properly, and she would like to know what staff thinks about the Commission's responses and how soon staff would like to move the process through the Commission or at what stage of completeness would staff want to submit the draft plan. Audree stated that ideally, if staff has the preliminary broader-level discussions like today about lodging, then we can go back, put it together and put the alternatives together to give you options to react to, from our opinions and observations. The Commission does really well when we give you something to react to, so the most efficient and effective way to bring something forward is substantive stock to review and react to. The Vice Chair indicated that she agreed.

The Chair then referenced #7 that asks about the time schedule and what some of the things are that the Commission could do to help keep the schedule on track. He then recalled that at one meeting, the Commission recommended that we perhaps should set a timeframe, so we don't string something out for 5 or 6 months; we should set a beginning and ending at least going into a project.

Commissioner Barcus asked what would be the right amount of time to do some of these less intensive CFAs. Audree explained that when we begin the planning process, we always estimate a timeframe with every process, so we have what staff thinks will be the timeframe. We know how much time we estimate for Phase 1, 2, 3, etc., so we could bring that forward, but sometimes where we are not as accurate is when we get to the Commission and Council involvement, so that is where we are asking how we can help keep on track and stay more focused on the estimated timeframe.

Vice Chair Levin stated that the way in which staff will bring a plan to us, as discussed in #6, will help with that hopefully to streamline the process and help the Commission to be more focused in the Commission's analysis, especially with alternative evaluations, so she is hoping it will reduce the back and forth and intensive staff time, and collapse it to that point that when the draft comes, it is nearly a whole document.

Commissioner Cohen referenced the two CFAs that have been done and stated that something happened with the Western Gateway that threw the Commission off track timewise and thinking-wise and that was the developer. The developer's whole thing, as part of that, actually messed the Commission up in terms of moving forward, because we started to focus on what the developer was saying and that was a problem. If we have that again, regardless of the schedule, we will be thrown off again – that was a confusing piece. Soldiers Pass actually did follow step-by-step in a good way, so if the developer hadn't been in the business with the Western Gateway, we would have been more directed, even though it was so complex.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that some of the upcoming CFAs are more complex and others are not, so he wondered if staff has a list – Schnebly Hill is next, right? Audree Juhlin explained that we are nearing completion, so we can talk about that and the next ones haven't been established. We are having a meeting with the City Council soon to talk about the Dells and that may be moved to the top of the list. We have an internal list from which staff thinks we need to react from, but it is based on a number of things, such as where we are with the traffic study . . . Commissioner Mayer stated that he just wanted to know which ones are on the list next. and Audree again stated it depends on different things – Uptown Sedona depends on the outcome of the traffic study and parking and traffic mitigation plans and should we be doing the CFA in conjunction with that study, like Phase 1, etc. There has also been a discussion at the staff level about starting the Industrial Park CFA, because that would not depend on the outcome of the traffic study necessarily, but we are waiting to determine if the Dells will be a priority based on Council direction.

Commissioner Mayer then asked if it is basically that the complexity of one CFA should precede some other one, and Audree again explained that in conjunction with the traffic study, we have heard a number of times from the Commission that you don't want to see another CFA until we understand the implications of the traffic results, so staff is trying to be respectful of those comments and we don't want to get too far down the road with one, and then say that you need to know what the traffic study says. Chair Losoff suggested going back to #7; that is a staff issue and we don't micromanage it. Commissioner Mayer then asked if the traffic study is going to come up with solutions and Audree Juhlin stated yes, solutions would be part of the outcome.

Chair Losoff explained that Audree Juhlin is planning to come to the Commission in the early stages with something, so that will become an agenda item. The Chair then summarized that some of the things we are hearing today include getting some things upfront would help the process and maybe we should spend more time on an issue, so we don't keep coming back in another meeting; we try to come to a solution in that meeting by talking it out. It is hard not to discuss all of the surrounding issues, like Commissioner Mayer's concerns, etc., but we want to get this done.

Mike Raber indicated that staff got some good insight on several points, and Audree agreed that staff received some clear direction.

- 7. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**
 - a. Thursday, April 28, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - b. Tuesday, May 3, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - c. Thursday, May 12, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - d. Tuesday, May 17, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Audree stated that April 28th is canceled, because that is an all-day City Council budget meeting and we do not have anything for May 3rd yet. Also, there is nothing on May 12th or May 17th, but based on today's discussion we may want some philosophical discussions about lodging in more

depth. Cynthia and Mike have done a good job in preparing information related to lodging and they can present what they did for the City Council, to give you some of that background information, plus possibly some Chamber facts and Lodging Council information in a later May meeting.

Chair Losoff stated that is a great idea and indicated that May 3rd is also canceled. He then suggested that it might be good to put some philosophical discussions on agendas going forward. Audree then suggested cancelling the May 12th meeting, because most of the staff will be in a Board of Adjustment meeting. The Chair asked about when staff would talk to the Commission about the traffic study and Audree explained that needed to be determined, but maybe in June, so she wanted to get information about the Commissioners' future vacation plans.

Audree then indicated that we perhaps could have a work session on May 17th for the lodging discussion if this room is available, and then we will figure out the dates with the consultant for the discussion on the traffic study. Vice Chair Levin asked if the lodging discussion was needed; depending on what CFAs are going to be coming forward, we might not need that right now.

Commissioner Mayer stated it would be a good idea to see where we are, and the Chair indicated that regardless of the CFAs, given what could or could not happen in the future, there may be some activity coming up and it might be good to have that discussion on the 17th. Audree noted that lodging will be a component of the Schnebly Hill CFA and we anticipate bringing that forward in June. The Chair then indicated that we could also have a general discussion on the concepts for that CFA and Audree agreed.

8. 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.

9. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 6:58 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 April 19, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date