

**Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, November 15, 2016 - 5:30 p.m.**

1. 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 and Larry Klein. Commissioner Gerhard Mayer was unexcused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Dan Garza, Audree Juhlin, Cynthia Lovely, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Cari Meyer, Robert Pickels, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber.

Councilor(s) Present: Vice Mayor John Martinez

Councilor-elect(s) Present: John Currivan

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

There were no announcements.

3. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

a. October 13, 2016 (WS)

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved for the approval of the minutes of October 13, 2016 Work Session. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion. ***VOTE:*** Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioner Mayer was unexcused.)

4. 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.

5. Consideration and possible action to amend the previously approved item 5b from the November 1, 2016 meeting regarding the Draft Schnebly CFA Plan.

Chair Losoff explained that a motion was made and approved at the last meeting regarding the Schnebly Hill CFA and, in going over the minutes, staff caught a concern. Audree Juhlin then explained that after discussion with the Chair and rereading the minutes, it was determined that the motion used for November 1, 2016 was the recommended motion provided in the September 29th Staff Report, and there were subsequent changes made to the CFA based on the Commission's direction. Therefore, the suggested motion from September 29th did not include those changes and was in conflict with them, so Chair Losoff asked for this item to be placed on this agenda for the Commission to reconsider the motion to more accurately reflect the CFA Plan as intended.

MOTION: Chair Losoff moved to amend the motion adopted at the November 1, 2016 meeting to recommend the adoption of PZ16-00010 (CFA), the Schnebly Community Focus

Area Draft Plan of August 1, 2016 to the City Council with the amendment to page 20 and 21 as shown on Attachment 2 that limits the new Oak Creek Heritage District to the Planned Area as designated in the Community Plan Future Land Use Map to: 1) Strike the reference to “August 1, 2016” and replace it with November 1, 2016; 2) To further strike the reference to “amendments to page 20 and 21 as shown on Attachment 2 that limits the new Oak Creek Heritage District to the Planned Area as designated in the Community Plan Future Land Use Map”, and replace it with the statement that approval may include grammatical corrections and minor editorial changes. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Commissioner Mayer was unexcused.)

6. Discussion regarding the update of the Sedona Land Development Code.

Chair Losoff stated that the purpose is to hear from the consultants on what is going to happen, and there will be ample opportunities in the future to go into specific details with them.

Mike Raber explained that we are kicking off an important project to update the Land Development Code that is over 20 years old and some parts are older than that, because they came from the county. We are anticipating that the project will take eighteen months to complete. We contracted with Clarion Associates and they have a lot of expertise in writing both codes and plans. Mike then introduced Matt Goebel and Tareq Wafaie of Clarion Associates.

Chair Losoff asked the Commissioners to introduce themselves to the consultants, and each Commissioner gave a brief introduction with a history of their background and experience.

Presentation, Matt Goebel, AICP and Tareq Wafaie, AICP with Clarion & Associates: Matt Goebel indicated that they wanted to remind the Commission about why planning is important for Sedona and how they see the plans you have done fit into the role they are going to play. Then, they are going to talk about the project scope for the next 18 months and the specific steps to get to the new Land Development Code. They also have planned for plenty of time for Q&As and discussion to hear what the Commission sees as the priorities for the project.

Mr. Goebel explained that Clarion & Associates is a small firm based in Denver, and they also have an office in Chapel Hill. Both offices have about 10 people and they are multi-disciplinary. He is a planner and an attorney by training; Tareq is a planner, and they have landscape architects and architects, so they try to approach their projects with that multi-disciplinary perspective. Their focus is plan implementation, so he and Tareq focus mostly on zoning codes around the country. They have worked in large and small communities, and they are now working in places like Syracuse, New York, Glenwood Springs, Colorado, and now Sedona. Their firm has done quite a few Arizona projects, including work in Tucson and work on a major new code for Buckeye, Arizona, so they have the Arizona perspective to bring to their projects, plus the national sense of best practices.

Mr. Goebel stated that Clarion is the main firm, but they will be the Project Managers and the lead drafters, so you probably will see Tareq and him at the meetings. They are also joined by Eric Wencel, a graphic designer, plus other planners, and they are also working with Interactive Studio for the project website.

Mr. Goebel indicated that they wanted to talk about why they are here and recap the overall goals for the project, plus discuss why the Land Development Code needs to be updated. It is an older document, but there is a lot of good stuff. You have been doing great work in updating the code over many years to address new issues, but it is time for a re-think and time to step back to see how the different pieces fit together. In particular, it is time to look at the Community Plan and ensure that you have all of the zoning tools you need to implement the Community Plan. When they think about the quality of development, building design, landscaping, protecting neighborhoods, sustainability and green building, connections and walkability, etc., all of those things are emphasized in the Plan, but you may not have as many tools as you need to implement those ideas, so that is a big part of their project goals. When the City issued an RFP for the project,

it also emphasized public involvement. A major goal for this effort was to reach out to the community to make sure that this effort was really grounded in a strong public involvement plan.

Taraq Wafaie stated that they were very excited to get the job in Sedona, because Sedona is a very active community, and when you drive to Sedona, you remember that drive. You also do things very differently compared to a lot of the code projects they have worked on, which was attractive to them as a firm.

Mr. Wafaie indicated that planning is important, because through the Sedona Community Plan and this process, they can help improve efficiency by looking at the approval procedures to see what it takes to get an approval in Sedona, how the government treats infrastructure projects, etc., plus the current traffic study, and those things help you become more efficient as a community and as a governing body. It also creates a great sense of community ownership, so by kicking off the project this week, they've already touched many different focus areas and gotten unique perspectives around the community, and that is important, because at the end of the day, when you are left with a new Land Development Code, people really take a sense of pride in that process, because they went to the open house and learned about planning from staff, consultants and you.

Mr. Wafaie stated that you can seize opportunities, so if there is a particular parcel that would be beneficial to the entire community, the City could act on that if you documented that it would be an important thing for the City of Sedona, but also in preventing undesirable development, which is something that Sedona is very good at, because you regulate aesthetics more than many communities do across the country. You can feel it when you drive into Sedona; you notice that a lot of thoughtful planning has occurred in this community.

Mr. Wafaie indicated that he wanted to talk about the relationship between the Sedona Community Plan and what they do, which is primarily implementation of those kinds of plans. This was adopted in 2014, and a big portion of that is the Future Land Use Map. What areas are appropriate for what types of development? What is the character of Sedona and how does that differ as you move from one part of the City to another?

Mr. Wafaie referenced an image from the Western Gateway CFA and noted that you are getting even more fine-grained to say that these things are important to Sedona, but in these specific areas, it is a little different – it is not a one size fits all approach, so they have spent hours reviewing the background documents and they will continue to do so to become familiar with them, but there is a lot that the Land Development Code can do to implement some of those strategies and policies.

Mr. Wafaie explained that the planning framework works through enabling legislation that tells Arizona cities that they have the right to have the Planning Commission and develop the Community Plan and have a good set of sub-area plans and Community Focus Areas, which gets you to the need to implement those policies and the vision that the community took part in, which is where you are now. It is time to look at the existing regulations on the books and pick apart what is working really well and use that as a starting point for improvements, but also learn what has not been working well or what kind of opportunities were missed, because there are barriers or things just weren't addressed. Effectively, you then end up with the beautiful and natural built environment that you live in today.

Mr. Wafaie asked what the Land Development Code is; the crux of zoning is, "What can I do on my property?" Where is it appropriate to build? Should the building be close to the street and how far from an alley does it have to be? All of those things are in the Land Development Code, but then how good does development have to be? Besides what I can do on that property, what does it have to look like? How many signs can I have? What does the parking need to look like and how should that function? How are properties connected to each other as I start laying out a new subdivision? Finally, how is development approved? They break up their drafting phases around

those central themes, ending with that last question, because by that point, you will have the standards in place in draft form to make some important decisions about the process for approval.

Mr. Wafaie indicated that a very high-level overview of their scope of work includes:

- Project Orientation – they have read a lot and will continue to read; they have listened a lot and will continue to listen, and they are going to give you some good advice.
- Land Development Code Analysis and Annotated Outline - They will put a lot of the options for moving forward into an assessment report and outline that says they think a good restructuring of the current regulations would go a long way, and here are some of the things that might be included in the new Land Development Code.

Chair Losoff interrupted to suggest that as part of the orientation, they could tell the Commission what yesterday and today were like. Mr. Wafaie stated that they spent about four hours in the car with Chair Losoff and drove around in a transit van, and they had varying perspectives even among staff and Chair Losoff, but they got to see a lot of what is working well in Sedona and some of the things that staff and others think are some missed opportunities with room for improvement. It was great to see some of the planning areas on the ground and see them from the windshield survey; it was really valuable to them. If they were to do that tour on their own, they would take a different approach to drafting a zoning code. Then, they interviewed a couple of developers and will be interviewing lots of people through tomorrow as well.

Mr. Wafaie continued with his presentation to say that after the assessment and outline of the new code, they will do the following:

- Prepare a draft of the new Land Development Code.
- Land Development Code adoption in May of 2018 is the current goal.

Vice Chair Levin asked for a description of what an annotated outline is and Mr. Goebel stated that he would cover that. He then indicated that their orientation trip was very important for them to establish their foundation knowledge for Sedona with what you think is working or could be improved, plus their outside perspectives. He doesn't want to undersell that, because coming up to speed on the community, the history and why you have made the decisions you have, plus hearing from the people what they value about life here is crucial to everything they do over the next 18 months. Staff has done a great job of reaching out to a broad perspective of stakeholders, which will continue for future meetings, and they are getting good feedback.

Mr. Goebel stated that they had an open house today and about twenty folks came by and had some good questions about how the project will move forward and what some of the new standards will be, so it was good feedback. There clearly is some strong interest in the project.

Regarding the Assessment Report and Annotated Outline, Mr. Goebel referenced the screen shot of the cover of the Assessment Report for Glenwood Springs, Colorado, and indicated that it is about a 45–50 page document and is a synthesis of everything they heard and all of the things that needed to be addressed. So based on key points previously identified, they have done a lot of issue identification by looking at your Design Review Manual, reviewing the administrative procedures, and looking at the definitions, so everything from high-level themes to the nuts and bolts, plus strengths and weaknesses and what needs to be carried forward, as well as what could be improved and where the missing holes are. Then, they identify potential solutions to fill those holes and bring to bear best practices from around the country. There could be other good models in Arizona that you might benefit from or there could be stuff from Colorado or other places around the country that might have lessons to learn.

Mr. Goebel explained that the way they structure the document is that the upfront piece is the narrative, so that could be 20-30 pages where they talk about big themes. A big theme might be a potential way to restructure your Land Development Code, so it is more clearly related to other parts of the code where there is overlap, and they will have to think about how to address that as a big theme. There will also be a table at the back of the document that literally goes chapter by

chapter and says very specifically in bullet form this definition needs to be replaced or this is missing an important point, so it will be a fairly lengthy document.

Mr. Goebel stated that the outline follows at the end of the document, and it is actually an outline of what a new Land Development Code would look like article by article and major section by major section. It is how they think the document could be structured; it is an important drafting tool, and they present that to get feedback and ensure that they are on the right track, because that guides the drafting for the next year. It is an important document that sets the policy foundation and the drafting outline for where they go. Then, they actually get into the drafting and break it into three parts to make it manageable, so as Tareq mentioned, it is broken down by theme. The first theme is the Zoning Districts that Sedona is divided into – your line-up of zoning districts and the land uses allowed within those districts. The next module is Development Standards, so all of the quality issues. How is a subdivision laid out? What are your standards for exterior lighting? How do the parking standards get updated? All of those things are in that module as well, and finally, How You get a Project Approved in Sedona. What is the process for initiating a rezoning; how do I get a Temporary Use Permit?

Mr. Goebel indicated that for each of those steps, they go through an internal step first where they work with staff to make sure that they haven't stepped into any holes and have gotten all of the details right, and then they will get a clean document ready for public review. Then, they will meet with the Commission and some focus groups to get community feedback as well, and turn around a revised version in a consolidated draft. The goal will be to have that consolidated draft ready in early 2018, so you have time to review and amend it as you need to, and get it ready for the final adoption process in May of 2018.

Mr. Goebel stated that the goal is adoption in May of 2018. Chair Losoff mentioned the Commission's key role in this and that when it comes to almost a final document at each step, Audree will call for a special meeting, so we will have to be flexible with our scheduling, because we don't want to wait for the second Tuesday of the month, etc. There may have to be some meetings in-between to keep this going without unnecessary delays.

Mr. Goebel indicated that illustrations are important and one challenge is to make the Land Development Code easier to use, more user-friendly to better clarify what you want to see in terms of future development, as opposed to just a long laundry list of things you don't want to see in words. They do this all the time, and he showed some examples of other codes they have done, including a mixed-use neighborhood with a purpose statement, an illustration and two annotations that are keyed to dimensional tables showing the height standard or setback requirements, etc. Another sample is a use table that is a common tool to show district by district the type of land uses allowed, and they are categorized, such as food and beverage uses, household living uses, etc. This is a tool that they may want to introduce in Sedona and it will make your lives a lot easier. Currently, every district is several pages of words, and it is hard to compare them across each other, such as how C-1 differs from C-2, how are the setbacks different, etc., and it is also hard to get a sense of how the uses relate to each other, because they are just alphabetical.

Mr. Goebel pointed out that very simple organizational tools like tables and categorization of uses will make government easier, more predictable, more efficient and help the Commission focus on things that will help make development better. He then pointed out footnotes in a draft used to help explain during the drafting process how they made changes. They will do what they can to draw a clear roadmap from where you are to where they are going with the new regulations.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the working document is footnoted, so you can follow the changes, but that drops out in the final, and Mr. Goebel stated yes; they strip those out at the end.

Mr. Goebel then concluded by saying that public engagement is going to be key, so they are working with staff to develop a public engagement strategy that makes sure the public knows what they are doing all along, and there are given multiple opportunities to find out about the project.

Key milestones include the Project Orientation when they first start talking to stakeholders; the Assessment Report analysis and Annotated Outline, probably in February, will be an important check-in with the public to ensure they are on the right track, and then all during the draft coding, they will use a variety of techniques to reach out to people, such as in-person meetings, online surveys, use of a new website at sedonaldcupdate.com, and email blasts, etc., to invite people to public meetings. They want to cast a broad net to get to 2018 and be able to say they reached out to a wide variety and had given people multiple opportunities to learn about and be involved in the process. It is a zoning code, and he thinks they will get good involvement, because it is Sedona, but they will have to see how many people turn out. In some communities, it is fairly low and in others it is robust.

Mr. Goebel then showed a slide from the open house that they used to encourage people to complete the survey of questions about how people use the code, etc., and they already have a pretty good response rate, and Mike Raber will be the project lead from staff as they move forward. Mr. Goebel again expressed their excitement about being in Sedona and noted that it is going to be a challenging project.

Chair Losoff noted that he has been on the Commission for nine years and there were discussions about changing the code at that time, but they waited for the Community Plan, which took another three years and we are now two years into it, so we are ready to go.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period at this time.

Neil Sinclair, Village of Oak Creek, AZ: Mr. Sinclair asked if within the consultant's scope of work . . . , he is trying to understand what this project will result in. If it results in a streamlined development process, is it going to examine the existing zoning and look at any attempts to quantify the effects on one zone by the activities in another? How is this going to tie into the larger land use plan of Sedona?

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

Matt Goebel explained that regarding how this product will relate to the Community Plan; it is important to emphasize that the Community Plan will be their guiding principles. They are not trying to rethink the vision of Sedona as part of this project, you have already done that. They are trying to provide a better tool box to implement that Plan, so that could come out in a variety of ways. It is probably going to be a slightly revised set of zoning districts, a new set of nuts & bolts tools like parking requirements, etc. It is too early to get into the details, but they are definitely going to use that as their guiding document. They used the term "streamlined procedures" and that term is probably premature to use; they are still gathering information about how effective the community feels your review procedures are, and they are going to come back with recommendations regarding ways they could be modified. The code can be cleaned up in those areas; there are a lot of repetitive lists of submittal requirements, so there are ways they can definitely reduce some of the bulk. A lot of communities put those things in separate handouts or administrative handbooks, etc., but the extent to which the process is modified is too premature to say.

Chair Losoff stated that in response to what the Commission heard from the public, the Request for Proposal that went out to the consultant included user-friendly, streamline and consolidate, so to the question, yes.

Commission's Questions:

Commissioner Cohen asked if the consultants have talked with Keep Sedona Beautiful and Matt Goebel stated not yet. Tareq Wafaie added that they have been identified as a group to contact. The Commissioner commented that our advantage in the world is the beautiful rocks surrounding us, and that organization is geared to help the City protect that.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the three separate areas outlined that the consultants will use as their construct for putting recommendations together and asked when the Commission will hear about them. Matt Goebel stated that the Commission will hear from them on all three; they will come back at each step along the way and at the end. The Vice Chair then needed to know if they will come back before the first step begins on what they have heard, etc., and Tareq Wafaie stated that the assessment and annotated outline will be presented.

Commissioner Brandt noted that that this is a complete overhaul like getting rid of the old one and starting over with the language, and Matt Goebel explained that the request was a complete re-think and modernization, but there are a couple of qualifiers to that. There could be some good material in there that needs to be carried forward, and their job is to be strategic and thoughtful as reviewers and make recommendations about where you need a complete rewrite and where some things just need to be massaged and carried forward. There is some good stuff in that code, so it is not a 'throw the baby out with the bathwater' project. Their job is to identify the pieces that they recommend carrying forward, but their main mission is to modernize the whole thing. There are close to 20 articles in there and the main focus will be on about 10 of those articles, so some pieces are not part of their immediate scope. The Sign Code is being updated as part of a separate effort and Historic Preservation is not on the current books for part of their scope, so they are focusing on the pieces they discussed tonight, including procedures, development standards, definitions, etc.

Commissioner Brandt then asked how Sedona does things differently than what they have seen in other Land Development Codes. Mr. Goebel stated that the Design Review Manual, Article 10, is a big part of this document and it is an unusual document. You go to greater lengths for a community your size than many other places around the country in explaining the rationale behind various types of environmental and aesthetic controls, and then walking through different guidelines and standards for how to balance competing objectives, and the fact that you have language that says, "You shall balance competing objectives" is very unusual in their experience. There was really good thought put into that initial Design Review Manual. You have gone farther than most communities your size. They have worked in other resort communities like Aspen, Santa Fe, etc., that have that type of stuff, so you're not totally unique, but you're in a small sub-set of communities that go down that road. You are like other communities in that some of that material is not well integrated with the rest of the code, so that is one of their challenges to think through how to better integrate those tools.

Commissioner Barcus commented that he is excited to move through this process; it is going to be great. Chair Losoff then asked if the consultants had any questions of the Commission.

Mr. Wafaie commented that this is his first meeting where somebody has introduced the Commission to them, so he commended the Chairman for that. Audree Juhlin added that an important point that Matt Goebel didn't bring forward is as we all know this document is a legal document outlining the regulations related to land use, and a legal perspective is extremely important, so we will be relying on our City Attorney, but we also have on the consulting team Matt Goebel who is also an attorney, so that was one of our selling points in having that legal expertise too. Audree then asked if there is anything specific that the Commission would like to share with the consultant as far as issues at this point.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that it is going to come out, but what we are all striving for is how to balance all of the needs of the community in a constrained area. Commissioner Cohen talked about the population being constant here, and we all need to keep in mind that population is by place of residence, not necessarily by place of occupancy or ownership, so we have a lot of owners who have their official residency elsewhere, but they come and visit regularly although they don't vote here and they aren't here all of the time. We also have a very vibrant tourism and hospitality industry that is a large service industry, and they have specific needs. This place is different than any place he has ever lived. We also have a whole host of other constraints, because we are landlocked. It is almost like an island with a couple of bridges that come to the island, so some of the things he is going to be looking at is the way this develops for vacant land. We spend a lot of

time on some areas like out west, but he is expecting to start seeing a lot of redevelopment. We have already seen some, but he is talking about major redevelopment where things are bulldozed and started over. Those are the things he is going to focus on in this process.

Commissioner Brandt stated that most of his comments have to do with the overall aesthetics and less about densities, etc.; in fact, they are all dealing with aesthetics at this point in time. For instance from the big picture, recently we had a subdivision proposed and it was recently discovered that the system of using envelopes within either individual parcels or individual subdivisions, kind of like condominiums where everything around the envelopes is common land, is not necessarily mandated by the Land Development Code, and he thinks Audree said that it is voluntary. Audree Juhlin agreed for envelopes and common areas versus subdivided subdivisions, individual lots. The Commissioner then indicated that it seems as though the subdivisions that have envelopes have a completely different feel than the traditional ones where the people own from lot line to lot line, and even within the subdivisions themselves they have rules about maintaining trees, overall densities, etc., but it still seems that the subdivisions that use envelopes blend into the scenery much better and that is a key goal for everyone.

Commissioner Brandt added that something similar to that is residential has strict codes about maintaining a density of trees, but commercial has nothing like that, so he has noticed development lately where there has been beautiful landscape plans developed, but then what actually seems to be in the completed project isn't as dense as the landscape plan or illustrations presented. The illustrator had the idea that the building was in a forest, but once the civil engineers got done, it was a different story, so through codes there could be items addressed to try to maintain the unique landscape character. He has even seen a difference between Sedona and the Village of Oak Creek that has a lot more golf course type, flowering things, but there wasn't a forest there to begin with, it was more of an open range, so a lot of that has been brought in, but as in-fill is happening in Sedona, there seems to be less emphasis on the natural landscape and more of an introduced landscape.

Commissioner Brandt then indicated that something for all projects, but more for residential, is the hypothesis that there could be a restriction on cut and fill. He has seen more recent subdivisions where they are putting ranch houses on a slope, so they are cutting and filling more than for old subdivisions in Sedona, and part of that is the old subdivisions were on flatter land, but that was a note he made a few months ago. Also with the new hotel that was completed, the approved color seems a bit lighter than what would have blended into the scenery and what he thought was approved, so we need to revisit the Light Reflectance Values (LRV) for projects, and it might be on a sliding scale perhaps where larger buildings or projects on the edge of the forest, etc., need to be darker to fit in. And, his last comment is about projects through the City. He wants to reserve comment, because he hasn't seen the completed elevator project in Uptown, but Planning & Zoning didn't review that. He assumes it was internally reviewed, but it seems that all projects should be reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Commission, and wouldn't it be nice if we could get the state to step up and not just build schools willy-nilly and have the City have some type of review, but that might not be possible with state legislation, although it would be a good idea, even though it seems that all of the schools have been built and there is no more land available.

Vice Chair Levin referenced Commissioner Barcus's comment about redevelopment and indicated that is probably true for residential as well as commercial, but she is more interested in what staff front loaded, which was bringing forward the CFAs for detailed planning, and she is interested in seeing how the Land Development Code can create the path between the Community Plan, the CFA and the regulations to achieve those small visions within those various sites. Interpreting that carefully, so we have something substantive for a developer to follow will be really important. Those areas are yet to be developed and there has been a lot of discussion on the community's vision for each of the larger areas, and we will need definitive language to carry those out. She doesn't know if they will end up being individually described or their similarities will somehow be addressed, but you will come up with that and she is eager to see how that is carried out.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that we are caught in kind of a matrix between two counties, the state and the federal, plus the Forest Service, so he supposes those will all be taken into account in the code and how that fits with the legislation that affects us. The State of Arizona recently passed a couple of laws that affect us, so he would suggest that we look closely at those. Secondly, about the CFAs, we have done a lot of work on CFAs. We have the Land Development Code, and the CFAs are supposed to be coordinated, so as we go to the next CFA, we ought to get some input about where you are going, so we have some coordination as we plan and you work on how we are going to plan in the future. Lastly, we need to have a particular look at S.R. 89A. We approved a project and they have now asked to expand, and the entry into Sedona through the Western Gateway – he is getting ready to buy it from the Marriott and open a car dealership – he shouldn't put that in the minutes, but we don't have a reasonable parking plan for how the city is supposed to look in terms of what gets parked where and where we put parking lots, and if we are not careful, we are going to look like Ventura Boulevard or some of the other cities where there is all of the bustle, but you lose some of the prettiness. It doesn't have to be done that way; we saw that with the drugstore. They did a beautiful landscaping job with parking in back, but the other one needs a lot more trees or something.

Chair Losoff summarized that the Commission will be looking at this very thoroughly, but keep in mind that our recommendations are just recommendations, and it goes to the City Council, which has the final say. Additionally, we hopefully will come up with a much more readable document, but again, unintended consequences like we have now is that any time we go through a process, we end up with grandfathered ordinances, clauses, etc., and sometimes the grandfathered sections are grandfathered a second time, so we may end up with some of that and have to figure out a way to streamline it so we don't end up with 25 interpretations, but we know what is going on and the more we go through it the easier it will be.

Commissioner Barcus asked how we procedurally will go through the 18-month project in terms of receiving positive and negative feedback from the City Council. His concern is if we go through a lengthy process and create a plan in April of 2018, will that be the first time that the recommended plan is sent to the City Council or are there intermediate steps?

Audree Juhlin explained that staff has discussed that and went back to the Commission and Council retreat when both bodies talked about the interaction as to having joint-sharing of the vision and direction or having complete separation, and the result of that discussion was complete separation, so whatever the Planning & Zoning Commission wants to move forward is what the City Council will review, so that is staff's recommended approach. Chair Losoff added that there will be minutes and other opportunities through focus group meetings and community meetings, etc., that they can attend, and staff will keep the Council informed. Audree Juhlin agreed, and then added that there was concern that the Commission might be influenced by Council and it is really important that the Commission act without that influence at the early stages.

7. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Thursday, December 1, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- b. Tuesday, December 6, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- c. Thursday, December 15, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- d. Tuesday, December 20, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Audree Juhlin indicated that at this time there are no items scheduled for the meeting dates listed above. We do want to discuss the Commission's Rules and Procedure and schedule, but not independent of other projects. Commissioner Cohen stated that he will not be available on December 1st and 6th. Audree again indicated that she doesn't think there will be any meetings. The Conceptual Review for Oxford Suites is on hold, so you won't see that in the near future. Therefore, the Commission's next meeting will be January 10th, and in February, you will hear from the consultants regarding the Land Development Code process. Chair Losoff then suggested that the Rules and Procedures be agendized in January, and he asked that Cari send out a project update list.

Audree Juhlin emphasized that the Land Development Code project is on a rigid timeframe, so working with us in special meetings will be critical and having quorums will be instrumental in moving this along in a timely manner, so we are going to ask for your cooperation that way.

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 6:35 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 November 15, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, Administrative Assistant

Date