



## City Of Sedona Community Development Department

102 Roadrunner Drive Sedona, AZ 86336

(928) 282-1154 • Fax: (928) 204-7124

---

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT** **Major Amendment to Sedona Community Plan** **Multi-family High Density Text Amendment (PZ 17-00008)**

---

#### **Public Outreach**

Application materials were submitted by City staff on June 1, 2017, distributed to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council on June 12, 2017, and distributed to review agencies on June 13, 2017. This proposal was also included on the Projects and Proposals page of the Community Development Department's website. An online comment form was also included. Comments as of September 5, 2017, are attached in the public comments section of the Public Hearing packet materials for this item.

The following is the schedule regarding public outreach and public meetings related to this proposal:

- August 15, 2017: Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session
- August 22, 2017: Public Open House
  - Noticed in the Red Rock News with a display ad, August 11, 2017.
  - Press Release placed on City Website
  - Follow-up article in Red Rock News August 16, 2017.
  - Public Notice Posted
- August 28, 2017: City Wide notice for September Planning and Zoning Commission meetings.
- September 14, 2017: Planning and Zoning Commission Work Session.
- September 19, 2017: Planning and Zoning Commission Public Hearing

#### **August 22, 2017 Open House**

On August 22, 2017, City staff hosted a public open house at the Community Development Department office. Approximately 20 citizens in were in attendance. Staff distributed a fact sheet regarding the proposal, gave an overview of the proposal, and answered questions from the attendees. After the meeting, the presentation and fact sheet were posted on the project page on the City's website.

#### **Summary of Concerns/Comments**

The following is a summary of the comments received by Staff during the outreach process.

- 1) Written Comments: August 22, 2017 Open House
  - a) We need to provide quality housing for our workers; they are the foundation of our economy.
  - b) We need to plan and build large enough dwellings that can follow the concepts developed in the Community Plan for walkability, accessibility, interaction of age groups and income levels (i.e. neighborhoods vs. complexes).

- 
- c) We need to be proactive in helping seniors age in place by providing housing that appropriately meets their needs. The homes can be rented out to those needing affordable housing. Set up a housing exchange.
  - d) Support for the proposed text amendment.
  - e) Need to provide a range of potential buildout by zoning. For example, if amendment passes, it could be potentially applied to how many lots at 12 units/acre, 20 units/acre, and greater than 20 units/acre.
  - f) Densities need to increase and City fees need to be lowered. Land cost is a barrier to affordability but so are construction costs and City fees.
  - g) Allow for modular buildings that meet IBC: multi-family modulars.
  - h) Apply deed restrictions.
  - i) Apply City credits to offset or eliminate Impact/Sewer Fees.
  - j) Consider three stories to help with parking.
  - k) Consider ADUs in areas that allow them and create incentives for them (bring back for long term rentals).
  - l) Need clearer definition of the Community Plan goal: Encourage diverse and affordable housing options.
  - m) What are the parameters under which proposals will be considered for more than 12 units?
- 2) Additional Comments – August 22, 2017 Open House
- a) City should contribute bed tax to housing.
  - b) Harmony neighborhood has many affordable options and a lot of amenities, including within walking distance to many services. The City should designate districts in these established neighborhoods and help provide assistance in helping residents improve and enhance their properties and existing amenities. People like these neighborhood areas and are not wanting small apartments.
  - c) There may be a demographic shift today vs several years ago with trends toward tiny homes and more urban living.
  - d) The requirement for a major amendment in addition to this text amendment is too onerous for an applicant.
- 3) Additional Comments – General
- a) Solving the issue of low cost housing should not be an objective of the City. It is totally wrong to increase densities. This is a violation of the community, the serenity, the landscape and the hope of residents and future visitors.
  - b) We must diversify our housing options to support the infrastructure (labor and material) that has evolved.
  - c) If you want to destroy what remains of Sedona, make it a high density traffic-clogged tourist trap, not just a traffic-clogged tourist trap.

- 
- d) One of the reasons Sedona incorporated was to control development to maintain open space and preserve scenic surroundings and small-town character and quality of life. Amending the Community Plan to allow high density development should not be allowed.
  - e) This will impact area character, will be costly to construct and maintain, will create additional traffic, noise and need for more cell towers. Why change the 3-year-old Community Plan?
  - f) The High density designation is worse than insanity as the current circulation system is already inadequate to move current traffic. This will make traffic congestion worse as well as health, safety and welfare issues.
  - g) Cottonwood is not the solution for housing. There should be an opportunity for a professional, hard-working person to live here. We should encourage people to live and work here, quality of life is what will attract the best people for all of the businesses here and what will make our community well-rounded and more interesting.

### **Response to Concerns/Comments**

- One of the concerns raised is that this amendment does not provide enough incentive for high density multi-family projects since it requires another major amendment to change the Future Land Use Map to the new High Density designation. A major amendment can only be considered once per year, so timing has been an issue. An alternative to provide additional incentive could include changing the major amendment criteria to require a minor Community Plan amendment for high density multi-family projects that meet local housing needs. Minor amendments can be considered at any time. A zone change would also continue to be required.
- A couple comments supported the evaluation of potential buildout estimates. This may be difficult to do relative to future projects that propose more than 12 units per acre. This proposal provides an opportunity to evaluate future projects. This is not the evaluation itself. It is also not possible to predict where a future project may be located and each would need to be evaluated based on Community Plan consistency, development standards and community benefits (e.g. potential impacts, location and ability to meet local housing needs).