

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, November 7, 2017 - 5:30 p.m.

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

Chair Losoff 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, Kathy Kinsella, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer.

Staff Present: Justin Clifton, James Crowley, Andy Dickey, Audree Juhlin, Ryan Mortillaro, Karen Osburn, Robert Pickels Jr., Rob Pollock and Donna Puckett

Councilor(s) Present: Councilor Scott Jablow

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

Audree Juhlin announced that Commissioner Kathy Kinsella has joined the Commission, and the Commissioner indicated that it is a pleasure to be here.

Commissioner Barcus announced that he attended the American Planning Association Conference of the Arizona Chapter for the City, and there were five take-aways. First, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is legally going to be interpreted to require all cities and counties in all states to have districts for elected officials, and he thinks the Planning & Zoning Commission may be able to provide guidance on districting down the road. The expectation is that it will become a requirement sometime in the next 10 years. Second, every Arizona city is special, because of unique history, features and constraints, and he heard that widely from participants, etc. Some have much larger populations and some smaller, etc. All of the planning solutions are local, and that was well explained at the conference. Third, some cities in other parts of the state are activity involved at the Commission and staff levels in regional planning issues. The planners from Cottonwood seemed to be receptive to exploring regional planning initiatives, although everybody is worried about how joint planning would work and be funded, but many of the issues we are facing in Sedona are also being faced in Cottonwood and elsewhere. Fourth, many cities are updating their sign codes and only a few have completed the effort; the punchline was how relieved everyone was that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on temporary signs in residential areas, because everyone was concerned about lawsuit's legal costs, and he is glad we are over that hurdle in Sedona. Fifth, this was held at the Wekopa Tribal Convention Center and we had a presentation by the president of the tribe. She said that the tribe does seven-generation planning, and everyone shifted when she made that statement. We could learn a lot from our tribal friends in Arizona and look at all of our decisions over a very long term. He appreciated the opportunity to attend the conference. The Chair then asked if the Commissioner was suggesting that we go back seven generations in our planning, and Commissioner Barcus stated no, forward.

3. 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.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:

- a. **Discussion/possible action regarding a request for approval of a Zone Change from C-2 (General Commercial) to RM-3 (High Density Multifamily Residential) and Development Review to allow for the development of a 45 unit apartment complex. The property is located at 3285 W State Route 89A, at the southeastern corner of the intersection of W State Route 89A and Pinon Drive. The property is approximately 2.26 acres. APN: 408-11-086A. Case Number: PZ17-00009 (ZC, DEV) Applicant: Keith Holben, MK Company, Inc.**

Presentation: Cari Meyer provided an overview of the request and indicated that the application was submitted in May of this year, and it included a Major Community Plan Amendment, Conceptual Zoning and Development Review. It went through that review process, and the Commission held a site visit and work session in August, and a work session and public hearing in September. At that public hearing, the Commission recommended approval of the Major Community Plan Amendment and reviewed the conceptual submittal. After the Commission forwarded a recommendation of approval to the City Council, the applicant submitted the comprehensive Zoning and Development Review application. It was at risk, since the City Council had not approved the Major Plan Amendment yet; however, in October, the City Council held a work session and public hearing, and approved this Major Community Plan Amendment along with a Text Amendment that created the land use designation category that was then applied to this property. In October, the Commission also had a work session on the comprehensive Zoning and Development Review submittal, so we are here tonight for a public hearing for the Zoning and Development Review, and after it moves through the Commission, the City Council will have a hearing on the Zone Change and Development Agreement that is being proposed.

Cari identified the location of the subject property at Pinon Drive and SR 89A and indicated that the property is owned by Haven Management & Consulting, LLC. The applicant is Keith Holben, MK Company. The property is approximately 2.25 acres and is currently vacant. Cari pointed out the L-shaped parcel and the surrounding area, and she indicated that the land use designation for this property, as of a couple of weeks ago, is Multi-family High Density Residential within the Dry Creek CFA, but there is no adopted CFA Plan for the area. The current zoning is General Commercial, C-2, and the proposed zoning is RM-3, High Density Multi-family Residential, which is considered a less intense Zoning District than C-2, General Commercial.

Cari stated that in looking at the new Multi-family High Density land use designation, this designation supports multi-family zoning designations greater than 12 units per acre on a case-by-case basis through consideration of strategies for achieving housing diversity, affordability, and availability to address local housing needs. This project is proposing to address this land use designation's requirements by entering into a Development Agreement with the City that would have a restriction on subdivision or condo conversions, so these would remain apartment rental units. There would be a minimum lease length, an initial lease length of 90 days, a prohibition on sub-leasing without management's approval, approved

sub-leases would prohibit short-term rentals, and priority would be given to tenants employed locally, with additional priority given to tenants earning less than the AMI. Cari pointed out that in discussions with the applicant regarding the Development Agreement, we are supporting his request to change his original proposal that stated the additional priority would be given to those earning 90% or less of the AMI to just say less than the AMI, so anyone earning less than the AMI would be included in that priority category.

Cari indicated that in addressing the Dry Creek Community Focus Area Expectations, as outlined in your Staff Report, staff believes this proposal is meeting the Expectations, including providing mixed-use and a more walkable environment that builds on the variety of civic, social service, and visitor-oriented uses already in place. In this case, the rental apartments would add to the already diverse mix of land uses. The closest apartment units are the Shadowbrook Apartments, just outside the CFA. In the CFA, there are no rental apartments, but there is a number of other uses and staff believes that this project would add to the already diverse mix, as the CFA Expectations state. Additionally, this project would provide buffering and land use alternatives as transitions between the more intensive commercial and the residential uses and adjacent single-family neighborhoods. Currently, the land uses transition directly from Commercial to Single-family, and Multi-family is often used in other areas as a transition between them, so this would create a transition where one doesn't currently exist. The Expectation that the natural open space along SR 89A is preserved does not apply to this property; the area is not natural open space, and the last expectation is to focus on the general needs of the West Sedona Corridor, and staff identified a couple that were applicable to this project, including development and redevelopment that achieves a broad use of land uses and identifying locations for desired land uses.

From the zoning map, Cari identified the subject property outlined in pink and referenced the other colors on the map. The blue is Commercial; red is Lodging; yellow is Residential, and purple is Office Professional. Across the street, it is actually Multi-family, but they are condos with a higher density than a single-family neighborhood, so this property going to Multi-family would create more of a mix of land uses in the area. The proposed site plan being reviewed under the Development Review has three apartment buildings and an office/storage building. Cari then pointed out the area preserved for stormwater retention and a passive park for the residents. Under the proposal, there would be 45 apartment units with the office, storage and BBQ areas as well. There would also be the Development Agreement with the provisions to ensure that this is meeting the goals of the Community Plan.

Regarding context, Cari identified the subject property and pointed out how it relates to the existing uses in the area, including the restaurant, hotel and single-family residential area. She indicated that the site plan has been designed to try to have as little impact on the existing residences as possible, and that is one of the main reasons the back-corner area is being left in its natural state. Cari noted that based on comments during the work session and from staff regarding elevations, there have been a couple of changes in mainly the left elevation of Building 1 that faces the highway. Some architectural details were added to that building, and they darkened the paint colors and reduced the number of paint colors from three to two. She then pointed out the elevations of the other buildings and the office building.

Cari indicated that in reviewing the plan, staff looked at the Community Plan, Community Expectations for this area, and the Land Development Code. A comprehensive evaluation of

how this project meets all of these standards is included in the Staff Report. One area that was brought up in the work session was regarding the requested parking reduction, so the applicant provided a site plan showing how ghost parking could be provided if needed. We also had the Public Works Department and City Engineer review the property and proposal regarding access, traffic, connectivity, grading, drainage, and wastewater disposal.

Cari referenced the proposed site plan alternative showing where there would be an opportunity to add additional parking in some areas on the site, if it is determined that it is needed in the future; however, those are areas where some of the natural trees are being left, so we do not feel it is appropriate to build all of that until it is necessary. There will be a provision in the Development Agreement that if it is agreed that the apartment complex needs additional parking, it could be constructed in the areas shown, and a complete explanation of that is in the Staff Report.

Cari then showed the slides that were shown at the work session and noted that there has been a lot of questions about traffic and volume of traffic, so we compared this area with some other areas in town. One area has two accesses to the highway at two unsignalized intersections, and it provides access for approximately just over four acres of vacant commercial land and 85 single-family lots. If this proposal is approved, it would change to just under two acres of commercial and 130 residential units. Then, staff compared that area just to the east, which accesses SR 89A at a signalized intersection, and the numbers are pretty comparable as far as commercial acreage and residential units, etc. In staff's experience, we have never seen a back-up on the south side of the highway at this location, and we believe the light there is warranted by the traffic volume on Dry Creek Road to the north that provides access to a number of trailheads and resorts. We also wanted to compare it to some of the other areas that are a little more similar, and one area identified was around Stutz Bearcat, and that area also provides access through two unsignalized intersections, although they do have access to a light through the Andante Inn parking lot, but we didn't determine how many cars actually use that connection. This area has just over one acre of commercial area and almost 300 residential units, so it has about 2.25 times more residential units than would be using the two access points we're discussing tonight, and there have been no issues with these intersections as far as access to the highway. Further east, we looked at areas that do have lights and the land uses and densities that would warrant a traffic signal. The light at Shelby provides access to about 10 times as much Commercial area as the neighborhood under consideration tonight, and almost three times as many residential units, plus 72 timeshares. The light at Sunset provides access for about five times as much Commercial area and 2.5 times as many residential units, plus the park, a church and some lodging units as well, so based on the volumes here, staff feels that the traffic at the proposed project site won't have any issues with access to the highway.

Cari stated that the project was routed to the review agencies and comments were received from a number of them. The outstanding comments deal with future requirements as far as construction, for instance, they are proposing a closure of one of the curb cuts on SR 89A, so ADOT had comments about ensuring they get all of the proper permits, so there are no outstanding comments that need to be addressed at this stage.

Cari indicated that there has been a significant amount of public input, and the applicant conducted two open houses and met with a number of neighbors individually. The

documents have also been on the City's website, and through previous public hearings with the Community Plan Amendments and the Conceptual Review, we received a number of comments and those have been provided to the Commission. The two main comments that were still outstanding during the work session related to noise and traffic. Regarding noise, the neighboring property owner had concerns regarding the placement of buildings and the potential for increased noise complaints, and in response to that, the applicant had a noise expert look at the project and offer recommendations as to how to mitigate some of the noise concerns, and staff agreed with the findings and didn't believe any further steps were needed. Regarding traffic, there were neighbors' concerns regarding the safety of the location of the driveway, and the City Engineer has reviewed this carefully and determined that it meets all City standards as designed; however, they are working with the applicant and some of the neighboring property owners to increase visibility through trimming vegetation, etc. Based on the traffic study, we are confident that the City Engineer has made the correct decision and we are supportive of the site design as proposed. Therefore, staff is recommending approval of the Zone Change and Development Review applications, subject to the Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Staff Report with the one modification that the 90% be changed to anyone making less than the AMI would be given that priority, as far as the Development Agreement requirements.

Chair Losoff noted that the Commission has had several meetings and staff has been very responsive to the Commission's recommendations. It was good to see that staff incorporated the Commission's concerns.

Applicant Keith Holben, MK Company in Scottsdale, AZ: Mr. Holben stated that between 1999 or 2000–2007, he was the developer of CR Ranch in the Village of Oak Creek, and that was about 125 acres and 88 lots, and it was his first experience in the greater Sedona area. It was very interesting for him to talk with the people working on the project, including Project Engineers and every context of employees that you could think of that he came across who worked directly or indirectly for the project. Over seven years of working them, the necessity of housing was so apparent, and hearing their personal stories really touched him. It was really dramatic to hear them, and not just one or two conversations, but to hear that over time. Over the last several years, he has looked in Sedona for property that might be appropriate to address some of these community needs. It has been a real challenge to even get to where they are today with this project. There is very little availability of land, and what they did look at and evaluated always had something that was very difficult for them to get their arms around and have it work well in the community at that location. For him, it is exciting to be here in front of the City, looking to help solve a real need in the community and be a part of this. From his standpoint, it has been a personal challenge to find something here that would work, because of the need -- and a difficult one to address. That is just a little history he wanted to share; he is happy to be in front of you tonight and thanks you for considering the proposal. He will be available to answer any questions you have.

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Barcus indicated that he had a question on ghost parking and is really pleased with how this has evolved and the comments from the public hearings and work sessions, etc. We have a really good product here, but will the ghost parking come before the Commission or will that be something that is part of the Development Agreement? Cari explained that it is proposed to be part of the Development Agreement, and as the project develops, if it is

determined in conjunction with the property owner and the Community Development Department that it is needed, it would need to be constructed. The Commissioner asked if additional parking is required, would it be handled administratively, and Audree Juhlin indicated yes; we would state through the Development Agreement the condition that if additional parking is needed in the future, working with the property owner and the Community Development Director, we would then create the parking as ghosted, in accordance with the alternate site plan. Commissioner Barcus indicated that if ghosted parking is developed, he would like to be informed. This is almost like a test case for the Commission with a new type of housing in our community, or at least new in the last two decades, and he would like to see how it turns out, so he would like to be informed, but he is not requesting that the Commission take any action on it. He would just like to know if more parking is needed. Audree indicated that would be done through the project review report that we have.

Commissioner Mayer stated that supports affordable housing, if you want to call it that way, and he voted for the Amendment as well. He had a question for staff; how many years since the last rental housing project was developed? Audree Juhlin indicated that the last project that she can remember being approved for rentals by the City was the Fairfield, now Wyndham, project with 64 apartment units in the late 1990s. Commissioner Mayer commented that it had been quite some time. He is glad that we have a project like this on our table, but he still has some questions regarding the traffic study. Where it says 300 trips from the future renters are possible per day and only 100 from the residents in the subdivision, is that correct? How did they come to those numbers?

Andy Dickey explained that as far as the number of trips, that is generated base on . . . Commissioner Mayer interrupted to ask who generated those numbers, and Andy stated that the engineer estimates based on the number of trips . . . Commissioner Mayer again interrupted to say from the developer, right? Andy continued to say, that are anticipated by different uses. Commissioner Mayer asked how many people live in the subdivision – 80, 90, 100.

Chair Losoff asked what the question is that we are raising, and Commissioner Mayer stated that the issue is the traffic study where it says only 100-day trips are done by the residents who live in the back – in the subdivision. He doesn't believe that. Cari Meyer asked if the Commissioner had a page number, and the Commissioner stated that the developer should know and the engineer. Andy Dickey explained that staff believes that was based on actual counts. Commissioner Mayer then stated actual counts on what, a Sunday? He really questions that, and Andy stated that he didn't recall. Commissioner Mayer stated he is all for the development, but he is still concerned in regards to the traffic. Everybody has voiced -- the neighbors have voiced their concerns about the traffic. It is an issue, he lives in that neighborhood and for the people who are his neighbors.

Andy indicated that he would like to offer something similar to what Cari talked about earlier, based on intersections that we have as typical evidence within our City that we observe where we need additional control measures put in place. We don't anticipate needing anything done at this intersection, based on what we see at similar intersections across the City.

Commissioner Mayer then asked the developer how wide the inlet and outlet is from the project onto Pinon.

Brian Andersen, Architect with BMA Architecture: Mr. Andersen indicated that the width is 28 ft., and Commissioner Mayer commented that it is approximately as wide as Pinon Drive itself, and Mr. Andersen stated that he thinks that would be a correct statement. Commissioner Mayer asked if problems occur after the development is done and there are issues, how is that going to be addressed?

Chair Losoff pointed out that all agencies have basically signed off . . . Commissioner Mayer interrupted to say that doesn't mean that technically it is going to work. If there is some issue, what is going to happen? Is there going to be some adjustments or something? He is really voicing the concern of not only himself, but people who live back there too. Andy stated that just like any other intersection, staff would continue to assess the conditions at the intersection and work with ADOT to consider additional control measures, as he indicated earlier. Bottom line with a development like this that you see at this intersection and what is contributing to this facility, you are not going to see a traffic signal here, so what might we see? We might see an additional northbound lane if things got really bad, but that is an overall community area issue for the City. It is not this developer that is causing that issue, if that happens. Commissioner Mayer stated that it is the renters too, not just the people who live back there as well, so you understand 300 day trips plus 100 from the residents or whatever it might be. Andy indicated that is exactly what he is saying; it is not just this development. Commissioner Mayer stated that he is not trying to needle and go down to nitpicking or something like that. He is just voicing major concerns about this whole traffic issue. He is very much for the project; we need it in town and everything else, but not at all cost – that is what he is saying. Andy added that the reality of what is being added in traffic for this development does not trigger then need for a Traffic Impact Analysis -- not for the City or ADOT. We only required it as an abundance of caution for this situation. Commissioner Mayer asked, if something appears, are they going to be able to handle that and accommodate. Andy explained staff would have to look at what would be needed to implement additional control measures at this intersection.

Commissioner Brandt thanked staff for a thorough, comprehensive report, and asked about the priority for tenants for AMI. The term in one part of the Staff Report said local employees, so what is the boundary? Cari Meyer indicated that we would start with employees working in the city limits; that would be the simplest definition of local. If we need to define it more through the Development Agreement, we could and we are open to suggestions. Since this is a Zone Change that is trying to address local housing needs, we probably would want to focus on the businesses in the City and employees who work in the City. Audree Juhlin added that when staff had discussions with the applicant, the reason we could support the initial request for a parking reduction was that we were looking at employees that were within a certain, like half-mile, radius of this project would have a higher priority, so we were looking at a real condensed area, and then expanding to the rest of the City as well, so we will talk to the applicant about how that is written in the Development Agreement, but we want an emphasis on those employees who work closest to the apartments for walkability and bike-ability.

Vice Chair Levin asked for clarify if it is the Conditions of Approval, the Development Agreement and/or a Deed Restriction that would memorialize the expectations in the

applicant's Letter of Intent regarding to whom these apartments can be rented. Cari Meyer indicated that it would primarily be the Development Agreement that would be the long-term guarantee that these continue into the future. As for the Conditions of approval, since it is going to the RM-3 zoning, once the project is developed, if it was just in the Conditions, it could be a question as to whether it applies or not. The Development Agreement would be recorded against the property and would go forward into the future, so that would be the way we would ensure that it continues. Vice Chair Levin added that they become one and the same; it is a Deed Restriction. The Vice Chair then expressed appreciation that the applicant responded to the concerns raised by the restaurant next door and undertook that noise study, and then implemented a recommendation from that study regarding the type of windows that will be placed closest to that facility. She also appreciated the staff's full construct of this Staff Report, including the Community Plan checklist, which is an excellent format, and the additional research done regarding the land use density scenarios, as well as the summary of the responses, so thank you for all of the extra effort, which brought this packet to us for decision-making.

Commissioner Klein asked if the applicant agreed to install those windows pursuant to the recommendation, and Cari Meyer said yes. Commissioner Klein indicated that he agrees with Commissioner Mayer. It is a good project and we definitely need housing. Ed Conway, the General Manager of Sedona Rouge, wrote a letter in support of the project and talked about how it is difficult to get employees. He actually had a long talk with him; he told the Commissioner at an event that Sedona Rouge is down 10% from the required employees they need, and he used to run ads in the Sedona Red Rock News weekly for employees, as did Enchantment, L'Auberge and the Hilton, but he stopped running the ads, because no one was even responding to them. It is definitely a priority that we get housing, so people can work and live here, and this project would provide that. He does have some significant concerns about the traffic. He understands staff looking at surrounding intersections to conclude that there is no problem here in terms of any back-up at this intersection, but he doesn't understand that we previously got something from staff on the Schnebly Hill CFA, that says trip generation based on the ITE Trip Manual for a single-family residential dwelling is nine trips per weekday, so if there are 80 houses in this subdivision that would be 720 trips per day, so he doesn't know where the number 100 came from. He couldn't find it, so he doesn't know how big of an issue this is, but if you are talking about 720 per day from the subdivision and you are adding another 300 to that, it is 1,000 trips per day. From living in the subdivision, he can tell you that when people want to go from the subdivision, there are two exists. There is Juniper Drive and SR 89A, and if they want make a right turn on SR 89A to go east, they generally use Pinon, and to go west, they are using Juniper. He is concerned about whether or not there will be a back-up of traffic at SR 89A and Pinon, but he is more concerned about whether or not this is creating a dangerous condition and could potentially lead to accidents for people approaching SR 89A on Pinon, coming around the "S" curve.

Commissioner Klein referenced the applicant's Trip Generation Report and noted that they put out cones and indicated that the site distance at the driveway looking left to see traffic coming on Pinon is 150 ft. of visibility and that can be increased, if they prune the shrubs, to maybe around 200 ft.

Chair Losoff asked the Commissioner what the question is and the Commissioner stated that the problem is that staff says it complies with the AASHTO requirements, but they give various

measurements for sight distance. One is at uncontrolled intersections, which this isn't, but one is for turning right from a minor roadway, and it says the right-turn mover must have sufficient site distance to permit entrance on the intersecting roadway, and then accelerate to the posted speed limit without being overtaken by approaching vehicles, and then they give the distances that they recommend, and this is on dry pavement, so if it is raining these are larger distances. He has been driving that Pinon road daily and he looks at his speed as he goes around that "S" curve; it is about 22 mph . . . Chair Losoff again asked what the question is, and Commissioner Klein stated that at 22 mph, according to AASHTO, you need 217 feet of visibility, so how is this providing that? Andy explained that this report has been updated to once the driveway was moved. On page 14, it shows there is 280 ft. of sight distance being provided at that intersection, and this is a controlled intersection – it is stop-controlled. Commissioner Klein asked what page, and Andy indicated that it is in the latest traffic report and it is based on the relocation of the side driveway.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the Commission was provided with that and Commissioner Klein stated no, we weren't; he hasn't seen that. Vice Chair Levin noted that it is a good news story. Andy explained that he just got it himself, so that is why he is trying to find things.

Chair Losoff indicated to put this traffic issue to rest, we have been concerned about it since before we started meeting, and unfortunately, we don't have this latest report, but what you are telling us is that overall from engineering's point of view, it is not a problem. Andy stated that is exactly what he is saying. The conditions, the way they were before where the driveway was located were fine according to staff's analysis and review of the information. With this new report, it actually got better. The Chair indicated he had talked with some people in the area, and they say they have never had a problem, so we just have to take it for what it is worth. Staff is saying it is not a problem and that is why we didn't go into more detail even though we were concerned about it. Andy added that in determining background traffic or existing traffic, it is very normal to not project that, but actually take traffic counts, and that is what the engineer did in this case.

Commissioner Klein stated that he is not concerned about the traffic count issue, as much as this site distance. He has the Traffic Report dated October 10, 2017, so is there a later one than that? Andy Dickey indicated that one is dated November 6th and Cari added, yesterday. The Commissioner asked if he could see it and the Chair noted that Andy had just told the Commission what it said. Andy explained that the point of this revision was to address the relocation of that driveway. Commissioner Klein then asked how the driveway is being relocated, and Andy stated it was moved further south.

Applicant Keith Holben, MK Company in Scottsdale, AZ: Mr. Holben explained that the driveway seen at the last work session has not changed. The site driveway traffic report analysis was not updated. Staff requested that they update the sight line distance, because the original location was moved further south, and that was based on one of the early work sessions with the Commission, so it provided the ability to accomplish two things -- create more . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to ask Cari to point out the change, and Cari indicated that the driveway was further north and they moved it as far south as they could. She pointed out the city-owned parcel and indicated that was as far south as they could move the driveway. Commissioner Klein stated that if you move the driveway south, you are moving it closer to traffic coming around the "S" curve, so how does that increase the sight distance? Andy

explained that by moving it further south, instead of trying to look into the curve, you are looking through the curve and that is how it increases the sight distance. Commissioner Klein asked how the distance was determined; did they put out cones, which you are supposed to do, and take measurements? Andy Dickey stated yes, they did.

Commissioner Klein asked if by moving the cars closer to coming around Pinon Dr., you are increasing the sight distance from 150 to 280, and Andy Dickey stated correct, by moving from trying to look from one end of the curve through the curve, you are moving into the curve and looking beyond the curve. Commissioner Klein stated yes, but then . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say Andy has already answered that. Commissioner Klein asked if any photographs showed that, and Andy stated yes. The Commissioner then asked to put them up on the board; however, the Chair stated that he is satisfied with what they are saying and asked if anyone else wanted to go into more detail, and Commissioner Mayer stated yes. Commissioner Klein indicated that he wanted to see pictures.

Audree Juhlin reminded the Commission that, for example, with CVS that was a similar situation, there was significant concern by the residents, Commission and Council about the traffic impacts of that proposal, and CVS had significantly more traffic in impacts than this apartment complex does, and all of the concerns that were raised and addressed by our City Engineer, have not materialized. In fact the waiting time is literally seconds at the light and seldom do you have to sit more than one light or even one or two cars, so she wanted to emphasize that our City Engineer has done an analysis and is finding it to be compliant with all appropriate regulations.

Commissioner Kinsella referenced an indication that there was an agreement to install the noise-reduction windows and asked if that is going to be part of the Development Agreement. Cari Meyer stated that it would probably be more appropriate for it to be in the Development Review Conditions of Approval. The Commissioner then asked, since the ghost parking area would be approved at the staff level, is it known, if it is deemed to be constructed, if it would be a paved or gravel surface. Do you know any of that in advance? Cari stated that we don't. The Commissioner then asked how those determinations would be made, and Audree Juhlin explained that staff would work with the applicant to ensure their proposal meets our regulations and requirements.

Commissioner Klein wanted to ask a follow up question, but Chair Losoff noted that we have talked enough about traffic. The Commissioner then stated that they determined this 280 ft. using cones, but it looks like all they did was use an aerial photograph. Chair Losoff pointed out that he has to go with the experts and he tried to close off the discussion, but at this point, we can come back to that and open it up to the public, and it will give us a chance to read the materials you have and see what else we have to talk about.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period at this time.

Dell Willman, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Willman indicated that she is a resident of Sedona and she lives on Pinon Drive. After attending the last Planning & Zoning Commission meeting, and the most recent City Council meeting, she remains unconvinced that the decision to proceed with plans for this complex, as well as the decision regarding residential density, have as much to do with increasing availability of housing as they do with allowing developers to do whatever

they want, wherever they want in this City under the guise of fulfilling the intent of the Community Plan. She is aware that the absence of a cap on the number of units per acre is predicated on the developers showing that any given complex provides diverse affordable housing in this community. At the P&Z meeting in September, the developer stated that the rents for the one-bedroom units in this proposed complex would be around \$1,200 a month. This hardly seems affordable to her, so she questions how this complex even fits the criterion of affordability. At a density of 45 units on this parcel, parking is very much a concern. Forty-five units with multiple people in each unit, most of whom will have a car, will necessitate at least 90 parking spaces for residents. Guest parking would require even more spaces. She fears that overflow parking would result in people parking on Pinon. It has been pointed out in the last P&Z meeting and at the City Council meeting that Pinon Drive is unsafe from the intersection of Cedar Lane to the intersection with SR 89A, precisely the section where the developer proposes to put the entrance to the complex. Any consideration of a complex on this parcel should require that the developer be responsible for reconfiguring that road if it is to be used for ingress and egress. Closing Pinon at Cedar could solve part of the problem, reducing the amount of traffic using Pinon to access SR 89A. Residents of Juniper Knolls could use Juniper to access SR 89A and the existing sections of "S" curves on Pinon could be removed and a straighter road, specifically designated for that complex, could be built. After the last P&Z meeting, she drove home on Pinon after dark and when she turned on Pinon a woman dressed in black was walking on the pavement, because there is nowhere else to walk. She was in front of her [Ms. Willman] on the wrong side of the street with her back to her [Ms. Willman]. She couldn't see her as she approached the curve and had she not been familiar with that road and going a little faster, she would have hit her. To make no requirements for changing the traffic pattern in order to build this complex is to invite disaster; she is against the rezoning.

William Gunning, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Gunning indicated that he is also speaking for his wife, Pamela, and they have lived in Sedona for more than 30 years. Their small ranch house is located on a scenic hill near this proposal. They enjoy views of many scenic red rocks from their historic western home. Their recommendation for this site is that they would be very pleased if the Mayor, City Council and Planning & Zoning Commission would reduce the density to the original recommendation of the original plan to approximately 25 units -- not 45 units. The reason for that is the sewer capacity is already overburdened at the plant, and this will create a larger problem for future Sedona, so please do not overburden the sewer plant or Pinon with traffic. It is a very dangerous condition now as some of the people have addressed already, and they would like to see that looked at a little more closely.

Patricia Garner, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Garner stated that she lives in Juniper Knolls. Her major concern is pedestrian safety. There are a lot of people walking in that neighborhood, and if this does pass, which it looks like it is going to, they need sidewalks, they need Pinon straightened and wider, and she agrees with everything that Dell and Bill have said as well.

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

Commission's Discussion:

Commissioner Mayer stated he still has the same concern, and when he saw that line with the 280 ft., there is a problem with that. There is a hill, and you cannot even see 280 ft.; it is not possible, because there is a hill going up the first curve. It is that high; you cannot see.

Theoretically maybe, but you need to be in a truck, high up, in order to see that. Andy Dickey indicated that there is a vertical image of that, and that is exactly the point of putting up a cone, and in their past report, they showed putting up cones and he believes that they did that here as well, but addressing the vertical potential obstruction, there is a photo that shows there is a clear, direct sight distance with no obstruction. The Commissioner stated that there isn't; visit the site please.

Commissioner Brandt stated that regarding the traffic, he follows the lead of the specialists on this, but as a layman, if you have 200 ft. of visibility, you should be able to slow down, and if not, you are going too fast. If you think about small residential houses that are 100 ft. wide, the property is 200 ft., if you can't stop within one residential house length going at 20 mph, then you are going too fast. The street curving is mostly to make it safer; on straighter roads, people tend to go faster and feel more comfortable. He thinks the way it curves was done on purpose, 1) To keep the sound from the highway from coming into the neighborhood, 2) So you couldn't see into the neighborhood from the highway, and 3) It kind of slows you down before getting out to the highway, so it works real well. If anything, the driveway in the project is too wide. Maybe if that was narrower it could show the people coming out of the apartment complex, but then again, it is not a straight shot coming out of the complex. You have to wind around and come out, and you will be looking to see if anybody is coming.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he appreciates the re-design of colors of the proposal from the direction that was provided at the last hearing, calming the building down and make it fit better into the trees and into the other buildings on the highway. As far as the density, he always gets a chuckle when he sees the High Occupant Vehicle lane in Phoenix, and you can have two people and it is a high-occupant vehicle, so calling this high density is kind of a misnomer. It fits all of the other requirements for height, setbacks, bulk, color, and parking is going to work out just fine, so calling it high density just makes it smaller units and more affordable. Are they affordable if you analyze it? Well, he doesn't know if that is important, diversity is what is important here, and the more diverse the housing stock makes all of the housing stock more available, and since there is more of it, it makes it more affordable. Not everybody might be able to afford this; the people that might be able to afford this are going to be finding a less expensive place, because that is all that is available, making that unit available for someone else, so this works and it is in the right spot, and it is working out fine.

Chair Losoff indicated that on the issue of high density, we went through this in previous meetings and it was approved by both this Commission and the Council, so that is not an issue for us tonight. The issue basically is only the Zone Change and Development Review, and traffic and noise have been the two major concerns, so he was glad to see the noise issue addressed, and it sounds like the Commission is pretty much in agreement with what we do with that. On the traffic, he is not a Traffic Engineer and doesn't plan to be, but he has to go along with what the experts are saying and from their points of view it is not a problem. There are some issues here or there, but from your perspective, you are telling us that you studied it and it is not necessary to go into a more in-depth study. He then asked Andy Dickey if he is hearing that correctly, and Andy Dickey stated that is correct. The Chair then stated that is all he can do at the point, so he thanks staff for the input. He wishes the Commission had gotten this report sooner; it would have maybe helped the discussion we are having tonight, but he appreciates the input.

Commissioner Klein stated that he appreciates that staff is the expert on these things; he is not a Traffic Engineer and we need this housing, but he thinks you are creating a potentially dangerous condition. In the old report, they showed photos with cones; that is how you are supposed to measure site distance according to AASHTO, and he doesn't see anything in the new report that says that they did this with cones. What they did is they took an aerial photograph, and how they came up with you would have – you are moving the driveway 40-some-odd feet south, closer to traffic coming on Pinon, so how that creates an additional 80 ft. or more of visibility, he doesn't get it. He is very concerned about it and thinks you are potentially creating a dangerous condition. Chair Losoff then asked if Commissioner Klein didn't agree with the experts, and Commissioner Klein stated that if they had put out cones and showed him photos like they did the first time that said here is the visibility and we measured it and it is 280 ft., but he doesn't think that was done. All they did was take an aerial photo and somehow conclude from that they have increased the visibility 80 ft. or more, and he doesn't get how they can conclude that. He is not an expert, so he may be wrong, but he doesn't get it.

Commissioner Kinsella thanked Andy Dickey for the additional information, and indicated that she thinks it is possible to gain additional site distance by moving a driveway. She has been in those situations where she has had to actually gauge those sight distances herself, and she knows that based on that experience, it is possible. She is not saying that we have evidence of that in a timely way, but she does think the additional information is valid, so she wanted to thank you for providing it.

Andy Dickey stated that if it helps, the whole point is determining if there is a vertical obstruction; there is no embankment there that is blocking the sight distance. There may be vegetation there, and that is a point of needing to trim vegetation, but from what he is seeing and he has been on the site, he doesn't think there is a vertical obstruction that would be. . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that at this point, we just keep repeating the same issue and asked if there is anything new to add.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he lives there and drives there every day and people are cutting the corner, where . . . He asked to approach staff, and the Chair asked the Commissioner to remain on the dais. Commissioner Mayer indicated that it is discussion about something which is of concern, and he could go and see if his concerns and the concerns of the people who live there can be diminished. He sees that corner, he drives there; people cutting that corner, and he has been numerous times in that situation.

Chair Losoff asked staff to put it up on the screen, and Andy pointed out that staff has neglected the whole point that was made in the report that says this site distance should be based on 15 mph. That is the prudent speed here, and if you accept that, it is nowhere near needing to be this distance. Commissioner Klein asked to comment on that, but Chair Losoff indicated that he thinks we have heard the arguments, and he guesses nothing is going to change Commissioner Mayer's mind, so he asked if we can move on. Commissioner Mayer again stated that he likes the project and he sees the need for that and everything else. It is just a concern about safety and security of the people who rent there as well as the people who live there, and when he questions something, because he lives there, he drives there every day and he knows exactly what issues he has when he drives every day, because people cut the corner coming into the subdivision, and when there is additional traffic coming out

from that proposed development, then it is going create a real problem, and that is what he is majorly concerned about; that is why he is harping on it. See if there is the possibility of moving that entry a little closer to the highway. Andy Dickey commented that accepting the 15 mph advisory speed limit, the site distance should be 170 ft., and the second point is there is no embankment here. He then pointed out the place they are looking at and Commissioner Mayer then pointed to a different location, and Andy informed him that is on the wrong side of the road.

Chair Losoff stated that Andy Dickey is saying there is no problem there, and at this point we will close the discussion on traffic. He then indicated that he would entertain a motion, and Cari pointed out that for the Zone Change, staff had a proposed change to condition 2.E to read, "Priority for some of the units would be given to prospective tenants who earn less than AMI".

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved to approve the proposed Development Review for Pinon/89A Apartments as set forth in case number PZ17-00009 based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Development Review findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as revised and as outlined in the Staff Report.

Vice Chair Levin then noted that staff had language that would be preferred.

Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion.

Cari Meyer stated that for the Development Review conditions, Commissioner Kinsella had suggested adding a new condition regarding the installment of the sound windows. Vice Chair Levin stated, ". . . as revised".

VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved to recommend to the Sedona City Council approval of the proposed rezoning as set forth in case number PZ17-00009 from General Commercial (C-2) to High Density Multi-family Residential (RM-3) based on compliance with Land Development Code requirements, conformance with the requirements for approval of a zone change and consistency and conformance with the Community Plan, and subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and the conditions as revised and as outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

- b. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new 50' monopine wireless communication facility. The property is located at 110 Indian Cliffs Road (Sedona United Methodist Church), at the southeastern corner of the intersection of State Route 179 and Indian Cliffs Road. The subject property is approximately 8.04 acres and is zoned Single Family Residential (RS-10b). APN: 401-34-011Z. Case Number: PZ16-00014 (CUP) Applicant: Sun State Towers**

Presentation: Cari Meyer indicated that this request is for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a wireless communications facility as a monopine at the Sedona United Methodist

Church. Cari identified the location of the subject property and indicated that the applicant is Sun State Towers, and Michelle Lamoureux, their representative, is present. The property is just over three acres and currently used as a church, but zoned as single-family residential. Cari showed a vicinity map of the subject property and surrounding area, and an aerial photo showing the proposed location of the tower.

Cari stated that the Church was originally constructed prior to the City's incorporation, but there have been a number of changes over the years, with new additions to the Church, including new buildings, parking lot expansions, and there is an existing wireless communications facility in the wall of the Church. They have also gotten some other approvals amending their Conditional Use Permit a number of times.

Cari explained that the proposal is for a new 50 ft. monopine wireless communications facility, and it is being reviewed under our current Article 17, the Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance, although this section of the Code is undergoing a revision, but it has not been approved, so we are using the existing Ordinance. This Ordinance requires these types of facilities to obtain approval of a Conditional Use Permit. As part of that review, these applications are reviewed by the City's wireless communications consultant, CityScape, for compliance with our regulations, as well as any applicable state and federal wireless regulations. Their report was included in your materials, and they are recommending approval of the application subject to the conditions outlined in that report.

Cari pointed out that the site plan shows the area being used for the new monopine and the elevations show what the monopine would look like. They resubmitted once, and one plan showed the monopine at 55 ft. and one showed it at 50 ft., so one of the conditions would be that it would be limited to the lower height of 50 ft. The applicant has also provided some photo simulations. View 1 is taken from the area to the east of the proposed site and View 2 would be from Indian Cliffs Road in front of the residences, and [View 3] is from the entrance to the parking lot where the building and existing vegetation hide the majority of the tree, and then View 4 is from the back property line of the houses that adjoin the Church.

Cari indicated that based on CityScape's review, the proposal meets all of the City Codes with the exception of the setbacks, so without a breakpoint, cell tower communications facilities are required to be 150% of the tower height away from a residential lot, so for a 50 ft. monopine a 75 ft. setback would be required. Currently, the monopine is only 43 ft. from the nearest residential property, which is the one to the southeast. CityScape did identify one area of the site that would meet the setback requirements; however, that would be more visible and would be closer to the existing residences, and in an area identified as an area of interest to a local Native American tribe, so that location created some issues. The Code does allow cellular wireless facilities to be designed with a breakpoint, where if the tower were to fail, it would break part way down the tower instead of at the base, so it would not fall on a neighboring property. In that case, the Code states that if it is designed with a breakpoint, the setback is 110% of the distance from the top of the tower to the breakpoint, so for this monopine to be compliant, it would have to be designed with a breakpoint of no more than 39 ft. from the top of the tree, and that would allow it to meet the requirements for setbacks with a 43 ft. distance from the nearest property, so that is included as a recommended Condition of Approval along with a number of other items that are standard for construction of the monopine.

Cari indicated that the applicant completed a Citizen Participation Plan and staff completed public noticing. All of the comments received have been provided in the packet, and a number of the comments regarded impact on views and the aesthetics of the tower. Other comments regarded items that we cannot review, so we are not summarizing those.

Cari stated that as outlined in the Staff Report, staff has determined that it meets the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit, and as reviewed by CityScape, as conditioned this application meets the requirements for wireless facilities. Any outstanding review agency comments would relate to future requirements, such as for construction, etc., so staff is recommending approval of this Conditional Use Permit, subject to the specific Ordinance requirements and the Conditions of Approval, and the applicant's representative is present. Chair Losoff asked the applicant's representative, Michele Lamoureux, to come to the microphone.

Applicant Michele Lamoureux representing Sun State Towers, Gilbert, AZ: Ms. Lamoureux indicated that Sun State Towers is proposing a 50 ft. monopine to be built here. It will be co-locatable. Currently, they have an agreement with Verizon to go on this site, but without building additional structures, it will be available for any additional carriers to go on it as well.

Commission Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Barcus expressed interest in the breakpoint, and asked if it is feasible to engineer the monopine with a 39 ft. or less breakpoint. Cari Meyer indicated yes; from what she has been told by the applicant, yes, and they have also provided a letter from their engineer stating that they will be able to do that. The Commissioner then asked if CityScape had provided any advice on breakpoints. Cari stated that CityScape has stated that they will review the plans, that are submitted for construction, for compliance with all conditions.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that he looked into it and looked at the images of various cell towers, and they look pretty fake – those pine trees. There is one you can see up in Flagstaff at the marketplace, the mall area. His question is there is a lot of money involved in it isn't it – the rent, the lease? Michelle Lamoureux stated that as far as . . . she doesn't understand. The Commissioner repeated the rent, the lease; it is like he makes about \$2,000. Robert Pickels Jr. pointed out that is not relevant to the discussion. Commissioner Mayer then stated that he was just wondering why churches are . . . anyway, whatever.

Chair Losoff stated that the only issue is that they are applying for a CUP and the Commission can't necessarily get into the financial concerns. Commissioner Mayer stated yes, but 50 ft. is an issue to him, especially with the views you have coming from SR 179 driving toward Sedona, it is going to be visible. Obviously, it is going to look fake, no matter what you do. That is his concern.

Commissioner Brandt asked staff to remind the Commission as to what we can and cannot review. He thinks staff said there are other things, but they are not reviewable, so we are not going to have them on the board. Cari Meyer indicated that it is mainly things regarding radio frequency concerns and that sort of review. Those are the main ones, and there were some on the impact on the views that the monopine could have. All the comments were provided, but things like concerns regarding radio frequency, we cannot review.

Commissioner Brandt noted that some of the information was dated last year, and Cari explained that the application was submitted about a year ago, and it was forwarded to CityScape for review, and they worked with the applicant over a number of months to make sure all of the application documents were complete, and that they had all of the information they needed, and then the issue with the Native American tribe came up, so the project was put on hold for a number of months while they worked with that tribe, and the applicant can speak more to what went on there, but in finding a location that was acceptable to the Church, the tribe and the different requirements, we have been working on it for about the last year. A lot of that has been CityScape looking into making sure all of the appropriate information had been provided and all of their questions had been answered.

Commissioner Brandt stated that within the work sessions of updating the Land Development Code for towers, there has been an indication that in the future smaller and more smaller towers would be the general direction that the industry was going, so is there any reason why we are seeing a 50 ft. tower and how was a 50 ft. tower determined to be what is necessary? Cari Meyer explained that would probably be a question for the applicant; we react to the applications submitted. Ms. Lamoureux stated that the RF Engineer was present, and she asked that he respond to that question.

RF Engineer Steve Kennedy, Goodyear, AZ: Mr. Kennedy indicated that he is the Radio Engineer that helps with Verizon, doing consulting, as well as Sun State Towers. The reason you are seeing a 50 ft. tower with a 41 ft. antenna centerline is basically the area of coverage. The area of service that this site is going to cover is a much larger geographic area than what you are referring to in the small cells. If you go to downtown Phoenix, every block there is a street light and about every two blocks there is a small cell, because it covers about 500 ft. to 1,000 ft. It is a very small area; the shorter the antenna, the lower the service area much like what you have in here, where you have areas where you are sitting above and higher than the chairs in front of you, and you can see those chairs better than they can see up to you as well. If you are lower, you are in the area where you are not going to be able to propagate out and the site is not going to cover as far, so the distance between sites is anywhere from 10 to 15 miles. There is one at Sedona airport and one south. The area of coverage or service there is so large, there has to be a little bit higher height. The positive thing is there are higher terrain areas, so you can get taller, but you have to be able to cover from site to site. The main part of this site is capacity; the ability to process calls. The area is so busy with so many consumers, users on the system, the amount of throughput per user is drastically lowered to where we need additional capacity.

Chair Losoff asked if the height also determines how many vendors can go on there, and Mr. Kennedy replied yes, sir. If it was a taller tower, it could have more operators on the tower, but the lower height restricts that because the lower the antennas go, the smaller the area they are going to cover, so for each carrier to be on it, they have to have enough height for those antennas to see the environment around them.

Vice Chair Levin asked if color, in addition to aesthetics, location and setback requirements, is a consideration that the proposed Article 17 addresses. If so, that is one of the issues, in addition to blocking views and the height of the pole itself; color was raised as a concern that it didn't blend in, so she was curious to know if there is any flexibility. Audree Juhlin explained that in Article 17, it talks about concealed towers and the requirements, setbacks and

construction aesthetics are part of them. When you have ground-mounted equipment, we can get into what color those would be, with concealed, you typically don't get into the colors, because of the nature of that concealed tower. When you have a monopine or monopole, you would have better ability to choose a color that better matches the surrounding area, with the pine you don't have that same . . . Vice Chair Levin interjected that when the word 'facilities' is used, it is typically the ground unit. In this example, you can't change the color of the pine tree. Audree Juhlin indicated that is correct.

The Vice Chair asked about the issues that arose around the adjacency of tribal lands, and Ms. Lamoureux stated that she can also address the color of the monopine for you. We can use a more variegated green color, so it is not just dark green. Some trees have more brown and yellows in the pine needles, and they are more than willing to work with the landlord and provide them a couple of different tree options, so they can choose from that tree option. They are happy to do that and she is sure the Church is willing to get the most natural-looking tree for this particular area. In Tucson, Aleppo Pines are more native to that area. They are a sparser tree, but that is what you see more of in that area. They work with Larson Camouflage extensively, and they have developed an Aleppo Pine to blend in more. It is difficult with the photo simulations, because the people that do them have a standard pine tree that they use for their photo simulations, but we have made great strides in what you want to look at as far as a pine tree. Obviously, it is a little less perfect and you do have 7 ft., 8 ft. and 10 ft. branches rather than just a perfect tree, and we are certainly willing to do that.

Ms. Lamoureux added that as far as the tribal concern, the original location that met all of the setbacks . . ., they have to go through extensive reviews with the tribes, FCC and FAA, and they discovered some arrows and broken pottery in the original area, so they asked if the tower could be moved, and when they moved it, they did their review, but there will be archeological monitoring on site when they dig.

Commissioner Klein stated that this is being decided under the current Land Development Code, Section 1703.03, Approval Criteria, that says that in considering any application for a Conditional Use Permit, the Commission's decision shall be guided by the application of the following criteria: A. Use of suitable existing towers or other structures is preferred over placement of new antenna-supporting structures. He then asked if there are any existing cell tower structures in this area that could be collocated on, instead of having this new 50 ft. tower. Cari explained that part of CityScape's review was asking the applicant what other sites they looked at and whether the existing facility at the Church could be collocated, but the Church did not want any additional facilities on their building, so that is not an option, and they did look at a couple of other sites, but opted to go with this one, and that was outlined in their report as well.

Commissioner Klein stated that he can't remember from the CityScape report if they discussed the issue of whether or not there are other existing sites in the area that could be collocated on, and Cari stated that was part of CityScape's review and there are no others; they determined that it was appropriate to build a new monopine in this location.

Commissioner Klein referenced the breakpoint and indicated that staff said the breakpoint cannot be located more than 39 ft. from the top of the monopine, and he then asked if that means the breakpoint could be at 11 ft. above the ground on a 50 ft. tower, and Cari stated

yes; however, Ms. Lamoureux clarified that it can't be engineered; the smallest fall area that they can guarantee, and it is in the engineering letter, is the 25 ft. radius, so you can engineer a 50 ft. monopine to fall in a 25 ft. radius. She is not sure exactly where they put the breakpoint, but that is the fall radius.

Commissioner Klein asked if the 50 ft. tower breaks, it is only going to fall 25 ft., and Ms. Lamoureux indicated that is right; basically it will collapse down as opposed to fall over. The Commissioner then asked, if you build a breakpoint, are they guaranteeing that it is going to break there or is it possible it won't break there and the whole thing could still fall over. Ms. Lamoureux stated that they engineer it to do that; she supposes in some extreme circumstance that it could still break at the base. She would never say never; however, that is how it is engineered, and it is engineered to withstand extreme conditions, and those conditions are outlined in the engineering letter.

Commissioner Klein referenced the current Land Development Code, Section 1704.01, and indicated that it says that the radio frequency emissions shall comply with FCC standards for such emissions, and since this is a Conditional Use Permit that we can put appropriate conditions on, in our revised Land Development Code and Wireless Communications Plan, we are going to require that a cell tower like this be tested every two years to make sure that it is not emitting more radio frequencies than permitted by the FCC. He then asked if we should be putting that same requirement on this tower. Robert Pickels Jr. pointed out that is not a legal question; that is an operational question. The Commissioner asked why we shouldn't; the people are concerned about the radio frequency emissions. We can't deny placement of a tower because of that, but we can require testing, because that is proposed in the new plan. If we are going to approve this 50 ft. tower, we should require them to do the exact same thing that we are going to require under the new plan. They have to have certification at the time of completion that it complies with the radio frequency emissions allowed by the FCC and that every two years they have to have testing by a certified Arizona engineer to say the tower is still in compliance with the FCC requirements.

Chair Losoff asked if that could be a Condition of Approval and Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that the Commission could; he would just qualify it to say two things that are of a legal nature. One is the Telecommunications Act does not allow cities to impose anything beyond what is required by the FCC in the form of compliance, and that typically is done in the form of a Statement of Compliance by the wireless provider or the developer, so that being said, you have the authority to impose conditions on the Conditional Use Permit. Vice Chair Levin stated that she would support that.

The Chair then asked the applicant what they think, and Mr. Kennedy stated that typically when a site goes into service or any modification is done on a site an RFE or RF Safety Compliance is done as a matter of business. OET is ran by the FCC and all wireless transmitters, no matter who they are owned by, are relegated to be able to follow the safety rule. As a matter of fact, any carrier, if it is a new service or an additional channel is being added or an antenna is being changed or anything has to be checked, and it is part of the standard operating procedure within each carrier to do that. RF safety is very important. Chair Losoff then asked if Commissioner Klein is suggesting that we do that and make it a Condition of Approval, and the Commissioner stated yes. The Chair then asked the Commission if there were any objections to having that as a Condition of Approval, and there

were no objections. Vice Chair Levin again indicated that she would endorse it. The Chair then indicated that the Commission wants to incorporate that into the conditions.

Commissioner Kinsella thanked Commissioner Klein for bringing that up, that was a great point and she is happy to see this go on as a condition, so she has no questions based on that one being answered.

The Chair opened the public comment period at this time and indicated that certainly everyone can say what they want to say, but if you have heard somebody say the same thing, you can just say 'on record', and we will go from there.

Chair Losoff stated that he first wanted to back up. Earlier on the agenda we had item 3, Public Form for items not on our agenda, and there was one card that got lost in the shuffle. Kerry Richardson wanted to talk about smoking in parks, sidewalks and city parking. He left so we aren't able to get him back on for a public forum, but for the record, Kerry Richardson did want to talk about smoking in parks and in the various public areas.

Reverend Fred Mast, Pastor of Sedona United Methodist Church: Reverend Mast indicated that he knows this has been a great subject of disagreement, consternation and conversation around Sedona, and he appreciates that. There has been much conversation and the question was asked by Commissioner Mayer as to why a church would consider putting a cell tower in, and he assures you with their budget, this is a drop in the bucket. It is not about money; their trustees met several times. They are a community partner, and he knows the Fire Department relies on cellular phone service immensely. There are hikers in the area right around the Church every day; they park in the parking lot and do not have cell signals out there. They couldn't call if they had a heart attack or emergency. Walking around the Church, you saw what happened at a church in Texas this past weekend, and it is a safety issue. He can sit in his office and drop calls consistently with Verizon Wireless. He has Verizon and if he is walking around the Church, in most of the areas, he has no service, and in many of the areas on the property he has no service. Coming up SR 179, he drops calls all the time. He is on wireless and on Bluetooth, so he knows he is not supposed to be talking, but he deals with emergencies constantly. This is much more than about just greed; it is not greed at all from the Churches' perspective. They are a community partner and take it seriously. They have heard the community responses and have also worked hard with the contractor and told them that we have to make this as aesthetically pleasing as we possibly can for the City of Sedona. Like it or not, building and development has happened in the City of Sedona. He wishes we didn't have power lines and houses up on the mountains, but we do and we all have cellular phones in here. He believes everyone could pull one out. They have also been told that the congregation has no idea about this. There are several within the audience tonight from the congregation that are here. They have not hid it from anybody; it has been public. It has gone through all of the approvals. They notified the public as soon as they possibly could. With contracts, you can't notify and have meetings prior to that, but thank you for the time and thank you for your consideration

Michael Givler, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Givler indicated that he didn't want to be redundant to what the pastor said, but his biggest concern is the fact that we have a lack of cell service in the Church itself. He is there at least once a week and usually two or three times a week, and he gets calls and cannot take them inside the building. He has to go out in the parking lot and

even then sometimes he loses them, but his biggest concern is, and Pastor Fred mentioned the fact of what happened in Texas just last weekend, and that could happen in any church in this country. They have no way of contacting authorities if something happened or calling 911, unless they run out someplace. The other big concern is that he is an usher at the Church, and part of their duties are if somebody collapses or has a problem during or before or after a service, they need to be able to get ahold of emergency people, so to be able to call 911, and get somebody out there; they need to be able to use their equipment within the Church where the person might be and that is not possible under the current situation.

Eugene Chandler, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Chandler stated that he lives in the Chapel area, and from his perspective, it is all about the things they mentioned about safety, the reception they need in that area, and that the views are not going to be impacted. There are trees that have grown up in the last 12 years that are now blocking his view, and that is just the way things are. You buy a house and have a view, and then maybe it is impeded later, so he is all for this tower for the safety reasons, the convenience, and the emergency use. If it wasn't placed there, it is going to be placed someplace else and there would be another group of people that would come and complain, so you are always going to have somebody that is complaining, but they need the tower.

Dennis Hackett, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Hackett indicated that he lives in the area, and he is a little dismayed over the Church's comments so far, in as much as, all they had to do was produce a little loyalty to AT&T. It has been their roof antenna since the beginning. The Church needs a name change; it should be the Church of Telecommunications, and whatever is profitable. From what he heard tonight, you are not only looking at Verizon raising a tower, but Verizon is looking at renting out the tower to other telecommunication facilities. We're looking at right now, you can go to a certain spot between the roof and wherever the tower resides and come up with an instant 10. The people around them, up and down that little stretch are worried not only about their views, but their health. They also are well aware of the fact that when these sites go up, the property values go down. He has a mother who lived on Pinon Drive from 1985, and the City Manager bought her house; we ought to move the tower right into your subdivision and see how that comes down the pike. Not only will it make your drive a little different, but it might turn around and turn your head a bunch. He is trying to sell a house; he wants out. This is stupid. You people spent a bunch of money turning around trying to find sites that would be adequate and out of the community residential areas and these people are putting another one smack dab in place. What is the point? You have been talking about this thing forever; you've turned around and spent money on where to place these things, so that they don't interfere, and yet we've got a church. Are they getting a business permit? Are they being taxed on this? This is a business enterprise; it certainly isn't a church enterprise. That's it; he thinks his time is up. That is how the residents feel.

Sharon Blankenship, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Blankenship stated that she is directly across from the Church, and the Reverend may come and use their phone or her cell phone anytime. They get service, so she doesn't know what the problem is. She sees the police and the sheriff and the fire department pulling in and sometimes just meeting there in the parking lot directly across from her house. If they don't have communications, why are they sitting there if they can't communicate with someone else? Speaking of communications, they have been in Sedona for 17 years and this is the only house they have lived in. It is a wonderful neighborhood; the people take care of their property. They pay their taxes and want to be part of the

community, and they have been good neighbors to each other and to the Church, so she dittos everything that Dennis said, and she is also concerned about the look of this tower, since everyone seems to be so concerned about the aesthetics. If you want to see a ridiculous tower, go down to approximately Bell Road and 56th Street in Scottsdale. They tried to put in a tower that looked like a palm tree. Now if you want a laugh, go down and look at that tower; it doesn't look very much like the concept of a palm tree that we or a child would draw, and she is a retired teacher, so she has looked at a few palm trees and pine trees in her time. She thinks her time is up. Would you consider this, because other neighborhoods, as time goes on, are going to have similar complaints as them?

Brian Henry, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Henry stated that he is a Sedona resident. He stays on Cathedral Rock Drive. He knows about Sedona quite a bit; it has been a great experience living here amongst everyone and it has been kind of like a research study for himself also. He comes from Atlanta, Georgia, which is like the biggest growing city in America. When it comes down to cell phone towers; there are so many that is like hunting for a beetle, like a punch bug. You see them in traffic, and it is like hey there is another one; there's another one. He had one in his community and it definitely was there until it wasn't there anymore. After a while of seeing it, it changes, but besides that, let's talk about the key points. He is kind of like everyone's son or grandson in this room, as far as his age is concerned. He is kind of like middle school. He is not new school and not old school, but he can kind of bridge the gap and show you the relevance of all of this technology and how you can apply it to your life. Let's just talk about face time. He has a daughter who lives in Atlanta, Georgia 2,500 miles away, and he would love to face time Olivia every day, so we could have more than just a conversation over the phone, but his cell phone drops every time. It cannot process the video and the analog, so to be able to have this phone call with Olivia every day, when he gets home from work or to be able to see her would be awesome, but that is just a small thing. Let's talk about upgrades. Every year with technology there are upgrades applied with nanotechnology, and nanotechnology is making something big really small. We talk about this really big tower and, in a couple of years, it is going to be small. Let's talk about aesthetics, when it comes down to aesthetics he has seen his Mom (audio unclear) a regular pine tree for Christmas or a fake pine and she does it where it makes him be in awe, like Ma, I love you. There are types of material in the world where we can make this look real. All we have to have is more of these trees and more years with applied technology to make it work. Let's talk about emergency phone calls, not calling out, but calling in. This is important.

Kimberly Lillyblad, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Lillyblad indicated that there were a couple of things that came up for her here. One is how much money they are being paid each month for the cell service, and then she wanted to address this gentleman who came up and spoke and said that you are installing a Master Wireless Plan so this wouldn't happen, and she wanted to let him know that she lives in a private residence by the creek in a historical district, and she is on their list for a cell tower site. She has been to – this will be her third or fourth time talking. They are doing this through a lift station. They are trying to propose to put a cell tower on a private road in her private neighborhood on the side of a hill. So to her this is not an alternate. The Master Plan is not alright with her until 11 Newcastle Lane is removed from the list, and she will continue to come to these meetings and make it aware that the City is pushing her neighborhood under the bus, and we are not even near the bus station. We wouldn't even be called on this, and what is happening is that they are taking the money away from her, because she could put in an application just like the Church did, and she could

collect that money every month, and she could sure use it, because if the City puts a cell tower less than 100 ft. from her door, she doesn't know that she will be able to live there. It will destroy everything that she has been building; her property values will go down, and she is not even on a right-of-way road. Thank you; she appreciates you hearing her.

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

Commission's Discussion:

Chair Losoff stated that the City is being accused of doing these things, but it is not the City. There is a federal guideline that says these things have to be done. What the City is trying to do is minimize or limit the impact. We don't have too many choices. The Federal Government has some very strict guidelines saying you must do these things and the state government has not helped, because they have also mandated where some of these towers can go, so our ability is very limited. All we can try to do is minimize the impact for whatever it is worth.

Commissioner Klein indicated that he had a question for the tower company, and then asked if the Church would allow it, could you co-locate on the existing tower and get the same result. Ms. Lamoureux stated that the existing site is stealthed on the site; it is not co-locatable. The Commissioner noted that a member of the public said that when you put these cell towers in a residential area, the property values go down, and then asked if staff knows if that is accurate. Cari Meyer stated that staff does not have that expertise.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that one of the examples presented for the Wireless Plan update was the Church of the Red Rocks and the short tower that is there is 20 ft. tall or something like that and it is on top of a hill similar to this tower, and from this Church to the new firehouse, the church he is talking about is about the same distance away, so it is just down SR 179. You have to go looking for it and really go up to that parking lot to see it. He guesses another question is why we have to look at something that is 50 ft. tall, when there are other options available that are demonstrated in this same district, same hilltop kind of situation. Mr. Kennedy explained that once again, it depends on the coverage area; he is not familiar with the Red Rock site that you are speaking of. Commissioner Brandt stated that it is about the same distance away and asked if Mr. Kennedy is familiar with the firehouse. Mr. Kennedy stated no, sir. The Commissioner explained that it is about two miles away, and Mr. Kennedy asked if it is on a higher elevation and the Commissioner indicated that it is elevated similarly to the site being considered tonight. Mr. Kennedy explained that a couple of things to take into account is that this is a capacity site more than a coverage site, so it is taking existing users or users attempting to attach to the network and trying to process their calls. That is the first aspect of why this site was even designed; it was for capacity offload of existing services. The second part is each site, in and of itself, is a different site. Not being totally familiar with the area, the fire station you are speaking of, depending upon how tall the hill is, what their service requirement was for that operator and what area that site is having to cover – if it is a smaller area geographically than what this site is having to cover, they are able to get away with a lower height. Due to the area or square miles this site has to cover, they had to go with a higher antenna centerline to cover the amount of area they need to offload the traffic from the site to the north and the site to the south.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that Mr. Kennedy is making it sound as though there isn't any cell service in that area, but obviously we know there is cell service. It is not a brand new part

of town. It is not a new development; it has been there longer than cell phones have been, so it seems as though – those fake trees, do those come in multiple heights? Mr. Kennedy responded yes, sir. The Commissioner then asked if they can get them to look like a juniper tree, and Mr. Kennedy indicated that the highest tree he saw was in Atlanta, Georgia and it was a 100 ft. monopine. Commissioner Brandt indicated that if you have noticed the the forest here is stunted; it is a pigmy forest and that is why you can see the views so well, because the trees are so short. He wonders if there are any of these types of trees that are shorter than 50 ft. Mr. Kennedy stated that a tower can be built shorter than 50 ft. Commissioner Brandt then asked if it could be disguised as a tree shorter than 50 ft., and Mr. Kennedy repeated if a monopine can be built shorter than 50 ft. – yes. It is dependent upon the design need of the site. If a tower is needed to be shorter or taller, it can be adapted to every situation. Commissioner Brandt stated that it is not as though it is a model that comes out of a box and this is the height that it has to be; it can be customized. Mr. Kennedy added depending on the need, but remember we discussed capacity versus coverage. You are right; there is existing service within the area. What this site was designed for was capacity; the amount of users in the area utilizing the site to the north at the Sedona airport and to the south are beginning to overwhelm this site, so the quality of service is lowering and the amount of throughput per user is decreased significantly, so we cannot provide the level of service that needs to be provided.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that Mr. Kennedy stated that the tower has to be elevated for the broader coverage, so can you tell him how high above the highway the bottom of the tower is? Mr. Kennedy stated that the base ground elevation at the tower based upon the survey – he is seeing 4,267 ft. is the ground elevation at the base where the tower would be located. The Commissioner then asked if Mr. Kennedy knew the elevation of the highway, because the highway is about level through there. Mr. Kennedy responded that they don't have the highway elevation. Commissioner Brandt then stated that means that you didn't take into consideration the existing height of the hill when you were determining how big of a tower you needed. Mr. Kennedy indicated that they do take that into consideration. The propagation modeling tool takes into account the base elevation of the location they are at, based upon the terrain in the area down to a five meter resolution. It also takes into account how high we want the antenna to go, the frequency at which the radio transmitter is working as well as the power. It propagates in a theoretical environment what the site is going to do, and then we use drive testing to verify the existing site's coverage and maximize that model. Commissioner Brandt stated that he guesses that he can't argue with that.

Commissioner Brandt then asked why didn't we see a photo illustration from the gateway into town where most people would be seeing the cell tower while driving along the highway, and Ms. Lamoureux explained that when they did the neighborhood meeting, the primary concerns seemed to be from the neighborhood . . . an interruption from the audience prompted the Chair to tell the audience that if it happened one more time, everybody would be asked to leave, so please try to respect our decorum. Ms. Lamoureux then continued to say that they did the photos from the neighborhood. She then identified a photo taken from a resident's balcony, so if they were contacted by a resident, they tried to address their concerns and do photo simulations for them from their residence, and they did do several photo simulations for residents that asked them. Commissioner Brandt asked if the City of Sedona wasn't concerned about what the view would look like on the entrance to the City,

and Ms. Lamoureux stated that they were not requested . . . ; they did several photo simulations from the requests they had.

Commissioner Mayer asked if they know of any similar city or town like our demographics with the surrounding -- like Aspen or Vail that have a 50 ft. camouflaged pine tree. Ms. Lamoureux indicated that Telluride and Vail both have monopines. Commissioner Mayer asked located where, and Ms. Lamoureux stated around their resorts to service their needs; she couldn't tell you exactly where they are, but she does know there are several in the area. Commissioner Mayer stated that Aspen doesn't, but anyway -- why does everything have to be maximized in regards of how many additional providers are going to be on that tower and all that stuff. He doesn't understand that we couldn't have shorter, more cell towers rather than a 50-ft. cell tower. He has seen all kinds of stuff where a saguaro is 50 ft. and doesn't exist. He really has an issue with this and especially with listening to the neighbors. We went on a field trip for possible sites owned by the City or with city access, and why couldn't it be in one of those sites, which are close to the Church as well. Ms. Lamoureux asked if the Commissioner is asking why it couldn't be shorter or smaller, and Commissioner Mayer stated yes, more shorter ones in some different locations. There were locations or sites which the City took us on a tour rather than right there at the Church, when it comes right at the entry into Sedona. It is like 50 ft.; it is just . . . Ms. Lamoureux explained that most of the view will be blocked by the Church; the top of the tree will be what is . . . Commissioner Mayer interrupted to ask how high above the Church, and Mr. Kennedy indicated that driving by, the road is about 20 ft. to 30 ft. lower than the Church, and Cari agreed. Mr. Kennedy then stated that if you have the baseline and you are looking up at an angle, you are probably going to see maybe 10 ft. to 12 ft. of the top of the tree. Commissioner Mayer stated that he thought the Church is about 30 ft. tall, so you are going to see a lot more than that. Mr. Kennedy again explained that you would see less, because of the angle up. As you are moving in, you will see less of the top . . . Commissioner Mayer again interrupted to ask about the neighbors; he heard concerns about the neighbors. They are going to see the full height of that tree. Ms. Lamoureux pointed out that they have done photo simulations from the neighborhood for the neighbors, and for all of the ones that contacted her directly, they also have done additional photo simulations for them.

Chair Losoff asked staff to put up the criteria for a Conditional Use Permit, and Commissioner Klein stated that they give a bunch of measurements and say the top of the new monopine branches is 55 ft. Ms. Lamoureux clarified that it is 50 ft.; however, the Commissioner stated that was your original proposal, so he is looking at what was originally there and based on that . . . Chair Losoff stated it is 50 now, and Commissioner Klein indicated that when you look at all of the heights listed, it says the centerline of a future carrier antenna is 31 ft., and right now it says the centerline of a new Verizon antenna is 41 ft., and it said the top of the new monopine branch is 55 ft., so if you lower that 5 ft. and cut out the ability of a future carrier to collocate on this antenna, couldn't you shorten this antenna by 15 ft. and still achieve the same result that you want to achieve now? Mr. Kennedy explained that based on the modeling and the current drive test coverage of what is going on, as well as the capacity needed, when the engineering staff looked at it, 41 ft. was optimal for this type of site. They actually started, when the original search ring went out, looking for a 70 ft. centerline. Commissioner Klein stated that you are saying that a future carrier could go on here and the centerline of their antenna would be 31 ft.; he assumes that if a future carrier is going to go on here and their centerline is 31 ft., you would think that would be sufficient for the future

carrier, so if it is sufficient for the future carrier, why wouldn't it be sufficient for Verizon. Mr. Kennedy again explained they wanted to get the height to be able to cover and provide the capacity needed for what they have seen in the area, to add that additional carrier is a fact of typically whenever any wireless carrier or tower company builds a tower, they try to make it capable of handling multiple tenants. Once again, it is the same concept; the lower you go, the less coverage you are going to have, because it is going to get farther down into less coverage. They are not going to be able to see as far; the same concept where you are sitting up a little farther than the people in the chairs. The Commissioner then stated that what they are proposing is that a future carrier could collocate on this tower, and they are not going to get as good of a result as you are. Mr. Kennedy replied that they may not, that is correct, and Ms. Lamoureux added that every carrier has different requirements and every carrier may have different needs, so another carrier may be able to satisfy their current coverage or capacity needs at a lower centerline

Chair Losoff reminded the Commission that we are not here to determine what the carrier's motive is or how many will go on there; we put up the criteria for the Conditional Use Permit and that is what we need to be concerned about. If we think there is going to be too many carriers or other issues, then we judge it against our criteria for the Conditional Use Permit, so maybe we should put our attention more to the criteria than the things we are talking about.

Cari Meyer pointed out that they are proposing a 50 ft. monopine; however, the Code does allow up to a 90-ft. tower, so they are quite below the maximum height allowed by the City, and in addition, the City's Wireless Ordinance states that new monopines and facilities like this have to be designed to be co-locatable, so they do need to design it to accommodate at least one other carrier. Robert Pickels Jr. added that the applicant has identified through their design what their needs are, and if we take any action to reduce the scope of the project after they have described their needs, we run the risk of violating the Telecommunications Act, which says that we can't prohibit service, and one of the criteria is that if they have identified a gap in service and this is how they are going to fill that gap, and we require something less of them, then we run the risk of violating the Telecommunications Act.

Commissioner Mayer asked how many more carriers they anticipate to have on that tower. Ms. Lamoureux stated that it is currently designed for one additional carrier. Commissioner Mayer then stated, but it could be how many? Ms. Lamoureux repeated that it is currently designed for one additional carrier. The Commissioner stated that if you go and upgrade, how many carriers maximum, and Ms. Lamoureux said two carriers and Mr. Kennedy added, under this stress load the way it has been designed. The Commissioner then stated okay, it cannot be upgraded above two carriers, right? Mr. Kennedy explained that you could replace the tower and the Commissioner asked with a higher one or what, and Mr. Kennedy said it depends on the . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that the Commission is not discussing that tonight; we are discussing a Conditional Use Permit for the 50-ft. monotower. Commissioner Mayer stated that he is just asking what the future could bring; okay, so two carriers for right now. Mr. Kennedy stated yes, sir.

Chair Losoff added that he wishes that the Commission could get into a lot of these other areas, but it has been pointed out that it is not the City driving this; it is not the City mandating this. It is mandated by the Federal Government and the state as to what can or can't be done, and the Commission has very little room for maneuvering, so if we turn our attention more to

the Conditional Use Permit and see how that fits, we would all be able to adjust to it. Having no additional questions, the Chair then indicated that he would entertain a motion.

Cari Meyer pointed out that based on Commissioner Klein's comments and kind of going with the language in the Wireless Ordinance amendments, the additional condition would be, "The wireless communication facility owner shall submit a report to the Department of Community Development certifying structural and electrical integrity, as well as continued compliance with RF exposure standards specified in OET-65, upon activation of the facility and thereafter once every two years on the anniversary of the Certificate of Completion.

Commissioner Klein asked if she is taking that language from the proposed Section 1708 and Cari indicated from the Assistant City Manager's Memo for the next item. Vice Chair Levin stated that she would like to make another revision suggesting another one that the applicant shall modify the color of the monopine to reflect adjacent tree colors. Commissioner Klein then stated that he wants to make sure that we are clear that you are going to put the entire language of the proposed 1708 in the conditions, and Cari stated, with the exception of what is in the parentheses where it says 'other than amateur facility owners', yes. The Commissioner then wanted to know if she was putting in a, b and c as it states under 1708. The Chair noted that all we are asking for is a review in two years, and Commissioner Klein agreed, but stated that the language that is set forth in 1708 in the proposed Land Development Code -- he wants to make sure we are using that language.

Karen Osburn stated that just to articulate what letter c. says in 1708, it says the City may conduct periodic inspections with the cost of each such inspection paid by the owner of the wireless communication facility, as provided in the fee schedule of the City of Sedona. To ensure structural and electrical integrity, the owner of the wireless communication facility may be required by the City to have more frequent inspections if there is evidence that the wireless communication facility has a safety problem or is exposed to extraordinary conditions.

The Chair then asked if the Commission is okay with all of that, and no objection was expressed. The Chair stated that he thinks we have spent enough time on this, so he will entertain a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Brandt moved for approval of case number PZ16-00014 (CUP), Monopine Wireless Facility at Sedona United Methodist Church, based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Conditional Use Permit findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report and as discussed this evening concerning 1708 and also the tree color matching the native trees. Vice Chair Levin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Brandt stated that one thing to discuss was if that is an adequate motion to include the amendments, and Robert Pickels stated that it was. Commissioner Mayer then asked if he votes no is Verizon going to cut his service, and Chair Losoff asked the Commission to proceed with the motion.

VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and two (2) opposed. (Commissioners Kinsella and Mayer opposed.)

The Chair recessed the meeting at 7:52 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

- c. **(Continued from June 1, 2017, and August 1, 2017, Public Hearings) Discussion/possible action regarding a recommendation to the Sedona City Council regarding amendments to the Sedona Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance, Sedona Land Development Code, Article 17, Wireless Communications Facilities, to be consistent with changes in federal regulations. Case Number: PZ17-00005 (LDC) Applicant: City of Sedona**

Chair Losoff opened this item and noted that it is a continued discussion regarding the Sedona Wireless Communications Facilities Ordinance.

Presentation: Karen Osburn indicated that as Chair Losoff mentioned, this is the second continuation of the June 1st public hearing. Our last meeting was on August 1st, and her apology on the delay in bringing this item back to the Commission, but we spent the last several months doing a couple of things. One is attempting to research, react to, respond to some of the comments that came up and what seemed like some consensus direction or request to staff for additional information from the last meeting, that is articulated in your attached Memo and she will briefly walk you through those. The other thing that took some time for staff to reconcile is what exactly to do or how to handle and integrate the new state law into Article 17, which is our wireless ordinance. What staff ultimately came up with, after many, many iterations and attempts to try to do that, was that they are just simply not compatible. The regulations and things that we are trying to impose and govern and regulate in the ordinance are things that the state will not allow us to do for the small cell in the rights-of-way, which is what that legislation governs, so we have determined that the best course of action in handling these is to have Article 17 as a standalone that governs all wireless facilities, except those governed by the new state law and those will be incorporated into a section of our City Code, Chapter 12, which is our right-of-way permitting, because essentially that is all it is. It is an over-the-counter right-of-way permit; they are entitled to be there by right based on this new legislation. Now, the ordinance contemplates everything else, and not those particular wireless facility sitings.

Karen stated that just to run the Commission through the Memo quickly. There were certain comments that came from the Commissioners on the ordinance itself, and there were also some pertaining to the Master Plan. The Master Plan, for all intents and purposes, governs those nineteen city-owned properties that were originally included in the draft to be considered for potential wireless siting. First for Article 17 comments, the Commission requested that not only do the wireless facilities need to comply with the Federal regulations on radio frequency emissions, but that they prove it, so this is new in this iteration of the ordinance, and it is not in our existing ordinance. Cari just read the excerpt from that, so she won't re-read it, but essentially, it requires the provider to hire a certified RF Engineer, certify at the time that it becomes a live working facility that it complies and is under the thresholds set by the FCC for RF emissions, and that every two years they will be required to do the same thing, just so we have a certain level of comfort for the community that they are maintaining compliance with those regulations.

Chair Losoff asked about any resistance from anybody on that, and Karen explained that how it works in terms of getting this out to the providers, it will go through the Commission's process, and it is scheduled to go to the City Council for a work session on December 13th

provided that there are recommendations made by the Commission tonight, and it will then get distributed to the providers, so although we have had the public input process, what our consultant, CityScape, is telling us is that the providers don't even want to see it until it is just about a done deal, because they don't want to see an early version. They want to see that, and then at that point, they may react to it; whether or not, it didn't appear that we got much push back from the applicant that was here, but who knows what will come. They feel comfortable; our legal staff feels comfortable that this is something that is within our purview to require.

Karen Osburn stated that we did talk about the next one last time. This isn't brand new, but we did some clarifying language to ensure the noise limitations have some actual parameters around them, so it is not just that it can't be noisy, but that it actually has to adhere to the 55 decibels or 65 decibels, depending on what zoning district you are in.

Karen indicated that the next request was that we would write into the ordinance that faux trees may not be taller than 40 ft., so we struggled with this one a little bit, given the fact that the height restrictions in the ordinance are based not on types of concealment, which is what a faux tree is, but rather on a macro facility versus a small-cell facility. For small-cell facilities, the ordinance currently is written that they cannot exceed 30 ft., so it is actually more restrictive than this. The macro facilities, and we just discussed that in the current ordinance that is at 90 ft., and we have reduced that to 70 ft. Per the consultant -- we said what is the lowest we can get away with without basically getting sued or inhibiting providers' ability to provide service, and their recommendation was that 70 ft. mark. What we wrote into the ordinance in terms of additional restrictions is that any of the concealed facilities, and a faux tree is a concealed facility, shall be placed and constructed in such a manner as to be compatible with the existing structure or surrounding natural terrain. There should be as little contrast as possible between the communications equipment and the structure or the natural terrain around it. Based on the language, we would consider the height of the adjacent trees, and then have that discretion to regulate or impose that height restriction accordingly. There is an area, for example, the parking lot at the Jordan Historic Museum has trees that are much taller than 40 ft. At that point, if they wanted to do a faux tree to blend, they would need to go higher than 40 ft., in order to make that be able to communicate, so what we like here is the discretion for Planning & Zoning, if that is through a CUP or if through a contractual agreement, lease agreement for a city property, that it gives the Commission or the Director that discretion to determine what fits best given any particular site or surroundings.

Karen added that with all this said, maybe she should also just say that, for the benefit of anyone watching from the public, when the Commission at the last meeting made comments, and there did seem for certain things that there was consensus around; there was no actual vote, so it was not action. It was inquiry, request direction, so that is what staff is bringing back -- just some responses, some conversation points around these items. Tonight when the Commission takes action, those recommendations will be documented and passed along to the City Council. This doesn't mean that we're trying to undo anything that was already done, but just rather provide some additional information and additional considerations before you make your final determination.

Chair Losoff stated that Karen did a good job of getting back to us with where we are, what was acceptable and what was not. He wondered, since we've had meetings on meetings, and

this is a continuation, for him, given what you said earlier, state and federal law, there is not much we can do, but what we've already talked about. It is great to put it in a review in a couple of years and all this, but for tonight, he doesn't know how the other Commissioners feel, since we have talked about this ad nauseam. Should we just concentrate on the areas that we want to keep in or keep out, and agree to anything else that we've talked about? He then asked if that is okay with the Commission, and Vice Chair Levin indicated that said differently -- provide feedback on the recommendations in the packet. Chair Losoff stated that the recommendations are what we recommended last time; they are just basically saying here is what we did and here is what we didn't do, so all we have left is what should stay in and what shouldn't, but maybe he is wrong. Commissioner Brandt indicated that is a good place to start; he doesn't see why we would need to go beyond that, but who knows.

Vice Chair Levin asked if Karen wanted to continue, and Karen indicated that maybe the first question is if the Commission feels comfortable with the changes that have been made to the Ordinance and the iteration of the Ordinance that is currently in your packet. If you feel good about that, then we can deal with that item, and then move on to the Master Plan item. If there are other changes that you would like to see made or other recommendations for changes that you would like to have passed on to Council about the Ordinance itself, then this would be an appropriate time to provide that direction.

Chair Losoff stated that speaking for himself, he is comfortable with what we have. We are very limited in what we can do, and he doesn't know what we gain by having another discussion after having continued this several times, but he could be wrong.

Commissioner Barcus stated that he likes where we are, except he is reluctant to include any city-owned sites in the actual document. If we pass this and a wireless provider is aware of this and comes to us and asks if we have any city-owned sites in this specific area, we can offer up the city-owned sites that we've hashed over, but we don't need to document every city-owned site specifically, so that is his only comment at this point.

Karen explained that the sites were identified so they could go through a public process. If they go through a public process and the Commission and City Council agree that they are appropriate, whether that is with particular stipulations about types of facilities, etc., but at that point, it would not require them to obtain a CUP. If they complied with locating at those sites with all the restrictions that have been agreed to in the Master Plan, that would be an administrative approval. That is the only thing that provides an incentive to the providers to site there, and in accordance with those stipulations. If they have to go through the same public process, then they can pick any site, and they can do only what is in the Code and not more than that. As a landlord, we can require more than that, so that was the whole point of doing the Master Plan, so we had some incentive to these providers to say here are the sites that have already been vetted and determined to be appropriate for this type of use.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that when we visited those sites, concerns were about the impact on neighboring residents, correct? Karen stated yes, and the Commissioner stated that the least impact the more likely that site would be suitable for something like a cell tower and the height. We discussed one in the Brewer Road area off the church down below, where we looked at the height of the trees and determined a few more feet higher is not a problem, right? He would like to see something which is that the residents are going to be involved in

any of those cell tower possibilities, locations. Is that possible? Karen indicated that she is not sure she understands. The Commissioner stated that he wants to find out if the residents have any say in regards of a proposed location for a cell tower.

Karen explained that is what this public process has been about; that is why we sent the letters out to everyone within 300 ft. of each of the sites, that is why we have the public hearings. We've gotten many, many, many comments and inquiries from residents. The next phase of this development and finalization of the Master Plan is to take it to the City Council through again work sessions, public comment periods and public hearings before that would become final, so that is where we are engaging the public in getting that feedback about what sites are preferable or not. Commissioner Mayer stated that needs to be a high concern and high priority; that is all he has to say right now.

Karen stated that we haven't discussed the five sites that were brought up at the last meeting to be tentatively recommended to be taken off. Chair Losoff stated that he wanted to come back to those. At this point, we are just talking . . . Karen interjected that the last two inquiries were about the city-owned sites, so she didn't want . . . the Chair said, no, we want to come back to that; we're just kind of concurring with your first part.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he is going to come back to a broad statement that regardless of the intent, which is awesome, the whole new Ordinance took the wind out of the sales, but he still sees it as somewhat of an endorsement of certain areas, and he can't get on board with a recommendation if we are still including city-owned property that looks like National Forest, acts like National Forest, quacks like a National Forest or is adjoining or is residentially-zoned. It makes sense if they can put it right out in the street in front of it, but that is not the City endorsing it, so it is almost like public relations, let it be on the state and the cell phone folks; let them take the heat instead of the City of Sedona, because he is tired of people complaining about government, but if you want to talk individually about the sites, then he will jump in on that.

Chair Losoff asked for the Commission to finish the first part about staff's recommendations and feeding back our recommendations; what you have accepted and so forth. If not, we can go on to specific sites.

No additional questions were asked, so the Chair said alright, specific sites. He is getting emails all over the place on Sugarloaf and why do we keep it in, why do we take it out? We haven't taken any stand on it yet, have we? Karen stated that at the last meeting, Commissioner Brandt suggested that those five sites – A1, A2, M, O and P be recommended to be removed, but because the Commission did not act on it, staff is bringing it back for the Commission to act on it tonight.

Karen stated that first, the Newcastle Lane site and the Panorama site, which were the sites that Commissioner Brandt referenced as being residentially-zoned. They are both sites for lift stations, but they are very small parcels and they are located in residential neighborhoods. While the Panorama site sits on a city street and may be subject to having something located in the right-of-way, Newcastle is not, so the young lady who spoke earlier and said Newcastle is a private street is correct, so that one does seem to be in alignment with the rationale for why it isn't an appropriate site. Panorama . . . Vice Chair Levin interrupted to ask, because in

your description of those, you say that you concurred with the Commission; however, they might be still suitable under certain circumstances for small cell facilities, so it sounds like there is still the possibility that it would be appropriate, and if so, can you tell us what a small cell facility is?

Karen Osburn explained that the reason she is clarifying that Newcastle is on a private street is because the justification, which is the same for the Buena Vista and Sugarloaf sites, the Back O'Beyond site and those two sites, is that if you can site it, a small cell is essentially what is now regulated by the state, so although small cell in our Ordinance is for things that would be sited outside of the City right-of-way, limited to 30 ft. in height and a much smaller footprint than what the state says, which is why we had a hard time reconciling those; the state says it can be up to 50 ft. and a larger footprint. She doesn't have the exact dimensions and things of the adjacent equipment in front of her, but that is what small cell is. When we refer to small cell, the only one that we have currently in the existing inventory in the City is the one from the Church of the Red Rocks. Vice Chair Levin asked if that is 30 ft. and Karen stated it is 27 ft.

Chair Losoff stated which is why our discussions here are somewhat . . . Karen agreed, but indicated that Newcastle, which is the exception, because the state law does not govern private streets; it only governs city-owned streets -- public right-of-way that is non-state owned, so for that one, it may be reasonable to recommend that that one be omitted. Vice Chair Levin indicated that she would certainly support that.

Karen then explained that the only justification for both the Back O'Beyond parking lot and the Sugarloaf Trail parking lot is that they may end up being preferable if we can encourage the provider to go there instead of right in the streetscape, but truly it is going to be their choice.

Chair Losoff again indicated that given all we have talked about, we have Newcastle Lane, Panorama (audio unclear) do we want to agree to discourage people from using them? Take them out as recommended, are we okay with this? Vice Chair Levin indicated yes, but she would also agree to remove Sugarloaf as well.

The Chair indicated there is a consensus and Commissioner Brandt wanted to confirm that the Vice Chair meant both of them, and she stated yes. Chair Losoff commented that he is not sure he can muddy the water by saying that if a small -- let's just maybe take it out. Vice Chair Levin indicated that she is saying nothing -- small cell, big cell, tall monopine. Commissioner Brandt stated that he became aware of the Arroyo Pinon site; that is a sewer station at the end of Arroyo Pinon; it is not residential, not forest, but it is not a trailhead in other words. Vice Chair Levin asked if that is Carroll Canyon and Audree Juhlin stated it is at the end of Arroyo Pinon. Commissioner Brandt noted that there is a petition against that one. Again, it is like public relations. Why encourage it in a place where the general public is not, and if they can put it out in the street, it is like don't do it; don't piss off the neighbors just because well, we could.

Chair Losoff indicated that Commissioner Brandt always raises a good point. It doesn't matter what we come up with, we need to push hard on the fact, it is not us; we're not the ones . . . Commissioner Brandt interrupted to say we are endorsing it though, through this, so we are

endorsing it. Commissioner Brandt added that we are trying to minimize the impact of the Federal Government and the state.

Karen stated that is true, but we are at some point talking about two different things. The small cell is what they have unfettered access to do in the rights-of-way. We just approved an example of a macro site; they needed a different type of coverage. Our general understanding of the industry from the consultants is that the industry is moving towards that small cell and we are probably going to see less of the macro, but one of the things about the macro is that it is not always big towers, so there are some very inconspicuous concealments that can be done as part of buildings. They talked about the antenna that is built into the Church that no one has any idea is there, so for example, that lift site is not a small little pump station like Panorama or Newcastle. It is an actual building, so if someone were to want to come in and need to provide coverage to that area and could do a parapet on that rooftop, that may be very inconspicuous and preferable to putting something, and if they need a tower or something that is of that macro radius and coverage, then we may still see those. There may be some providers that need that before we fully transition to everything becoming the small cell distributed antenna type of system. That would be the only reason why, for a site like that, we might want to continue to keep it in the list of consideration.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that the unspoken issue relates to health issues, and as we all know, we are not to discuss them nor do we have jurisdiction over them, so it is not only aesthetics that the neighbors are pushing back on, and while that can't be part of our reasoning, it certainly made its way into her head, and it's important to acknowledge that there are other concerns that the neighbors have about siting, and they are not only about location and aesthetics.

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission requested information that we received on retesting every two years; that was put in. We asked about noise and put in some criteria. We talked about faux trees may not be taller than 40 ft. and we have your comments and recommendation there. We had comments and discussion and you brought us back recommendations on that. We talked about limiting tower placement on city-owned sites, concealing macro or replacement towers and new ones, and he thinks we are okay with all of that, so that can be incorporated into the plan. The next question is the next section in Karen's Memo about the sites that we just discussed, are we okay limiting what we put in there. Vice Chair Levin stated A1, A2, P, M and O.

Chair Losoff then stated that as Karen pointed out, because the City's right-of-way is now governed by the state, she is taking this out of this code and putting it into Chapter 12, and also the Land Development Code, Article 17, that identified the siting of wireless facilities on National Forest, we don't really have any jurisdiction over that, so that comes out of our Code too.

Commissioner Klein stated that in the old Land Development Code on setbacks, they had to be away from residential properties by a minimum distance of 150% of the tower height, and in the new Code it has to be a minimum distance of 100% of the tower height, so he is curious as to why we are reducing it. Karen explained that was simply a recommendation from the consultants, and quite frankly, that wasn't something that we really explored further with them. We can certainly go back to them and ask that questions, but she thinks the breakpoint

technology item, which was 110%, was consistent, and what they are telling us is that they are all made with breakpoint technology, so that may have been the reason, but staff did not specifically ask that question, so she can't be sure of that. The Commissioner then stated that if you had a 50 ft. tower and the breakpoint is 25 ft., the setback would have to be 110% of 25 ft., and Karen stated yes.

Commissioner Klein indicated that Karen said that because of the new Arizona law, we are removing that aspect from Article 17 of the Land Development Code, but even though there is the new law, if someone wants to put up a wireless facility pursuant to that new law, can we still require them to certify that it complies with the radio frequency requirements of the FCC and require them to do testing every two years? Karen stated that initially, the response from the consultant was that we could, because all of the facilities need to comply with OET-65. As to what we are allowed to do and because this is a brand-new law, much of this hasn't been tested on this specific legislation, but we're allowed to regulate things pertaining to health, safety, welfare and aesthetics if it's a requirement of the Feds, she thinks their opinion was that we could impose that they prove they are in compliance with the Federal law, but it is not explicit in the legislation. Robert Pickels Jr. then asked Commissioner Klein if he is talking about with respect to right-of-way in Chapter 12, and Commissioner Klein stated right. Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that is really not the subject of the discussion tonight; that is something we are going to address with the City Council on a different day.

The Commissioner then indicated that he was curious about some language that is in one of the sections that the towers have to be compatible with the existing structure, and he asked what is meant by 'existing structure'. Karen explained that is for a base station application, so what she just described on potentially the lift station building, where they could build a parapet and hide it, they would just need to build that so it is compatible with the existing structure.

Commissioner Kinsella asked if we could talk about language in the definitions or do you want to stay to this point, and the Chair asked to stay to this point, since we had a lot of issues discussed, but if it is a matter of definition or maybe technical, you could bring it up with staff afterwards, if it is not changing any substance. Commissioner Kinsella stated that when you get into the definitions, there is the definition of antenna array and a definition of antenna element, and the definition of antenna element says any antenna or antenna array, so it harkens back to that without really defining it, and she would like to suggest changing that definition to say any antenna or part of an antenna as the definition.

Chair Losoff confirmed staff had gotten that and indicated it was no problem. The Chair then indicated that he had certainly had enough conversations and he keeps repeating that we are limited as to what we can and cannot do, and staff and the Commission has come up with some very effective modifications to minimize the impact of any of this going forward, so at this point, more discussion, and then open it up for a motion.

Commissioner Brandt asked to add Arroyo Pinon to the list that is deleted and there was no objection from the Commissioners. Karen clarified that she thinks the Commissioner is referring to the El Camino lift station, site E1, and Commissioner Brandt stated E1 Camino, yes.

Commissioner Kinsella asked for clarification for her own understanding; you talked about removing sites, and the sites are M, O, A1, A2 and P, so which ones are remaining? Chair Losoff asked her to talk to staff afterwards. Commissioner Brandt indicated that there is about a dozen or so, and the Chair added that he thinks there were 19 originally. Commissioner Kinsella indicated that her question was misunderstood and clarified that of the sites that she just said, are all of them being removed now, and Chair Losoff indicated yes.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that he would make the motion and he assumes we are doing two motions. The first motion is PZ17-00005 Wireless Communications.

MOTION: Commissioner Barcus moved to recommend to City Council approval of case number PZ17-00005, updating Article 17 (Wireless Communications) of the Sedona Land Development Code. Commissioner Mayer seconded the motion.

Commissioner Brandt asked if this includes the alterations we did, and Vice Chair Levin stated that is the next one.

VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

- d. (Continued from June 1, 2017, and August 1, 2017, Public Hearings) Discussion/possible action regarding a recommendation to the Sedona City Council regarding the draft Sedona Wireless Communications Master Plan. Case Number: PZ17-00006 (MP) Applicant: City of Sedona

See discussion under agenda item c. above.

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved to recommend to City Council approval of case number PZ17-00006(MP) adopting the Wireless Master plan, including the modifications to eliminate the following properties identified in the Staff Report as A1, 2070 Buena Vista Drive; A2, 2050 Buena Vista Drive, and P, 515 Back O'Beyond Road, and M at 11 Newcastle Lane, and O at 160 Panorama Boulevard, and the site identified E1 in the El Camino area. Commissioner Klein seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

Chair Losoff thanked staff for their work and expressed appreciation for what the Commissioners had done to modify and make some major adjustments to this plan. Vice Chair Levin added, and listen to the public.

5. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Thursday, November 16, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
- b. Tuesday, November 21, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
- c. Thursday, November 30, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
- d. Tuesday, December 5, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)

Audree Juhlin stated that the Thursday, November 16th work session is canceled. The Tuesday, November 21st regular meeting also is canceled; that is Thanksgiving week. The next meeting will be November 30th, that is a Thursday and we will be discussing amendments to the Land Development Code. Then, we will have a meeting on Tuesday, December 5th, to

discuss to Conditional Use Permits we are currently processing for a food truck and Whole Foods. On January 11, we are proposing a retreat with the Commission for approximately four hours from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. with lunch, and it will be on the City Hall campus.

Commissioner Barcus asked if that will be jointly with the City Council and Audree Juhlin indicated no, but it will be a public meeting. Vice Chair Levin indicated that since we are talking about future meetings, she thought a 450-page packet . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that is not on the agenda, but we can discuss that at the retreat. He encouraged the Commissioners to let Audree know about what items you would like to put on the retreat. It should be an open meeting with anything and everything to be discussed. We should be able to put on the table . . . Robert Pickels cautioned that we have a limited amount of time and we do have certain issues identified that we, at the staff level, would like to discuss with the Commission, so we have to be realistic about what we can add. The Chair indicated that if we do see a lot of things coming back from the Commission maybe we can extend the time, and . . . Vice Chair Levin interrupted to ask when the agenda would be shared, and Audree Juhlin indicated that she could sent it out this week to get it tentatively on your calendars.

6. 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 constitute 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.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 8:45 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 7, 2017.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date