

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, October 12, 2017- 3:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL

Commissioner Brandt called the work session to order at 3:34 p.m. and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

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

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, James Crowley, Andy Dickey, Cari Meyer, Ryan Mortillaro, Rob Pollock, Robert Pickels Jr. and Donna Puckett

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

Warren Campbell asked Commissioners to speak clearly and project their voice for the recording.

3. Discussion action regarding a request for a Zone Change and Development Review to construct a new 90 room hotel (Marriott Residence Inn) at 4105 W State Route 89A. The property is zoned L (Lodging) and OS (Open Space). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the southeast corner of W State Route 89A and Upper Red Rock Loop Road. APN: 408-11-430B. Applicant: Sunridge Hotel Group (Paul Welker) Case Number: PZ16-00009 (ZC, DEV)

Presentation: Cari Meyer explained that there had been some questions about the Community Focus Area Plan, so City Attorney Robert Pickels Jr. will give an overview of that aspect of the project. Robert Pickels Jr. stated that there were some questions about whether or not the CFA Plan would apply to this rezoning request. There was a Development Agreement that was executed with respect to the first phase of the Marriott project. In that Development Agreement, there was an agreement for the developer to come back through a zoning process if there was an increase in the lodging units for the second phase, so it was identified in that development that there might be a second phase, and the CFA Plan was adopted in between the development of the Marriott project and the submittal of this new application, so the question is whether or not the CFA requirements will be applied to this new project and is it a traditional rezoning or if it is a new zoning application in the traditional sense.

The City Attorney stated that their counsel is present today, and we have talked about whether this is a traditional rezoning or a major amendment to the development plan that existed for the Marriott project. The Land Development Code has two different processes outlined for those two different things. The language of the Development Agreement is less than clear, unfortunately. It doesn't give specific direction on whether or not this is a major amendment to the Development Agreement or whether it should be considered as a new zoning application. It simply says that the developer agrees to bring it back through the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council. It is not specific as to the designation between those two things, so there is a dispute as to that. There is a disagreement of different interpretations.

Robert Pickels Jr. stated that we are working through that and the preference of the applicant's counsel and the City is that we look to try and harmonize that difference into something that is still consistent with the Community Focus Area, but not necessarily requiring all of the details of the CFA, as they would be applied to a new zoning application. He has not had a chance to follow-up with their counsel regarding the current status of those discussions, so he doesn't know if there was anything that their legal counsel wanted to add.

Applicant's Legal Counsel Jeff Blilie, Phoenix, AZ: Mr. Blilie indicated that they have had some discussions back and forth, and it was his understanding as well that the process, for all intents and purposes, will be the same process; it goes to P&Z and Council. It is the applicability of the CFA and they have tried to harmonize their project with the CFA as best they can and meet the intent of the CFA, but not necessarily technically covering every aspect.

The City Attorney added that he didn't want to use the word 'compromise', but this is the best approach, while still respecting what the overlying requirements are for the CFA with respect for this project, but not saying that if it doesn't check every box and is not 100% consistent with the CFA, then it should be denied. It is going to be an issue to work through as this project works its way through the system, but if we can get to a point where it is for the most part consistent with the intent of the CFA, then that is appropriate.

Commissioners' Questions of the City Attorney:

Commissioner Cohen asked if the request for 211 from 121 affects this in any way, and Cari Meyer explained that the increase in the number of lodging units is why it is going through the Commission and City Council. Warren Campbell added that the process would be the same even if they had just one extra unit, so it is not the number 90; it is the increase of one. Robert Pickels Jr. agreed that is clearly spelled out in the Development Agreement. It says that if it is even increased by one lodging unit that triggers this additional process.

Commissioner Brandt commented that it is then less the design and development standards; the discussion revolves around exactly what is expected to be submitted as far as documentation, just the process to get to the same point. Robert Pickels Jr. clarified that the design standards are still an issue, but having said that, there were only a couple of minor discrepancies between what was submitted and what the CFA would have required and that is what he wasn't sure had been resolved yet. Commissioner Brandt then stated that how it addresses the CFA is the real question as to which path it takes and how that adjusts to the CFA.

Commissioner Klein indicated that the Development Agreement says that any additional development will require resubmittal to P&Z and City Council pursuant to the requirements of the current Lodging District, so when you look at the Land Development Code under the Lodging District, Section 629.01, it says that the lodging has to be consistent with the Sedona Community Plan or specific plan for the area, which would be the CFA, so doesn't that say this has to basically satisfy the requirements of the CFA? Robert Pickels Jr. stated that it might, which is why there is a difference of interpretation, and we are trying to come up with something that would avoid a Prop 207 challenge and potential litigation. He can't say, "No, it wouldn't", because that has certainly been the City's position. Commissioner Klein confirmed that the City Attorney meant that it has to be consistent with the CFA, and then stated that if that is the City's position, then why shouldn't the Commission follow that? Robert Pickels Jr. again stated that it is less than clear. The language is not clear when you look at the Land Development Code in the Lodging designation for what constitutes a major amendment to the development plan. It talks about an increase in lodging units, which is the applicant's argument that that is what was intended by the Development Agreement, and we think something different was intended by the Development Agreement. Maybe a third party would have to decide what the clear intent of the parties was at the time the Development Agreement was executed, which is not in anybody's best interest.

Commissioner Klein asked, whether it is a major amendment or a rezoning, how do you get around the fact that this section in the Land Development Code says it has to be consistent with the specific plan for the area? That doesn't seem ambiguous language to him. Robert Pickels Jr. asked when the specific plan was adopted; at the time the Development Agreement was executed or after; there is a timing issue that creates a problem. Commissioner Klein agreed and indicated that one of the problems he has is that the Development Agreement acknowledges there is going to be additional lodging on this parcel, and the CFA was adopted after that, so knowing that there was going to be additional lodging on this parcel, if the intent of the CFA was to – in other words, why did the CFA say there should be mixed-use here, meaning commercial, lodging, multi-family? If

you already know there is going to be lodging there, and if that is acceptable to just have the lodging, why didn't the CFA say we are just having lodging here? Why put in all of that language about there should be mixed uses? Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that without getting into that, maybe a better approach at this stage in the review process is to look at how close this project is going to be to the CFA standards anyway, irrespective of whether or not it meets every specific item. Why don't we get it through and see if there is a significant enough discrepancy that it warrants further analysis? Commissioner Brandt then added that the CFA is for anytime; it might stick for 100 years in updates for this property, and these folks may or may not have come through with their hotel, and somebody else might buy the property and do something different, and then it would or would not address the CFA.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that in a presentation to the City Council, the developer was asked what kind of development is in a residential neighborhood, and he said that it is kind of a residential development anyway, because it is called Residence Inn. Mr. Welker stated that was correct. The Commissioner then asked where the residence is; it is a hotel called Residence Inn and Mr. Welker explained that it is classified as an extended stay. . . Commissioner Brandt requested that Commissioner Mayer hold off on that question until we finalize any more questions for Counsel regarding the question of the CFA and the path we are taking. Commissioner Mayer stated that the CFA is multi-family housing, etc., and Robert Pickels Jr. reminded the Commission that staff has a presentation to give.

Presentation: Cari Meyer explained the purpose of work session is for the Commission to provide comments and feedback on the project prior to a public hearing. We have not yet scheduled the public hearing, but your comments and feedback should focus on what additional information you need to be able to take action on the project, and your comments should not include an evaluation of the merits of the project or whether you are in support of the project, etc. It is really what additional information you will need to make a decision.

Cari indicated that the staff and review agency comments received are in the packet, and they also were provided to the applicant, and as stated in the memo, they have provided some responses to staff's comments, but staff has not had a chance to review those, so staff's comments are based on their July submittal. There was a subsequent October submittal that staff will be reviewing and providing an evaluation of as part of the public hearing process.

Cari identified the location of the property and indicated that the Applicant Paul Welker is present in addition to Architect Mark Fredstrom with Architecture Plus. Cari indicated that the site is just over eight acres with this project being just over three acres, and the area proposed for this development is currently vacant, but the site does have the Courtyard hotel on it. She showed a Vicinity Map and identified the surrounding area and, on an aerial view, pointed out the location of the proposal and the existing lodging.

Cari indicated that the Community Plan designates this property as Commercial and Open Space, with the Commercial portion of the property being within the Lodging Area Limits. The open space is just over three-quarters of an acre and it is within the Western Gateway CFA. The current zoning is Lodging for 121 units and Open Space, and they are proposing to increase the 121 units allowed to 211, which is an increase of 90 units for the proposed project. There is no proposed change to the Open Space zoning.

Cari referenced a Zoning Map showing the property and indicated that the properties to the north in darker blue are Planned Development, which encompass the Cultural Park area and the Summit timeshare development; there are some other commercial properties in the area, with the orange being the high school, the residential zoning to the east in yellow, and the green is National Forest.

Cari stated that the vision of the Western Gateway CFA Plan states, "The Western Gateway will be a sustainably developed, distinct, active, walkable and vibrant place with a diversity of land uses

that attracts both locals and visitors while promoting health, wellness, arts, and education, achieving harmony with the natural environment and creating a sense of arrival to the community.”

Cari explained that the City Attorney was referring to the general intent of the vision of the area and the general statements for the Southside Character Area when he said that we are looking at how this project complies.

Cari showed the proposed site plan and pointed out that it would continue the parking lot along the front of the property; it was established with the Courtyard project. The Residence Inn project is currently proposed in three separate buildings so that the buildings follow the topography as it steps down to the south towards the National Forest. They are proposing 90 lodging units with a little bit of meeting space in that building as well. The proposal also includes a trailhead connection with some parking available for trailhead use, an affordable housing contribution, and a City easement given to the City for the odor treatment facility at the northeast corner of the property. They are also incorporating easements for the neighboring subdivisions, which are required as part of the previous agreement.

Cari referenced a Context Map showing how the property fits in with the surrounding neighborhood and relates to the neighboring subdivisions and the highway. She then showed the elevations provided by the applicant and explained that the top elevation would be the view from the street, the parking lot and SR 89A, and the other two would be visible from the Foothills South neighborhood. The rest of the elevations keep the same architectural theme and would be visible either from the Courtyard and other areas of the site, but the first ones are the ones that would be visible from the more public areas.

Cari explained that staff reviews this application for the Community Plan and CFA Plan, and we also look at the Land Development Code, Development Standards and Design Review Manual. Many of our comments are related to how it fits with the height requirements, and we have been working on that with the project’s Architect. We also look at it from access; traffic; connectivity from both the vehicular and pedestrian standpoint; grading and drainage, and wastewater disposal.

Cari noted that it was routed to all of the review agencies and we received comments from Community Development and Public Works Departments plus the Fire District and the U.S. Forest Service, because they are proposing a trail connection. The applicant had at least two open houses and the documents have been available on the Community Development website. We did a conceptual hearing last year, which was publicly noticed, and a future public hearing will be noticed in the same manner. We also have been collecting comments on this project for almost a year, so all of the comments received were provided.

Cari then added that as a reminder, today’s work session is to provide feedback, discuss what additional information you would like to see or ask questions. Staff, including the engineering staff, the applicant and his representatives are present.

Applicant Paul Welker indicated that they would be happy to answer any questions. Commissioner Brandt asked if the applicant had anything to add in a presentation and Mr. Welker indicated that they didn’t; staff did a good job of presenting what they are doing, but they would be happy to answer any questions.

Commission’s Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Barcus indicated that the Commission has seen this in a design earlier, but he couldn’t figure out when. Cari Meyer indicated that it was actually last November as a conceptual hearing and there was minimal information, and then with that feedback the applicant provided the comprehensive and staff has been working with them. They have done a couple of different submittals where staff provided some comments and asked for additional information, but held off on bringing it back to you until a number of those questions were answered.

Commissioner Barcus referenced the big picture stuff the Commission saw last November and provided our comments and noted that this is sort of a follow-on conceptual meeting. Cari Meyer indicated yes, the idea of a conceptual review is that any big picture items are asked and answered or at least they are made aware of the issues, so they don't design a project that would be completely outside of anything the Commission would consider. They know they are on the right path, and now you are provided with more details. Commissioner Barcus commented that they are incorporating the comments they heard from the Commission at that time, and Cari indicated yes, that is the way the process works. Commissioner Barcus indicated that since the Commission knew most of the details last November, he is confused as to why we have a disagreement of whether this is an issue related to the original Development Agreement at the Marriott Courtyard and the subsequent phase two development for a CFA issue. Did we just go to sleep between November and October or has this been festering? Cari Meyer explained that the one issue that was brought up during that was the housing. The CFA Plan is more specific about what kind of housing contribution projects are expected, but what came before the Commission last November was an 88-unit Residence Inn with four employee housing units, and now it is a 90-room Residence Inn, so that increased that by two. Some of the changes to the building necessitated . . . , the Commissioner interrupted to thank Cari for answering his next question, and Cari continued to state, a cash contribution for housing instead of the onsite units

Commissioner Mayer indicated that he wanted to follow-up on his first interaction with staff, and he would like to ask the developer what he meant when he presented the project to the City Council and said this is a kind of residential development. Wouldn't that fit into the CFA if it was kind of residential development, because it is called Residence inn and people have an opportunity to stay there, because people have relatives in the hospital, so they can visit and stay there? Mr. Welker confirmed that is correct. The Commissioner then stated that parents can stay there and visit a student; we don't have a hospital here, we don't have a college here or a university with a dorm or anything of that sort, so wouldn't a B&B fulfill that demand?

Mr. Welker explained that some customers want to use Airbnb and some want to go through a more traditional approach, so they know what they are going to get, whereas, Airbnb may not fulfill that. An example of a situation they just had at the Courtyard was a group came in that was booked through Cerner Travel, and they were doing re-computerization of all of the hospitals in the Verde Valley. They came in the end of July and wanted a situation like the Residence Inn, because they were here for two months. They provided 45 to 50 rooms per night or about 30 to 70 rooms for two months, and they were refitting all of the hospitals' computer systems, so they were here long-term. They traded out people occasionally, but they were here for two to four weeks servicing all of the hospitals in the Verde Valley, and they provided a half-million dollars in business to them. They wanted full kitchens, so it is not all one aspect, but it is a lot of things and in situations like that, people come in and they can't go to a timeshare with that many people and coordinate who is coming and going. Some were here for a week and some were here for eight weeks.

Commissioner Mayer asked if Mr. Welker was sure that there is a demand for this type of hotel, hospitality, and Mr. Welker pointed out that he is spending a lot of money based on that. Commissioner Mayer then commented that he is sure that Mr. Welker did his marketing, and Mr. Welker agreed and explained that they have built other at Residence Inns, and they have checked people in that have stayed for one year, and they have had people stay longer than a year.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the daily, weekly or monthly rate, and Mr. Welker explained that it varies based on demand and the length of stay; the longer, the less. People like that because it has full amenities; they have a full kitchen and the Residence Inn Program is they will do the grocery shopping, so if you are working or disabled. . . Commissioner Mayer interjected that it is full service, and Mr. Welker stated yes, per se. If they want services as part of the program, they will have the laundry done, buy their groceries, etc. It is very different from a typical hotel room. It serves a different function, and they have a choice of a studio, one-bedroom or two-bedroom unit. Commissioner Mayer then wanted to know the total square footage, and Mr. Welker indicated that he believes that it is about 80,000 sq. ft. on two floors. The Commissioner then asked about the

cost per unit per square foot, and Mr. Welker stated that it is going up. They haven't bid this out, but obviously it is more expensive to build in Sedona, so off the top of his head, he would say at least \$150 per foot, notwithstanding any difficult issues, etc. Commissioner Mayer then stated that he may come back with some additional questions.

Commissioner Cohen asked if there is a difference in the tax you charge Mr. X staying in a hotel room versus one that is staying in a suite. Paul Welker explained that the bed tax is an ordinance passed by the City and it is a percentage that stays the same based on the dollar amount you spend. Commissioner Cohen repeated his question and Mr. Welker stated that typically they charge more in the suites, so the City would collect more bed tax. The Commissioner then asked if the tax percentage is the same, and Mr. Welker stated yes.

Commissioner Cohen then asked the City Attorney if that helps in looking at the difference between a residence and a hotel, because if a tax is being charged the same as it is on a hotel, then doesn't that provide a definition that deals with the issue? Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that he didn't have an answer to that. The Commissioner then indicated that it needs to be looked at, that is the line in his mind. Paul Welker commented that if the City would waive that, they wouldn't charge it in the suites. Commissioner Cohen stated that where he is going is does this fit as residence or as a hotel, and if you are charging a hotel tax, does that not by definition make it a hotel? He doesn't know the answer; that would be between you guys.

Commissioner Cohen then referenced the presentation last time and indicated that a question was raised about what kind of screening would go in parking lot so it doesn't look like a used car lot, so he is assuming the architect has given that some thought. Mr. Welker stated that was one of the things they addressed. They changed that and did a line of sight drawing where you are not going to see the tops of the cars. Mark Fredstrom added that there should be two images on the screen that show a cross section across S.R. 89A, and they also had a perspective rendering done with their (audio unclear) berm and gabion. Paul Welker explained that one of the things they want to do is the City Code only allows a 3 ft. wall, and they proposed taking that to 4 ft. with the gabion rock, individual placements, so you don't see anything. They would happily do the 3 ft., which would more than meet the normal screening requirement, but their intent is to not have any cars visible.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he understands that you need visibility of the hotel, so people can find it and it is part of your advertising. Paul Welker agreed, but explained that they want to screen that parking lot and they are willing to do that; that is important, and Residence Inn is a little different too, because the customer that is looking for a Residence Inn may be staying for a longer period of time, so they will find it. In the development world, Residence Inns don't necessarily have to be on the prime corner with the highest traffic and visibility, because people will find it, since they are looking for a little bit different animal than a standard hotel room. Again, these still perform an overnight hotel function, but it is a different build with full kitchens, and it serves a different audience than a typical hotel.

Cari Meyer stated that from a land use perspective, staff looks at length of stay, and if they are allowed to be less than 30 days, it is considered to be a hotel. Regarding the question about the screening, Cari showed the items that were submitted showing the proposed screening, and indicated there is some drainage work between the sidewalk and the wall that would screen the parking lot. She pointed out the line of sight and the location of S.R. 89A. Paul Welker then pointed out the swale and Cari identified S.R. 89A, the sidewalk, swale, screen wall, parking lot and buildings. Mr. Welker added that the screen wall would have dense landscaping behind it, all with mature trees. Commissioner Mayer commented hopefully denser than what you have now in front of the Marriott, and Mr. Welker stated that it would be. Mark Fredstrom then pointed out that the gabion wall also has offsets, so it is not a straight line and within those offsets, there are plantings shown on both sides of the wall.

Commissioner Brandt asked about a comment in the memo indicating there was some discrepancy regarding the screen wall, and Cari explained that staff was looking for clarification as to the

description that it would be bermed, and then the wall would be on top of that, and through the zoning process certain variations of the height requirement can be approved, so we were trying to get clarification on what they were asking for, because the Code does limit wall height in the front yard to 3 ft., but based on the comments from the Commission and the public, there seems to be support for increasing that height. As far as screening, we weren't saying they had to make it lower; we were just looking for clarification, so if they ask for the exception, we would know what that would be. Commissioner Brandt then asked if the applicant understands that, and Mr. Welker stated yes.

Paul Welker indicated that some of the adjacent subdivisions have walls that are 6 ft. tall, if you look at the condos in front of Foothills South and also at the timeshares across the way, but they don't want a 6 ft. wall, unless the City wanted a 6 ft. wall, then they would do it. They are not that concerned about visibility; they will find it. There is a great demand for that product in this market. They are confident and when they did the Courtyard and the original Development Agreement, they planned for the additional units, notwithstanding the fact that they knew they would have to come back here, they put in a lift station in front of the hotel to accommodate the future hotel, so they spent that money for the infrastructure, sewer lift station and utilities, and all of that is already in based on their original plans to do a second hotel.

Commissioner Cohen stated that his concern is not the size of the wall, and Mr. Welker asked the Commissioner to tell him what he wants. The Commissioner indicated that he is concerned about as S.R. 260 is getting redesigned and built, there is going to be a lot more traffic through the Western Gateway, because S.R. 179 is difficult to manage, so the Marriott is the 'hi guys, you are in Sedona'. He doesn't care about the size of the wall; he cares about how it looks in terms of greeting people to Sedona, so it can be done with vegetation or whatever. The goal is to make it a good greeting into the City. Paul Welker agreed and indicated that they don't want to do anything that is going to take away from their project, so if the Commission came back and said they want the wall to be 4 ft., it will be aesthetically correct. If you look at the Courtyard, the way everything is done, there was no skimping there with the walls and barriers, etc. They are going to make it look right and it will be done in a way that is compatible with what you want and what they want to be presented.

Commissioner Mayer asked them about improving the appearance in front of the Marriott; it is just skimpy almost dead trees. Mr. Welker stated that if they are almost dead, they will get pulled out. The Commissioner then asked if there could be some improvement like they just described for the Residence Inn. Mr. Welker explained that they have a lot of people that just rave about it and like the rocks more than the trees – that is why they come here. They don't want to put a ton of trees there, but they could add some if that was an issue. We are talking about the Residence Inn, but if that is what you all felt in weighing everything and that is a consensus, they are more than willing to discuss doing that. It would not be difficult; the infrastructure is there to do it, but because we designed that swale, it is all done with rock up to the back of that retaining wall. People walk along that sidewalk and take family pictures there. The Commissioner asked if they take rocks too, and Mr. Welker stated that they could have the rocks, but you would be surprised how many people want those rocks every day, and they want to know if they can go to the rock pile. In fact, they donated thousands of tons to the City for the sewer plant.

Commissioner Cohen asked if Traffic Engineering has weighed in on the difference in traffic between the 121 units and the 211 units, and Ryan Mortillaro referenced the 211 units of the Courtyard and the Residence Inn combined and indicated that the Traffic Impact Analysis Report does take into account the new traffic generated by the Residence Inn, and for the peak trips, they are thinking of a 40 to 45 increase in the peak hour, so the traffic impact is pretty minimal. The Commissioner stated that is good to hear, and he assumes the Marriott has a shuttle to bring people into the town, and Mr. Welker indicated that they do.

Commissioner Klein indicated that what he is confused about is that the applicant submitted two applications – the original and the revised, and both say this is an application for Conceptual

Review. Cari Meyer explained that was probably the original application and they didn't uncheck the box. The Commissioner then asked if the second one that says Conceptual Review is not accurate and Cari asked if he was looking at the application sheet. Commissioner Klein indicated that he is looking in the materials that staff attached, there was Part 1 and Part 2 of the original application, and the box is checked Conceptual Review. Then, there is the revised application and it is still checked Conceptual Review, so he was confused about if this is a Conceptual Review hearing or not. Cari explained that most likely would have been the application, just a cover sheet that they submitted with the original one and the box was not unchecked. Commissioner Klein then stated that this is not a Conceptual Review hearing then, and Cari agreed saying no, that was last year and again explained that the purpose of this work session is to determine what additional information you would need to make a decision.

Commissioner Klein asked how many employees the Residence Inn would employ, and Mr. Welker stated that it depends on season, but probably 30 to 45. The Commissioner then asked how many employees the Courtyard has and Mr. Welker explained that with bistro restaurant probably 50 to 75 including that, depending on the seasonality. Commissioner Klein then asked if the Courtyard is at full employment or does it need employees, and Mr. Welker explained that there is always some turnover, but right now they are fully staffed. There are always things going on and another thing is that they run a shuttle daily to and from Cottonwood to bring in employees, because transportation is a problem, so that also helps to cut down traffic and helps them too. The Commissioner then asked if, when the Courtyard opened and hired all of its employees, how many employees they took away from other lodging places in Sedona. Mr. Welker stated that he was not sure; they had employees that moved in and some that came from other lodging. It is a pretty transient industry; there is some turnover, but he couldn't give an exact number.

Commissioner Klein referenced the three buildings – A, B and C and asked what is in each building. Mr. Welker indicated that the front building is the registration and lobby area, and then there are rooms on the left-hand side. The Commissioner wanted to know how many rooms and Mr. Welker stated that he didn't know. Mark Fredstrom stated that the total number of units is on the site plan, and he thinks they have them for Buildings A, B and C, and in the A building on the far left, the units are on the bottom and top. The rectangle in the middle and the connecting spaces are really public spaces. Commissioner Klein stated that he can't read plans and again asked how many lodging units are in each building. Mr. Fredstrom stated there are a total of 90 units. He then asked if the Project Data could be enlarged.

Commissioner Brandt asked if it will be built in phases, and Mr. Welker responded no, it will all be built at once. Mr. Welker stated that initially one of the things they changed, since the conceptual hearing to now that they have been working on with staff to come somewhat into compliance with the CFA, is that the buildings were connected, and they disconnected them and made them into three separate buildings. They are not connected per se; they are divided and on the front building you see the courtyard area is in the middle, so that was a concession they made and they lost two of the units doing that, but they divided it up to comply with the CFA. Cari Meyer noted that there was also the fix on the height issues with all of the buildings.

Commissioner Klein indicated that we have heard from the City Attorney that there is an issue about compliance with the CFA, specifically, where the CFA says that for this parcel there should be multi-use – commercial, residential and lodging. He then asked Mr. Welker if he would be willing to convert one of the units into multi-family, if the City Council were to decide that to comply with the CFA there shouldn't be just lodging. Mr. Welker explained that it doesn't work; Marriott would not allow that. It doesn't work with the concept to merge those two. They are providing amenities for everybody in that building and to provide those amenities, you need a fixed number to make it feasible to do, so it wouldn't be feasible to do that.

Commissioner Klein referenced the applicant's papers and indicated that he didn't understand where it talks about the heights of the buildings, and in one place it says the buildings will comply with the 27 ft. height requirement, but then there was something that said the buildings won't be

higher than 40 ft. He then asked what the 40 ft. refers to, and Cari Meyer explained that the height requirement limits height to a certain height at any one point and that is the 27 ft. Then, the 40 ft. is the overall height of the building, so if the building is sloped, the lowest point to the highest point on the other side of the building can't be more than 40 ft. She then drew an example on the board and Mr. Welker mentioned the difference in the terrain.

Commissioner Cohen asked if staff has looked to see what views the 40 ft. blocks and Cari explained that staff has mostly been reviewing the plans for compliance with the height requirements. The Commissioner then said that it would be helpful to know what views are blocked. Warren Campbell clarified that there is no point of the built buildings that will exceed 27 ft. The 40 ft. is another regulatory tool to ensure buildings don't have extended lengths over terrain that would have a negative impact on the visual. The tallest point of the building at any location will be 27 ft.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that if this project was one building, it might be difficult to get that 40 ft. threshold, but by separating it into three separate buildings and allowing those to step down the slope of the existing terrain, the physical buildings comply. We have three buildings, so it is not Building A to Building B to Building C – it is 40 ft. within each building. He is trying to clarify why having three buildings makes it easier to meet that threshold. The Commissioner then asked if they are all 40 ft. or less and Cari stated that she believes they are all less than 40 ft.

Commissioner Klein stated that staff's materials say that while the CFA Pan provides guidance for review of this proposal, please note that other sections of the Community Plan may be applicable to this project. He then asked if staff had any specific sections in the Community Plan in mind, and Cari Meyer indicated no, staff hasn't done a full evaluation of the Community Plan. Staff will do that as part of the public hearing. Commissioner Klein then asked if the next step is a public hearing when the Commission will vote on it, and Cari stated that it could be a public hearing. Staff will work with them if they want to make any changes based on the Commission's comments. We still need to review their latest submittal and if that is the next step, it will be agendaized to vote on it.

Commissioner Klein then indicated that in staff's comments, it says that when the traffic study was done and measured traffic on Red Rock Loop Road in June of 2014, that is when school was not in session, so a traffic study should be done when school is in session. He then asked if that is something the applicant will need to do before the Commission moves forward with this. Ryan Mortillaro stated yes, that something they are working on now to update the traffic count to 2017.

Commissioner Klein then referenced staff's comments regarding the Land Development Code section about areas being under 16 ft. in height would not meet the requirements of that section, then another one is showing Buildings B and C as not appearing to meet massing requirements, so that is something that staff expects them to take care of before the Commission votes on this project. Cari indicated that they are working on it, and the Commission would get the final evaluation as part of the public hearing. The Commissioner then stated that regarding the traffic study, staff said that future traffic counts appear to be understated for the size of the development; the trip generation numbers should be based on the hotel category and they used motel, so that is something . . . Ryan stated yes, that is one thing they are going to update.

Commissioner Klein again referenced the Community Plan and indicated that it says there shouldn't be strip lodging. He then asked what staff considers to be strip lodging, and Cari Meyer explained that there is no set definition for that, but in her mind a lot of our design standards try to get away from that as well, where we have the breaking of the building planes, but she would see it as the typical older motel-look where it is just door after door or window after window of hotel rooms. The idea would be that there is a breaking of the building planes and different elements incorporated, so it is not just one wall of hotel. The Commissioner then asked if you have a Residence Inn next to a Courtyard is that strip lodging, and Cari again stated that she doesn't know that we have that definition. What you are getting at is one of the reasons why the Lodging Area Limits were put into place, to prevent the entire length of S.R. 89A from becoming hotel developments, where the

Community Plan says hotels are acceptable but only in areas, to try to concentrate them and have other land uses between the hotels. Warren Campbell agreed that is what the Community Plan is getting at. With Lodging Area Limits, you wouldn't have lodging fronting the entire length of our major thoroughfares. It wasn't getting at you can't have a hotel next to a hotel; it was that you can't have hotels from the Western Gateway to Uptown fronting the road, so that is all you see.

Commissioner Klein referenced the applicant's papers and stated that they say if you have higher density commercial uses as opposed to lodging, that would create more traffic. He then asked what the basis is for that statement. Mr. Welker explained that, as staff indicated, lodging generates very little traffic, because it is not multiple repeat trips usually. It is not like a filling station, which would be applicable for this lot, where you have a thousand customers every day come into a convenience store and get gas. An establishment like this generates less than 100 trips per day, so these other uses -- if it is a retail use, big box, convenience store or gas station, it is car after car, trip after trip, and the typical hotel guest, and as staff indicated, hotels generate minimal traffic. That is one of the good things about them. The Commissioner then stated that the applicant said that the Residence Inn will generate less than 1,000 vehicle trips per day. Mr. Welker stated no, not anywhere near that. Commissioner Klein stated that is what it said and Ryan Mortillaro clarified that the current study states around 500 daily trips. Commissioner Klein agreed but again said there was also something in the papers that said it would be less than 1,000 trips per day, and someplace else, it said it would be 500 and some odd trips per day. Page 2 of the traffic study says that this project is projected to generate less than 1,000 trips per day. Mr. Welker asked if that is staff's report and the Commissioner said no, it is your traffic study, and then further on in the traffic study where you used the motel trips per day, it says there will be 518 total trips per day, so he was confused. Mr. Welker stated that he doesn't know what the qualifier is there, because an engineer did that, so you would have to look at the context in which you are reading that. Cari Meyer indicated that for the public hearing, we will make sure all of the numbers are correct. Ryan explained that there might be some confusion, because at the beginning of the report, they have talked about the Courtyard's generation initially, and that is what it might be. Mr. Welker asked if they are talking about the combined, but the Commissioner said that is not the way he read it, but he will go back and look at it.

Commissioner Klein then referenced the study done in 2014 and stated that it shows that there were like 16,000 some odd vehicles going by this area a day. He then asked if that number has increased since then, and Mr. Welker stated that he would have to go back and rely on the traffic study; the engineer that does that, so that is in progress. The Commissioner then asked if there is going to be an updated traffic study and Mr. Welker stated yes, Ryan indicated that is underway and it will be requested of the developer and the engineers to bring the data up from 2014 to 2017. It is very likely that the daily traffic will show an increase.

Commissioner Klein then stated that the applicant had indicated that shuttle service would be provided within a 5-mile radius, but staff asked for a 10-mile radius. He then asked if that is okay with Mr. Welker who stayed yes, that is fine.

Commissioner Klein indicated that to be clear about the issue being raised regarding the visibility of the vehicles parked along S.R. 89A, if you drive down S.R. 89A now going east, you can see the cars parked at the Courtyard. Mr. Welker agreed that you can see part of them. The Commissioner then asked if, with this gabion wall, you feel you won't see any of the cars for the Residence Inn, and Mr. Welker stated that he doesn't know what percentage, but it is a pretty substantial wall. Mark Fredstrom added that the proposed gabion wall is 1 ft. taller than the one they have now, and in addition it would be on a 2 ft. berm, whether it takes a variance or not to get to 5 ft., that would visually block the parking lot from the cars traveling on S.R. 89A.

Commissioner Brandt asked if there is a way to break the visual of the parking area from the existing structure to the new structure, because as you come into Sedona, you will be able to see across the existing parking lot and see the new parking lot. Mr. Welker explained that they have to have some points of connectivity for those driveways. He then asked if it is possible to turn that

gabion and run it 90°, and Mark Fredstrom explained that as you see the entry coming in, above it you see that there are three planting areas on their landscape plan that are pretty heavily planted out, so you would see the driving aisles, but they would be partially obscured by the amount of trees and shrubs; the landscape plan illustrates that better. Mr. Welker then stated that what they would propose would be to fill those islands, with the exception of the driveways where they have to have ingress, egress, for fire, etc., with trees to block that as much as possible.

Commissioner Brandt asked staff if it is two separate lots from the existing hotel to the proposed, and Cari Meyer stated that right now it is one lot; the whole thing is one parcel. Commissioner Brandt the referenced Commissioner Mayer's concern about the existing landscaping and indicated that in reality this is an addition to the existing hotel, and then the whole property is really under consideration. Cari repeated that as of now it is all one property. The Commissioner then stated that it is all up for review or it can be. There is no reason why it can't be all up for review. Mr. Welker stated that he would defer to the City Attorney. Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that at this stage in the review process, he would agree, but as we get closer to the public hearing it will have to be a little more specific, so he is not sure where the Commissioner is going with the question. Commissioner Brandt explained that Commissioner Mayer had asked about improving the existing landscaping at the existing parking lot, and we are actually looking at an addition to the existing parking lot, so in reality that is realistic to be considering the whole thing as part of this review process. Robert Pickels Jr. stated that he thinks so.

Commissioner Cohen stated that by clarification when we did the CFA and the City Council reviewed the submission, these were looked at differently. That parcel that isn't built was looked at separately, because we had recommended when we were doing the CFA prior to the Marriott that it be multi-use, so it is confusing. Robert Pickels Jr. stated that is correct, that discussion did go that way. The Commissioner again stated that it is confusing, because Commissioner Brandt is correct too in the way he laid it out. The City Attorney stated that this is a unique project with respect to the CFA application, and that is one of the things we have discussed with the applicant's attorney. You are not likely to see another project like this, because of the variables that are in play here. This is very unique, so we are going to figure this out as we progress to the public hearing.

Commissioner Cohen then stated that Commissioner Brandt's point and the tax question that he raised earlier go hand in hand. Mr. Welker then stated that when Commissioner Mayer commented, he indicated that they would certainly consider adding trees across that front; they aren't objectionable to that, but to go back and have everybody all of a sudden refocus on the Courtyard and say one person didn't like your stucco color or one person didn't like – they are going to get everybody's opinion and redesign a project that turned out very nice . . . , Commissioner Brandt stated that is the process that we are going through. That streamline helped you in some aspects, but the flipside is that it could be detrimental in other areas; that is the way you chose to present this. Mr. Welker stated that they are reasonable people, and Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that in the last letter he authored back to Council he represented the same thing; it is a double-edged sword, because there are things that benefit and things that potentially hurt, so it is how you balance that, and that is what we are going to work on with them. Commissioner Brandt added that he did think that the color on the existing hotel was lighter than what was presented, but staff assured him that it was the same, and it is bringing up provisions in the Land Development Code that will be looked at in the future; larger buildings perhaps should be darker. Mr. Welker stated that they did go darker and Mark Fredstrom added that these buildings are considerably darker and have more stone applications. Commissioner Brandt agreed stone for sure, but on the body of it, he knows that it helps to show contrast, when you are showing the representation of what it looks like, but he would like to see . . . Mr. Fredstrom referenced the color board and indicated that you can see that the colors are quite a bit darker than the Courtyard. Commissioner Brandt then suggested that perhaps larger samples for larger buildings might be a good thing for us to do.

Cari Meyer stated that they have provided some larger samples, but they are in storage right now with our building relocation, so we will check to see what we have. Commissioner Cohen asked if there is a problem with the suites being darker than the existing building from an aesthetic point-of-

view, and Commissioner Brandt stated that a differentiation between the buildings would be beneficial. You can look at the strip development of hotels just side-by-side and more of a differentiation is going to help break it up visually. If they are all darker, then it blends in with the scenery also.

Commissioner Brandt asked staff if there are any big picture things with the CFA that trouble staff as far as not meeting the intent of the CFA, and Cari explained that staff hasn't done the full evaluation and staff's comments were in the packet, but similar to the Plan Amendments, etc., staff is going to be using the same format as far as a Community Plan evaluation, and that will be part of the final packet.

Commissioner Brandt stated that regarding the Forest Service trail access, it is great that it is included with this project. The Forest Service's memo said something about they were not sure where the dedicated parking was going to be, and Cari explained that they were not proposing dedicated parking, so you wouldn't see a sign that says Forest Service trailhead parking. They believe that the peak times for parking at a hotel are at night and empty during the day, because their guests go and do stuff during the day, so they believe there will be parking available for the trailhead and it doesn't need to be signed as trailhead parking. Commissioner Brandt indicated that the flipside would be if there are any restrictions on people using the trails from parking there. Mr. Welter stated that it would be just space available, and as Cari said, hotels have a reciprocal demand point from what the trailhead use would be. Their guests are checking out, going to trailheads in the morning or leaving, and then returning in the evening, so during the day is their minimal time as far as demand, so they think that is a good fit. Obviously, they are throwing that in as an amenity and they agreed with the Forest Service to pay for a kiosk and the construction of the trail to join the adjacent Skywalker Trail, plus they have to insure for liability for that, because public and non-guests will be using the property, and that is a substantial consideration. They talked with their insurance people and they can do that. Commissioner Brandt indicated that it is great that the applicant is providing that benefit for community. He just wanted to make sure that in the future it doesn't suddenly become a private amenity and is not available. Cari Meyer stated that they discussed that there would be a public access easement through the property to the trailhead, including parking.

Commissioner Cohen commented that we were assured of that the last time we met and Cari pointed out that in their latest response to comments, they related that they would work with staff to memorialize that in whatever way we needed. Mr. Welker then explained that they had to check on their end to see how feasible that was, because it is a unique situation and they are providing a pretty substantial public amenity, so they have concerns about liability and different issues they have to address.

Commissioner Cohen referenced the site tour of the parking lot and indicated that was pointed out where the trail was coming, and the Commission was assured the applicant would manage it that way, and Mr. Welker replied that is where it is going to be and it actually works out to be the perfect spot, because the adjacent trail is 150 ft. away; it is fairly close and it is at the point in their parking lot where they can do a kiosk and put these amenities in.

Commissioner Brandt then asked why they decided to delete the units and do a payment in lieu, and Mr. Welker stated that they had long discussions on that, and part of it is based on what they think the demand factor would be from employees that would want to live there versus contributing to the fund, and previously they contributed to the fund on the previous project, and they thought this would work better and be a better fit for them to do that. They are not adverse to contributing to affordable housing, but this seemed to be a better way for them to do it than to have employees housed on site. Commissioner Brandt asked if that will be part of memo for the next meeting, and Cari Meyer said yes.

Commissioner Mayer asked what the City is going to do with \$50,000. He has a few suggestions. Warren Campbell explained that the funds are put into a special account for housing projects, and

he believes that in the past some has been used to offset some fee waivers for habitat homes. It is earmarked for housing projects. Commissioner Mayer stated that he has a real beef with regard to affordable housing for people in this community, because even though they provide a shuttle to Cottonwood, Cottonwood is not that cheap either. Rents are close to what we have here because of the demand and supply. To provide \$50,000 for four units when each of those units, for just the building without the land, costs about \$60,000, and you are talking about \$240,000 just to build, not with the land included, so he has a beef with that. You know from previous meetings this is something he is (audio unclear) affordable and multi-family housing; we have to have something here, so we don't have a situation; we're probably never going to have like in Vail which was snowed-in and the people who were tending to the roads lived outside, and Vail was snowed-in for two weeks. We don't have snow here, but there could be something provided and \$50,000 is not going to get you very far; it is nothing, a token. It is \$12,200 per unit, so he doesn't understand why it has to be totally maxed out. Commissioner Brandt pointed out that the Commission is looking for information and asking questions. Commissioner Mayer then asked why every developer brings up what could be there like a gas station or a convenience store, etc., everyone comes up with that stuff – he is sick and tired of it. Paul Welker explained that on the units they actually deleted two units to break the buildings up into separate buildings, and then they took two of the other units out and proposed the contribution to the affordable housing. Commissioner Mayer then wanted to know how big their shuttle bus is; does it provide for 120 people? Mr. Welker stated that they currently have 15 passengers and the Commissioner said 15 and you have 120 employees living outside mostly. Mr. Welker stated that some of them bring their cars and some don't. They will probably have a second shuttle for the Residence Inn, so they would have two shuttles.

Commissioner Mayer then asked if in regard to the neighbors, he guesses the ingress/egress was resolved for Foothills South, and Cari indicated that there have been a number of comments regarding the access that is required as part of the previous agreement and it will be done through an easement. She then pointed out the access to Park Place and Foothills South. Everyone involved with the project is aware of the need for the access and staff will be reviewing it, and it will meet any turning radius and slope requirements for the Fire District.

Commissioner Barcus stated that he would like some data that would not be harmful to proprietary information for the business. What he is trying to get a feel for is we have a Courtyard Marriott and other hotels, plus occupancy ideas that feed into traffic studies, wastewater studies, etc., for hotels throughout the City, so we have an understanding of what the hotel occupancy stay levels are, and then we don't have a lot of good information for short-term rentals, but we do have a lot of timeshares in our community that operate like short-term rentals for one or two-week periods. We kind of understand that there are blocks of time associated with timeshares, and then we have hotels that have other visitation rates, etc., but the applicant is talking about kind of a hybrid facility and it would be helpful for him, since the applicant has made a representation that this is a different kind of product, to know how we are going to do a traffic study if we -- do we need to know the length of stays at the Residence Inn and is that different than a typical hotel? Warren Campbell indicated that you will hear that Marriott Residence Inn has a lot of that kind of data and shared some in the past about what kind of occupancy levels they expect. Mr. Welker stated that the trip counts aren't going to change much, because if you are running 80% occupancy at the Courtyard and 80% at the Residence Inn, that still means there is going to be a body and potentially an associated vehicle with that person for that 80% occupied, so it is not really going to change. Commissioner Barcus stated that if we have an apartment complex with six month minimum leases, it would be helpful for him to understand what the expected mix is going be at this facility, for him to understand how this is meeting seasonal or longer-term housing needs than a typical hotel. Mr. Welker stated that the typical stay at a normal hotel is about 1.5 nights per stay, but it varies depending on location, etc., so that is a general average. At a Residence Inn, it is probably about 4 to 5 nights average

Commissioner Barcus referenced the folks that came to work at the hospitals and indicated that was an interesting antidote that this kind of housing is provided, and there may be a substantial number of folks that might want to stay for multiple weeks or months. To understand this project, it

would be helpful just in gross components to give the Commission . . . Mr. Welker explained that the Residence Inn has four pricing tiers – zero to five nights, six to eleven nights, twelve to 29 nights, and 30 nights and over. The majority of the occupancy is in tier one, the second is probably six to eleven, and the third tier would be the third most used and the least would be 30 nights and more. The financial model on the Residence Inn is that it is less labor intensive than a typical hotel, because you have longer stays, so you have less staff and you don't fully service the room every day. You do what they call a refresh that is just the garbage and give them towels unless they request the extended service, so it is a different model from a labor perspective, because your trending stay instead of 1.5 nights is probably closer to 5 nights per stay. All of that affects that model; those four tiers and percentages and how much you get in each segment of those four tiers will vary from location to location. If you are next to a military base, you get more of the 30 nights plus. The Commissioner then acknowledged that it would be really tough to gauge the mix of those four tiers, but it would be helpful for him to understand that even though you have the fourth tier, you are expecting a market out there that you will be able to tap for people who might want to spend 90 days here during the summer, and Mr. Welker stated absolutely, and the beauty of it is that they can book it for 10 nights and they don't have to worry about having a week to exchange for a timeshare, etc., or if they want to stay for 90 nights, they can do that with one phone call.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that he was bringing that up because it seems like it is an addition to the number of rooms on the property, but it is a different product that is going to provide a housing need, whether that is five nights or fifty nights. Commissioner Brandt asked Commissioner Barcus if he had a question, and Mr. Welker stated that he thinks he can wrap this up. The Residence Inn is the highest demand product in the Marriott limited service portfolio with full kitchens. They run the highest occupancy on average across the brand portfolio. It is a different product and it is underserved. How many of these type products do you have in Sedona? There are very few; there are timeshares, but that is not the same thing, so they are the highest occupancy product in the Marriott umbrella of products, and it is underserved, because you just don't see that many of them, and their experience is that the highest occupancy in the brands they have is the extended stay. If he was told he could build another 90 Courtyard rooms, he wouldn't do it, because he couldn't fill them, but he could fill the Residence Inn, because it is a different demand and a different product.

Commissioner Brandt asked Commissioner Barcus if he is wondering about traffic, and Commissioner Barcus indicated that he is trying to distinguish between adding on to the hotel with more hotel rooms and adding a long-term stay hybrid product. Commissioner Brandt suggested just looking at it as hotel rooms and people can get deals for staying longer; why wouldn't you just consider it that way if the numbers are generated in the traffic study based on hotels? The longer you stay the less services you need from the hotel, but the more FedEx deliveries, pizza deliveries, etc., so to him it equalizes. Mr. Welker indicated that the difference is that they have the amenities for the extended stay – full kitchens, full refrigerators. Commissioner Brandt commented that they will still be ordering pizzas.

Commissioner Klein asked how much is currently in the Housing Fund and Warren indicated his recollection is it is somewhere between \$250,000 and \$300,000. The Commissioner then wanted to know how much has been spent over the last 10 years. Warren stated he could have that information for the next meeting. The Commissioner then asked if it would be correct to state it is a very small percentage, and Warren stated likely. Commissioner Klein then stated that basically the Housing Fund is accumulating money and nothing ever happens with it. Warren stated that as projects present themselves, they are evaluated on their merits.

Commissioner Brandt asked about public comment and Robert Pickels Jr. stated that it is discretionary with the Chair and Commissioner Brandt pointed out that is what public hearings are for. Commissioner Klein left the room at this time, and Cari noted that staff is accepting public comments in writing and there is a page on the City's website.

Commissioner Brandt recessed the work session at 5:10 p.m. to allow Commissioner Klein time to return to the meeting and reconvened the work session at 5:16 p.m.

4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. **Tuesday, October 17, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- b. **Thursday, November 2, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- c. **Tuesday, November 7, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- d. **Thursday, November 16, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work session)**

Cari Meyer stated that Tuesday, October 17th, is a public hearing for consideration of a Time Extension for the façade remodel at the Andante Inn. We also will be doing a work session on the Development Review and Zone Change for the potential apartment project at S.R. 89A and Pinon. It will be similar to today as to what kind of information you need, and we will also have an item to discuss the City Council's adoption of the Sign Code. On Thursday, November 2nd we do not have anything at the moment, so we will let you know about that. On November 7th, we have a public hearing for the Wireless Ordinance and Master Plan and a proposed monopine at the Sedona United Methodist Church. We are also scheduling a public hearing on the S.R. 89A and Pinon apartment project, pending the City Council's action on the Community Plan Amendment.

Commissioner Mayer asked about two public hearings on Pinon and Cari clarified that one would be the work session on the 17th and a public hearing on the 7th, pending City Council's action on the 25th of October.

Commissioner Cohen announced that he will not be here on 17th, so this is his last meeting and it has been wonderful working with you all.

Cari then continued to say that we don't have anything on November 16th, and she asked the Commissioners to send their availability for November and December to Audree.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

No Executive Session was held.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Brandt called for adjournment at 5:19 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on October 12, 2017

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date