

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, September 28, 2017- 3:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER ROLL CALL

Chair Losoff called the work session to order at 3:35 p.m. and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

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

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

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

Warren Campbell announced that a planning class from NAU is here that is taught by Margo Wheeler. They have visited us before, but this is a new group going through the program, so we would like to welcome them. He also reminded the Commissioners to speak one at a time and speak clearly and loudly for the recording.

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

- a. **Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Conceptual Zone Change and Conceptual Development Review to for a new mixed-use project consisting of 126 lodging units (Oxford Suites), 12 condominium units, 5 employee housing units, a restaurant, and retail space at 1335 W State Route 89A. The property is currently zoned C-2 (General Commercial) and RM-2 (High Density Multifamily Residential). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the area to the south of the intersection of W State Route 89A and Soldiers Pass Road. APN: 408-26-004B, -004C, -009A, -009C, -010, -011, -012, -013, -014, -086A, & -088. Applicant: Robin and Curt Baney Authorized Agents: Stephen Thompson and Jason Morris Case Number: PZ16-00013 (ZC, DEV)**

Presentation: Cari Meyer stated that this is a conceptual public hearing for a mixed-use project called the Village at Saddlerock Crossing, and as a preface to our discussion, the purpose of a Conceptual Review is to give review agencies, staff, the Commission, and the general public the opportunity to provide comments on a development proposal in its early conceptual stage of design. This allows the applicant to become aware of major issues, concerns and suggestions prior to the completion of more detailed plans for comprehensive Development Review, and because it is conceptual, staff is not evaluating for full conformance with specific code sections nor providing a recommendation, nor is the Commission. This is really to take the applicant's ideas and provide feedback, so as they develop more comprehensive plans, they know what issues they need to consider in their design, so it has been reviewed by staff and a number of other reviewing agencies and those comments have been provided to the applicant and are included in the Commission's packet.

Cari identified the location of the subject property, the owners Robin and Curt Baney, and their authorized agents Stephen Thompson and Jason Morris. Cari then indicated that the property is about 6.3 acres and is currently vacant, but was previously developed with the Biddle's nursery.

Cari explained that the applicant originally submitted an application for this project in October of 2016, and staff provided some comments based on that submittal, and the applicant then

chose to place the review on hold. Since then, they have acquired an additional property and made revisions to the proposal to incorporate that additional property into their development plan. They resubmitted their current application in July of 2017, and currently, it is an application for a Zone Change and Development Review. As the project progresses, there may be additional approvals, for example, if their condos become ownership units, there would be a Subdivision application involved as well.

Cari identified the subject property on a vicinity map and an aerial map from 2014, and she explained that the buildings shown on the site have been demolished. The applicant received demolition permits to remove all of the previously existing buildings. These properties have two separate Community Plan designations – Commercial and Multi-family High Density, which allows up to 12 units per acre. The Commercial portion of the property is within the Lodging Area Limits and the Multi-family designation is about an acre of land with the remainder being Commercial. This area is also part of the Soldiers Pass Community Focus Area, and the plan for this area was adopted by the City Council in April of 2016. The current zoning of General Commercial and High Density Multi-family correspond with the Community Plan designation, and they are proposing to bring in all of the properties under one Planned Development zoning designation.

Cari then referenced the Zoning Map with the property highlighted in pink, the Multi-family portion in darker yellow, and the Commercial designation shown in blue. The surrounding properties are also shown with the blue being Commercial designations, the lighter yellow being Single-family Residential and the red is a Lodging designation. In a zoomed-in view, Cari pointed out the property that is under consideration with this application and identified the Planning Area boundary for the Soldiers Pass CFA. This is a large property within the Planning Area, but it is not the entire Planning Area, and all projects within the CFA should be trying to implement the vision, goals and objectives of the CFA Plan, but there are a number of properties, so not all of the vision and goals might be applicable to this one property.

Cari then indicated that the vision for the CFA is to be, “. . . a dynamic and walkable center of activity for neighbors, visitors, and businesses. The already diverse mix of land uses will be enhanced and new development will complement existing land uses. People will walk, bike and use transit more as improvements will be designed with people in mind by improving connectivity, safety, and convenience.

Cari explained that this vision is going to be accomplished through the following objectives:

Land Use objectives:

- A complete neighborhood center that is a mix of complementary and compatible land uses.
- A range of housing options that vary by type, size, and price ranges that offer an alternative to single-family housing.

Circulation objectives:

- Improved safety and reduced traffic congestion on SR 89A.
- Improved safety, convenience, and experience for walking and bicycling.
- A connected network of sidewalks and trails that link neighborhoods and lodging to businesses and destinations such as parks, National Forest trails, and the West Sedona School.

Environment objectives:

- Conservation practices being incorporated into building and landscape design, construction, and maintenance.

Community objectives:

- An identifiable area recognized for its natural features and the design quality of its built features.

- A neighborhood center with appealing and accessible community spaces that reflect a sense of community.

Cari then showed the site plan and indicated that the development proposal includes approximately 126 lodging units and some meeting space. She then identified the proposed locations for the lodging units with a hotel lobby and meeting space, their 'elite' lodging units, 12 condominium units, five employee housing units that would be located above the restaurant and lobby area of the hotel, approximately 9,500 sq. ft. of retail space, and approximately a 4,400-sq. ft. restaurant with some outdoor dining area that would be accessed through the hotel lobby. They are also proposing a public street connecting Saddlerock Circle to Soldiers Pass.

Cari explained that based on the numbers provided for the square footages, the hotel uses would be just under 80% of the entire square footage, with the condos being around 7%, the employee housing about 2%, the retail space about 7.5%, and the restaurant about 3.5% of the total proposed square footage. Going back to the CFA Plan, Cari pointed out the CFA boundary shown in blue with the proposed site plan overlaid on the site. She explained that you can see how the street would connect to the existing road network and how the buildings on the site would relate to the existing buildings on the neighboring sites. At the Chair's request, Cari again pointed out the placement of the proposed street and buildings.

Commissioner Mayer asked where the entry to the restaurant is located, and Cari Meyer stated that it is all within the site, so the parking lots for the proposed uses would be accessed off of the proposed road. Commissioner Mayer then commented that he sees a connection to Elks Road and Cari explained that Elks Road is a private street and the property line goes to the middle of the street, but they would be incorporating the street and some connections into their plan as well.

Commissioner Cohen referenced a mention of a connection from this site to the cemetery and asked how that connects. Cari Meyer indicated that is something that the applicant can probably address; she believes that is discussing a pedestrian connection and trail system that they are proposing.

Cari then referenced some of the elevations on the proposed site plan and pointed out the elevation of the hotel lobby and restaurant building, and she indicated that the top elevation is what you would see from S.R. 89A and the bottom elevation is what would be seen from the proposed new public road.

Commissioner Mayer asked where the public space is located and Cari suggested that the Commissioner ask the applicant about their intention. She then showed the elevations for the hotel building on the southern side of the site that can be seen from the neighborhood and indicated that the top view is the north elevation that can be seen from the SR 89A side of the building. The final elevations are of the retail, elite lodging and condo components, with the top view being the retail, the middle being the condos and the bottom being the lodging units.

Cari stated that as a reminder, you are not evaluating the project for compliance or conformance with all of the codes. We are providing feedback for areas they may need to look at and code sections they may need to look at to come into conformance, but in the next phase of review, we will be looking at compliance with the Community Plan, the CFA Plan and any Land Development Code requirements, which include development standards and the Design Review Manual that has guidelines and regulations for site layout, building design, parking, landscaping, lighting, screening, and compliance of signs under the new Sign Code. We also will be looking at access, traffic and connectivity from both vehicular and pedestrian viewpoints; and the engineers will be looking at the grading, drainage and the connections to the wastewater disposal system.

Cari indicated that this application was routed to all review agencies and an internal meeting was held. The comments received were from City of Sedona Community Development and Public Works, the Sedona Fire District, the County Health Services and Unisource, and for this submittal, there is also some comments from City of Sedona Arts & Culture and ADOT that were provided with the initial submittal that will carry forward, although they didn't update their comments. As far as public input, the applicant conducted two open houses and a summary of those meetings are in their Letter of Intent. These documents also have been on the Community Development Department's website, and since this is a conceptual public hearing, it has been noticed in the Red Rock News, and there was a mailing to the neighbors plus a posting on the property. All written comments we have received were provided to the Commission as part of the packet, and we received two additional comments in the last week that were provided to the Commission prior to the meeting.

Cari indicated that completed staff's presentation and Chair Losoff described the procedural steps of the hearing.

Applicant's Authorized Agent, Jason Morris: Mr. Morris indicated that this is a family application, so he will introduce the applicant that he and Stephen Thompson have been working with. He then introduced Applicants Curt and Robin Baney of Baney Hospitality, and indicated that they hopefully will have a chance to introduce themselves and give you a thumbnail of why they are here, what they do and why they want to do it in Sedona. He then introduced local project team members Art Beckwith, Stephen Thompson, himself, Richard Hubbell and Joel Westervelt, so they will be able to answer questions, and they understand this is an opportunity to hear from the Commission. They do have an overview that goes into more detail, which may address some things that staff pointed out, but they also recognize that this is the beginning of the process, so they hope to be able to put together a good application based on. . . , Chair Losoff interrupted to say that it was nice of them to say this is the beginning; it is conceptual and gives the Commission an opportunity to hear from the applicant and the applicant to hear from the Commission in kind of a working session. He then asked the applicant to keep the presentation to about 20 minutes.

Presentation, Architect, Stephen Thompson: Mr. Thompson wanted to point out that through the process with a couple of staff meetings, and this being a concept, there are a lot of loose ends, so not everything is always tied together. He wanted to make sure that Saddlerock people understand with the non-colored elevations shown in staff's PowerPoint, that is not what faces Saddlerock. What faces Saddlerock is the same level of detail and development of the building. He then showed the Saddlerock elevation and the north elevation of the building, so it is a four-sided piece of architecture. They have also done some things to it, in the course of their interaction with staff, to mitigate height. As you know, they have some three-story portions to the building that they have to deal with from a design guidelines standpoint, but they also have at this point chosen to depress the center of the site, so the buildings are in basic conformance with the height code ordinance.

Mr. Thompson referenced Commissioner Mayer's comment about the public gathering space and indicated that is one thing they consider to be a major benefit to the community in this project, and he pointed out its proposed location and indicated that it becomes a visual symbol to the entry of their project, and passersby, who may or may not visit this, will have that visual sight and an architectural element will be somewhat of a replicated historic building, since they have no structures remaining on the site, except for some rather substantial trees, most of which they are saving. The elements within this public space are the retail element that will be somewhat supportive to that space, and the self-guided venue of about 600 sq. ft. that relates to the cemetery project, so people can come and know where the cemetery is. He lived here five years with an office a couple of hundred feet from the cemetery, and he didn't know it was there, but that will be one of the ways of creating some historic aspect to this project. They will also have a display in the hotel lobby that talks about the Cook's Ranch, the cemetery and some localized history that relates to this area – he feels that is pretty exciting.

Mr. Thompson stated that Robin Baney is very interested in the cemetery project, and he heard someone ask about access from the site. They are not providing the access to the site; they are providing an opportunity for a West Sedona vision of a continuous and generally parallel pedestrian and bike route to the highway. You may recall from the CVS project that a link happened there, so between that and this, they have a real opportunity with the Elks Lodge property. It is a one contiguous site and may be or may not be Elks very much longer, so he would hope that they can stimulate some interest, and you could perhaps urge whoever plans on developing that to participate in this project's link that they hope to eventually see move its way up and down S.R.89A. He wants Robin Baney to discuss her interactions with the Historic Society to date, so he won't get too much into that, except that she is interested in finding out what they want to do. The applicant has a process to go through, and they were interested in making that project related to theirs.

Chair Losoff asked if it is their idea that people would come up S.R. 89A, cut through their property, and go out Elks Road, and Mr. Thompson stated yes, there is a visual, but in essence all they can do at this point for sure is ensure they have a link to this segment of the trail that may happen in the future. They have one at CVS, they have a contiguous property between, so they have chosen to let that intersect about where the other paved accessway is, bring it through their site; they don't know exactly what form it is going to take, but it will be maybe an 8-ft. wide paved path. It traverses their site; they have a Bistro with a walk-up window adjacent to their lobby for hotel guests and for the public; then if they can figure out the traffic issues here, then can cross the road and come into their public space. They have public restrooms that will be for guests and the public's use, and they will have water, shade, seating, and they are also seeing that integrate into the Lynx or mass transit stop. They want it to be a contiguous plaza with some common architectural theme out to the shelter, so that is the vision they have for the project.

Mr. Thompson indicated that another aspect is that they are considering after hours, say 10:00 p.m., securing the courtyard part of this project for management purposes that would close off the public restrooms and possibly the water stand to ensure this doesn't become any kind of attractive nuisance, and in conjunction with that, they have provided for a bypass, so in the case that the inner-part of the plaza is closed and someone happens to be on the bike path, they will have a clear, safe path to travel to get around that. That is just a concept they have talked about right now. It makes sense from a project management standpoint. Another thing they are doing is providing five employee housing units, and they actually are turning out to be quite interesting. They are about 400 sq. ft., and they tried to analyze who will use them, how they live, what their profile might be, and chances are they are single, maybe ride a bike to hit the trails, so they are providing interesting amenities like a storage shelter outside each unit and these are on the second floor with an upper level seating terrace and about a million-dollar view. Mr. Thompson referenced the architecture of this elevation and indicated that they anticipate that no building on any side will have a back-end. They are all going to be considered and composed so that they become a piece of the visual context of the area, and it is very interesting that they are able to do it or even required to do it, and they are trying to make that something that is a real effort; it is not just space at the bottom of the stairs somewhere.

Mr. Thompson stated that another element of the plan is two buildings that are quite similar. One they have developed into some little more involved lodging units. These are two-story buildings, so there are 10 lodging units, and then the condominium wing is basically the same layout; they work very much in the same fashion spatially, and from an economic marketing standpoint, they see some flexibility there to think that, if the market dictates or if they can put up an incentive to make their project more palatable, perhaps some of these condo units could expand into the other building. He understands that there are a lot of concerns about what happens to a condo. He then asked Mr. Baney if it is true that he is going to maintain ownership of these, and Mr. Baney stated yes. Mr. Thompson then stated that they will maintain ownership and manage them, and an agreement to keep them what they are could be arranged, so there wouldn't be much concern that they would ever turn into something else.

Chair Losoff asked what the rental unit prices or hotel rates are, and Mr. Baney indicated that it is premature on that, but they would be compatible with the market. Mr. Thompson then stated that the Baney's will be prepared to talk a little about the profile of their lodging guests; they have done this 17 times with a grand opening a couple of nights ago in Rohnert Park, and it tends to be a rather interesting clientele. They tend to be interested in where they are going; they interact with the environment they are coming to, and they stay a little longer.

Mr. Thompson then showed the Saddlerock Subdivision and indicated that they have had two neighborhood meetings – one at the Hampton and one at the Elks Lodge, and they fielded their comments and concerns. They have put up some story poles along the corners of the back of the building, and he will be scheduling a site walk with the concerned neighbors and Robyn Jones who is the manager, and they are looking for a day when most people can be available, so watch for that in the next two to four weeks. They are also going to get into their 1,000-ft. radius, public information center, and that will be noticed within the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Thompson indicated that in closing on their site plan consideration, these buildings are in essence complying with the 22-ft. height and alternate standard heights from the perspective of pre-existing and probably a natural grade – it probably isn't, but it has been that way for a long time, and they have the buildings set back about 80 ft. from the south property line and that is due to a landscape buffer parking and landscape zone, so that is a pretty good setback. They are also complying with the Community Plan and CFA desires in that they are shielding more intensive commercial uses from the residents. A lot of comments they got at the public meeting with Saddlerock homeowners was that they actually foresee walking to this place and making use of these commercial and retail venues, which is nice to hear.

Mr. Thompson added that they heard comments like they would like village-type, local tenants. The bistro was one, a place to get coffee and something light. They have the restaurant and bar, which will be full-service. Part of the rationale for those two being next to each other was that they heard comments that it feels more like a hotel restaurant than a public restaurant; it is both, but there are staffing formalities with Oxford where it is staffed down at night and people wear a multitude of hats, so this is arranged so desk people can man the bar and guests can enter that way, but the main entrance to this restaurant is from the parking where there is a pathway that comes across. They haven't really segregated where various parking is going to be, but he identified the location of the main entrance to the restaurant and hostess station, plus a convenience store for the staff, and guests can move into the bar. The restaurant has a strong presence from the road. Their exterior terrace is on the north and west side, and they had some comments from staff on how to deal with parking there. They will be providing a full parking analysis; it is very complex and there are a lot of uses. They don't want to overpark, but they don't want to not have enough spaces. They did a comprehensive site analysis of lot coverage, building areas, parking ratios, etc., and that will be formalized and they will have a detailed analysis. They have talked with staff about things like maybe getting away with fewer parking spaces than might be required and ghost them in and landscape some areas, then if they become necessary after they see patterns of the use, they could pull them back in if needed. Also regarding some discrepancies, again it's a concept and a lot of moving pieces to this, so sometimes numbers in one place weren't matching numbers elsewhere, and they brought that all together too.

Mr. Thompson stated that for the value of the visitors, he asked if ecology or conservation is part of their program, and the group indicated no; it is planning and urban design. He then indicated that he was going to tell them that with this being a former plant nursery, a lot of substantial trees on the site were planted by the nursery owners a lot of years ago or by someone who lived there before. They are not native trees, but they are adaptive and they have thrived.

Chair Losoff asked if it could be opened for questions or if there is more to the presentation. Mr. Thompson stated that he would like for the Baney's to do a couple of minutes, and he then

showed the relationship of one of the large trees to the building, so you can see it is pretty substantial, and they are preserving those.

Applicant, Curt Baney with Oxford Corporate in Bend Oregon: Mr. Baney stated that the Oxford Suites concept was developed in the late '80s and the first property opened in Roseville, California in 1989, and they have since grown to about 17 properties on the west coast in California, Washington, Oregon and Idaho. Most of their properties rated on Trip Advisor are usually ranked first in their markets or up to third. They opened the Oxford Hotel in Bend in 2010, and in 2017, it was named the number three Trip Advisor-rated hotel in the United States, and they have been in the top 10 in the U.S. for the past four years. Mr. Thompson mentioned that we just had a grand opening two nights ago in Sonoma County; that is their latest Oxford Suites Hotel with 163 rooms in Sonoma County. He and Robin have been involved in the day-to-day operations for many years, and they have been a property owner in Sedona for over 10 years. They have accumulated property for this site and have been planning this development for quite a few years. They are looking forward to being part of the community.

Ms. Robin Baney stated that she just wanted to throw in one little thing that wasn't in the agenda; those employee houses that we have being built up top are 400 sq. ft., and their first Oxford Suites were the prototype that she and Curt built themselves on their ranch, and it was 400 sq. ft. and that was where their first son was born, so it is actually a very livable space. She also wanted to talk a little about their clientele; they may be traveling for business purposes during the week, but then will visit them again while vacationing with their families on weekends. Their average stay is four nights, and due to their planned onsite meeting facilities, Sedona guests will be able to conduct their business onsite, minimizing car trips, and they will be able to walk to the nearby dining establishments. Their guests will frequent area businesses, engaging in cultural and recreational opportunities – shopping, dining or any of the other many activities Sedona offers. They have a disposable income and will look for ways to become part of the local community. As far as local community and their involvement, she brought a few items here tonight. In Bend, Oregon, they have the Oxford Hotel and do the Jazz at the Oxford, and there is a poster that talks about the folks they had last year, and they do a free music education workshop with that jazz, and it is for all ages. They ask their jazz performers to put that on for the local community. A few other things they have been involved in are the OSU Cascades that is a local college in their town, and in 2017, they made a \$500,000 cash donation to that school. They also did a \$10,000 cash donation to the Bend High Athletic Department. They are very involved with the local community and education. She is really looking forward to being part of this community. Her family lives in Prescott, so she has been coming here forever, and she looks forward to helping with the Historic Society; that is something she could really get involved in. She has talked with a few people about the cemetery and reached out to them, and she will send for their feedback and what their needs are, so she looks forward to being part of that community as well.

Commission's Questions and Comments:

The Chair reminded the Commissioners that this is conceptual; we are not here to design the building or determine some of the specifics, but how the overall concept fits with the CFA and complies with other issues.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she noticed a number of discrepancies and inconsistencies in the way the project was described, and if she had read Cari's comments first rather than last, she might not have listed them all, but she is sure you are going to catch them regarding rooms and parking spaces and others – the number of Multi-family units in one place is six and twelve in another; things like that, so that we have some consistency of what your project is actually proposing. Also in the retail space, you mention that perhaps as residents suggested, there might be a café, coffee shop and restaurant, but she would like some clarification that it is in addition to the restaurant and bar proposed in the project itself. She also would like to know about the rationale behind day use only for the public plaza, and is that in response to public

comments about a sense of security, privacy and lack of noise or was it a corporate policy to designate that for daytime use only?

The Vice Chair stated that the architectural style is described in many ways as pioneer, Sedona lodge, Sedona vernacular and contemporary, so when we get down the road, she would like to see a clear design ethic and standard applied to this project that we can all understand, and maybe it is a mix of all of them, which is what it would suggest right now. She also asked Mr. Thompson to explain what the walk-up services are that is referenced on page 20.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that the largest part of her remarks are around historic resources. The CFA for this area lists in Community Expectations that historic resources should be preserved, and also in the Community Expectations for this area, it talks about a sense of place, and it encourages the reuse of historic buildings to preserve the cultural history that contributes to that sense of place. She is afraid that there was an opportunity that we have missed to integrate two historic structures on this property into this proposed development, and it is unfortunate, because they can be reused; they can celebrate our local history, and they clearly defined what that area was. It was a homestead that belonged to the Cook's. The Cook's later built the Cedar Glade Cemetery and there were two lovely red rock homes, which needed a lot of repair, that could have either been rehabilitated in place or reassembled and reused on another place on this site, so she sees that that history has been demolished, and she understands that the applicant met with the City staff, and they encouraged you to work with them and retain them, so she is asking, since there are no historic resources, to be transparent. In your report, you say there are no historic resources and what you should have said is you demolished them, and if you did, for what reason? There must have been a good rationale for doing that; why did you not look to reuse them, why did you not disassemble and reuse the building materials, or maybe you have and you cached them someplace and you are planning to reuse them; she would like to hear that. Frankly, she thinks the Council and the Historic Preservation Commission would like to hear that, but she would like you to come clean and she would like to better understand your refocus to the cemetery and perhaps ask you to look back to the people that were on that site – the Cook family. Talk about the Cook home and reintegrate whatever you can to tell that story in an authentic way, and then perhaps you will have been able to reclaim a portion of what was demolished.

The Vice Chair then asked if any of the architectural materials were preserved, and Mr. Thompson stated that to his knowledge none of them had been. He looked at the buildings before they were demolished, and there were some window elements there that were steel and there were some structures that were concrete blocks with stone veneer, and that doesn't move very well, plus a concrete floor. There was nothing significant in the structures; they were 2x4 roof framing and there was some state of deterioration, so the buildings did get taken down. There were some hazard issues, but he personally doesn't know if the Historical Society was contacted by anybody, when that was going on, and maybe the Baneys can elaborate on this but he does know there were issues with . . .

Chair Losoff interrupted to say that we just want to focus on the overall concept. What has happened is another issue on the historical side, but that is not necessarily going to change their concept of the Planned Development or Zone Change; however, the Vice Chair stated that she would beg to differ. They want to reclaim a part of the Cook heritage. They have talked about a museum, a linkage to the cemetery and refurbishing the cemetery itself, so in the next iteration before the Commission and in consultation with the Sedona Historical Society, she would like to hear more details of how to embrace and celebrate the Cook family, its heritage and what specific plans they have for doing so, in addition to their linkage to the cemetery. Again, underscoring the idea of sense of place, which comes out of the CFA, out of the language of the Community Plan, and an opportunity that perhaps can be reclaimed in part.

Commissioner Cohen stated that there are lots of elements in this project. First, he would like to know how you arrived at 126 units for the hotel; that might be significant in looking at things

like the parking, traffic. This is a very busy traffic area, because Airport Road comes right down to CVS, which you were instrumental in making happen on the corner; there is all kinds of traffic, so he is interested in how 126 was arrived at and is that the right or wrong number. He has no way of knowing, but it is important in terms of the use of the entire property, and there will be a traffic study, so that will be important. He is also concerned about the crossing from the area you are developing to CVS, because there will be a lot of people doing that – that is just logical, that is a drugstore of significance. Mr. Thompson asked if he is talking about vehicular or pedestrian, and the Commissioner stated both. Regarding the walking area and public space, he would like for you to look at that more closely, because the Community Focus Area Plan says that this area should be having that and it should be significant for it. Then, your parking on the schematic, which will be different next time, looks like it is spread out, and he would like to have a better notion of how that works. The Commissioner then asked if the conference area, the hotel meeting space, is the yellow one, and Mr. Thompson stated that it is actually in the basement of the lobby and restaurant . . . , Commissioner Cohen interrupted to say that his question is what is the difference between blue hotel and the yellow hotel. Mr. Thompson stated not much physically, but it will be in the way it is managed and the length of stay, etc. The Commissioner then asked if guests could be put in either one, depending on room availability, and Mr. Thompson explained that at this point, they are thinking the yellow is the lodging rooms and the blue is the 12 condominium exchanges for the RM-2. The Commissioner then stated that the yellow and the blue hotel spaces are the ones that will house the projected 126 units, but Mr. Thompson explained that those are the total number of rooms between three structures; he thinks it is about 123 or 124 now that they scrutinized it.

Commissioner Klein referenced the Staff Report under Conceptual Review and indicated that staff states that based on the initial review of the materials submitted, staff is concerned about how this proposal fits within the recommendations of the Soldiers Pass Community Focus Area Plan and other sections of the Community Plan. He then asked staff to elaborate on those concerns, and Cynthia Lovely explained that the Soldiers Pass CFA Plan has several elements, and probably one of the most important or prominent ones in the CFA Plan was already mentioned. . . , Chair Losoff interrupted to point out that the Commission was given copies. Cynthia then continued to say, . . . is the community gathering space, so that is something that staff thought would be a more obvious prominent area, and at this point, it looks like the courtyard area is serving that purpose in the current site plan. One of the areas in the CFA Plan, where there is no mention in your material at this point, is the conservation practices under the Environmental section; are there any green building elements? That could be in the construction of the buildings or it could also be with landscaping, so that is one area that we would like to see more information on. Then, the mixed use is probably the sense of community gathering together – a big one. We talk about mixed uses, and it could be a combination of housing, retail and lodging, and the concern was that the proposal now looks like it is really heavy with 80% on lodging. . . , Chair Losoff interrupted to say that Cynthia could not be heard; Cynthia then stated that, the balance of mixed uses – lodging, retail and housing, and the majority or 80% is lodging, so you could say that is not very much of a mix and that was one of their issues.

Chair Losoff asked to see the slide with percentages that Cynthia mentioned again, and Cynthia stated that another one was that in the CFA Plan, it talks about site layout, multiple buildings, and there are multiple buildings, although one concern was on one of the elevations of the lodging, it appears to be one really long, big building, and then the parking, and the idea was to minimize the presence of the parking, and some people have pointed out that it just looks like it surrounds it with parking, and the CFA talks about trying to break it into smaller components.

Cynthia stated that those are the major issues that staff noticed with the Community Plan. The other is connectivity, and we are concerned about connectivity within the development. It talks a lot about connecting with CVS and the cemetery, but their concern is if you are staying in a hotel room in the south yellow area and you need to go to the plaza, how do you get there?

And similarly, if you are on this end of the hotel, what is the route to get from here to there; we think that could be improved, especially along this proposed new roadway, there are no paths or sidewalks along that, so that is an obvious thing that we would like to see in the next plan.

Commissioner Klein indicated that the applicant is trying to accomplish a Zone Change, and currently, these properties are zoned High Density Multi-Family and Commercial, so they want a Zone Change to build 126 units in the hotel, and in staff's papers in looking at the objectives for the Community Focus Area, the first one is Land Use, and it says, "A complete neighborhood center that is a mix of complementary and compatible land uses." Now, lodging can be a component of that, but he agrees with staff's concern that 80% of this project is lodging, and that is really the main purpose of it. He loves all of the surrounding stuff around the lodging units, but he doesn't think the citizens of Sedona are going to be attracted to this area because of the lodging. They are going to be attracted because of what is around it - - the commercial, the retail maybe, the park-like area, so he has some significant concerns that there are too many lodging units in this project that would fit within the objectives of the Community Focus Area. Personally, he would much rather see more housing and less lodging. Housing is much more of a concern in Sedona than lodging, and since this is zoned for Commercial and housing, if there is any way possible, he would like to see more housing and less lodging units. Also, he heard that the owners are going to retain ownership of the condos, so on what basis will they be rented out, by the night or by the month. Ms. Robin Baney indicated that it is multi-family housing, so long-term apartment-type rental. The Commissioner asked if that means a minimum of 30 days or month to month, and Ms. Baney indicated that her son just rented a place and his lease is six months, and that seems to work well with managing long-term housing.

Chair Losoff commented that when we get to that point, we could put in a Development Agreement. Commissioner Klein then asked if all of the condo units are going to be the same size, and Mr. Baney indicated that he thinks there is a mix of one and two-bedroom units and studios.

Commissioner Klein referenced the diagram on right, and stated that he takes it that the top horizontal line is the 22-ft. line, and Mr. Thompson stated yes. The Commissioner then asked what is located above the 22-ft. line, and Mr. Thompson explained that was an idea to make some kind of significant statement for the project, but as it turns out, it probably will be a point of contention. In any classic town or village layout, there is always some recognizable and orientational element, but it probably is not going to fly in Sedona. Chair Losoff stated that Mr. Thompson might want to take it out to avoid a bone of contention. Ms. Robin Baney pointed out that it was a piece of structural art; it wasn't part of the hotel lodging. Mr. Thompson added that he doesn't anticipate getting his client ordained as we did at the Creative Life Center.

Commissioner Klein asked staff if there are currently any three-story buildings in the City of Sedona, and Cari stated yes, she doesn't know, off the top of her head, the actual height when they were built, but we can look into that. Vice Chair Levin stated that pre-incorporation Motel 8 on the west side, and Cari mentioned the Best Western in Uptown that is five stories, but it was definitely built pre-incorporation, and then the Marriott has three stories, but they don't have more than two stories at any one point. Chair Losoff interjected that they are not extending the 22 or 28, and Cari continued to say that we don't necessarily disallow three-story buildings; it is based on the overall height, and the information they provided right now is not complete enough for us to review for height, but that is definitely something we will be looking at closely as it moves forward. Commissioner Klein indicated that in the applicant's papers, they indicated that they will comply with the Sedona Land Development Code regarding signs, and the maximum height for a sign in the Land Development Code is 8 ft., so why did the applicant put in their site plan that they want a monument sign that is 27 ft. tall? Mr. Thompson stated that it sounded like the thing to do, and he understands where the Commissioner is coming from; that will be removed. Architecturally, it probably could work, but not in this town.

Commissioner Klein indicated that there are several residences to the south of this project and they have nice views of Thunder Mountain, so will this project interfere with their views? Mr. Thompson explained that they put up engineering story poles that are significant at certain corners along the building where the roofline undulates up and down, and they are in place as of last week or so. They will be touring the neighbors, and he actually took some pictures from the cul-de-sac today, and they're going to take out something obviously, because it is a building, but it does not take out the top of the rocks or upper one-third realm of half the site from this perspective, but that is going to be more developed and obviously will become a significant part of the site. . . ., Chair Losoff interrupted to point out that the Commission will have a site visit and see some of that.

Commissioner Klein then asked where parking for visitors to the restaurant and commercial is located, and Mr. Thompson stated that they haven't really segregated parking yet, but in the overall parking calculations, they have allotted spaces for the public use of the restaurant, and they also are calling for 10 spaces for the public use of the gathering plaza. The Commissioner then referenced their Letter of Intent that says that a decel lane is proposed for eastbound right turns from the highway; he then asked Mr. Thompson to show him what he is talking about, and Mr. Thompson pointed out the area and indicated that it would also include the mass transit stop. The Commissioner then asked if that is something that they are going to be adding, like on S.R. 89A, a decel lane. Mr. Thompson referred that question to Mr. Beckwith, Civil Engineer.

Art Beckwith, Shephard Wesnitzer, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Beckwith explained that through the traffic study, they will recommend that a deceleration lane be added to eastbound S.R.89A for right turns into the property. Chair Losoff asked if that is an ADOT decision, and Mr. Beckwith stated that he believes that ADOT will require it based on the outcome of the Trip Generation Report that will be created, and that counts all of the daily traffic and the a.m./p.m. counts.

Commissioner Klein again referenced the Letter of Intent and the neighborhood meeting held on January 17th, and referenced a comment that says okay with lodging element. He then asked what they based that statement on; is that something that people verbally said at the meeting? When you look at the emails that have been submitted, there are probably more emails with concerns than support. Mr. Thompson stated that they were comments obviously taken by notes, because of verbalization of thoughts. A lot of it had to do with the fact that they would rather see lodging there than a commercial center, so he is not sure how qualified of a statement that was. There is a compatibility aspect; it shelters the neighborhood from commercial along the highway, it is quiet at night, the lights go out, and it is a good neighbor.

The Commissioner then wanted to know where the pool will be located, and Mr. Thompson indicated that it is in the central plaza. Chair Losoff reminded the Commissioner that this is conceptual, so we don't necessarily have to get into exact locations. Commissioner Klein asked if there is going to be some limit eventually on the hours that the pool can be used, and perhaps posted to the neighbors behind there, so noise from the pool area won't get to the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Thompson indicated they had specific discussions with the neighbors about that, and at least at this point, they are addressing it by depressing that courtyard and creating a bit of a barrier on the south side, and it will also be managed from a time of use standpoint. The Commissioner then wanted to know how many employees they anticipate employing, and Mr. Baney indicated from 10 to 20 or 25 during the day, and there are probably only two or three employees onsite after guests are checked-in and the restaurant closes. Commissioner Klein then wanted to know if that includes housekeeping and Mr. Baney stated yes, housekeepers work during the day. One housekeeper per 15 rooms is plenty. The Commissioner then wanted to know if they have looked into the issue of how easy it is going to be to get employees. . . ., Chair Losoff interrupted to remind the Commissioner that he would like to stay away from some of this; it is conceptual so should it be rezoned, does it meet the CFA, and are we in line with those things? Good questions, but it is going further than maybe it should.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that a lot of the questions he was going to ask have been asked and answered or at least asked, so he won't repeat those. First, he wanted to say that he is thrilled that such a high-quality applicant and developer finds Sedona a place that they might want to invest in. This is a very high-quality company and their properties throughout the western United States are as their ratings indicate. He thought that the consistency with Community Focus Area Plan was well done on a scaled basis. He doesn't think there is any responsibility that a developer has to meet all of the needs of the entire area on their individual property, and he thought the balance here was excellent. He really liked the plaza area and he understands why there should be a closure of the plaza area during the late evening and early morning hours for security purposes. He was really pleased to hear that there was an alternative pathway around the plaza that could be used for people who might be coming through that area during the summer or early in the mornings or late in the evenings, but obviously, there is not going to be that much foot traffic in the wintertime when it is dark.

Commissioner Barcus stated that he is a little concerned about the road that traverses the property from Saddlerock Circle over to S.R.89A. That signalized intersection at S.R.89A, from a traffic standpoint, one of the treasures we have in our community is signalized intersections, so he doesn't understand how traffic will flow out of the Saddlerock area to use that signalized intersection during the peak travel times. He would hope that the transportation study mentioned will address those traffic flows, plus a traffic management plan as to what the expectations are for traffic.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that the setback by the parking on the south edge of the hotel property development was outstanding; that spacing provides a reasonable accommodation to the residential properties to the south. It seems that this is significantly in excess of what would be required given its current zoning, as for as setback and height requirements. It is an excellent concession and that concession should be recognized as something that the developer and architect has designed purposefully to make that accommodation. He also actually liked the architectural statement promontory, but he is not going to break a pick over that. Regarding the question about employees has been asked, but he wants to understand how the retail space will be managed. Are those going to be retail spaces that will be owned, operated and managed by the developer or will they be sublet? He is concerned about parking, because of the multiple uses and where the designated employee parking will be. You might be able to enforce employee parking with your employees, but you need to be careful about having the other retail properties' employee parking managed, so you don't have a problem with the restaurant or hotel guests, etc. This is a terrific project and he was thrilled to go through all of the gory details.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he is really concerned about the community gathering plaza, which is one of the CFAs priorities in this community; we don't have too many places where people can get together and mingle with the tourists. With 10 parking spaces for that venue, you are probably going to get room for about 20 people to gather there and maybe some hotel guests. He is also concerned about the historic significant buildings that were taken down. He understands masonry with veneer on it, but it was significant and he agrees with Vice Chair Levin on that part. Maybe there is a way around that, maybe there are pictures available, to rebuild something with old stones, which there might be some around from other buildings -- that would be great, or at least partially something like that in the community plaza possibly, so people know in the community what was there or at least what people lived like. Also in the CFA, we always talked about having a buffer to the residents with multi-family housing rather than lodging right next to the residents, even so there is an 80-ft. buffer to the next residence, this project reaches far into the residential area.

Commissioner Mayer then referenced Jazz at the Oxford and stated that with a venue that small in size, you are not going to have any jazz going on there at all, so with your historic, the owner he is addressing this to, you lined out that you are very concerned and very adamant about historic preservation and all that stuff, so maybe there can be something done in that

respect. The size of the lodging with 127, almost 80%, that is a lot of concern he has and shares with the other Commissioners who brought that up. He doesn't want to talk about the architecture and design of it, etc., because it might change a little bit, so he is not going to criticize anything, even the tower, whatever, there is a steeple like you said or something tall in the village, because that is the concept. Then, referencing the employee housing, the 400 sq. ft., he asked if that is going to be affordable for the lower-income employees or something almost like affordable housing, something like that? Also, you mentioned something about 10 employees, was that right for the whole project? Mr. Baney again stated anywhere from 10 to 20. The Commissioner then asked if that includes the retail people, and Mr. Baney stated no, there will be retail employees also. Commissioner Mayer stated that the closing at 10:00 p.m. bothers him too, because there is nothing going on after 10:00 p.m., everything is out, so what is going to happen there? He thought it was a community gathering place where people enjoy each other and have something going on, so it definitely has to be a bigger place. He would like to see that much bigger with a lot of greenery and landscaping; he doesn't see much landscaping on there at all.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he agrees with Commissioner Barcus about everything he said actually, but he was concerned in that Commissioner Barcus was questioning the access from Saddlerock to the signalized intersection, and he thought that wasn't going to work and he wanted to make sure . . . , Commissioner Barcus clarified that he wanted to understand how it is going to work.

Commissioner Brandt then indicated that he heard a lot of things he had written down, so he only has a couple of things. He was glad that Commissioner Mayer said the word 'tower', because that is what it is, and he kind of liked the way that the composition works there perhaps with the scale of the trees that exist and making it a public space that you could actually go up and get some aerial view photos or something like that—that might be a fun thing. When you were asking about 10:00 p.m., it is like everybody goes to bed before 10:00 p.m. here, so . . . , Commissioner Mayer stated not him, and Commissioner Brandt added that if you want to get around this town, drive at 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Brandt referenced Elk Road and stated that it might need some attention; it is a major access to that whole neighborhood and it functions for the Twice Nice Thrift Store that is a very important part of our community and the Verde Valley as it functions, so we want to make sure that the street isn't terribly compromised or actually could help out Twice Nice. For those that don't know, Twice Nice is a benefit store or 'thrifrique', as they call it, for the domestic abuse shelter in the Verde Valley. He also would like to see the evolution today of the condominiums, usually condos or timeshares or something like that, so for them to be housing for locals, market share, but to ensure that they will housing and not rented short-term would make the whole project work for the balance of uses for him.

Commissioner Brandt pointed out that there are a couple of landlocked parcels to the south of the pool area, so he is curious as to how those get access; he thinks it is actually to the south of the L-shaped wing. Mr. Thompson indicated that those parcels are accessed from Elk Road; they have an access easement. Commissioner Brandt then stated that we want to make sure the large trees are preserved as much as possible, and we want sidewalks everywhere. Again, this is a great start for this project and he appreciates the work that has been done. Overall, it appears to have a bit more of the suburban feel with the curving road, the new road, and if that was somehow made more of a village feel, but he doesn't know with Fire Department requirements. He knows that you don't want people to come through there and be heading to the Elks, when really, they want to be going to the signalized intersection, but if there was a way to just get that – he knows that parking around the hotel needs to have more of a suburban feel, but if certain aspects had less of a suburban feel, that would be good. With that said, the way that the buildings push up to the highway, are off-grid, and kind of work around the trees he imagines, would be a nice addition to the highway. There is a setback shown along highway, and he then asked if it is correct that commercial property doesn't really need to have

a front setback along that side of the highway, and Cari Meyer explained (could not be heard). Commissioner Brandt asked if that is not something that is adjustable. Cari Meyer indicated that with a Planned Development they can propose anything and we can consider it. The Commissioner then pointed out that in Uptown, it would be storefronts right up to the highway or property line, and that could be something that is looked at here.

Chair Losoff stated that from a conceptual point-of-view, he would disagree with a couple of Commissioners. He is looking at it not from an overall, what it looks like Design Review or colors, whatever, he is looking at if it conforms with the Community Focus Area Plan, and as he looks at it, he would like to see significant changes, because he doesn't think it does. We spent a lot of time on the CFA, what we want there and what we don't want there. He doesn't know how many meetings we had, but we had a lot. We talked a lot about a dynamic walkable center of activity for neighbors, visitors and business. This has over 85% lodging; he doesn't see that as neighborhood-friendly. He doesn't see what the neighbors are going to get out of it. It could be that the City may benefit economically, but from a neighborhood CFA, he is kind of lost with the idea of what the benefits are to the community. We talked about walkability, winding around and cars coming in and out through the parking lot; he will be anxious to see what the traffic study shows, not just what traffic is going to do on S.R. 89A, but what the traffic alignment is within the property. He knows the Fire Department has some concerns, but he doesn't know if they have expressed them yet. The Chair then asked if they have written their report, and Cari stated that Fire has provided some comments, and she would also point out that our Engineering Department has more. . . , the Chair then interrupted to say that it is not just what is going to happen on S.R. 89A, but within the property itself.

The Chair then stated that again, this is a residential area to the back, out front he is sure we can do some things, but he was kind of concerned about what we are going to get out of it. We talked in the last several meetings about multi-family housing, and we passed a Plan Amendment for multi-family housing and the importance of it for Sedona. Here we have some acreage, some land that is already designated Multi-family housing. We would be giving that up, so again, what are the benefits to the community to get 80% or 85% lodging. The public area could be a benefit, but as he looks at it, it is not easy to access, and again for a public area, is it more restaurant, hotel-related or is it truly where people are just going to come and hang out? When we looked at the CFA, we looked for a more open area where people can congregate, come in with their buggies and kids and animals, and this does not seem to appeal to that, if he understands it right. Viewsheds are extremely important, and we've heard from several of the neighbors in the written comments. In Sedona, viewsheds are high on everybody's list, so as much as the tower may be nice, we had a development in Uptown, and they wanted a higher tower, and he came back nine times until we approved regulation height, so he would be careful with this. No matter how nice it might look and what kind of statement it might make, it still is Sedona, so you want to be careful of that. From an overall design development point-of-view, somebody mentioned that it didn't quite look like Sedona. It has more of a, he doesn't know, it (audio unclear) have that kind of a western Sedona feel, but until we see more details, the jury is out on that he guesses.

Chair Losoff then summarized that overall, he was concerned that we have as much lodging as we do; he would like to see more emphasis on community development in terms of housing, mixed-use units, and a true public area that is open to everybody, not just maybe a few, and having said that, he will stop talking. He also thinks the Staff Report highlighted a lot of issues that we are all concerned about aside from what we have talked about, so before we get into any place, those issues have to be addressed to make sure it conforms with everything. Conceptually, you have heard the Commission's comments; some people think it is great and some don't, and we will have to weigh it all and see what you as developers can act with staff on it.

Commissioner Klein asked if the ground level is 4 ft. to 7 ft. below grade will it create any potential flooding or drainage issues. Art Beckwith stated that there is a substantial amount of

water drainage that runs across the property, and it has to be managed and controlled, just like it does on every project. They will have a drainage study that will address that, and they will provide all of the requirements the City requires for detention and retention. Chair Losoff asked if it can be managed, and Mr. Beckwith stated yes.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he is hearing some concerns about the plaza and how that may or may not work. He then referenced the 10 lodging units that actually fronts out to that plaza, and asked what 'elite' lodging means. Mr. Thompson commented, choice of words, it is just a more accommodating living space than a room in the hotel. It has a little more substantial kitchen-type pullman arrangement and a separate bedroom, whereas in the hotel, you have a singular space. Commissioner Mayer said, "Suite", and Mr. Thompson stated that might be a better word. Commissioner Brandt then stated suite or a long-term hotel, kind of like Phase 2 of the Courtyard Marriott is thought to be. Commissioner Brandt then asked if that makes sense to have it by a public plaza or should that be more apartments or retail or something that would be more compatible – it might be compatible, he doesn't know.

Commissioner Mayer asked if there is a retention pond going to be there or just runoff into the ditch. Art Beckwith again stated that they are going to comply with what the City requires, detention and retention.

Commissioner Cohen referenced Cynthia's comments about a pedestrian crossing, and stated that we have a street that is going through the property, coming off of the street on the far left, so a guy comes out of his room, he is going to cross to the plaza and retail, that is now a street that he has to cross, so some arrangement has to be done for pedestrian safety. Second, he is concerned about the tower for the reason that, as well as somebody raised about line of sight to rocks, people's property in this town has a value based on the site, and if anything is blocking the view of the people who own the homes, that is a bad thing. Third, is the City's sewer system able to handle this large development in that area? Andy Dickey stated yes, we have sewer facilities in this area, and he doesn't see why we wouldn't be able to accommodate the development. We will need to commit the additional demand for this site to what we have available. Commissioner Cohen then asked if that includes the processing center for sewage, and Andy stated correct, all the way to the treatment plant.

Commissioner Brandt referenced the southern portion of the development shaded green and asked if that is the recessed area, and Mr. Thompson stated yes, he had failed to point that out.

Chair Losoff opened the work session for public comments.

Michael Vitek, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Vitek asked if on the connector road between Saddlerock and S.R. 89A, there are going to be sidewalks. Mr. Thompson stated yes. Mr. Vitek stated that he can't tell that there are going to be sidewalks on that. Mr. Thompson again stated yes there will be, and the Chair explained that Mr. Vitek should make his comments; this isn't a question and answer time. Mr. Vitek repeated that there need to be sidewalks on that road, and possibly put along Saddlerock Circle from the edge of their development up to that road – that is his main concern with that road right now. Plus, is there going to be parking allowed on that road? If parking is allowed, it won't be wide enough for the amount of traffic to go out that way.

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

The Chair asked Cari Meyer to comment on what the Commission just heard, and Cari indicated that one of staff's comments was that we would want to see sidewalks on the road, and she believes Engineering had the same comment. Parking along the road depends on road width. Andy Dickey then added that if they wanted to have parking along the road, it would have to be wide enough to do it. If it is not beyond a certain width, it wouldn't be allowed. Chair Losoff added that the CFA calls for walkability, sidewalks, etc., so hopefully we will see that more clearly in the next iteration.

Commissioner Mayer referenced the Elks Lodge and other commercial developments all the way out to S.R. 89A and suggested switching that around that big block instead or something like that.

Chair Losoff stated that you are hearing some likes but a lot of concerns; some significant concerns, and then asked if the applicant wanted to make any final comments.

Mr. Curt Baney stated that he is hearing a lot of concerns about traffic, and he wanted to point out that it is a 6.3-acre site, and there is one acre of Multi-family, and on that one acre, you can put 12 multi-family units, so they are not asking for a rezone on that portion. They are preserving those 12 units by incorporating that into the development, so that means that from the 6.3 acres less one acre, there is 5.3 acres of Commercial zoning, and with Commercial zoning, and they have a lot of traffic studies on all of their developments, and retail and restaurants generate a lot more trips than hotels do, so they are zoning from 5.3 acres of Commercial zoning that would create a lot more traffic than what they figured. He is not sure if 80% is accurate; he thinks there are 3.5 acres of lodging, so they are going from 5.3 acres of Commercial zoning to 3.5 acres of Lodging zoning, and that leaves about two acres of Commercial zoning. When the traffic studies are done, it is really a downzone from a traffic generation standpoint. There is a lot less trip generation from a lodging development than from commercial or restaurants or fast-food restaurants, so with what we are proposing, the potential for traffic is less by allowing the Zone Change. Also regarding the connection from Saddlerock to the Soldiers Pass intersection, it is designed solely for the safety of the Saddlerock residents, so they don't have to go out Saddlerock and make a left turn on S.R.89A; they can come through the property and get to the light to make a left turn safely, so that is the reason that was designed into the property. They appreciate everybody's comments and will take all of them into consideration and hopefully will be incorporating a lot of things into it.

Chair Losoff suggested that they take a closer look at the CFA; of course, it is in the eye of the beholder.

Mr. Thompson asked if the students had any comments or questions; however, Warren Campbell explained that they would have to fill out cards if they are going to speak, and the Chair noted that it had already been opened to the public, so at this point, we will save that, but he then asked Warren for his thoughts, and Warren stated that the Chair can decide if he would like to open it back up. The Chair then stated that if the students wanted to comment, they would have to complete a card, and he will give them an opportunity to comment on the proceedings for three minutes; however, City Attorney Robert Pickels Jr. explained that if you are going to open it up to the students, you need to open it to everybody else. The Chair then stated that at this point, we won't open it up, and Mr. Thompson stated that he would talk to the students outside.

Cari Meyer stated that this concludes the Conceptual Review part of this project. The applicant will take all of the comments and come back with a comprehensive submittal, so there will be a lot more information. The Chair indicated that given the comments that we've heard, he wondered if there should be another Conceptual Review, and Cari explained that will be at the discretion of the applicant, and if they want to do another Conceptual Review, we will be happy to do that, but if they want to move forward to the comprehensive, that is a decision they need to make. Vice Chair Levin had expressed a desire to have a site visit, so as part of the next meeting, staff will arrange that

4. **FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**
 - a. **Tuesday, October 3, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - b. **Thursday, October 12, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - c. **Tuesday, October 17, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - d. **Thursday, November 2, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work session)**

Cari Meyer stated that the hearing on Tuesday October 3rd has been canceled, and we are now looking at November 7th for the Wireless public hearing. On October 12th, we have a work session on the Residence Inn project at 3:30 p.m. On October 17th, we have a Time Extension for the Andante Inn and Super 8 façade remodel, and we plan on having a work session for the Multi-family project that is going through the Community Plan Amendment process. He has submitted his complete Zone Change and Development Review package that is online, and currently, we have nothing on November 2nd, but that could change.

Chair Losoff stated that he would not be present on October 12th.

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

Chair Losoff 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 September 28, 2017.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date