

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, February 6, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

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

Vice Chair Levin called the work session to order at 3:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

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

Staff Present: James Crowley, Andy Dickey, Audree Juhlin, Ryan Mortillaro, Robert Pickels Jr., Rob Pollock, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Moriarty

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

Commissioner Barcus announced that he submitted his resignation yesterday, effective April 1st, because of scheduling; he would be unable to fulfill his obligation to the City to attend the meetings. He will be here less than 50% of the time, so he felt it was appropriate for him to resign. He will be here until April 1st, and this is not an April Fool's joke. This will give the City an opportunity to advertise for a replacement, and then his term ends in October, so the new appointee will fill the rest of his term and be able to reapply. Vice Chair Levin noted that there will be many more opportunities to thank Commissioner Barcus for his service and that he will be here regularly until April 1st. Commissioner Barcus agreed and added that he will be prepared. It has nothing to do with the issues, Commissioners, staff or anything else; he is just not going to be able to be here for the meetings, even though we have abbreviated the schedule as much as we have, so he felt that it was appropriate. When you are serving on a Board or Commission, you need to be present and that is the reason he has resigned. Vice Chair Levin stated that she was sorry to hear it; we all appreciate the Commissioner's preparation, diligence and service.

3. Discussion regarding the update of the Land Development Code.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she would expect those Commissioners that raised the issues in the memorandum to address those points.

Mike Raber then explained that this continues the work session discussion on the Development Standards portion of the Land Development Code Update. For the January 16th work session, staff prepared a summary of the questions and comments on the draft, and at that work session, the Commission was not able to get through all of the items, so we're picking up where we left off by using the summary as a guide for those remaining items. As noted in the memo, the discussion on Firewise, landscaping and density will be discussed on March 20th. Mike then confirmed that the consultant will be at that meeting, and we will also be talking about the next part of the Code.

Mike stated that we left off with Section 5.9, Public Art on page 95 of the public draft, and it includes exemptions from the requirement to establish public art. Currently, that exemption includes single-family, but staff also supports exempting multi-family projects that are addressing local housing needs, so we want to discuss that today, and it brings up the broader question in terms of our Development Standards and housing affordability. We discussed that a little bit in November, but that is up for discussion.

Commission's Comments:

Commissioner Kinsella indicated that the definition of multi-family starts at two dwellings, and she thought that perhaps is a high burden for a small two or three-family house -- some of the burdens in terms of requirements, including a public art requirement, so she wanted to make sure we spoke about that in the course of our discussion. Vice Chair Levin asked if staff wanted to provide a definition of multi-family for the Commission, and Mike Raber agreed that essentially it is more than one unit per lot.

Commissioner Kinsella asked if the Commission would be able to make different categories. She doesn't want anything that contradicts language elsewhere in the Code that has been developed thus far or in the Master Plan, but if we were looking at various requirements, would we be able to segregate out a duplex and triplex and if we wanted to, could we include that language? Mike Raber indicated that he thinks so. If you are talking about exemptions, you could be specific about what that would be.

Commissioner Klein stated that there is no definition of multi-family in the Definition section at the end. He would be in favor of exempting multi-family projects, but where you say, "If they address local housing needs", he is not sure what that means. Mike Raber explained that similar to the recent apartment development and the citywide density change that went along with that, where the applicant did provide some mechanism so some of those units could be affordable and were not going to be converted into condominiums, etc., those are all things that we can discuss when we get a project like that, including if this exemption could apply in that case. He wouldn't see it applying to a small duplex or triplex, because they aren't going to be in the position of being able to address that housing need the way a larger complex would.

Commissioner Klein asked if someone were building a triplex, would they be exempt from the public art requirement or not, and Mike stated that the way it is written now, no multi-family is exempt, but that question has been asked in the draft, and staff would support some kind of exemption for multi-family that is addressing our housing needs. Vice Chair Levin stated that there is no minimum threshold above which . . . and Mike stated not the way the draft is written, but that is something the Commission could recommend.

Commissioner Brandt stated that you don't need to exclude duplexes or triplexes. There might be ways for them to show an employee local housing need and meeting that. Is there any discussion about having the criteria listed, like three of the five items? For instance, like what we just saw; is there a way to include that in the LDC? Like the housing needs, we keep saying it is not going to be a condominium; that it could be listed. Audree Juhlin stated that she thinks we could give examples of what "addressing housing needs" means and define that in the regulations. Commissioner Brandt commented, alright, let's do it.

Commissioner Mayer asked to what extent is the size or cost of the art for those triplexes, four fourplexes. Is there going to be a standard for that? Audree explained that the Sedona Land Development Code Article 18 is the Arts in Public Places Ordinance, and it defines the amount per square footage. The Commissioner asked if the amount of square footage means you have to put up art, and Audree stated that you have the ability to either pay in lieu to the Arts Fund or place artwork equivalent to . . . the Commissioner then interrupted to say so you can buy your way out basically, and Audree stated yes. Commissioner Mayer then said that you pay for the square footage you have and Audree indicated that is correct. The Commissioner wanted to know if we have a number for that, and Audree Juhlin stated that she would have to look it up, but she thinks it is about 50 cents per sq. ft. Commissioner Mayer then said if somebody comes up with a piece of art that is several thousand dollars, is that going to be applied to the square footage or put in a scale? Audree explained that if artwork is going to be proposed for Art in Public Places the value of the art has to equal the dollar amount. Then, the Commissioner asked if there are restrictions on what kind of art and Audree stated no.

Commissioner Barcus referenced the video that says we are the City animated by the arts and asked why we are exempting single-family dwellings and why don't we have a contribution to the City of Sedona Art in Public Places Fund for all structures that are built in the City; that would be his preference. Audree noted that staff could poll the Commission to see if there is agreement to move that forward. Commissioner Mayer asked if art inside of a building counts, and Audree stated no; it has to be visible for the public right-of-way.

The Vice Chair then asked if the language of Article 18 would have to be uniformly applied or if it could be at some lesser formula, and Audree Juhlin indicated that the Commission could direct staff to look at some other ways in which to address single-family homes. The Vice Chair then commented that you might be able to modify the formula if not get away from it entirely, as an incentive for affordable housing.

Commissioner Barcus stated that his suggestion is keep it simple, and that means it applies to everyone, and you can either make a contribution or put your art in your public place for your larger development. Why are we quibbling over art in public places? The Vice Chair explained that it is whether you view it as a possible incentive towards the development of affordable housing. She then asked if there could be a menu of options.

Audree explained that the purpose behind staff's recommendation to consider exempting multi-family for more affordable housing is, as we discussed in the last meeting, the costs that add to the housing that make it more expensive and less affordable, and this would be one of the things that would be considered adding expense to a project.

Commissioner Mayer asked if we are talking about a 3,000 sq. ft. home or \$1,500, and Vice Chair Levin indicated that we are talking about multi-family, not single-family homes; however, the Commissioners clarified that Commissioner Barcus was proposing it for everything. Commissioner Barcus again explained that he is suggesting that you don't discriminate between building types and if the housing meets the affordability criteria, it would be exempt. If you cover for multi-family, because they make representations about affordability, you can do it for single-family as well.

Vice Chair Levin then asked to see if the Commission wanted to include all single-family, and Commissioner Kinsella noted that 60 cents per square foot is what we think it is; however, Audree clarified approximately 50 cents. Commissioner Kinsella then asked if someone built a 3,000 sq. ft. home for two families and one might assume they are trying to keep the affordability in place is why they are sharing the structure, so this is going to add \$1,800 to the cost of the project, and Audree Juhlin stated that as drafted, yes that is correct. Commissioner Kinsella then indicated that the question is if we feel that is an impediment and contradictory to the purpose of people trying to share homes on smaller lots. She is not concerned about multi-family once you get into the higher numbers; she is concerned with a duplex and that is a burden, so maybe it should fall into the same category as single-family versus multi-family.

The Vice Chair again asked if there is support for Commissioner Barcus' suggestion to apply art to all housing, and no other Commissioner agreed. Vice Chair Levin then asked Commissioner Kinsella if rather than applying the proposed exemption for all multi-family housing, she want to . . . Commissioner Kinsella interrupted to state that she wants move to the higher-end numbers. Commissioner Kinsella stated .60 cents is she is not comfortable with the exemption for all multi-family housing, because you could have a larger-scale development with 40 or 50 units, and that is an income-producing property and part of that means that is a give back to the community to provide public art, but if somebody is struggling to build small homes that is a different category and that is why she sees a difference between a larger number of units versus a small number of units.

Vice Chair Levin then asked if there was support for the language in the packet, which would provide an exemption for all multi-family; however, Audree clarified that it is an exemption for all multi-family if they address affordable housing needs, and four Commissioners agreed. The Vice

Chair then suggested concluding that discussion, reflecting the minority opinions on either end of the dais, with a majority opinion for the existing language.

Mike Raber asked if there was any further comment on the other item on there. Last time, we talked in general about Development Standards and housing affordability, and it is going to be more important after the next part of the Code. Vice Chair Levin noted that it will come back in the March meeting and suggested moving on to Article 7.

Mike Raber referenced the Subdivision Standards on page 100 that starts as a general question. The Land Development Code currently doesn't address gated subdivisions. Should the Code address this issue and if so, how? We also noted that the draft Code doesn't directly address private streets, so staff wants clarification that private streets in new subdivisions need to meet City standards and provide enough easement space to get the roadway and all other amenities and utilities in as well. There doesn't appear to be any state law on gated communities, but at least one city allows gated subdivisions as long as they don't impede the connection of streets adjoining or abutting the property, and as a minimum, we would want to ensure that could happen. The issue is really, how do we ensure we don't create an impediment to a street connection?

Commissioner Barcus stated that he guesses that we are talking about a large parcel of land with streets that abut it, and if somebody proposes a gated community how are we going to handle that? He would think it would be addressed in the development proposal as opposed to in the Code. If we try to come up with every possible hypothetical, we will miss half of them, so we are coming up with hypotheticals in the Land Development Code that may be easier handled when we get a development proposal. . . Audree explained that the issue before staff in relation to this question is the Community Plan promotes connectivity throughout all subdivisions, and if a gated community comes in, what is our ability to say we still want to promote and implement the Community Plan's goal for connectivity? How do we address that?

Commissioner Mayer asked what the law says, and Robert Pickels indicated that based on the research there doesn't appear to be anything that limits our authority under state law to impose some restriction, but there has to be a valid purpose for doing so, and that is the connectivity. Whether that is sufficient enough is subject to being tested, but if that is established as the purpose for some kind of regulation in that regard, then we don't have anything in state law that prohibits us from doing that. The Commissioner then asked if the gated community has to be surrounded in order to have the connectivity instead of . . . whoever develops a gated community is going to have a real issue with that, because of the privacy, and they basically sell that whole project with private streets, etc., unless it provides a solution for that, which doesn't cut off that connectivity. Robert Pickels Jr. stated that you have the competing interests of the public interest versus the privacy rights, and then the engineering solution that would have to be achieved.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that the other thing is applying all of the right-of-way, etc., for streets in the gated community, and how that is going to work. It will take a lot more land. Mike Raber explained that it needs to be clear that if they are private streets, they have to provide enough room just like a public street; we inherited some that don't. Andy Dickey explained that the current practice is to require that they supply adequate right-of-way and easement as if it were a public street, but there had been streets established prior to City incorporation that didn't meet that standard, and we deal with the complications of that today, when there is not enough room for all of the infrastructure that we might want within the right-of-way, like utilities and sidewalks, etc. The Commissioner then asked about all of their roads meeting the requirements of the Fire Department, and Andy stated that there are definitely streets that are not quite wide enough for fire standards as well. Audree Juhlin stated that the point is that currently the draft only addresses public streets, and we directed the consultants to include that public and private streets have the same requirements.

Commissioner Brandt asked if staff is asking if the Commission agrees with that, and Mike Raber pointed out that it brings up the issues of gated subdivisions, and we have not talked to them about

that. Commissioner Brandt stated connectivity, not necessarily the engineering standards or fire department standards or anything like that, because that is already being done. Audree Juhlin agreed, and the Commissioner then indicated that would also suggest that it should be codified. If you look at Casa Contenta on Soldiers Pass Road as a gated subdivision, it wouldn't connect to anything unless you go through the forest to Uptown, so he doesn't see many possibilities where someone would consider a gated subdivision where there is already a road through their property, so it doesn't make sense to him. Mike Raber explained that you might get a gated subdivision proposal where you couldn't get a street connection and it wouldn't make sense, but in the case that you did need something, we wanted to make sure we don't ignore that. Andy Dickey then added that there are times where we might not think of a vehicular connection as feasible, but a ped or bike might definitely be feasible and desired, so we want to keep that in mind as well.

Commissioner Kinsella indicated that Commissioner Barcus raised a very good point about some of this having to come forward in the development proposal, because we can't anticipate where the area is going to be and what kind of street they are going to be looking for, so that should be considered at that time, but we have been talking about the private streets in terms of engineering standards and EMS standards, but she wants to make sure, especially in some of the larger developments with 100 or 200 homes, that the streets are meeting Manual Uniform Traffic Control Specifications as well, because even though they are privately owned, there is a lot of public use of those streets with visitors and deliveries, so she is concerned about things like signage and speed limits, and that they are following standards. Andy Dickey stated that definitely would be required.

Commissioner Mayer asked, regarding available open land, how many acres are needed for a subdivision. Audree Juhlin explained it is over three lots, Commissioner Mayer then commented that there is still a lot of land possible and asked if it cannot be predetermined that there is connectivity before they even start, to like plan ahead. Mike Raber stated that that there isn't a minimum size written, and just to clarify, it sounds like the majority of the Commission would lean toward having something in the Code that would address gated subdivisions, and the Vice Chair agreed.

Mike Raber indicated that the next item was on page 103, in the Lot Planning section for access and it is 3.B. This is requiring at least two points of access into a subdivision where feasible, "unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that legal, topographical and/or engineering constraints preclude it". The question is how that applies to a simple lot split, and it raises a question that staff has regarding the general applicability of this and some of the other standards where we have splits of two or three parcels versus the definition of a subdivision, which is more than that. It appears that the way this has been put together, there is not a very good distinction, so it is sort of like all of the standards apply to everything, and Clarion is aware that it is an item we want clarification on, but this item has to do with requiring two points of access and how that would work with a simple lot split.

Commissioner Klein indicated that under the definition of subdivision, basically you don't have to worry about two access points until you are dividing into four or more lots. Mike Raber stated that the draft doesn't really make that distinction; it isn't very clear in the draft that subdivision is less than four lots, the way the state defines subdivision. Audree Juhlin added that this was more informational; the Commission will see this topic clarified in the codified draft.

Commissioner Barcus referenced page 103 and asked if we were going to talk about flag lots as one of the issues. Mike Raber indicated that is another area where we are recommending a change. The Commissioner stated that we are going to provide the flagpole portion of the flag-shaped lot and prescribe the width of that flagpole, and the length of that flagpole shall not exceed 300 ft., so if it is 24 ft. wide, which is the minimum proposed width and it is 300 ft. long, that is 7,200 sq. ft., which is probably more land than in the lot that is being proposed as the flag attachment to the flagpole. Is the devil in the details that because it is going to have public water and sewer systems, is that the issue? He is looking at a flagpole serving a single lot; not a flagpole serving multiple lots that the water and sewer systems would be in the flagpole right-of-way. The flagpole

lots that he has seen developed have the sewer connection either at the cul-de-sac or street as is your water connection, and you are required to make the run up to 300 ft., and the 300 ft. is fine, but we don't need 24 ft. or 40 ft. Mike Raber explained that we are asking for one change, so it is really serving five lots or less that this would apply to; it would not apply to lots above that number. Commissioner Barcus indicated that is fine, but if it is a single lot or maybe two lots with two flags on the pole, it is still a lot of square footage, and it just seemed like a substantial amount. Audree Juhlin indicated that staff will look into that.

Mike Raber referenced Street Design Standards on page 106 and pointed out that it references engineering standards and the Standards Manual, and in 4.B, the section also notes that "other suitable designs and materials may be approved when in the opinion of the Planning & Zoning Commission such methods would be more environmentally desirable or more in keeping with the design of the development or neighborhood". The question is what are these other suitable designs and materials, and Clarion wants to remove the word 'suitable' and coordinate with us on previous alternative street designs that we have looked at, and then provide examples with this paragraph, so that is something they are going to address. Vice Chair Levin noted that this will come back.

Commissioner Mayer stated that in a CFA we have a historic designation, the Schnebly, so are we going to do something in regard to the street design for that? Audree Juhlin pointed out that the Schnebly Hill CFA provided direction to have a Heritage District or something like that included in the Land Development Code, and we will be working with Clarion to determine what the Heritage District is going to look like – if it will be a standalone or a mixed-use district, so we will be looking at that and bringing it forward.

Mike Raber referred to the Cluster Subdivision section on pages 108 and 109, and Table 7.1, and he indicated that the question on page 108 was regarding parcel and lot size. We started this discussion in November, but one question is if the parcel size of three acres, which is the minimum size for a subdivision, and a lot size of 3,000 sq. ft. is too much. We had discussed possibly reducing the 3,000 sq. ft. to 2,500 sq. ft., but does it really hurt anything to leave that flexible as long as the overall density isn't increased, because if we did this under a PRD, we would leave that flexible, and that is the question. Do we even need an overall minimum acreage? We don't have that with our standard subdivisions, so that is one question. Clarion also noted that the standard in Cluster Subdivision block lengths should be the same. A Commissioner had asked why it was 600 ft. versus 660 ft. in main subdivisions, and they noted those should be the same. There is no reason for the difference. Typically, it is between 400 and 800 ft., but they thought 600 ft. would be a good start to encourage walkability, but we will need to coordinate with Engineering to see if that is really appropriate or if that is something we even want to address as part of this.

Vice Chair Levin asked if we have a definition of Cluster Subdivision in the Articles of Definitions, and if it implies that it could be mixed use. Mike Raber stated that the way it is set up, the underlying zoning would dictate the use, but the question is if we want to be flexible with some of the standards, and we would probably have to cross-reference that with the first part of the Code that has all of the zones listed. Vice Chair Levin noted that it could be viewed like a PRD where you wouldn't have specificity, and Mike Raber explained that is the question, and staff feels there is a lot to be said for keeping some of those standards pretty flexible. Vice Chair Levin stated that she would agree. Mike then added that setbacks is another one that has been asked, and that is the same issue.

Commissioner Barcus asked if we are going to require storm water retention on these individual clustered lots. He is trying to figure out if we spend a lot of time trying to develop clustering, which makes sense, because the whole objective of clustering is to leave more open space in larger places rather than between houses, so you have the same density in a development with the structures clustered, and then there is some open space that may provide a more suitable design, but if we require storm water retention from the rooftops and driveways on the individual lots, is that going to preclude clusters from happening or do we need to indicate that it is okay to have that on the common space. Andy Dickey explained that it is fairly common for the detention and retention

requirements to be accounted for in the common area. As far as whether or not we would have to account for it, we would have to look at what potentially has already been accounted for, so if it is an in-fill development within an already developed area, the historic flow patterns for pre-development versus post may already be accounted for, so we would have to verify that, but it would definitely have to be accounted for in some way. The other thing that could happen if area is a consideration of what we are looking at, it could be subsurface like what you see with commercial developments, where you have a pipe under the ground and you are able to still develop the surface area and account for that detention-retention under the ground, but it is more expensive.

Commissioner Barcus then indicated that we are prescribing Cluster Subdivision setback requirements of 5 ft. front, 3 ft. side and 10 ft. rear, which seems pretty skinny, but these are minimum 2,500 ft. lots, so in that context it makes sense, but are we indirectly excluding zero lot line cluster developments? Mike Raber indicated that he had a similar question for the consulting team, and the setbacks between structures is something that should be driven by the proposal, because clustering is just that. You may be bringing them fairly close and maybe zero lot line, but what might be more important to talk about is the periphery of the subdivision itself. Do we need some standard, and do they meet the standard of the underlying district for the perimeter of the subdivision itself, and those are questions we would like to ask Clarion. Commissioner Barcus agreed and indicated that would make an incredible amount of sense too. The Commissioner then commented that we don't know if we are excluding zero lot line from our development standards, and Mike indicated that he is trying to think of what the ramifications might be for doing that. The Commissioner then stated that most zero lot line developments he has seen still have the same spacing between houses; it is just on one side, not on both sides. Mike Raber indicated that we need to rectify our definition of Multi-family, which has often been attached dwelling units, but if they are not raising the density, then there needs to be something that clarifies Single-family Attached, which we do have in the new Code as a housing type, and just make sure that we are consistent in how we are dealing with that, if we decide that a zero lot line would be okay.

Commissioner Barcus clarified that he is not referring to zero lot line attached; he is referring to zero lot line detached and Mike Raber asked how that would work. The Commissioner explained that every house is built on the lot line, and then there is 20 ft. between houses; they are just slid over. Mike stated that you could certainly have that situation. The Commissioner again asked if we are going to allow for that or prohibit zero lot line developments. What do we want to do?

Commissioner Brandt noted that flexibility is always good and pointed out that there is something in Part I of the Land Development Code that talks about duplexes can have zero lot lines, but the other feature is just a way to have more open space. The building wall becomes a fence line basically; there are no windows so you are not looking into your neighbor's; however, Commissioner Barcus stated that on the lower floor the building wall is the fence, but you can have windows on the upper floors and you are still 20 ft. apart or 10 ft. and a fence separating. Commissioner Brandt noted that there needs to be more flexibility within the cluster, and Audree Juhlin stated that is the direction we are hearing, so we will meet with Clarion and make sure that the cluster is allowing for flexibility, whether it is zero lot lines or open space in the common areas.

Commissioner Mayer stated that he would support that to have open space, you know combine them somehow, because 19 ft. left over in the width with a car garage is not going to leave very much. Commissioner Brandt pointed out that you are not looking for open space around the buildings; you are looking to preserve open space elsewhere. That is what clustering is all about. Block length also doesn't quite make sense if you are trying to preserve open space. Mike Raber and Vice Chair Levin indicated they also questioned that.

Commissioner Kinsella indicated that in other areas, we have put in where waivers can be obtained, so would it make sense to use it, so we still have some sort of minimum in here for guidance for the developer who is looking at our Land Development Code before coming up with a proposal, but then waivers would be allowed – is that a route to go? Vice Chair Levin indicated that we don't use the term waivers, but she thinks Commissioner Kinsella is talking about flexibility.

Commissioner Kinsella commented that she thinks the term waiver exists elsewhere in the Land Development Code and Audree agreed. Mike Raber explained that where this might come into play, but he still wants to get his head wrapped around it a little better, is the fact that we have an underlying zoning district that already has its standards that go with that district, and some of that has to be waived in order to put a flexible clustered subdivision in place, so we need Clarion to give us a little more idea on how that would work. Audree Juhlin added that part of that will probably be in the next process phase, but staff will look at it.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that there is a question about the lot size, so do we want to discuss that and reference the 2,500 sq. ft. Mike indicated yes, or leave it flexible; leave it open. Commissioner Brandt stated that 2,500 sq. ft. works; he has done that. Mike Raber then stated that he is hearing maybe leave that flexible and we can entertain a wide variety of options.

Mike then indicated that there were suggestions for definitions for the following: Culvert, Director, MUTCD, Trailer, and then providing an alternative for Exception, but he doesn't have alternative language now, so we will let Clarion know that we need to define these terms.

4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Tuesday, February 20, 2018; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
- b. Tuesday, February 20, 2018; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
- c. Tuesday, March 6, 2018; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
- d. Tuesday, March 6, 2018; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)

Audree Juhlin stated that for the February 20th meeting, we do not have anything; however, we are not canceling it at this time. For March 6th, we have no definitive items at this time, but March 20th will be a long meeting date. We will start at 3:30 p.m. with the consultants. Commissioners noted that a site visit is scheduled for 2:00 p.m., and Audree indicated that she will send an email with the updated schedule, but plan on March 20th being a very long day, because we will have the 3:30 p.m. work session on the Land Development Code with the consultants, and then the Residence Inn public hearing and continue discussion on the Land Development Code, if necessary.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the public hearing is also for the Land Development Code and Audree stated no; the Land Development Code is the work session. Vice Chair Levin asked if the February 20th and March 6th would tentatively start at 3:30 p.m. and Audree indicated yes.

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

Vice Chair Levin called for adjournment at 4:24 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 February 6, 2018.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date