

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, June 19, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Losoff called the work session to order at 3:32 p.m.

Roll Call:

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

Staff Present: James Crowley, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Cari Meyer, Ryan Mortillaro and Donna Puckett.

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

Audree Juhlin welcomed new Planning & Zoning Commissioner George Braam to his first meeting. Commissioner Braam thanked everyone for walking him through the process, and he looks forward to contributing. He has 40 years in engineering in a municipal business, and he is from Chicago. George stated that he is happy to be here and hoping to help any way he can.

3. Discussion/possible direction regarding a request for Conceptual Zone Change and Conceptual Development Review to consider a rezoning from single family residential (RS-10a) to multifamily residential (RM-2), and for the construction of a 6-unit multifamily development at 50 & 60 Oak Creek Boulevard. The property is zoned RS-10a and is located on the east side of Oak Creek Boulevard, near the intersection of State Route 89A. APN: 408-08-053 and 408-08-054. Applicant: Mike Reynolds. Case Number: PZ18-00004 (ZC, DEV)

Presentation: Matt Kessler explained that the purpose of a Conceptual Review is a step before the comprehensive review and a chance for the applicant to get some initial feedback from the Commission as well as reviewing agencies, staff and neighbors to alert them to any red flags, major concerns and issues. It also allows them to more easily change their plans before they have the full submittal package for their comprehensive application submittal. At this step, staff does not do a full analysis for conformance, because we don't have all of the required plans; it is a conceptual stage where we are looking for general feedback from the Commission.

Matt provided some background on the subject property indicating that is comprised of two parcels on Oak Creek Blvd, and the owner, Mike Reynolds, is the applicant. The two parcels are .56 acres, and the applicant lives on the property and uses it as a home office. The lots also act as some accessory storage for his construction business.

Matt indicated that two approvals are needed for the proposed project – a Zone Change and a Development Review for the new construction. Matt showed a Vicinity Map and identified the location of the subject property, and on an aerial view, he pointed out the surrounding properties. Matt stated that both parcels are zoned Planned Area, and they are unique in that they are in the Grasshopper Flat Planned Area. The current zoning for both properties is Single-family Residential (RS-10a) which allows for a density of four units per acre. As part of this Conceptual Review, the Zone Change would be going from RS-10a to High-density Multifamily or RM-2 which would allow for a maximum of 12 units per acre.

Matt showed the current Zoning Map of the Grasshopper Flat area and the subject property, indicating it is definitely a mix of different uses in the area with RS-10a, C-2, OP, Multifamily and SU, and the

mix of uses is highlighted on the Grasshopper Flat Planned Area page in the Community Plan. There also are some additional considerations for the Commission and staff to consider when a Zone Change is requested in this area, as the Community Plan highlights some specific benefits and unique characteristics of this neighborhood when we talk about a new land use. A few of them in the Community Plan are considering alternative access, multi-modal pedestrian and bicycle activity when possible, and it also strives to retain the small scale single-family character of the neighborhood by retaining the single-family structures for alternative uses when possible.

Matt indicated that the applicant is requesting the construction of a new two-story, four-unit building on the southern parcel of the property. These four units would be two-bedroom, two-bathroom units around 1,200 sq. ft. each. The applicant is also proposing to remodel their existing residence on the northern portion of the property, create a new studio unit above the existing garage and retain their home as well, so it would provide for a total of six units. The RM-2 Zoning District would allow for a maximum of 12 units per acre, and the cumulative acreage for these two properties is .56 which would allow for that; however, the applicant would need to combine the properties to get that required density, so a condition of any approvals would be that they combine the two parcels into one property.

Matt reviewed the proposed site plan showing the new two-story, four-unit building with accessory parking and the proposed remodel with the studio unit above the garage. He also showed the proposed elevations and a sample floorplan for the units

Matt indicated that the proposal was sent to all of the reviewing agencies and feedback from Public Works and the Sedona Fire District was provided to the applicant along with comments from Community Development. He explained that there are a couple of different categories that we look at when considering an application, such as Land Development Code compliance that includes the Development Standards and Design Review Manual as they are requesting Development Review approval, and that includes the site layout, parking, landscaping, lighting, etc. We also would review for Public Works requirements that include grading and drainage, wastewater, etc.

Matt noted that there is no recommended motion for action, because staff hasn't completed the evaluation at this time and the applicant is really looking for your comments and feedback, so they can make any necessary changes.

Mike Reynolds, Owner and Applicant: Mr. Reynolds indicated that he has been in Sedona quite a long time; he is a building contractor and some of you know him, but any questions he can answer, fire away.

Commission's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Kinsella asked how long he had owned the property, and Mr. Reynolds stated 20 years. The Commissioner then asked if the current zoning was in place at that time, and Mr. Reynolds indicated that the RS-!0a has always been in place, yes.

Chair Losoff reminded the Commission that this is conceptual, and Commissioner Kinsella then referenced the Letter of Intent that says that he takes the needs of affordable and workforce housing into account, so she was wondering how, since she didn't see that illustrated. She also asked what assurance there is that these will be workforce or affordable housing or if they will turn into short-term housing. Audree Juhlin explained that this is conceptual, so a lot of details have not been worked out at this point. Perhaps that comment should be, if you are looking at affordable housing be sure it is articulated in your next submittal with the tools and processes in which you are going to assure that, and Commissioner Kinsella stated okay that will be something that she will be curious about. She would also like to know if a home business will continue there with the new zoning, and she wants to understand more about the northern piece of the property and how that fits into the overall plan, as well as what public benefit there will be with this change, such as pedestrian flow. Staff also had a question about sidewalk connections and she is curious about that as well.

Mike Reynolds stated that they have been trying to figure out some way to fit within the Community Plan as far as pedestrian flow, but at the same time mitigate traffic. They've all heard stories and rumors about trying to get out, and it is a tough one. He is hoping to work with Engineering to get a few more ideas, but one concept that may resolve both is that they would like to do a sidewalk along the front of the property. It is not shown on the plans, because they want to work with Engineering, but since the property is about 200 ft. long, they would like to have the sidewalk meander, so they could include some individual parking places and add trees to enhance that Grasshopper Flat area, hoping it will slow some traffic, because people race by the house and by getting some greenery there, they will realize that they are in a neighborhood.

Chair Losoff noted that it is getting into a little more detail at this point; the conceptual questions would be what the overall benefits are if the rezoning is approved, and. . . Commissioner Kinsella interrupted to say what the uses of the property will be in terms of the home business plus the north lot uses.

Commissioner Klein indicated that the main thing he will want to know for the future is if this project is approved and these units are built, is the intent going to be to rent them by the month or on a long-term lease or rent them by the night on Airbnb? Mike Reynolds stated that the intention is long-term and that kind of goes to the affordable housing. They want to do long-term month to month rentals for business people, people that live here. Chair Losoff indicated that if this comes back to us we could make that a Condition of Approval if we feel strongly about it.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she is in agreement with the two other Commissioners; apartments on its face is a community benefit for this community, so having the kind of guarantees that would stipulate that they remain long-term as opposed to short-term would be an additional community benefit in addition to the sidewalk connections.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that the Community Plan calls for some buffer to businesses and it would be a great asset; there are quite a few other businesses further into the residential area. He then asked the distance from the southern border up to the highway, and Mr. Reynolds stated that it is about 300 ft. or 320 ft. The Commissioner stated it would be a great asset if it is going to be a long-term rental.

Commissioner Braam indicated that he drove by the site and recognizes the situation, being right behind the carwash; they have some issues there. Just as a few general comments looking at the preliminary site plan, it seems that a lot of the utility purposes -- the driveway, the compressor and the trash structure are all adjacent to the residential property to the south, and that could be a concern. Also, there are 14 parking spaces for the two parcels combined and that seems to be a high number for the surrounding residential area.

Vice Chair Levin requested a site visit before this comes back, and the Chair added that he would be curious as to what will be seen from SR 89A looking past the carwash, how tall it would be over it and if it would be blocking anything – probably not, but he can't visualize it. The Chair added that overall conceptually it makes sense. It is a good location for apartments, but we would be curious as to anything we can do to make it workforce housing and see how it fits into the neighborhood. As Vice Chair Levin stated, any more apartments in and of itself is a benefit to the community, and we are looking for rezoning benefits and that would be a significant benefit in itself.

Commissioner Mayer asked if there are existing buildings on the southern property, and Mr. Reynolds indicated there is an old trailer with an add-on, 1958 or something, that is currently occupied. The Commissioner then asked about the renter, and Mr. Reynolds stated that he is not sure; they are hoping they can roll him in. He has been with them for a long time and faces the economic hardship that we all do renting property, so they are hoping to roll him in. He is a single renter now, and how they could augment the difference going to a two-bedroom apartment, they are not sure, but they would hope to keep him if they can.

Commissioner Braam stated that when looking at the sidewalks on the east side of the street, there is a significant drainage ditch there that would make it a challenge to put sidewalks in there, but if you are working with the City, he is sure it is something that could be overcome. Mr. Reynolds explained that is why he didn't want to comment until he had a chance to work with Engineering to see what suggestions they have.

The Chair summarized that for future meetings, they want a site visit and to hear any issues from community input or comments from the neighbors. Matt indicated that the immediate neighbor to the south called but didn't want to submit a written comment. She has lived in her home for a long time and was concerned about the multifamily use, because it might be a lot of added density to her neighborhood, but she acknowledged that there are other multifamily properties around her, although she felt this might be a little too much.

The Chair asked if there will be a noise factor from the car wash, and Mr. Reynolds stated that there is significant noise. He is one of those guys that lets bygones be bygones; he doesn't want to get in the way of his business, but it is significant noise, and they feel they will help buffer that noise. He doesn't know if the Commission is familiar with some of the problems they have with Harry Christie's property next door and trying to mitigate all of that noise, but since he has two lots, just the mass of two lots is probably enough to mitigate the noise, but one of the things they want to do is mitigate the noise for them personally and their renters, so that will be part of the game plan. Chair Losoff asked if he had talked with the carwash people, and Mr. Reynolds stated that he built the carwash, so he knows the clients real well and was actively involved in trying to mitigate the noise and suggested several things to do that. He would like to fold them into this process, but what they will do, he can't say. The Chair asked if there were any other cooperative ideas between. . . Mr. Reynolds interjected the sidewalk benefit, and he thinks they could be amicable to that. He is sure that Bill didn't want to fork out any money for that, but he thinks Bill would be amicable to working something out. The Chair noted that the Commission would encourage that; it would be very helpful. Think of it as a community benefit. Mr. Reynolds agreed but explained that he has not approached them yet.

Cari Meyer noted that it is a public hearing, so it needs to be opened to the public. The Chair commented that for future work reference, we are trying to keep work sessions with not having public comment.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period and, having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.

4. Discussion/possible direction regarding a request for Conceptual Plat review for a proposed 30-unit subdivision at 125 Bristlecone Pines Road (Hillside Vista Estates). The property is zoned single family residential (RS-35) and is located west of Bristlecone Pines Road, north of Navoti Drive, and south of Bob White Circle. APN: 408-11-178D. Applicant: Hoskin Ryan Consultants (Scott Lorentzen) Case Number: PZ18-00003 (SUB)

Presentation: Cari Meyer referenced the platting procedures and indicated that it is a five-step process outlined in Article 7 of the Land Development Code. Stage one is the pre-application conference with staff and the applicant to discuss the process and the requirements, and that was done with the applicant earlier this year. Stage two is the Conceptual Review of the Conceptual Plat, and where we are now. It is very similar with what we just did with the Conceptual Development Review. They give us some information about what they want to do and start getting feedback, so they can further define their plans before getting into the more involved Preliminary Plat, so the Conceptual only requires Planning & Zoning Commission review. Stage three is the Preliminary Plat which is a recommendation from the Commission and action by City Council, so that is the full submittal package, very similar to the amount of information you receive for a Development Review that includes grading and drainage plans and lot layout. You can read more about this in Article 7 of the Land Development Code where it outlines all of the requirements for each step. Stage four is the revised Preliminary Plat and that would be if the City Council added a condition that something was to change. They could approve it with the condition to modify a road, etc. Then, the applicant would

submit a revised Preliminary Plat for staff review to ensure compliance with any conditions. Then, the Final Plat is when it is in its final form and that gets approved by the City Council and recorded with the county. We are currently at step two and the Conceptual Plat procedures are outlined in the Land Development Code. It occurs before commencing with the more formal Preliminary Plat submittal and review procedures, and it provides an opportunity for the applicant to hear concerns and comments from staff, the Commission, review agencies and members of the public. The Commission does not take action on the plat; you just review it and provide comments.

Cari showed a Vicinity Map and identified the subject property and the surrounding area. She explained that this property had a subdivision application filed about 12 years ago in June of 2006, and it went through the whole process – Conceptual Plat and Preliminary Plat, but a Final Plat was never approved, and a Preliminary Plat approval is only good for three years, so we are starting over with this project. The applicant contacted staff last fall to start the process again.

Cari indicated that the property is off Bristlecone Pines Road and the proposal is for a 30-unit single-family subdivision on approximately 32.13 acres. This will eventually require a recommendation from the Commission with final action being taken by the City Council. Looking at the Community Plan and zoning, the Community Plan is Single-family, Low-density that allows .5 to two units per acre, but the Zoning for the property is RS-35, which is the minimum lot size of 35,000 sq. ft., with a maximum density of one unit per acre. We are not looking at the construction of future homes. Those would be subject to RS-35 standards and reviewed through the City's single-family home review process. We are looking at the layout of the lots, the road and utilities, but no homes are necessarily approved as part of the subdivision process; that is done through the established building permit process for single-family review. If any Codes for single-family review or RS-35 change through the ongoing Code update, the Codes in place at the time of building permit submittal will be applied to future home construction.

Cari showed the Conceptual Plat and indicated that this plat is basically the same plat that went through the Preliminary Plat process 11 or 12 years ago. The applicant has been working with the neighboring property owners, so you will be seeing some alterations as they move forward, but we are starting with what they ended with in the last platting process. She then referenced a context map and pointed out the two access points with the road going through the property and the lots on either side of the road. The lot sizes are just over 35,000 sq. ft. to over 64,000 sq. ft. and the overall density is .93 units per acre. The building envelopes shown on the plat meet or exceed setback requirements in some areas where they designated non-buildable areas to protect drainage areas and other natural features. They also show some non-vehicular access easements to help with protection and drainage.

Cari explained that during the previous plat approval, they worked extensively with the neighbors and a number of the concessions they made during that process have been carried forward in this Conceptual submittal, such as the inclusion of non-buildable areas and some modifications of lot lines and building envelopes that were done to address neighbors' concerns, and you will see more on future plats.

Cari indicated that the main criteria used for subdivisions is the Article 7 of the Land Development Code that covers a number of different items. We look at access and traffic, grading and drainage for the road and utilities, how they connect to the wastewater system, vegetation and landscaping mostly where the road construction is going, signage and how utilities are provided to each lot. We are not including single-family review, but if you have questions about some of the height requirements, we have talked to some of the neighbors and the applicant about the height requirements to help people understand what could be built on some of the lots, so knowing generally what single-family review entails can be discussed, but we will not be discussing any specific designs for houses on the lots.

Cari stated that this was routed to review agencies, and we had the internal review meeting. There were comments from Community Development, Public Works, the Fire District and the Forest

Service, and those were provided in the packet. The applicant has started their citizen outreach and mailed notifications to property owners within 300 ft. and held an open house. You will see a full Citizen Participation Report as part of the Preliminary Plat Process. The documents also have been on the City's website, and it was noticed as a public hearing in the paper and in a notice on the property, plus the mailing to the neighbors.

Cari indicated that the questions received were generally regarding the previous plat, the property history, the platting process and where this is in that process. Cari again explained that this is an opportunity to hear any concerns, comments and requests for additional information. Staff is not making a recommendation and the Commission is not taking action at this time.

Applicants, Mark Weinberg with Diamond Ventures and David Grounds with Dorn Homes: Mr. Weinberg explained that he and Mr. Grounds are working on the project together, so they will both answer the Commission's questions.

Commission's Questions, Comments and Concerns:

Commissioner Braam noted that some of the neighborhood trails extend through the site and asked if there are any opportunities for connections to the Forest Service. Cari Meyer explained that staff received a comment from the U.S. Forest Service stating that the land adjacent to the property is part of a cattle allotment and public access is not permitted at this time. Mr. Weinberg added that there is an existing trail on the north end of the site that a lot of residents use, so they have agreed to leave that trail in an easement, in the event that the Forest Service starts to allow the residents to continue using it; it is next to an existing wash.

Vice Chair Levin asked if that is a social trail or a dedicated Forest Service trail, and Cari indicated it is a social trail. Mr. Weinberg pointed it out on the Conceptual Plat and again stated that they will leave it as open area and maybe someday the Forest Service can be convinced to leave it as a trail for the neighbors.

Commissioner Braam referenced the possibility of a lift station that might be used by surrounding areas, and he guesses that would be surrounding areas on septic or alternative systems. Cari indicated that she would defer that question to Public Works; however, Chair Losoff suggested that conceptually, maybe that could be saved for the next time around.

Commissioner Mayer asked if there is some open space provided or community gathering area included or if it is just going to be lots, and Mr. Weinberg pointed out the size of the lots and the washes that will remain open, but there won't be a community gathering area per se. The Commissioner indicated that was in the Community Development Plan that a larger development should have some space for the community of people who buy those lots, like a little park, etc. Mr. Weinberg indicated that they would look into it, but their thoughts were that the lots are big enough that a lot of folks with homes on large lots generally. . . , but there could be an opportunity where the sewer lift station goes at the low-end of the site and the area has to be graded out or where there is open space and no lots next to the forest. Commissioner Mayer indicated it is just a thought.

Commissioner Mayer then asked Mr. Grounds if Dorn Homes has done some construction on neighboring properties and Mr. Grounds stated in Rimstone.

Chair Losoff indicated that this is a good time to talk to the Forest Service to get some understanding now, before anything is built, so he would encourage staff and the applicant to get with the Forest Service to see if some understanding or agreement can be done now. Mr. Grounds stated that they would love to see that trail stay and to allow the neighbors living around this proposed community have that full access. That is one of the benefits of having this community there, so anything the City can help them do to add leverage with the Forest Service would be appreciated. The Chair stated that he thinks we can be proactive on a get together with staff, applicant and Forest Service to see what can be done about it.

Vice Chair Levin asked staff for a site visit and emphasized the need for the Commission's understanding of where the building envelopes are, as they would impact the neighbors and residents to the east; she is sure you are being sensitive to preserving those view corridors. Additionally, ridgeline construction and heights will come into play as the development moves forward, but she is thinking of neighbors who are there now and if the applicant can demonstrate that he is working with each of them for whom there would be some impact.

Mr. Grounds stated that in their initial meeting where many residents showed up from neighboring properties, they gave out their email addresses and offered to sit with them on their patios to see the views and do what they could to help preserve them, and that led to three different meetings. One in the morning and one in the afternoon, and Mark met with one separately to see what views were critical to them, so they plan to modify where they put homes that could potentially block their views, even to the point of moving the main road partially towards the west, away from them, which will allow the homes closest to them to also move to the west away from them, and then to also honor the building code height, they can keep the homes a lower profile.

Vice Chair Levin asked if they are proposing one-story homes only, and Mr. Grounds stated that right now they are all one-story. The interpretation of the Code is on some of the sloped homesites where the high part would be 22 ft. on the building envelope, and then it would go out like a walkout situation where it would be higher from the low part, but 22 ft. from the high part. They would rather stay more concerned with the neighbor's views than that rule, so if there is a home that will even be blocked by that, they are willing to meet with them and look at ways to even go lower than that.

Vice Chair Levin then asked if they would be able to maximize the views for the new home owners at the same time they preserve it for adjacent neighbors. Mr. Grounds explained that they are trying to do a win-win. Those folks were there before they were, and their views are there, so they are trying to preserve them. Right now, they think their homesites are big enough that they can modify where they put the home to help preserve their views. They met with seven couples or single people and there is maybe three that they haven't heard from, so they are hoping to connect with them as well. Also, there is no mass grading planned; these will have strict building envelopes around where the home goes, so they can preserve all of the vegetation as you get outside of the building envelope; that is the beauty of the site and they don't want to destroy it.

Mr. Weinberg added that after their open house and before meeting with the neighbors, they staked the lot corners of every lot that is adjacent to these homes and put an 8 ft. tall PVC pole in the center of each building envelope and staked the centerline of the road, so they could see where the lot corners and center of the building envelopes were, so they could move things around before submitting a plat, and it will reflect the agreements made with the adjacent neighbors. Vice Chair Levin then referenced the easements for road access on the south and north and asked if they had similarly reached agreement with adjacent properties about mitigating noise. Mr. Weinberg stated that he believes it is dedicated right-of-way, but as it relates to one entrance, they met with the neighbor, Mr. Campbell, and he had an issue with dust, so they agreed to put up a 6 ft. dust fence along his side, and when they thought about it, they thought they might as well do it on both sides of the road at both entrances during construction.

Vice Chair Levin asked how they would mitigate road noise from adjacent built properties post construction, and Mr. Weinberg stated they would have to comply with the construction hours and, as far as trash and debris, Mr. Grounds has strict rules; however, the Vice Chair clarified that she is talking about post-construction and what if any mitigating structures or natural vegetation they are considering along those easements. Mr. Grounds stated that he understands that it is the inlet and outlet for the subdivision and depending on the right-of-way space and if they could do some landscaping on the sides of the roads as you come in, to create more privacy for the folks living there. Mr. Weinberg pointed out the space and right-of-way where they would be happy to plant trees and do a really nice landscape buffer. Vice Chair Levin then indicated that she wanted to know how that would mitigate noise. Mr. Grounds stated that they are open to suggestions. One of the concerns that came out of their meeting with the neighbors was the speed of cars driving through there, so

they are open to any suggestions on what the City will allow – speedbumps, posted signs. They don't want to step ahead of what they are allowed to do as the developer, but they are happy to cooperate and spend the money to put in the speedbumps and signage, whatever you recommend to make sure people aren't speeding through that subdivision.

Cari Meyer explained that as part of their Preliminary Plat, they will be doing a Traffic Analysis, so we will get more in depth then. The Vice Chair then stated this would be 30 units at 10 trips per day for a residence, and Cari indicated that she didn't know. The Vice Chair stated that the average daily traffic for a single-family home would be 300 trips.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she needed clarity on the comment that you will bring in sewer capacity for this new subdivision, but there also was language that you would make it available for adjacent areas as well. Cari stated that came in a comment from Public Works, and the Chair noted that we were getting a little ahead of ourselves conceptually; however, the Vice Chair asked if that suggests that if there were parties that aren't on the sewer, you were somehow extending it to the east. She didn't understand if that was a commitment you were making or if Public Works was exploring it with you. Mr. Weinberg stated that their obligation is to sewer these 30 lots, and he thinks to the extent that they could do some oversizing, then maybe it could benefit others and Public Works would either ask them or require them to do that.

Commissioner Kinsella indicated that she read the 50 ft. right-of-way will become a public road, and some subdivisions have private roads, some dedicate them to the City as public roads, and from what she read, it appears that this is intended to be dedicated to the City as a public road, so she wanted staff to provide some understanding of the benefit to having that be a public road as opposed to it being privately maintained within the subdivision, when this comes back. Also, there is nothing about any affordable housing component, and she would urge you to consider what can be done and look that over carefully in terms of development that the City is doing. Is there something that should be considered that the Commission should be looking at that you will be coming forward with, and will there be any community meeting space, since this is a subdivision? There is going to be an HOA, so will there be shared amenities and if so what would the shared amenities be? Commissioner Kinsella stated those are questions she will be looking for going forward.

Chair Losoff pointed out that he is not sure the Commission gets into HOA issues. Commissioner Kinsella stated that she would like to know what public amenities there are, even if it is contained within an HOA going forward. One of the reasons that might become something for the Commission's consideration is if there is an HOA, there obviously would be CC&Rs, and the Chair again stated that is not the Commission's purview at all; it is nothing the Commission gets into. We are concerned with the zoning, Land Development Code and how they organize themselves. . . Commissioner Kinsella interrupted to ask if she could finish how she was linking it, and then he could overrule it. She then stated that she is looking for something that is going to address whether or not these will become short-term rentals. Audree Juhlin stated that we can't get into that and the Chair again stated that is not the Commission's purview.

Mr. Grounds offered to address a few of those voluntarily and stated that they will have CC&Rs. There will be an HOA which enables them to have the enforcement power to preserve or protect what is built there, so people don't disturb all of the protected vegetation, noise, and all of the things that could endanger the values and investment of the people already living next door. Their intention is for the road to be public, and he is a big supporter of affordable housing. He is doing the big workforce housing project in Prescott now. One of their company's missions is to end homelessness in the Prescott area over the next five years, so that is part of their mission as a company. Regarding this project specifically, the land is very expensive and zoned one home per acre or larger, so he is not sure how they are going to solve affordable housing on this particular site, while trying to respect the neighbors and what they are doing for them by keeping the homes as far away from them as possible, so that will be a challenge, but he respects that you asked, because he is with you and thinks there is a big problem in offering affordable housing in Sedona, Prescott and a lot of these northern Arizona

towns. Commissioner Kinsella thanked him for voluntarily answering the questions. She then stated that going forward her question is the road issue and that is for staff.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the lots would be sold to individuals, and Mr. Grounds indicated that the plan is to sell home-lot combinations, so people don't just buy a lot; they buy a home and a lot. The Commissioner commented that they are going to be the builder as well, and Mr. Grounds stated yes, there could be a situation where they may have another custom builder or two involved in the project. . . Chair Losoff again explained that conceptually, the Commissioners have to stay on the concept. Is it good for us and make sense for the community, is it meeting our codes? What is being asked is beyond the concept. Mr. Grounds indicated that one concern that came from a neighbor was that they don't want to see this as an Airbnb rental community, and they agreed that it will not be; that is the beauty of having CC&Rs. They can create powers there to protect it from short-term rental housing.

Chair Losoff summarized that the applicant has heard that we like open space and anything we can do to keep the trail and encourage the Forest Service to work with us on this. One Commissioner mentioned viewsheds and that will be important. When we have our site visit, it will be good to see what we see with the poles. We talked a little about traffic, but the study will pick up the Commission's concerns and any impact it will have on SR 89A as well as the arteries in and out. We also talked about the noise and privacy issue and anything you can do to mitigate it would be helpful. The Commission will also be curious to hear comments from the community; we're already hearing some.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period.

Stan Bronson, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Bronson stated that he lives in Bristlecone and has been there for approximately 18 years. His concern is the northern egress out of the proposed community. In the original meeting, they said they needed two exit and entrance points. They don't have that luxury in Quail Run and they have more than 30 homes. All of their egress is going south on Bristlecone Pines, so they are concerned about the additional traffic. You mentioned 300 exits per day, but they are proposing five-stall garages, so there may be well in excess of 300 of those. Their issue in Quail Run, and they have more than 30 homes, is exiting south on Bristlecone Pines, and that northern egress could inhibit their egress if some tragedy occurred like a forest fire, which they are next to. That is his major concern, but also, he is concerned about people who walk on Bristlecone Pines. They come from the condominiums and there are several dozen per day, and the additional traffic on Bristlecone Pines where there are no sidewalks is going to cause some jeopardy for those people.

Peggy Lanning, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Lanning indicated that she has lived on Bristlecone Pines for 30 years, and she was the second house in Quail Run. Her point is that she would like to ask if this is the same proposal you came to them with 12 years ago. Have you made changes or is this the same proposal? Her second question is of course they are all troubled with trying to get to SR 89A right at this moment. They all have problems with that; they wait and pray they don't get broadsided from one direction or the other. She can't see that this is going to improve this unless there is some consideration for a traffic light at Bristlecone Pines Road and SR 89A. She hasn't heard anything about this and that is her major concern, and the fact that their quiet neighborhood will be changed, even though they do have acre lots. There will be 30 homes there and there is a lot of traffic on Bristlecone Pines that they will be faced with, so those are the things, and lastly, she hasn't heard any changes from what it was 12 years ago.

Sal DiGiovanni: Mr. DiGiovanni indicated that he is almost a 50-year resident, before it was a City. He used to own property there in the '80s; he lived there, and they are going to do a nice project. It is good that they want to open the trail and it is a good huggy, feely thing that the developers want to open up that trail for the community, but he doesn't think they understand. Who is going to live here? They have 30 houses, and he is in favor of this project, but where are you going to put 20-25 parking spots near that trailhead? You should forget about the idea of the trailhead, because he doesn't think you have thought it through. Ask people that live on Dry Creek Road, Soldiers Pass Road or a lot of these places where they park the cars. When they can't go there, you are going to have parking all

up and down, and in the worst case, you are going to have, where your new homes are going to be, people parking on the street. You should address that; it is now illegal to go there, and you should leave it that way, because it is going to hurt your project, and the City is going to have the same problem they have on Dry Creek Road and a bunch of other places, so pay attention to that one. Don't put your foot in there, if you don't have to. The screening for the dust isn't as important as paving it, because you are going to have dust on that road. If you pave it and wash it occasionally, you will have less dust in the area, so do a little bit of paving there, even if it is not great paving, but something other than dirt. Also, in the '80s, the guy that did all of this. . . *Mr. DiGiovanni was advised that his time had expired.*

Dean Gain, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Gain stated that he lives next door to Peggy Lanning on Bristlecone, and he wanted to touch base. It looks like someone is doing a traffic count on Bristlecone, but his concern is where they are doing it. It is undercounting the traffic on Bristlecone, because it is at the south end of this on Bristlecone where Navoti, on both sides also enters Bristlecone, and then you have a short segment of Bristlecone to SR 89A, which is the greatest amount of traffic. He wishes it was counting the traffic on Bristlecone south of this, because it would be not only our subdivision, the Los Lomas subdivision and the new subdivision, but it also would be both sides of Navoti, which would be the ER hospital complex and the timeshare street. If they are going to do that traffic study on Bristlecone, move it farther south, just before the stop sign at SR 89A.

Summary Discussion:

Chair Losoff indicated that this is a conceptual public hearing and it will come back a couple of more times and there will be more public forums, and if somebody did not have a chance to say everything, you can send an email or comment to staff.

Cari Meyer indicated that the Commission will see more when it comes back, and staff will schedule a site visit. Chair Losoff referenced the proposal 12 years ago and asked if this is the same. Cari explained that she believes the initial Conceptual Plat submittal is the same as the Preliminary Plat, but as you heard, the applicant is making changes based on the neighbors who currently live there, so you will see something different the next time.

Commissioner Klein referenced the potential trail and indicated that in the packet, it says that the Forest Service submitted a comment that the area to the west of the proposed subdivision is part of a cattle allotment and pedestrian access will not be permitted, so it seems that there is no point in having a trail there, because you can't go to the west of the subdivision. He then asked if that is accurate, and Cari explained that the Forest Service stated that there is no trail access in this location at this time. We can get clarification on what "at this time" and "cattle allotment" means. Commissioner Klein then referenced a comment referring to traffic and the number five, but he didn't know if he meant there would be five-car garages. Mr. Grounds explained that the architecture is way off in the distance, but their plan is to have three-car garages as the standard feature, and they have a home they built in Sedona Ranch, and one of those spec homes had an optional five-car garage, but the intention is not to build a lot of five-car garages, and that house hasn't sold. There isn't a lot of demand for five-car garages, so that was not their vision. Commissioner Klein then asked if the statistics say that a house like this would have 10 trips per day is that true whether it is a three-car or four-car garage? Audree Juhlin indicated that she doesn't believe it separates it by the number of vehicles per garage.

Commissioner Braam stated that he has made a left turn onto SR89A and had the same issues, so it is probably beyond the Commission's purview, but he can understand concerns with traffic growing in the area and a bigger picture study. The Chair noted that traffic is a problem on just about every project, and the Commission has to look at it by development, but we also have to think of the big picture and how it affects the rest of the City. As we look at the traffic study, it will be interesting to see how it shapes up. Initially, there seemed to be a lot of ways in and out of the project, and it might be better to limit ways in and out to keep some of the privacy and noise. He then mentioned coming off of Dry Creek; however, staff clarified that there is an entrance at the northern and southern end. On the plat, there are some other shaded areas that are drainage areas, but just the two access

points. Chair Losoff noted that he stands corrected and indicated that anything we can do to make it an attractive project; it has been on the books for a long time, so we will see the applicant again with more specifics.

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 4:45 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on June 19, 2018.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date