

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

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

Chair Losoff called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

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

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, James Crowley, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Cari Meyer, Ryan Mortillaro, Karen Osburn, Robert Pickels Jr. and Donna Puckett.

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Sandy Moriarty, Vice Mayor John Martinez and Councilor Jessica Williamson

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

Chair Losoff announced that this is the last meeting for Director Audree Juhlin after 24 years. He wished her good luck and indicated that she will be missed. Commissioner Kinsella added that she regrets that they didn't have more time to work together, because it truly has been a pleasure. Vice Chair Levin also wished Audree well and noted that she has known Audree for maybe 15 years, and she knows that Audree will enjoy this next chapter in her life with her husband in Montana -- and you won't have evening meetings, so yay!

3. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

- a. **June 5, 2018 (Work Session)**
- b. **June 5, 2018 (Public Hearing)**

Chair Losoff indicated that he would entertain a motion for approval of the June 5th work session and public hearing minutes.

MOTION: *Vice Chair Levin so moved. Commissioner Klein seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Brandt and Commissioner Mayer were excused.*

4. PUBLIC FORUM: (This is the time for the public to comment on matters not listed on the agenda. The Commission may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.)

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

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

- a. **Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Development Review to allow for the construction of a 3-unit townhome development at 460 Peach lane. The property is zoned High Density Multifamily Residential (RM-3) and is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Peach Lane and Sunset Lane. APN: 401-14-100. Owner: Verde Valley**

Habitat for Humanity (Tania Simms); Authorized Agent/Applicant: Dan Surber; Case Number: PZ18-00001 (DEV)

Presentation: Matt Kessler indicated that this request is an application for a Development Review for a triplex for Habitat for Humanity. It is roughly 4,200 sq. ft. in a three-unit townhome development. There is more detailed information in the packet that breaks down the square footages and landscaping, so if there are any questions, staff will answer those. Matt indicated that the first bullet in the PowerPoint is a timeline that shows where we are in the approval process. In a previous meeting, as part of the Development Review application, the applicant was requesting a reduction to their interior and exterior side yard setbacks, and the Commission heard that item in March and approved that reduction on March 13th, so we are now on the consideration for Development Review, which will cover the site planning and building design of the townhomes. Since the applicant is wanting to sell these units to qualified homeowners, they will need to complete a townhouse subdivision in order to create those three lots. That application has been submitted and staff is issuing comments on that, so the Preliminary Plat will be brought forward in the near future for the Commission's consideration.

Matt then provided the address location and indicated that the owner and applicant is the Verde Valley Habitat for Humanity, and they have been working with Dan Surber a local architect who is acting as an authorized agent, and Dan is present to answer any questions. The property is just over one-quarter acre in size and is designated in the Community Plan as Medium High Density Multifamily. With the current zoning of RM-3 for Multifamily Residential, the maximum density allotted is 20 units per acre, so the three units proposed are in compliance as a maximum of five units would be allowed on this site. Matt also noted that the current land use is vacant on the property.

On a Vicinity Map, Matt pointed out the location of the property in relation to Uptown and the surrounding locations. On an Aerial Map, he also showed the location of the vacant subject property and again pointed out the surrounding properties including the condos at Jordan Road to the west of the property and the proposed location for access to the site.

Matt referenced the proposed site plan showing the three units, two of which are three-bedroom and one is a two-bedroom unit. They are all two stories, and Matt referenced the rear access off of Peach Lane and explained that they are doing a consolidated driveway with carports behind the building for each of the units. Matt showed the proposed elevations from Sunset Lane and Peach Lane and indicated that the southernmost unit is a one-story that steps up to two stories as the grade goes up. Matt stated that looking from the Jordan side of the property, you can see the three proposed carports, the view from the common access driveway and the view from the existing apartment complex.

Matt indicated that staff completed an evaluation of the project for all applicable Land Development Code sections, which includes the Development Standards of Article 9 and Design Review Manual, plus the Development Review considerations outlined in Article 4. Staff also provided a checklist of the Development Standards and the Design Review Manual, and there are a couple of items that are partially compliant; most items are fully compliant. Those that are partially compliant have been addressed through the recommended Conditions of Approval.

Matt stated that the application was routed to the all reviewing agencies and an internal review meeting was held. We received comments from Public Works and the Sedona Fire District. All of those comments have been addressed by the applicant or will be addressed in the building permitting phase of construction.

Matt noted that staff and the applicant completed the required notification for the project and the property owners within 300 ft. were notified for the Development Review. Documents were placed online, a notice for the meeting was placed in the Red Rock News, and the property was noticed.

Matt stated that staff did not receive any written comments for the Development Review; however, the comments from the Administrative Waiver application were provided in your packet, because that waiver request was in conjunction with this Development Review although you may have already seen those comments. The applicant received some feedback from the neighbors, largely from the condos to the west, and they provided that information in their submitted Citizen Participation Report and their response to those concerns are included.

Matt stated that after staff's review for compliance with all applicable codes and standards, staff is recommending approval of this Development Review application with the recommended Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Staff Report.

Matt indicated that the applicant has a short two-minute video about the blitz-build process and philosophy to show to the Commission, and Chair Losoff asked for the applicants to come to the table for any questions or comments. Matt then played the video.

The applicant attending introduced himself as Paul Murphy, Construction Manager for the Verde Valley Habitat for Humanity. He has been here six months, so he is getting a little more used to this area; it is cooler than Phoenix. He saw the materials presented and they looked complete, but if you have any questions, they would be more than happy to answer them.

Commissioner's Questions:

Commissioner Kinsella referenced revisions in the Conditions of Approval, specifically a notation that balconies were removed from the front yard setback to be in compliance with the Land Development Code. She then asked if there is any substitution for that. Matt Kessler indicated that staff hasn't received any revised site plan, but that would be something they would submit at the building permit stage, and staff would be reviewing for it.

Architect Dan Surber explained that basically they will still be balconies, but they are going to decrease by 2 ft.; they will still be balconies for the upper level.

Commissioner Braam asked if all of the public comments have been resolved, and Matt indicated that Dan Surber had reached out to the written comments he received. Dan Surber stated that the majority were from the Jordan Road Condos and one was supportive; all she was worried about was the height of the trees, which were required for the landscape plan, and he told her that they would look at other approved trees that are part of the Sedona Landscape Guidelines and pick a tree that won't get as high as the ones they had picked. The other comments were about the concept of putting affordable housing there, what it will look like, who will be living there, etc., so it was more of a dialogue on just letting them know what Habitat for Humanity was. There is going to be homeownership, pride in ownership, and it won't be a blight on the neighborhood. The site is very conducive to multifamily density, because multifamily is on the north and west already, the east is medium density, and then the parking lot is to the south of them, so it fits within the neighborhood and that is how he tried to come across to the comments basically. Matt clarified that staff didn't receive any written comments; however, he did receive a couple of last minute questions from neighbors who couldn't attend the meeting. One was from someone on the board for the condos on Jordan, and he was able to resolve the one question that staff could answer which was related to the undersized nature of the lot. There was confusion as to whether or not the property could be developed, and it can, so he believes he was able to resolve that. The other questions were geared toward decisions made for the number of units, and he was able to clarify that it was under the maximum density, but there were things such as the location of the access that were geared toward the applicant more than staff, but he thinks he was able to resolve the questions for staff.

Commissioner Braam then asked if the use of volunteers on the project would affect the construction schedule and if there is some review by a skilled professional. Paul Murphy stated that nationwide they have built thousands of homes, and he was with Habitat in the greater Phoenix area where they built over 1,000 homes. The homes probably made more first-time

inspections than a standard builder due to the poor experience working with volunteers, and they will have team leaders, but this particular build is not a standard volunteer build. This is the builders in this area of Sedona and Cottonwood, etc., that are going to do the majority of the work. He doesn't see as many volunteer opportunities, and in either case, he can assure you that the house will be first rate.

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

Vice Chair Levin stated that it is a super project and Habitat for Humanity does noble work. Sedona is really fortunate to have a three-unit housing development added in this community, and to the architect, it has been designed beautifully. It will be a good neighbor in that community adjacent to other multifamily units, so thank you Habitat for partnering with the City and with contractors and other volunteers that want to see this happen.

Commissioner Klein stated that he agreed with what Vice Chair Levin stated, and Commissioner Kinsella indicated that it is wonderful that there is a project that so meets the Community Plan vision, so thank you for bringing that.

Chair Losoff stated that he echoes what everyone has said. This is the second Habitat project in our community and we have to make it a showcase. There are a lot of concerns about the concept; people are concerned about what it is going to look like, how it is going to feel, but the quality and overall operations of it should be very good. With the concerns we've heard about the noise, trash and all of the various stereotypes, it is really important that we make this work well for everybody, and we are very confident in what you are doing. It is a good project for everybody.

Chair Losoff then stated that he would entertain a motion for approval, continuance or disapproval.

MOTION: Commissioner Klein moved for approval of case number PZ18-00001 (DEV), Habitat for Humanity Triplex, based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Development Review criteria and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the staff report. Commissioner Kinsella seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion passed five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Brandt and Commissioner Mayer were excused.

- b. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new 75-foot monopine wireless communication facility at 75 Kallof Place. The property is zoned Lodging (L) and is located on the western side of Kallof Place south of the intersection of Kallof Place and W State Route 89A. APN: 408-26-032. Owner: Dale Street LLC; Applicant: YDC for Verizon Wireless (Nancy Smith); Case Number: PZ18-00002 (CUP)**

Presentation: Warren Campbell indicated that the request is for a Conditional Use Permit for a cellular tower on Kallof Place. He then noted that there is a little bit of uniqueness to this in that on May 22, 2018, the City Council approved amendments to Article 17 that became effective on June 21st; however, this application was submitted in March and therefore reviewed under the previous regulations, so we will be reviewing it under the previous Article 17 regulations, so there may be some confusion around the conversation regarding changes to Article 17 that may not be applicable. We also received one public comment from citizen Gerhard Mayer that was received after the packet.

Warren provided an overview of the request and indicated that the owner's agent is the Young Design Group represented by Nancy Smith who is present today. He also noted that there is a commercial office building on the site and the Community Plan designates it as Commercial within the Lodging Area Limits, and it was zoned Lodging as part of the project across the street.

On an Aerial Map, Warren pointed out that it is located behind Natural Grocers and Walgreens off of Kallof Place and SR 89A, and he explained that the building was constructed in 1969 prior to the City's incorporation and it has been in operation as an office building since that time. In 2005, there was a building permit approved that added a second-floor terrace with stairs and storage, and then over the years there has been a number of permits for various tenant improvements as tenants changed.

Warren stated that the proposal is for a new 75-foot monopine wireless communication facility, and it was reviewed pursuant to the former Article 17 and, according to the Code, new facilities are required to obtain a Conditional Use Permit. As a new wireless installation, it was also reviewed CityScape, our wireless consultant that was also the consultant on the amendments to Article 17, so they reviewed it against Article 17 and applicable state and federal regulations.

Warren pointed out the location on the proposed site plan and explained that it is about a 19x22 ft. square in a landscaped island, so no parking is lost with the proposal, and there will be asphalt on three sides, because there was an island protruding into the site; there also will be an enclosure around it. Warren showed some elevations and the enclosure, and he indicated that in the application, they are showing the collocation of one additional cellular provider, and CityScape indicated that because of the site's location, a third carrier could be incorporated on the site. In speaking with the applicant, they understand that condition suggesting that we add to it, and they are comfortable with it. If we can collocate more carriers, there will be less need for more towers.

Warren showed some photo simulations from Kallof Place and from SR 89A, and he noted that CityScape found that it met all Codes and suggested some conditions. Warren explained that while commercial cell towers don't require particular setbacks, there are setbacks from rights-of-way and residential properties. In this case, there are no residential properties within the 300 ft. area, so it meets the setback requirements for rights-of-way and residential properties. The proposal is a 51.5 ft. setback from the nearest commercial property, and CityScape's suggestion was to include the breakpoint technology, so there is a condition that suggests that the breakpoint technology be designed no more than 25 ft. from the top of the tower.

Warren indicated that we are pleased to hear that the applicant is willing to address the collocation concept. There were five conditions added to the City's standard conditions, and there is a number of them in the memorandum, but the five suggested conditions from CityScape are that all of the lines, etc., be put inside and concealed, the breakpoint technology be no more than 25 ft. from the top, they install a secure facility below it, there be an engineered stamp on the tower design at the time the building permits come in, and finally that Verizon signs a document acknowledging they will comply with all federal regulations.

Warren state that for public input, the applicant sent a notice to neighbors within 300 ft. and did not get any response, and therefore, did not hold an open house. Staff put the documents online, posted a hearing sign on the property, mailed a letter to individuals within 300 ft. and placed a public notice in the Red Rock News. We recently received the one comment provided to the Commission, but before that there were no comments on the application.

Warren indicated that staff believes the application meets the findings for a Conditional Use Permit and as reviewed by CityScape and conditioned this application meets the requirements for a wireless facility. Any outstanding review comments are related to future elements of the application, such as the building permit process, so our recommendation is based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Conditional Use Permit findings of the Land Development Code, staff recommends approval of case number PZ18-00002 (CUP), Monopine Wireless Facility at 75 Kallof Place, subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and the attached Conditions of Approval.

Applicant Nancy Smith with Verizon Wireless: Ms. Smith indicated that she had no additional comments, Warren did a great job of presenting it.

Commissioner Questions and Concerns:

Commissioner Kinsella asked if other designs were considered, and Ms. Smith explained that they looked at a few different ideas, but the concern was to make it blend in with the landscape versus any other design.

Commissioner Klein indicated that the stated reason for the tower at this location is there is a drop in coverage and data capabilities in this area. He then asked what 'a drop in coverage' is based on, and Ms. Smith stated the number of calls lost as people are driving through the area and the data capability is really about everybody's phone now doing much more and being more of a computer than just a phone, so it is a capacity issue. It is not holding enough capacity to keep up with the demands. Therefore, they receive complaints because of it. The Commissioner then asked how many complaints were received, and Ms. Smith stated that they don't give them that information. Commissioner Klein then stated that he has Verizon and goes to Natural Grocers and Starbucks a lot, and he has never had a problem with any drop in coverage. Ms. Smith explained it is not just at this site, there is also the site at the airport that is overloaded, so they are not just trying to improve the current data need, they are looking at what is going to happen in the near future as well and the airport site.

Commissioner Klein asked what it means when you say the airport site is overloaded, and Ms. Smith explained that means it is not handling the traffic on it. The Commissioner wanted to know how Verizon knows that and Ms. Smith stated based on their studies.

Chair Losoff pointed out that we are looking for compliance; he is not sure we can assess the need for them if they feel the need is there. The federal guidelines say we cannot challenge that. Nancy Smith added that there were RF Propagation Maps submitted that showed that information.

Chair Losoff indicated that he would assume that if they are going to the expense of putting this up, they did some kind of market study. Cari Meyer added that the applicant has to submit documents regarding their current and proposed coverage, and our consultants reviewed their application data and said that they demonstrated the need for a new facility at this site, so staff is going off of the consultant's conclusion that the need is there. Nancy Smith explained it is not all based on a phone call; it is based on several things which is why they were required to submit the propagation maps showing the differences in coverage with and without this site.

Commissioner Klein indicated that Scottsdale puts dishes or transmitters in traffic lights and asked if there would be a way to achieve the results Verizon wants by putting something on the nearby traffic signal. Ms. Smith explained that recently Verizon issued a new packet that explains the differences between the sites on a light standard and these macro sites. Those on a light standard are considered small cells and they don't handle near as much traffic; they can't offload the larger sites the way the macro sites do, so even though they help fill-in the little spots, they do not allow them to offload the larger sites.

Commissioner Klein referenced the update to the Wireless Code and Verizon's application to put a tower at the church on SR 179 where we inserted several things as a condition, and the City Attorney did a good job of drafting that language, so as opposed to what CityScape put in here about Verizon signing a statement saying that the tower will comply with the Federal Government's RF emission standards, we used language that required a RF Engineer to certify that the tower will comply with the Federal Government's RF emissions and that they would have to retest the tower every two years to ensure it would comply with the RF emission requirements. He then asked if the City Attorney had that language handy and Robert Pickels Jr. stated that he did not, but he recalled those conditions, so he could try to locate that.

Chair Losoff asked if those would be appropriate and Robert Pickels Jr. stated it would be up to the Commission. Chair Losoff noted that the Commission spent a lot of time recommending some of those, and they would be a nice standard for all of our . . . Commissioner Klein indicated that he agreed and for every cell tower that is going to be put up in Sedona, that language should be a condition. When we initially did this, the City of San Francisco tested cell towers and 50% of them were emitting more radio frequency than permitted by the Federal Government.

Cari Meyer showed the three conditions added to that monopine application on the screen and indicated that the applicant didn't think there would be a problem in adding those to this as well.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that CityScape stated that the applicant shall provide a statement from Verizon that it will comply with all FCC guidelines regarding RF energy and exposure limits; she then asked if we have this and Warren Campbell explained it would be part of the building permit process.

Commissioner Braam stated that he looked at the site today and it appears that a 75-ft. monopine will be 40 ft. higher than any other trees in the area, and the photo simulation from 100 ft. or 200 ft away doesn't give justice to what it is going to look like if you are at a higher elevation looking from a further distance; 75 ft. is high. Chair Losoff asked staff if there is a maximum height, and Cari stated that under the Code that this is being reviewed under, the maximum height is 90 ft. Chair Losoff then commented that the new Code is 70 ft. and asked if Verizon could go lower a little bit. Ms. Smith stated that they would if they needed to; they obviously are restricted in how much lower they can go, because of the view to the other site.

Commissioner Braam added that Warren stated that the actual site seems to be 15 ft. lower roughly than SR 89A, so that is a positive. Chair Losoff then asked if regarding co-applicants the City tries to recruit, or they do, and Ms. Smith stated that Verizon would.

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

Chair Losoff stated that after many meetings on the subject, we realize we are restricted in what we can do, but the staff with recommendations from the Commission put in some pretty good criteria and if we use these conditions for all of our projects, we can make it work pretty well and mitigate some of the issues on our part.

Vice Chair Levin asked about the language including the consideration that the Commissioners suggested so it could be amended. Cari pointed out that it is on the slide and repeated that those are the three conditions that were added to the monopine at the Methodist Church, but she doesn't know if we can just reference these conditions. Robert Pickels Jr. indicated that we can reference them as the three additional conditions as presented to the Commission. Also, the concept of potentially lowering below 75 ft. was addressed, but he doesn't know if the Commission has a preference about adding some language that would require that it go as low as possible to meet the connection. . . Chair Losoff asked the Commissioners if they are okay with 75 ft. or want to consider a lower number or say just as low as possible.

Ms. Smith indicated that Verizon would be happy to bring it to the 70 ft. level you currently have as your maximum height; that would not be an issue. If we go further, we can't have the two additional carriers, so if you take too much away, you can't do the other parts. The consensus of the Commission was to go to 70 ft. and the Chair commented that we would like to have at least a couple on one tower.

Motion: Commissioner Klein moved for approval of case number PZ18-00002 (CUP), Monopine Wireless Facility at 75 Kallof Place, based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Conditional Use Permit findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the staff report and the

additional conditions of the three items presented to us that we used for the Verizon tower on the church at SR 179, and we are going to lower the height from 75 ft. to 70 ft. Vice Chair Levin seconded the motion. Motion passed five (5) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Brandt and Commissioner Mayer were excused.

Chair Losoff commented that he is glad that they picked that location; it is away from some of the residents and should be okay.

- c. **Discussion/possible direction regarding a request for Conceptual Development Review for the construction of a 59-unit townhome development at 3865 W State Route 89A (Park Place). The property is zoned High Density Multifamily Residential (RM-2) and is located on the south side of W State Route 89A between Upper Red Rock Loop Road and Foothills South Drive. APN 408-11-531; Owner: Park Place Presidio, LLC; Applicant: Miramonte Arizona, LLC (Jack Kemmerly); Case Number: PZ18-00007 (DEV)**

****Note: This site (Park Place) has an approved subdivision (plat) that allows for the construction of an additional 76 condominium units. The current proposal represents a decrease of 17 units below the current approved plat.****

Presentation: Cari Meyer indicated the request is for a Conceptual Review for a townhome development at Park Place, and she reviewed the purpose of a Conceptual Review and explained that staff does not provide a recommendation at this stage. She identified the location of the property and indicated that the whole site is just under 10 acres and is a partially-built multifamily development known as Park Place. For this proposal, they do need approvals of the Development Review application and a Minor Plat Amendment. On a Vicinity Map, Cari pointed out the subject property and the surrounding locations. She indicated that the previous subdivision was a condo plat and you can see where the condos were proposed and where the units are located that were constructed. On the Aerial Map, Cari pointed out some of the grading done where the roadways were graded, but only 12 of the units were constructed.

Cari stated that the property is designated as Multifamily in the Community Plan allowing for four to 12 units per acre and the zoning of RM-2 matches that. The previous subdivision was the Park Place Condominium Subdivision, and it approved a total of 88 condominium units on the property and only 12 units were constructed, leaving 76 units unconstructed, and the 88 units were just over nine units per acre. The Zoning Map shows some of the zoning in the area, including the single-family subdivision of Foothills South to the east, the Marriott property and high school to the southwest, and Sedona Summit, the medical center and vacant land across the street.

Cari indicated that there is a more comprehensive property history in the packet, and staff would be happy to answer questions about that, but in general, the original approvals for this area were started in 2003 to 2005. The City considered the Development Review and Subdivision application for the 88-unit development, building permits were issued in 2006 but only 12 units were completed. In 2013 and 2014, the property owner came back to the City with a redesign for 12 of the units and that was approved, but those units were never constructed, so there are only 12 units on the site.

Cari stated that the current proposal is to build 59 townhomes in 12 buildings, and they would replace the unbuilt 76 condominium units that were unconstructed, so instead of 88 units, there would be 71 units bringing the overall density down to 7.3 units per acre rather than the original 9 units per acre. They are also proposing a new clubhouse and pool area and a Minor Final Plan Amendment would be required to change the plat to reflect the new configuration of the townhomes, but that only requires City Council review, so they would go through the Development Review process and then change the plat through the City Council to match what is approved.

Cari then pointed out the existing buildings on the site plan, the new units with six new buildings to the south and six new buildings to the north of the existing buildings and the clubhouse right at the entrance. She showed one of the elevations and pointed out the front of the buildings facing the interior of the development, the ends of the buildings, and the view from the SR 89A side of that particular building.

Cari explained some comparisons between the current proposal and the previous 88 units proposed that were provided by the applicant and indicated that the townhouses will be a little shorter and a little less massive than the previous development.

Cari indicated that it was routed to all review agencies and we had the internal meeting. We also received comments from Community Development and Public Works on the conceptual application. As they get further into the project and develop more extensive plans, we would expect to hear from other departments as well. We eventually will review for compliance with all applicable sections of the Land Development Code and provide you with an evaluation if this project moves forward to a public hearing.

Cari again stated that staff is not making a recommendation and the Commission is not asked to take action, but we are looking for comments on the proposal, so they will know what to expect as they go forward.

Applicants, Jack Kemmerly with Miramonte Homes in Northern Arizona and Don Walters who will be the project (audio unclear) introduced themselves and Mr. Walters stated that he is a fourth generation local native.

Commission's Questions and Concerns:

Cari added that Commissioner Brandt is not here, but he sent a comment on the elevations indicating that the walls above the one-story element should have some kind of relief.

Commissioner Braam stated that a significant concern would be traffic at the intersection, and he knows there will be an updated traffic study done, so he looks forward to reviewing that study not only for the current development but proposed developments in that area.

Chair Losoff agreed and indicated that there had been concerns over the years about the people living behind the property, and he asked if they would have access in or out of the property. Cari stated that there is no access between this property and Foothills South. Similar to the Foothills South Subdivision, they do have an emergency egress through the Marriott property.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the Letter of Intent under the section titled Economic Development and indicated that it states that the project seeks to provide additional housing options for people employed by local businesses who have struggled to find housing. She then asked the applicant to explain how the pricing of those units would address Sedona's employee housing needs. Mr. Kemmerly stated that they are still under market studies and trying to figure out their exact price point by doing studies especially on construction costs. They are kind of in the middle range between Phoenix and Flagstaff from a construction pricing standpoint, so as they get closer, they will get closer to honing down their final price points, but they are not even in the realm of what they are going to be offering these for. They are still trying to figure out their product, and then they start to price things out as they hone down exactly on the square footage and one-story or two-story, etc.

Vice Chair Levin asked how familiar they are with Sedona's shortage of rental housing or affordable single-family housing, and Mr. Kemmerly stated they are; they have done some research on that as well as Northern Arizona as a whole. They have an office in Flagstaff and they understand the major crisis that Northern Arizona as a whole has as well as Sedona.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that another section talks about your target buyer and read, "Townhome living attracts cultural creatives of all age demographics, single people with and without children as well as move-down buyers". She will be looking forward to more information about how you feel that addresses the market that we see for affordable housing.

Chair Losoff asked if they would envision the same price for all or certain units more affordable than others. Mr. Kemmerly stated that they have been throwing that around, but they are not quite there yet. The Chair indicated that it is early on, but they hear the Commissioners' concerns. Mr. Walters added that they are very aware of that; he was born and raised here. His family has been here for four generations, so they understand that it is very challenging. Most of his family is still here.

Commissioner Klein asked about the square footage of the townhomes, and Mr. Kemmerly stated probably in the 1800 sq. ft. to 2600 sq. ft. range conceptually. The Commissioner then asked about the square footage of the 12 condos previously built, and Mr. Kemmerly stated that he believes they are in the high twos. Commissioner Klein then stated that those condos are going for about \$500,000 and asked if that sounds right, and Mr. Kemmerly stated in that range. The Commissioner then asked if you build a mid-2,000 sq. ft. townhome is the price going to be in that same range. Mr. Kemmerly stated that they would have to do some studies with local agents and appraisers. It would probably complement that range, but they really have to study Foothills South and other adjacent communities to determine the price point range. Commissioner Klein then asked if they think a \$500,000 price deals with the housing shortage in Sedona and making places affordable for people, and Mr. Kemmerly stated he did not.

Commissioner Klein asked why in 2003 the City Council disapproved the project, and Mr. Kemmerly indicated it was height regulations. Audree Juhlin indicated that it was height related; there were some issues with the height language and the height proposed. We did mediate it and change the Land Development Code to reflect the height concerns. The Commissioner then referenced a phrase on a slide that said 'Conceptual Zone Change', and Cari stated that was a mistake; there is no zone change. It is already zoned for this.

Chair Losoff reminded the Commissioners that this is conceptual to look at the overall idea of the project. There is a slide showing building material and he assumes that is what you chose. When we will get more details; it will fit in with what is there now.

Commissioner Kinsella asked if there is an update on the phasing plan. Mr. Kemmerly indicated that they will be submitting a full phasing plan with their final Development Review submittal. They will work inside-out of where the existing buildings are, starting with the clubhouse and the first building is adjacent to the clubhouse, and then working their way out on Portofino. Chair Losoff indicated that gives him the idea that we should have a site visit to see all of that.

Commissioner Kinsella stated that she will be looking at the landscape plan closely when you submit that. She also agrees with the comments and is very interested to know how you will address the workforce housing questions. Another area she will want more detail on is that this is a gated community and there are streets behind you, so she is wondering what access you have considered for neighboring communities for emergencies, etc., and will you give consideration to that? Mr. Kemmerly explained that in the southwestern edge of the project there will be a fire access gate. Chair Losoff pointed out that before the next stage the Fire District will have to sign off on it. He then asked if they have talked with them yet, and Mr. Kemmerly indicated that they have just been talking through Cari. Their intent was to not change the original Capital Improvement Plans of the main roadways; they are just designing their buildings where the previous buildings were approved. They do not want to change the civil improvement plans of the streets.

Commissioner Kinsella asked how much space is between the buildings, and Mr. Kemmerly indicated that as proposed they are around 15 to 20, but they are allotted a minimum of 10 for RM-2 standards.

Chair Losoff indicated that they will have to address traffic when it comes back, and they heard some issues from the Commission, but one concern that hasn't been brought up is noise. Will there be any additional noise issues? Last time that came up from some of the residents living there now and in the development behind you.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period.

Bonnie Golub, President of Foothills South Owners Association Board of Directors: Ms. Golub indicated that since this is a conceptual hearing, she will address the one conceptual issue they have, and that is exactly what was just brought up, which is the platted easement that comes from Park Place. A second one comes from Foothills and the two of them go through private property owned by the Marriott Corporation, so rather than reading this to you, which is unfair just before the July 4th holiday, you can have her comments in the form of a letter. It speaks to the issues of evacuation and reminds your Chairman Marty Losoff that when we discussed Park Place, they discussed the very issue of making sure that these platted easements and the access to the two communities would never be blocked off or used in any way, except as they were designed which is for ingress and egress of emergency vehicles only or under the direction of emergency services to get people out. As stated in her final paragraph, they are in the process of developing an evacuation plan for Foothills, and they hope you will require the same thing for Park Place when it is fully built.

Ms. Golub also wanted to say that Audree has helped them tremendously over many years – many more years than she has been part of Foothills, and they can't thank her enough and all wish her very well.

Lorraine Coutin, Board of Directors of Foothills South: Ms. Coutin indicated that during the period of planning and construction of the Park Place property, will and does the developer plan to be in communication and coordinate with Foothills South Owners' Association and its relative committees, such as their Architecture Control Committee, their Planning and Operations Committee, and the committee that is reserved for working with Park Place. She wants to make sure those needs are met.

Savas Sosangelis, Board of Directors of Foothills South and Chairman of the Architectural Control Committee: Mr. Sosangelis stated that this is the first time he is here and not talking in favor of or against it. He just has a few concerns, and then they have a litany of questions they would like to developer to answer. The first question is the term 'incomplete', this has been an incomplete project year after year. They are very concerned with the term 'incomplete'. There are issues they have had in the past; they have had agreements in the past, some honored and some have not been honored. They are talking about some of the elevations. He has walked the property many times; there are massive boulders, rocks and outcrops. He doesn't know how you can fit them into an elevation pattern, so he is asking the developer and the City to be very cautious with the elevations. With the privacy between their 30 ft. setbacks, they are going to have backyards basically facing Foothills South and that means BBQs, etc., so they do need that privacy. There is an incomplete fence wall and that needs to be completed. The term is 'incomplete', so as long as we are cognizant of the term 'incomplete', and it has been incomplete for the last 10 to 12 years. Lastly, they need discussions directly with the developer; they have done it with other developers and builders; it works very well, so they are here to constantly meet with you and if you have any issues, before you go running to anybody else, come to Foothills South to discuss them and they will be neighbors. Let's get the project complete.

Bob Maxwell, Board of Directors of Foothills South Owners' Association: Mr. Maxwell indicated that his main concern is there is really only access from that middle point on this

property, which means all of the construction has to go through the one point. There will not be access through any of the Foothills South areas or the gate that is between the Marriott and the project, so all of the construction is going to have to go through that one entrance which is right across the street from Bristlecone Pines, and it has become a challenge to get out into traffic as it is now. Once the project is completed, you have all those people that will not have access to any of the gates, egress to Foothills South, so they will be contained in that one entrance and exit. Again, he is not saying they are in favor or against it; it is just one other challenge they will be facing because of the close proximity to Foothills South owners.

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

Cari Meyer indicated that the applicant would like to say something, and the Chair recapped the comments brought up during the public comment period and indicated that the Commission would like to hear what the applicant thinks.

Applicant Jack Kemmerly indicated that Bonnie's request for an evacuation plan is something they can look at and it is a smart idea and the Park Place Board has also brought up evacuation issues, so that is something they can definitely add to their plans and entitlement process. Regarding Lorraine's' comment about working with the Foothills South HOA, absolutely. They have reached out to their management company and requested that they present at their next HOA meeting on the 24th at 6:00 p.m. They will be in attendance and they would absolutely like to reach out and be proactive as part of their Citizen Participation Plan and Community Outreach Plan. The third question about being an incomplete project and privacy, they will take that into consideration and work with the HOA. Their intent was to finish that incomplete fence along one of the Foothills South main roads adjacent to Park Place and behind those buildings. It is quite above the existing grade of what they have proposed, so it is something they will look at and clean the site up as they start their land development process. Regarding Bob's concerns about access especially during the construction process, they are going to submit an application to ADOT to use two alternate access points for construction vehicles. The first one will be at Building 8 along the northeast corner of the project; they will cut open that wall for construction activities on the northeast corner; they will request it in a permit to ADOT and work with them to access off of SR 89A, as well as utilize that easement to the southwest through Marriott's facility and work with them during their construction.

Chair Losoff asked if staff is okay with that and Cari stated if ADOT approves it. The Chair then asked if they have talked to Marriott, and Mr. Kemmerly indicated they have to sit down with them and will probably ask Foothills South who they were working with directly, because it is trying to pin down the direct point of contact that has been interesting. To respond to Bob's main concern, their intent is to not have any construction activity or vehicles through the main entrance. It is just not a good idea, especially with an automatic gate for any existing residents that live in there. Their intent is for all of the construction activity and traffic to go through those two alternate temporary access points.

Chair Losoff stated that conceptually he likes the design and the material. All the years Park Place has come back and forth, we have had some of these concerns and if you get together and coordinate your efforts with the various parties around you, it would make a very worthwhile project if you can all agree to settle some of the issues.

- 6. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**
 - a. Tuesday, July 17, 2018; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - b. Tuesday, July 17, 2018; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - c. Tuesday, August 7, 2018; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - d. Tuesday, August 7, 2018; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Audree Juhlin stated that the next meeting will be Tuesday, July 17th and the only thing we have will be the Foothills South Subdivision at 5:30 p.m. and most likely the 3:30 p.m. work session will be

canceled. On August 7th, we had an item that we thought was going to go forward, but it is not, so we have nothing at this time and it mostly likely will be canceled. Commissioner Klein asked if that was Arizona Water and Audree stated that is correct and it most likely will be on August 21st. Audree then indicated that it is safe to say August 7th is canceled.

Chair Losoff asked if a work session is needed on Foothills South and Audree stated no, it is relatively straightforward. The Chair then wished everyone a happy July 4th and thanked Audree for all of her years of service and help to him personally, as well as the Commission, and wished Karen Osburn good luck.

7. 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.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 4:52 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on July 3, 2018.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date