

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, August 21, 2018 - 3:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Losoff called the work session 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, Eric Brandt, Kathy Kinsella, Larry Klein, and Gerhard Mayer.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Cynthia Lovely, Karen Osburn and Donna Puckett.

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

There were no announcements; however, Chair Losoff suggested omitting this agenda item for work sessions in the future.

3. 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.

4. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:

a. Discussion/possible action regarding inclusion of the Oak Creek Heritage District in the Land Development Code (LDC) Update Draft.

Presentation: Cynthia Lovely indicated that it is a little confusing, because it is different than what we have done before, so she will go through a little of the process and background on the CFA, but first she will explain how we got to this point.

Currently, we are considering a new Zoning District as part of the Land Development Code update. When the CFA Plan was approved in April of 2017, the CFA Plan proposed a new Zoning District as a tool to implement the CFA and through the Land Development Code update with the Clarion consultants, their suggestion was to include this as part of a Planned Development District instead of a new Zoning District, but during that process, it was decided that maybe it should be a new Zoning District. We said maybe the new district would be more appropriate, because there are some drawbacks to including it as a Planned Development District.

Cynthia indicated that Clarion had originally suggested that, because one of their directives was to simplify the Land Development Code which meant consolidating Zoning Districts, and they really didn't want to create new districts; however, when it was written into the PD, everyone had a chance to review it and when the Commission looked at it in June, you were looking at the whole thing and we didn't go into any level of detail on this topic, but we did explain that we were considering changing it to be a standalone district.

Cynthia stated that we are now looking at the proposal to make this a standalone district in the new Land Development Code. We have more comments from the Clarion consultants and comments from people living in the area, so we want to hear your comments and questions, so

staff can discuss how we might modify what you are looking at today. Then, our plan is to bring it back to you on September 4th with those changes. We are trying to keep on track with City Council's review, so if we can discuss this today and on September 4th, and then send something to Council and stay on schedule, they are trying to wrap up the Land Development Code by the end of the year, so we didn't want to put it off any longer even though it may not be perfect today.

Cynthia referred to the CFA Plan and indicated that the purpose of creating a new district was that we wanted to encourage creative site design that will preserve the area's natural and cultural resources while strengthening the sense of place, and this would provide an alternative to the current zoning. Most properties in this area are zoned RS-10 and RS-18, which is Single-family Residential. Most likely in the future, if you don't see a continuation of houses being built, you could see a consolidation of properties, and then housing subdivisions, so that would be if everything stayed as is with no zoning changes, etc.

Cynthia stated that when we did the planning process and worked with the neighborhood, they really didn't want to see this turn into just another subdivision, so that is why this is a unique situation and unique area. From the aerial photo, you can see Oak Creek on the left side and there are a lot of vacant properties that are between Oak Creek and Schnebly Hill Road that could be developed.

Cynthia indicated that regarding the discussion of doing a Planned Development District or a standalone district, she put comparisons together to give you an idea of the differences. Staff felt that if we went with the Planned Development District, it could be quite a while before seeing any movement in this area towards implementing the CFA and another concern might be some owners who aren't quite ready with a development proposal or they don't want to develop themselves but want to rezone and have that assurance that it will develop in the future through the CFA Plan, and the difference would be if you come in and want to rezone to PD, it would be all at once – a package deal, so you would request a rezoning at the same time you would have your development proposal, and you would go through the process together. The new standalone district would allow an owner to come in and ask for a rezoning to the OC District, and they could stop there. Then in the future, the current or future owner could come in with a development proposal, which would need to adhere to the standards of the new Zoning District as well as the CFA Plan. They also could still do the package deal where they could concurrently request a rezoning and have their development proposal at the same time, so it gives a few more options and doesn't put the pressure on the property owner to have to develop it themselves or know exactly what their development project will be.

Cynthia then asked if the Commissioners had any questions at this point.

Commissioners' Questions:

Commissioner Klein stated that we have more control over the development proposal when they are requesting a rezoning as opposed to properties already zoned for what they want to do. If we go to the OC District and they say they want a rezoning, and then later come in with a development proposal, they already have their zoning so isn't that going to lessen the Commission's control over the project? Cynthia stated that it doesn't lessen the control; it probably breaks it up into pieces. One of the concerns we heard is if they came in just for the rezoning, the concern was there may not be any assurance of exactly what they are going to do, so how do you decide whether you should approve a rezoning, and staff's answer was that you have the CFA Plan and the standards under a new district, so that would dictate what they can do under the development proposal. The control that you would have is to make sure their development proposal adheres to the district standards. Commissioner Klein stated that he doesn't like that idea.

Vice Chair Levin asked, if the property owner intends to sell, what the advantages are to the property owner to rezone, and Cynthia explained that if they have concerns about how the property is developed in the future, that would be part of their decision. We can't say whether it

is going to increase or decrease their property value, that would be up to them, but those are two considerations. The Vice Chair then asked if staff expects current property owners who are planning to sell to request a rezoning or those who plan to develop to come through with a rezoning request under the OC District alternative. Cynthia explained that there is nothing concrete out there; we just want to make as many options available to people as possible.

Chair Losoff stated that as devil's advocate we have a CFA Plan that somewhat dictates what can or cannot be done and asked if the new district would be redundant to the CFA plan. Cynthia explained that the new district is going to be regulatory language, whereas the CFA Plan is not regulatory; it is not required. If they were to rezone to the district, they are required to follow those standards, whereas with the CFA Plan you are relying on a rezoning to negotiate. With the CFA Plan, you need to negotiate, but if they are under the new district, they are required to follow those standards. Chair Losoff noted that is a good point and if people understand that it makes more sense.

Commissioner Mayer asked if that means that the CFA Plan is kicked out, and Cynthia stated no, not at all. The Commissioner then added because there are historic properties in there, and he is wondering what it will do to those historic properties. Some of them are small and some are really big, so it is a mix of lots or what can be done, and when we talked about the CFA, we wanted to see a diversity in the CFA area. He then asked to see the outline of that CFA Plan and Cynthia showed an aerial view of the whole CFA, but the Commissioner asked to see the parcels and the Chair advised him it is on page 22 of 44 of the packet and noted that there also are a couple of other pages in the packet, page 26 is the current Land Use and page 28.

Commissioner Mayer asked if it is from the bridge all the way to the boundary of the city and Cynthia showed another aerial photo of the CFA. The Commissioner then noted that the Commission toured all that area, and Cynthia agreed. Chair Losoff asked Cynthia to bring up page 26, and Commissioner Mayer then stated that he is a little concerned. The Chair noted that page 26 gives a general idea of what we are talking about, and Cynthia added that it shows all of the parcel boundaries.

Commissioner Kinsella asked if, since this is a voluntary rezoning application, someone doesn't want to go into the Heritage District if it is established, then they still are under the CFA guidelines, and Cynthia explained that we should not mix up the district zone versus the CFA. If they don't rezone, they are under their original which is usually the RS-10 or RS-18. The CFA Plan will kick in if they want to do something other than their existing zoning.

Commissioner Brandt wanted to follow-up on the concerns. It was set up to be a win-win situation, so we are trying to encourage the landowners to change the zoning to the new zone to follow the recommendations in the Community Plan, and it seems as though instead of doing the PD, doing it as a new district takes some of the questions out of the landowners' minds and still encourages all the things that were going on in the Community Plan. Cynthia stated exactly.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he has a couple of questions on how it is implemented, but maybe he will save those until after Cynthia's presentation. Chair Losoff indicated that at the time we looked at the CFA, the issue of creating a new district came up and we said we were looking at the Land Development Code, so maybe we would wait for that, so we were kind of back and forth, but the initial attempt was as Commissioner Brandt stated kind of a win-win situation for the people.

Vice Chair Levin asked if a property owner came through for a zone change to the Heritage District and then came through with a lodging proposal, the first in would affect how all the other remaining parcels could proceed, given the suggested cap we have around mixed-use. Cynthia stated that with lodging, in particular, there is a statement that says lodging is not to exceed half of the CFA. The Commissioner then stated that if you were a single property owner, then you can't speak for the balance unless you have amassed a number of lots and know what the fuller

development picture might look like. Cynthia explained that the thought was that it is going to be in smaller pieces then cumulatively over time, you could reach that cap, but we never expected it to be reached with one project.

Commissioner Brandt asked if a landowner chooses to do lodging in this district would they still need to do a rezone for Lodging, and Cynthia stated that the Oak Creek Heritage District would allow for lodging, so that would be the rezoning to Lodging that would allow them to do that. The Commissioner then noted it wouldn't be like Commercial, where they still need to have a Lodging application; it is just automatic, it is just allowed. Cynthia pointed out that in the new Code, we are also changing how we go about lodging, so the current method will not be the future method.

Chair Losoff indicated that you get the sense that our issue with the big picture is the concept of a new Zoning District. We will get to what goes into it, but we are more concerned with why we should or shouldn't – good conversation. The Chair then asked if staff had heard from anybody since the Commission got the packet in terms of pros or cons, and Cynthia stated that we haven't heard anything regarding whether it should be the PD or the new district.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the landowners were informed about this process, and Cynthia stated yes. The packet information was sent to the original work group, and there are probably some new people that were added to the list. Commissioner Mayer then asked if there was nothing back yet, and Cynthia replied not yet. She knows that one was out of town. Commissioner Mayer then wanted to know how many landowners we have there, and Cynthia stated not very many, but she doesn't recall the exact number. The parcel map is on the screen; it may look like a lot, but there are multiple properties owned by one owner. Chair Losoff indicated that if he remembers correctly, there are less than a handful of owners or two handfuls.

Cynthia Lovely pointed out if you look at the properties that are likely to be developed, for example the white on the map is the vacant parcels, then yes, you are looking at a handful. The Chair commented that we are talking about large properties, but not that many landowners.

Presentation (continued):

Cynthia noted that the next slide was to talk a little more about why this area is unique. She then showed a historic photo and noted that it used to be orchards in that area, which goes back to the Vision. She then read the Vision stating that it would be a pedestrian friendly area and noted that getting at the pedestrian-friendly is the fact that it is so close to Uptown and you can walk to most locations from here. Then, focusing on Oak Creek and Sedona's heritage, and again this was the historic part of Sedona, this is where a lot of the original development was, and they were at this location because of the creek and the water, so you have the Oak Creek riparian corridor that we want to see preserved, and there are also some hillsides that are undeveloped and very visible especially from Uptown. She then pointed out Oak Creek, the "Y", Uptown and the visible hillsides and mentioned that if you are in the Hyatt shops, you sit up higher and look down and across that area. She also pointed out the Creative Life Center, the RV campground, the Gassaway House, the Schnebly Hill roundabout and the nearby office building.

Cynthia added that the CFA Plan calls for trails throughout the area, including some sort of a footbridge across the creek. We don't know exactly where that would be, but if you had a footbridge, you would be in Uptown almost immediately. Currently, there are a lot of people that walk or ride their bikes, and the aerial photo is great to show that people staying in the RV Park use a foot path across the vacant lot, which is an indication that people regularly walk or bike to Uptown from the RV Park. There is also a neighborhood behind the RV Park with more houses.

Chair Losoff noted that as we developed the CFA, we were excited about how this could turn into a true pedestrian-friendly area with walkability to various places and many trails.

Commissioner Mayer asked what is going to happen to the RV Park in that scenario and if there is a possibility of changing the zoning for that too. Cynthia explained that the RV Park is zoned

Residential and at some point it could sell, and it may or may not continue as an RV Park. If the current or future owners were to develop it, they could go with their Residential zoning, continue the RV Park or rezone to the new district.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that some of the uses allowed are commercial as a primary, and it is a 750 ft. limit. He then asked where that is, and Cynthia explained that during the planning process, the working group didn't want to see this area turn commercial. They didn't want it to become another Uptown, so they limited commercial to 750 ft., and she pointed out the limit at about a driveway and just in proximity to the roundabout. The rest of the area could have commercial as an accessory use with the thought being for example if the RV Park wanted to have bike rentals or if you did lodging and you wanted to have a spa or gift shop.

Commissioner Mayer asked about high density, and Cynthia stated that it is unlikely that we would see high density here, but we are saying that you could rezone and do multifamily. One comment received from the consultant was to look at putting a cap on that, so staff will want to figure out what that would be, because their comment was if you are going to allow multifamily to go higher density if they provide certain benefits, we probably need some guidelines on that.

Cynthia indicated that as a reminder, when we are talking about the Land Development Code draft, the current one is the adoption draft dated July 2018, so any references are referring to the July draft. Chair Losoff noted that has been submitted to the City Council, and Cynthia agreed that the City Council has a copy and it is out for the public, available on the website.

Cynthia then referenced the proposed changes and stated that the first one is a standalone page in the Land Development Code. Each zone had a page; there is a Purpose Statement, standards and dimensions, and some of the zones had a diagram of a typical development, so there were a few comments on this. The consultant wasn't sure that we needed #2, since in the other districts, there is a method under Minor Modifications, so it is addressed elsewhere in the Code. We have heard a few comments like that from Clarion that there is some language that may not be necessary, because it is already addressed elsewhere.

Cynthia indicated that the next section of the Code to amend to accommodate the new district would be the Table of Allowed Uses. They would need to add a column for the OC District and you can see where there is a P for Permitted. We have received a few comments and one was why not allow wineries, and one of the allowed uses says winery, distillery, brewery, so that was a comment made and we will consider putting a P under that one as an example.

Vice Chair Levin asked if temporary housing is defined in the definition section of the adoption draft, and Cynthia stated yes. The Vice Chair then indicated that it seemed like it would include campgrounds and asked if there is an expanded definition of temporary housing. It seemed to be used interchangeably later when campgrounds are mentioned, so she wondered what is encompassed in the definition of temporary housing as a permitted use. Cynthia stated that she would look that up, so she will put it on the list.

Commissioner Kinsella referenced Table 3.1, when you get to commercial uses - recreation and entertainment that has indoor recreation facility would not be permitted and outdoor recreation facility would be permitted, so she is curious as to what kind of indoor recreation facilities would not be permitted. She wants to know if there was a building structure in a campground with indoor recreation activities, would that not be allowed. Cynthia explained that without looking at the exact definition of indoor recreation facility, as she recalls, they are thinking more about things like bowling alleys or swimming pools that are large buildings. The CFA does not talk about having large buildings, they want smaller buildings, so as she recalls that was the reason it didn't have a P for Permitted, but it is something that staff can look into, although she doesn't think it would exclude recreational activities in a building. The idea was that it would exclude large facilities. The Commissioner then stated that if she could get clarification on that it would be great.

Cynthia Lovely referenced a mix of uses and that we can use some affordable housing, including multifamily which isn't always affordable, and she then noted that we covered commercial. One of the reasons there might seem to be a lot of information on the revision list is that in the CFA Plan, there is one statement about commercial within 750 ft., but in the Code, there are multiple sections depending on the type of commercial use, so we are repeating the same statement in different locations. For example, under bar, tavern, restaurant and personal services, we are repeating that same statement.

Cynthia referenced the campground and noted that a density is set on that, and we also have a statement about campgrounds may feature sites for . . . , and the consultant asked if that is even necessary. One of the things that is different about Sedona is that it currently does not allow camping in the city, so this is something new and different to allow for campgrounds with tents. Vice Chair Levin noted that is where the temporary or mobile structure language appears as well, and Cynthia indicated that is probably the type of thing that staff would work with the consultant on, in case something needs to be reworded.

Cynthia indicated that regarding lodging, one of the things that the consultants said is redundant is we don't need to say we are limiting the building to 5,000 sq. ft., if we have that on the main district page, but again, one question was why we are doing that. For those not familiar with the CFA Plan, if you go back to the intent of the CFA to be a more rural character and recall the picture on the right is El Portal, we used that as a model of the type of lodging we would want to see in this area, and that was a little difficult to compare for square footage, because it is a courtyard style, but basically we set the limit at 5,000 sq. ft. with the intent that you would have smaller buildings similar to Los Abrigados, as opposed to one large lodging facility, to try to retain the character. Again, regarding the rural character, the CFA Plan calls for keeping the driveways and internal roads gravel with no asphalt or concrete in trying to retain the rural character, and there are some more specific things like sharing driveways, so the Code would say if you are going to do new development, you either have to work with your neighbor to share an access road or have one access road. The idea is to limit how many driveways you have on Schnebly Hill Road. Currently, the way it is developed with mostly houses, if each house has its own driveway, it is a lot of driveways, whereas if there is redevelopment you could probably consolidate the number of driveways.

Commissioner Mayer commented that the east side is quite a hilly area and to combine the driveways with smaller lots too, how is that going to look? Cynthia stated that most of the parcels on the east side are already developed; we don't see major redevelopment happening there, and there is the Gassaway property that is already platted for subdivision with one driveway.

Cynthia indicated that the CFA Plan emphasizes pedestrian-bicycle circulation, and in the Land Development Code, we would have more details specific to this CFA, including getting some access easements so you can permanently set aside trails access, connecting to the National Forest, a trail along Schnebly Hill Road, and the possibility of a creekwalk. Those are all things that are specific to this area, so we would add some language to that section of the Code.

Cynthia stated that for the landscaping standards, the Code currently calls for 50% native plant species and in this case, we have upped that to 75% in trying to go with the CFA vision. The other comment staff has heard is we probably need to reword this statement, because there has been some confusion about how it excludes orchard trees, so we may want to make this clearer. Under site design, the Land Development Code does not have any specific language about sensitive area protection that a lot of other codes do. We use that more generic language if in the future we want to add anything else under that topic; in the CFA, we have the preservation of Oak Creek. Another comment is that we are calling this the Oak Creek Heritage District, because it could be used outside the CFA. There are other properties along Oak Creek that might want to rezone to this District and a lot of them have frontage on the creek. It is not called the Schnebly Hill Zoning District and that is one of the reasons.

Regarding open space, Cynthia indicated that there is a variety of different directives, and the most important might be the cluster development to encourage the preservation of open space. To do that, you can cluster your development whether it is residential or lodging to preserve the corridor, but it could also be along Schnebly Hill Road. The CFA Plan talks about that viewshed of the open area along the road and the hillsides. Then for architectural character, there is a section in the Code that addresses that, so we would add some language to that section as well as Historic Resources. There are several recognized historic resources; the Gassaway House is a designated city landmark, and there are a couple of other features in the area that are not designated landmarks, such as the Steele Cabins in the RV Park and the photo on top is an old irrigation ditch, the Schnebly House and the Farley Cabins, which is a city landmark, so there are quite a few features in the area that we do not want lost to development and there is some specific language to address that.

Cynthia indicated that is a brief summary of what is contained in these revisions, but just to recap why we are doing this, we want to encourage creative site design that will preserve the area's resources while strengthening the sense of place, and you would have a hard time doing that under the existing Zoning District, so this provides an alternative. She then pointed out that staff have several comments to go through and we probably will be talking with the consultant on some of these revisions. She also made notes on what you brought up today, and staff's plan is to bring back a revised version on September 4th that hopefully will be at a point to forward to the City Council.

Commissioners' Questions and Comments:

Chair Losoff encouraged Commissioner Kinsella and Commissioner Braam plus anyone else to make arrangements for a site visit and indicated that the Commissioners could call Cynthia or Warren to drive you through.

Commissioner Kinsella asked how many parcels are in the 750 ft. commercial intrusion or boundary. Cynthia pointed out the office building as the first property on the left side of the road, a vacant parcel and a parcel with one house set back. She then pointed out the rough area of where the 750 ft. ends and added that on the right side of the road is the Gassaway subdivision, so there are very few parcels.

Commissioner Braam indicated that he applauds the consideration of Oak Creek with the riparian environment and having that as a focus for the area. He then referenced the trail map and asked if there is a public right-of-way or easement in any of those areas or if it would be something that would have to be acquired. Cynthia Lovely indicated that there is no public access in this CFA, so the thought was, if redevelopment occurs, to work with the property owners to try to attain easements. There are a lot of social trails where people are just walking, but they are not open to the public and designated as legal trails. The Commissioner stated that particularly in the floodway or floodplain where you have restricted uses, if you could work with the landowners for development in those areas, it would be great. He then noted that he hasn't seen wording promoting fishing in this area and asked if that is a consideration with public access to the creek. Cynthia stated that has never come up that she recalls. The Commissioner then asked, with potential public access to the creek, how you would provide the access without turning it into a kind of new swimming hole per se. Cynthia explained that there was a lot of discussion about that during the planning process, and there were some ideas about having a park of some sort, and it was decided to just limit it to a creekwalk. One of the ways to limit access is that there would be no designated parking for this, and second, there was discussion about things like signs, fences, design features, etc., to try to keep people on the trail and prevent it from becoming a congregation type of place.

Chair Losoff indicated that has been an age-old issue for as many people that would like to see access to the creek there are as many that don't for various reasons, but if it came up, we need some control and regulations.

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

Commissioner Mayer stated that regarding the Community Plan update one of the priorities was access to the creek. He doesn't know if it will be possible with the land owned by private people, so possibly a give and take is a possibility and that would be great.

Commissioner Brandt asked how the new district addresses clustering or preservation of open space, and Cynthia explained that there is language about that. She thinks it is under Site Design where it talks about clustering, but the idea is that we would be more flexible on the setbacks, so a good example would be Oak Creek where you want to preserve the riparian area and move all of the development into the corner, but the idea would be that you might have reduced setbacks to allow for that so they could cluster in one area to preserve the rest of it. The other example is the Creative Life Center property that has the hillside, and on the parcel map, it is actually two large parcels and you can see the building near the road, and the thought would be if they want to develop their property with a cluster development, you would leave the hillside as open space and move the development down either near the road or in the low area that is not visible. It is a little more challenging, because you have the floodway through it, which Commissioner Mayer also noted.

Commissioner Brandt stated if you have a parcel and that is about five acres combined; however, Cynthia stated it is more like eight acres. The Commissioner then indicated it is really to encourage those who want to develop their property, but it is somewhat encouraging them to do lodging. If they are doing residential and it is currently four units per acre, and the new Code is one per acre or one per three-quarters of an acre, 35,000 sq. ft. for any use, if they do a housing development, they probably wouldn't choose to rezone, because it would be a downzoning. Cynthia stated that there is an example of that, there are some undeveloped parcels in this area, and if you have a large parcel that is entirely in the floodway, there isn't a lot you could do with that and your options are limited now. If you consolidated, rezoned and clustered the development outside of the riparian corridor, that is a good example in that now they are limited in what they can do, but they could develop it as residential without as many options as they would have under the new District.

Commissioner Brandt stated that if it is one per acre and you had four acres, but almost all of it is in the floodway, then they could bring all of their zoning and put it up. It is as if just because it is one per acre, you can bring it all into one spot, so floodway or meadow is kind of the same way, although he doesn't know what the incentive would be, because it is really almost impossible to build in a floodway. Cynthia commented not entirely impossible and Commissioner Brandt agreed, but stated that unless there is no other possible place to build and regardless of what the zoning is underneath. Cynthia Lovely stated that if they were to continue to keep their Residential zoning and develop under that, then there are pretty rigid setbacks and that could prevent them from clustering whereas if you go to the new Zoning District, we would be flexible on setbacks for clustering.

Commissioner Brandt asked if there would need to be something within item B., the Lot Building Standards of 40 ft., 20 ft., 20 ft. that says unless it is a clustering situation. Cynthia Lovely stated that we have in a couple of different locations under the Purpose Statement a comment about flexibility, and we have also had comments from the Clarion consultants that says under our Minor Modifications process, it would allow for that flexibility as well, so that is one of those things we have to look at to determine if we need to reword that language and if it is necessary, because it is mentioned elsewhere. The intent is that flexibility is in there, so even though that page lists out the front, side and rear setbacks, we would be flexible in order to preserve the open space. Commissioner Brandt stated okay, you might just need to have something that suggests that, and Cynthia noted that one comment received was asking if we even need to list the setbacks if we expect it to be flexible. Commissioner Brandt agreed.

The Chair asked if staff has recommendations or suggestions to Clarion, and Cynthia explained that we have comments from them, some comments from the public . . . , the Chair interjected that staff has heard from the Commission today about temporary housing, recreation and clustering, and again, he emphasized that it would be good to make arrangements for a site visit and to make it easy for staff, maybe Commissioner Kinsella and Commissioner Braam can do the same time.

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 4:25 p.m. without objection and noted that the Commission will reconvene for the next session at 5:30 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on August 21, 2018.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date