

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting**  
**City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ**  
**Tuesday, December 4, 2018 - 5:30 p.m.**

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

Acting Chair Brandt called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present:** Acting Chair Eric Brandt and Commissioners Randy Barcus, George Braam, Charlotte Hosseini, Kathy Kinsella and Larry Klein. Vice Chair Levin was excused.

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

**Councilor(s) Present:** Mayor Sandy Moriarty and Councilor Scott Jablow

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

Karen Osburn indicated that one request from the Commission was to have follow-up, on the items you recommend approval or denial on to Council, as to what happens to those once they leave your consideration, so she has two recent updates. One is on the Residence Inn project, which left the Commission's desk many months ago. We had a couple of work sessions with City Council, and the project morphed a little since you saw it last. They ultimately ended up with a unanimous approval, not for the 85 units and the five affordable housing units, but for 90 hotel units and a \$824,000 contribution to the Housing Fund. The other thing that left the Commission in June or July was the Land Development Code and, on November 14<sup>th</sup>, the City Council also approved the Land Development Code, and it will go into effect on December 14<sup>th</sup>, 30 days after Council action with the exception of bees and chickens, which will be the end of March, so it gives a little time to develop a process for permitting, etc.

**3. RECOGNITION OF FORMER COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Acting Chair Brandt stated that next is a recognition of former Commission Members. We've recently had two retirees, and he has a statement from Chair Kathy Levin who has put together a brief message, and then we will have some cake.

Acting Chair Brandt then read the statement from Kathy Levin regarding Marty Losoff as follows: "I have had the pleasure of working with Marty Losoff for over a dozen years. He cares about Sedona and brought prior management experience to effectively lead the Commission.

I first started working with him closely when he was a member of the Citizens Steering Committee for the Community Plan. Marty was involved in that three-year effort while he simultaneously served as Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission. When the Plan was ready for formal review, he helped shepherd it through the Commission and on to the City Council. On the heels of this major work, Marty then oversaw the Commission's review of a re-write of the Land Development Code, a new Sign Code, a Historic Preservation Code, a Wireless Plan and his favorite Land Development Code work—the "birds and the bees" (also known as the Chicken Ordinance). Secretly, I knew that he did not fully appreciate the nationwide move towards "urban agriculture".

In all of these efforts, Marty was professional, courteous, a consensus builder, and respectful of city

staff, applicants and the public. He is one of Sedona's best examples of selfless volunteerism in the pursuit of public service."

Acting Chair Brandt indicated that Kathy also had kind words for Gerhard Mayer and read her statement about him as follows: "My fondest memories of Gerhard Mayer come not from his long service on the Planning and Zoning Commission, which is noteworthy, but from his contribution to the update of the Sedona Community Plan. We had developed three enormously large full-color banners to illustrate three possible "visions" for Sedona's 2020 and Beyond. In his capable hands, he constructed the support system for them to be safely displayed in meetings all around town and in the courtyard at City Hall, taking responsibility to move and install them each time. This literal hands-on approach was indispensable to the success of the Plan's ultimate adoption.

As a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, Gerhard has shown a sensitivity to projects that carry potential impacts on existing neighborhoods. He recognized that his position allowed him to give voice to those who might not speak up on their own behalf. He has also been a champion of renewable energy by drawing upon his extensive knowledge of European systems and potential local applications.

Finally, on a personal note, he brought me a bottle of good French white wine to celebrate when I retired from the City of Sedona" (staff position that is). "Gerhard will be remembered by all of us for his kind heartedness as well.

*Acting Chair Brandt then thanked both former Commissioners, recessed the meeting at 5:38 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 5:50 p.m.*

#### **4. INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Acting Chair Brandt introduced new Commissioners Charlotte Hosseini and Randy Barcus and welcomed them to the Commission. Both new Commissioners indicated they would give their personal introductions at a work session.

#### **5. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

Acting Chair Brandt indicated that we actually have a Chair, Kathy Levin; however, Karen Osburn clarified that Kathy Levin is Vice Chair, which means that when the Chair isn't here, she defaults, but this is an opportunity to elect both a Chair and a Vice Chair. Acting Chair Brandt noted that in his mind, it had already happened.

Acting Chair Brandt asked for nominations for Chairperson.

***MOTION: Commissioner Klein moved to nominate Kathy for Chair. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion.***

Karen Osburn asked if that was Kathy Levin or Kathy Kinsella. Acting Chair Brandt confirmed that we have a nomination for Kathy Levin for Chair and asked if there were any other nominations. No additional nominations were presented.

***VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Chair Levin was excused.***

Acting Chair Brandt then asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

***MOTION: Commissioner Klein moved to nominate Eric Brandt for Vice Chair and Commissioner Kinsella seconded the motion.***

Acting Chair Brandt indicated that he was actually going to pass on the nomination, but thanked them.

**MOTION: Commissioner Kinsella moved to nominate Randy Barcus, and Commissioner Braam seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Chair Levin was excused.**

Acting Chair Brandt indicated that he understood by state law and passed the gavel to newly-appointed Vice Chair Barcus; however, Vice Chair Barcus commented it's not state law -- an ordinance that the gavel gets passed. Vice Chair Barcus chaired the remainder of the meeting.

**6. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:  
a. October 16, 2018 (R)**

Vice Chair Barcus noted that this item is for approval of the minutes of October 16, 2018 and asked for a motion to approve.

**MOTION: Commissioner Kinsella moved to approve. Commissioner Braam seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Chair Levin was excused.**

**7. 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.)**

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

**8. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEM THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:  
a. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Preliminary Plat approval 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 stated that this application is for a Preliminary Plat for Hillside Vista Estates and explained that the platting process is a five-stage process that begins with a pre-application conference between staff and the applicant, which was done in February of this year. After that, the applicant submits for Conceptual Review, which concludes with the Commission's public hearing on the Conceptual Plat and that happened in June. We are now in the Preliminary Plat stage of this process, and in this stage, the Commission gives a recommendation, and City Council will take final action on the Preliminary Plat. After the Preliminary Plat is approved, the next stage would be a revised Preliminary Plat where the applicant makes any required changes and staff reviews those changes to ensure they comply with the conditions before moving into the Final Plat stage that City Council takes final action on. This will be the last time the Commission sees this plat.

Cari stated that the Preliminary Plat facilitates the detailed planning submittal, review and approval of the Preliminary Plat and allows for comments by the Commission and public to be considered prior to the finalization of the Plat. The Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed Preliminary Plat.

Cari referenced a Vicinity Map and pointed out the subject property and the surrounding area. She then explained that there was an application for a subdivision submitted in 2006 for this lot, and it went through the Conceptual Preliminary Plat stage, received Preliminary Plat approval by the City Council, but there was never a Final Plat approved, so the Preliminary Plat expired in May of 2010. You have 36 months from approval of the Preliminary Plat to have the Final Plat approved and that did not happen, so this application starts over from the beginning.

Cari indicated that the application is for a 30-unit single-family home subdivision and the lot as a whole is just under 32 acres, so the density of the project is just under one unit per acre. The Community Plan for this property is Single-Family Low Density, and the Single-Family Residential zoning that requires a minimum of 35,000 sq. ft. per lot and has maximum lot dimensions with a maximum density of one unit per acre, so it is at .93 units per acre, and this project is under that. We are not reviewing the homes that go on these lots. We are reviewing the lot layout; the road and the building envelopes, but the homes will be reviewed through the single-family review process, which is an administrative process that we do through staff.

Cari explained because of the timing of this, as Karen mentioned, the Land Development Code was passed and goes into effect on December 14<sup>th</sup>, so assuming that they are not submitting any single-family home permits before then, these homes will be reviewed under the new Land Development Code, although the Plat is being reviewed under the old Land Development Code because of the timing of the submittal.

Cari referenced the cover page of the Preliminary Plat and pointed out the lot layout, Bristlecone Pines Road and two existing stub outs of right-of-way that the lot connects to, so the road will go through that, connecting at each end, with lots generally on either side the road. On a Context Map, she again pointed out the roadway with the layout of adjacent neighborhoods.

Cari stated that this Subdivision has two access points, and there is a proposed 50-foot right-of-way. The lot sizes on the Plat range from 34,850 sq. ft. to over 76,000 sq. ft. The minimum lot size is 35,000 sq. ft., so Lot 7 is a little short and one of the Conditions of Approval is that they will need to adjust Lot 7 and the lots around it to ensure every lot has 35,000 sq. ft. The lots around it have sufficient square footage that could be moved, and the applicant has already determined how they will do that. With the revised Preliminary Plat, they would submit something, and staff would review it to ensure the 35,000 sq. ft. minimum is met.

Cari indicated that the building envelopes shown meet or exceed setback requirements. In some areas of the Plat, because of drainage, slopes, knolls, or other significant natural features, they have restricted the building envelopes further than the setbacks would require and designated areas as non-buildable to protect the drainage areas and those natural features. They are also using some non-vehicular, non-access easements along portions of the road with steeper slopes, and that prevents driveways from being built in those locations which further protects some of the slopes and puts driveways on areas that have a smoother transition to the lots.

Cari explained that when they went through the process in 2006, they went through a lot of community outreach and made some adjustments to the plat that were carried forward onto this Plat, so she wanted to point out some of those as follows:

- Some of the non-buildable areas carried over from the 2006 approval. The original plat that they were considering in 2006 had 32 lots, and they agreed to reduce it to 30 to make it fit with the contours of the land better.
- The reduction in the building areas.
- The reduction in the number of driveways crossing the southern wash. On the Plat, a number of those lots on the very south have shared driveways, so there is only one driveway crossing the wash, and in some places, they have two.
- They did some redesign of some of the lots, particularly Lots 29 and 30 to prevent building on a prominent knoll. They did that by moving the property line, so it goes right through the knoll, so setbacks will get buildings off of it, and one of the lots has a little bigger non-buildable area.

Cari summarized that this Plat was reviewed for compliance with all of the city's Subdivision requirements, including access, traffic, grading and drainage, and wastewater. There are findings in the Code that are required for subdivisions and also subdivision requirements that we reviewed and included in the Subdivision Checklist, and single-family review is not reviewed as part of the platting process, but once the permits come in, they will be reviewed for compliance with all applicable codes.

Cari stated that we received comments from a number of agencies, and with the exception of the Public Works comments, those have all generally been addressed. Public Works' comments are generally about how the drainage will be constructed in the road, so you see a number of comments that will be reviewed during the future stages. The applicant is aware of those and has not raised any objections, but they are generally construction requirements.

Cari indicated that the applicant held an open house and held follow-up meetings with individual property owners. Their Citizen Participation Report was included in the packet, and staff did our typical noticing for projects and has not received any comments, but the applicant did talk with a number of neighbors and took their comments into consideration when designing the Plat.

Cari pointed out that prior to the meeting, there were some amended Conditions of Approval, so there is a new Condition 7A. One of the recommendations from the traffic study prepared by the applicant regarded some changes to the intersection of Bristlecone Pines Road and SR 89A. There is a recommendation for a change in that intersection that did not make it into the original Conditions of Approval, so that is what the extra Condition is to ensure those recommendations in the traffic study are realized in the construction.

Cari again stated that the Commission is to make a recommendation to Council on the proposed Preliminary Plat, and staff is recommending approval with the recommended Conditions of Approval as amended.

**Commission's Questions:**

Commissioner Kinsella thanked the applicant and staff and indicated that the Commission looked at this in June and a lot of the details have been filled in. She brought up one question in June and still would like to have some more clarification. A road was to be dedicated to the city and become a public road, but she is curious why Public Works and Community Development think that it is a benefit to the city, since the road is a jug-handle configuration and doesn't provide any connectivity to other neighborhoods, other than Bristlecone which does that on its own. She can't see a public benefit to the road, so she wonders why it would be a public road, instead of a private road to be maintained at the expense of the development. Andy Dickey stated that one benefit that we see for the city is the trail access and what the developer has proposed onsite within this Subdivision for a shared-use path. Having that available to the public and having full access for our wastewater facilities there, and that public access to that shared-use path is the benefit we see. The addition of this one-quarter mile of paved surface to our inventory is a small increase to what we currently have and maintain. Also, the fact that the developer is bringing us in at city standard is another reason we would consider.

Commissioner Kinsella referenced a 5 ft. tall tan-fabric fence along part of the project and asked if that is to address noise and dust. She just wants clarification, because there is probably something more at the building permit, but she doesn't know what it is. It is referenced in several locations, and part of the question is it says it is along a single property, and then at another point, it says it is along a longer section. Andy Dickey noted that it is on the Plat cover page, and he reads it to be construction fencing, which is intended to reduce dust and noise during construction. Cari added that was one of the questions that came up during the Conceptual Review as to how dust and noise would be controlled during construction, so she is assuming that is why they are clarifying it. It is not typical for that to be on the Plat, but that was a question, so they are addressing it. Typically, we would review for those types of things during construction. Commissioner Kinsella then asked if it is sufficient to address noise and dust.

**Applicant's Representative Mark Weinberg with Dimond Ventures** explained that when they met with the neighbors and walked their homes, the gentleman on the corner at the south end asked if they would install a fencing for dust control during construction, and they agreed to do that and memorialize it in a note, and it sounds like that note may have made it onto the Plat, but it is only on the north end from Bristlecone Pines Road into the Subdivision a couple hundred feet, and they agreed to put in a tan fence five or six feet tall that they would maintain during construction. Commissioner Kinsella then asked if it is a solid fabric, and Mr. Weinberg stated correct.

Commissioner Braam referenced the Conditions of Approval regarding the left-turn lane that will be added and indicated concerns for that location with not so much the Subdivision, but for incremental increases in traffic in the future. He then asked if there is any thought of doing a traffic study that goes beyond this Subdivision. Andy Dickey explained that we have the Traffic Master Plan that looked at this area. Recently, we have been looking at traffic signal warrant analysis at Foothills South as well. We are looking at different studies in this area, but this particular situation with this development doesn't warrant a traffic signal, and that analysis was covered by their consultant as well. It is something that we will continue to monitor, because of all the development in process and considered in the future. It does seem that this intersection is a little close to Cultural Park Place and Upper Red Rock Loop Road, and it seems that it is likely that a signal will be warranted at Foothills South sometime in the future, although it is not now, but that is a more likely place for a traffic signal, and if that signal is installed, he doesn't know that you would end up seeing one here. There may be other improvements that would need to be considered rather than a signal, but we will continue to monitor this intersection for needs for improvements.

Commissioner Braam asked if something was done at Foothills South, there might be a rerouting of traffic or some consideration, and Andy indicated that is right and with that signal analysis, you are always expected to look at other improvements before going to the extent of a traffic signal installation, so yes, if we continue to see increased traffic, increased conflicts, accidents, etc., we would see what improvements might need to be made, and as one option, looking to direct people to a traffic signal.

Commissioner Braam indicated that he assumes that the sanitary sewer will be under the ownership of the City of Sedona, and Andy stated that within the street and right-of-way that portion of the facility will be owned by the City. Once it leaves the right-of-way and goes to the private residence, that service line would be owned by the resident and anything from that point to the house would be private land. The Commissioner stated that noting the drainage in the Subdivision, there is a 50-foot right-of-way throughout the Subdivision, and he knows a lot of locations where the drainage in crossing culverts extend beyond the 50-foot, and he then asked if those are all going to be covered through drainage easements, and Andy Dickey stated correct.

Commissioner Braam then noted that some of the velocities for the sanitary sewer are a little bit below the recommendations from the state and asked if there is any impact to the city on that. Andy Dickey stated that we had feedback for them on their wastewater design, so that may actually be part of what we are looking at. We had a lot of comments on that, so for a final design on the wastewater, we still have a ways to go, but in concept, we don't have any fatal-flaw concerns on their proposed system.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that there is a handful of common driveways and asked if those are to be built the same time as the roads. Cari Meyer stated that her understanding is typically common driveways would be built by the first of two that build the houses. The Commissioner stated that is not what he has seen in past subdivisions like Casa Contenta and Thunder Mountain.

**Dave Grounds owner of Dorn Homes** explained that traditionally in a community like this where they have an area minimized for disturbance and construction, they don't build that driveway to that minimal disturbance area until the homesite is sold, so when someone purchases the home, they know which home they are picking and which side the garage will be on, and they are not carving into that hillside to leave it natural as long as possible. A few reasons for that are that somebody may purchase one of those lots and not build for quite a while, and they would rather leave it natural as long as possible in that case and not disturb it, but they are open-minded if there are some important reasons why you want to see some of them built when they build the roads. They are open-minded to that. Commissioner Brandt stated no, that answers his question. He was under the impression that these were custom lots, not a tract development, but if you are going to control the construction that is fine.

Commissioner Brandt stated that similarly, Bristlecone Pines Road is a right-of-way and the intersections at the two ends of the new road have a small gap between what is shown as the improvement and the Bristlecone Pines pavement, so would that be built by the developer? It is like 20 ft. of pavement and perhaps continuing edging material for curb and gutter. He suggested looking at the plat that has the existing houses and the existing Bristlecone Pines Road; the pavement runs straight, and the right-of-way actually turns in, as you can see on the other plats. Commissioner Kinsella asked what page he was on and Commissioner Brandt stated that page 52 of 82 shows about 20 ft length of pavement on the two ends, so he is just curious as to if that would be something the developer continues to bring it to the existing pavement. Andy Dickey stated that on the Preliminary Plat, it shows the improvements extending all the way to the existing edge of pavement along with a saw cut to match, because typically, you will cut in a little bit and let that transition be reconstructed. He now sees what you were looking at, and he is not sure why that particular map is showing it ending like that; he doesn't think that is the intent. Cari Meyer explained that one of the early comments from the Engineering Department was exactly that the pavement didn't go forward, and this map is a topographic map that was provided as more background information. The Preliminary Plat and the construction plans show it correctly. It was just not corrected on that page.

Commissioner Brandt then asked for some light to be shed on the 10 ft. multi-use path and if that was instead of a sidewalk. Andy Dickey stated yes, it is and the idea within the city is that we are trying to promote a more walkable community as well as multi-modal travel, so whether it be just for this Subdivision or beyond, that is a strategy and priority the city is looking to in the future, so we have some of these paths. He then asked Commissioner Brandt if he is asking what the path is or what the need is. Commissioner Brandt asked if there is an example in the city, and Andy stated that we just recently constructed a short segment at Ranger Station Park, and some great examples of these type of facilities are in Flagstaff and many cities in the Phoenix area, such as Scottsdale. It is something that is pretty common and popular in many other cities, and something that we are looking to install and promote within the City of Sedona. One of the reasons is for multi-modal walkability, bikeability, etc. The idea is getting this traffic out off the roadway and creating a comfortable, good experience for the walking person or the bicyclists. Commissioner Brandt asked if it would be like the path along Soldiers Pass, and Andy Dickey stated no, what we are looking at is if you take decomposed granite, and actually a great example locally is at the wetlands. If you look at the pond closest to the parking lot, it has a decomposed granite stabilized path that runs around that pond. It is stabilized, because it creates a solid surface, but it is more natural looking, so that allows you to meet the regulations for ADA, but by creating a wider path, it is typically a 10 ft. wide path, you are able to get multi-modal bi-directional traffic on that facility and off of the roadway.

Commissioner Brandt then asked if there is a plan for that or if it is something that gets fit in here. Andy Dickey stated that on sheet three of the Preliminary Plat in the far-left section detail, it shows a cross-section including this trail. For examples outside of the city, Flagstaff has the Flagstaff Urban Trail System, and they have a lot of these types of trails. Commissioner Brandt then asked what page Andy is looking at and Cari Meyer said page 64. Commissioner Brandt indicated he was seeing some that were five feet, and Cari explained that some of the earlier sheets were part of the applicant's Citizen Participation Report and what they mailed to the neighbors, but those were earlier versions. The version of the Plat that we are considering tonight starts on page 62 of their packet.

Commissioner Klein referenced staff's comments that say the current southbound left movement at Bristlecone Pines and SR 89A currently operates at an inadequate level of service and will continue to do so with traffic from this Subdivision. He then asked if the developer is required to put in this designated left-turn lane, will the intersection to turn left still operate at an inadequate level of service or will the left-turn lane correct that problem. Andy Dickey explained that what you gain by placing the dedicated left-turn lane is you allow the right-turn traffic to not be stuck in the middle of the left-turn traffic. As far as the delay and level of service for that left-turning movement, it will remain still at a low level of service. What you gain is the right-turning traffic improves to a much better level of service. The Commissioner then asked if the left will still be rated inadequate, and Andy stated that is correct.

Commissioner Klein asked if you put in a traffic signal at Foothills South and traffic going to Cottonwood backs up from that traffic signal, would it backup far enough to block people making a left turn onto SR 89A from Bristlecone Pines. Andy explained that there are a lot of variables in what you are asking. It is a long distance, but we have all seen backups in West Sedona between Coffee Pot and Rodeo and areas like that where you get a backup that extends from one intersection to another, so he can't say it will never happen; it is possible, but that is part of what we look at in Traffic Management with ADOT. ADOT is currently working on trying to improve and implement a program where they coordinate their signals and improvement efficiency between them, and that is how you overcome those queueing issues. The Commissioner asked if there is anyway to get traffic out of the Bristlecone Pines Subdivision other than on Bristlecone Pines Road, and Andy explained it is currently connected to three other intersections besides Bristlecone Pines, so a traveler has several options for entering and exiting the highway.

*Vice Chair Barcus opened the public comment period at this time.*

**Public Comments:**

**Keith Oswald, Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Oswald indicated that he noticed on a vacant lot next to 155 that there was a survey stake in the middle of that lot that looks like the staked used on your properties. He then asked them to tell us about that; what would have been the purpose to put that stake there?

Vice Chair Barcus explained that we are not allowed to take questions and respond. Those are the rules of the public comment, so you can make comments, but we can't answer questions.

Mr. Oswald stated alright, we'll find out later.

**Robert Pickels Jr.** explained if the information being asked if relevant for the Commission's purposes and you deem that you want to have that question answered, you can ask that of the relevant staff or applicant.

**Barbara Vincent, Sedona, AZ:** Ms. Vincent stated that she lives on Bristlecone Drive and she was the first house in the Subdivision, and now she is curious as to why it isn't possible to have a road from Navoti where you are going in on Bristlecone over to Cultural Park Road. Has that been considered at all?

Vice Chair Barcus once again explained that the Commission can't take questions in public comment, but we will try to get that clarified when the Commissioners discuss this and ask staff additional questions.

Ms. Vincent then indicated that if you have been there and parked and watched traffic for a while from Bristlecone Drive, you would be surprised at how long you have to wait to get out onto the highway at times. She would suggest that you do that.

**Steve Hoyt, Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Hoyt stated that he lives on Bobwhite Circle and his property is adjacent to this planned development. On the northwest corner, it abuts up to it, but he is not sure of the lot number. The last meeting in June, they talked about the trail. It comes off of this north access road. You can drive straight west and probably access the trail discussed by Kathy; he thinks she was talking about the public or private road issue, and in the last June meeting, it seemed as though there were questions and objections by the property owners as to using that trailhead. It is not really an official trailhead for public access. For purposes of what -- it is not an approved trail, because it is already designated for some other grassland use for grazing, so that issue has not been resolved to his understanding. Public access would bring a lot of traffic from the rest of the community and outside the community. December 1<sup>st</sup>, he and his three neighbors on Bobwhite Circle all heard what they think were gunshots, just off of that trail west of it, five times. They called the police and they found no resolution, but that is an issue for the neighbors there already just in the last few days. He called the police back; if there was a resolution, they could nothing. They came out and patrolled the area and looked, but found nothing, but we heard what appeared to be gunshots from a high-caliber



weapon five times. He knows his neighbor went out on his back porch. It alerted all of us. We could hear it loudly, and it is very, very dark out there, and he doesn't see any use of lighting at night for that trailhead. Those are his comments.

**Gary Gallerstein, Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Gallerstein indicated that he lives on Bristlecone Pines Road, and he hasn't heard that a roundabout has been discussed at Bristlecone Pines Road, but it sounds like we're likely, sometime in the future, going to have a stoplight at the hospital, and we already have a stoplight at Cultural Park, so he would just ask that maybe a roundabout be considered, because traffic is speeding up right there and that would move things along well. Secondly, he would just like to thank the builders for being so responsive to the neighbors in terms of trying to accommodate their wishes and desires. They have been really nice to work with.

*Having no more requests to speak, Vice Chair Barcus closed the public comment period.*

**Commission's Questions and Comments:**

Commissioner Kinsella asked about other road connectivity such as through to Cultural Park Place, and Cari Meyer showed a map of the location of the subject property, private residences, forest land and the Sedona Summit to the south. She explained that the two connections it has to public right-of-way are along Bristlecone Pines Road going out to the Cultural Park. She is not sure where the member of the public was speaking of, but a direct connection would have to go through forest land, which will likely not happen. There is access along Navoti Drive, so people coming out of here can go along Navoti Drive and access the light, but as for a new road that would go through the Forest Service land to the Cultural Park, she doesn't see that as an option. Additionally, she also wanted to address the comment regarding the public access. We have talked to the Forest Service and currently that land is not available for public access, and we have acknowledged that; however, in looking at things we have done in the past as far as connectivity, we've lost opportunities to get connectivity where these kinds of situations have changed and then said that we wished we could have gone back and gotten that path, so we do acknowledge that the trail access point is on the Plat and essentially goes to nowhere right now, but we asked for it in case the Forest Service's position changes, so we wouldn't have to go back and get that access. We have it ready to go in case the status of that land changes.

Commissioner Braam asked if there is just going to be an easement for a trail or is the trail improved at all, and Cari explained there is an easement for a trail now shown on the Plat that goes through that section on the north end. Andy Dickey added that it will be graded out through the easement, but for right now, it is just an easement. The Commissioner then commented no improvement really, and Andy responded, not other than just grading it out and making it flat.

Commissioner Klein asked if someone wanted to get out of the Bristlecone Pines Subdivision and not have to make a left turn onto SR 89A, they can get onto Navoti and go to Cultural Park and access the traffic signal there, and Andy stated that is correct. Cari added that Navoti also goes the other direction to the hospital, so if a traffic light was installed there in the future, they would have access to that one as well.

Commissioner Brandt asked if there is any thought given to roundabouts along that part of the highway, and Andy explained that was a good point made, and he should have mentioned that because of its proximity to other signals. If a controlled access became warranted at this intersection in the future, a roundabout would be a more viable option at that location. Now, that is a much more expensive option, but considering how it is laid out in relation to other intersections and how it is coordinated, etc., that would be more appropriate at that point. Commissioner Brandt asked if it would be considered at this intersection or at the hospital, and Andy indicated that both options would be considered in the future. Usually, thinking back when we put in the signal not that long ago by Airport Road, originally a roundabout was recommended at that intersection, but because of cost it was decided to go with the traffic signal. The Commissioner then asked if the cost of the electricity of running the lights doesn't come into that, and Andy stated that it does, but usually the biggest cost for a roundabout are right-of-way acquisitions, etc., because they are much larger in area.

Commissioner Kinsella referenced the Land Development Code taking effect and indicated this will be under the new – Cari interjected that the houses will be under the new Land Development Code. Commissioner Kinsella then stated that her question had to do with Firewise, because that was not adopted as part of the LDC, so she is wondering about that but thinks that will come at the point of building. Her concern is about the land clearing and fire safety issue, but she is anticipating that this is not the appropriate point for that question. Cari Meyer stated that, obviously, they will be removing trees during the road construction, but during the single-family home construction, we will review tree removal and all of that as well. The actual Firewise concepts were not adopted as part of the Land Development Code, but we did change the landscaping section, so if someone wanted to do Firewise, they would not be in violation of the Code. Some of the landscaping requirements, more for commercial, were in conflict with Firewise recommendations, so we tried to back-off of some of those landscaping requirements. If someone wants to do Firewise, there is no conflict. Commissioner Kinsella asked if there is any indication of the direction the project would go in terms of . . . Cari stated no; the landscaping requirements for single-family residential are minimal compared to single-family where you're looking at removal of trees. Essentially, it is in keeping trees and that sort of thing; there is not a lot of requirement for new planting.

*Vice Chair Barcus closed the questions and comment period and called for a motion.*

***Motion: Commissioner Klein moved to recommend to the Sedona City Council approval of the proposed Preliminary Plat as set forth in case number PZ18-00003 (SUB), Hillside Vista Estates, based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Subdivision criteria and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report, including the most recent conditions we were given tonight. Commissioner Brandt seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Chair Levin was excused.***

#### **9. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**

- a. **Tuesday, December 18, 2018; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- b. **Tuesday, December 18, 2018; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- c. **Tuesday, January 1, 2019; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- d. **Tuesday, January 1, 2019; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Karen Osburn stated that right now for Tuesday, December 18<sup>th</sup>, we do not have any items for the work session, so pending anything coming through very shortly, we will probably be sending out an official cancellation notice for that meeting, but we do have an item for the 5:30 p.m. public hearing, and that is for a Conditional Use Permit for a new business in Uptown. Tuesday, January 1<sup>st</sup>, is a holiday, so that meeting will be canceled.

Vice Chair Barcus asked about January 15<sup>th</sup>, and Cari stated that currently we don't have anything on that agenda, but it is more than a month out, so we will probably make a decision on that in a couple of weeks, because with the holidays, we have to get a packet out a little earlier.

Vice Chair Barcus asked if the Commission would just be holding one meeting in January rather than one on the 15<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>, and Karen stated that we would just have the one on the 15<sup>th</sup>, if there are agenda items. The next meeting would be the first meeting in February.

Commissioner Kinsella asked about the Conditional Use Permit item on December 18<sup>th</sup>, and Karen indicated it is for a new business called Thunder 66; it is a motorcycle rental or tour company just off of Forest Road in Uptown, but the zoning in that district requires a Conditional Use Permit for that use.

#### **10. 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.*

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Barcus called for adjournment at 6:46 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 December 4, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date