

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, January 3, 2012 - 5:30 p.m.

(10 minutes 5:30 - 5:40 for agenda items 1-4)

1. Verification of notice, call to order, pledge of allegiance, roll call.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Roll Call

Planning & Zoning Commissioners: Chairman Marty Losoff, Vice Chairman John Griffin and Commissioners Eric Brandt, Michael Hadley, Scott Jablow, Geoffrey Messer and Norm Taylor.

Staff: Andy Dickey, Nick Gioello, John O'Brien, David Peck, Donna Puckett and Ron Ramsey

2. Commission/Staff announcements and summary of current events by Chairman/staff

John O'Brien announced that on December 13th, the City Council reappointed Commissioners Hadley and Taylor to 3-year terms on the Commission, so he welcomed them to the Commission again. Additionally, over 60 applicants were received for the vacant Associate Planner position and interviews were conducted a couple of weeks ago by himself, Nick Gioello, Audree Juhlin and Chairman Losoff. A gentleman named Jared Raymond, who is a NAU Public Planning graduate with eight years of current planning experience, was selected and will start on January 17th.

3. Approval of minutes for the following meetings: Tuesday, December 6, 2011 (R)

The Chairman indicated that he would entertain a motion.

MOTION: *Commissioner Hadley moved to approve the minutes of the Planning & Zoning Commission for December 6, 2011. Vice Chairman Griffin seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.*

4. Public Forum – for items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).

The Chairman opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING REQUEST THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES: (60 minutes 5:40 – 6:40)

Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Development Review for Natural Grocers. The applicant is proposing a new, approximately 13,903 square-foot retail grocery store on approximately 1.66-acres, located at 1915 West S.R. 89A (east of and adjacent to the Walgreens development). The subject property is currently zoned C-1 (General Commercial). A general description of the area affected includes but is not necessarily limited to the area south of State Route 89A between Kallof Place and Sunset Drive. The subject property is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number: 408-26-030E. Applicant: Leadership Circle, LLC. Case number: DEV2011-1

Chairman Losoff introduced the request and Nick Gioello explained that this request is for a Development Review for Natural Grocers. Nick then displayed a Vicinity Map and aerial view of the subject property and surrounding area to point out the driveway connection into the Walgreens development, the wash and what is called a bridge or boxed culvert that spans the wash, and

Kallos Place. He then summarized that the proposed building is 13,903 sq. ft. and it has a loft or mezzanine for a couple of offices, which qualifies as a second story. There are 60 parking spaces proposed and a shared driveway access with the existing Walgreens' driveway, plus a secondary access off of Kallos Place.

As strengths, Nick indicated that staff has noted that it meets or exceeds all of the Land Development Code requirements; the applicant uses sustainable practices; there is no additional highway access or curb cuts proposed; there are ADA pathway connections from the sidewalks, and no weaknesses were noted.

Nick explained that the drawings shown are from the last set received; however, the applicant has provided the Commission with a new packet showing some minor revisions that the applicant will present. Nick then showed slides of the proposed building from different views and the layout showing the proposed building on top of the aerial view, plus the connection to the existing Walgreens' driveway and the secondary access off of Kallos. A more recent landscape proposal also was shown; however, Nick explained that there will be some minor variations from what some other drawings show, because of the short timeframe since the work session.

Nick indicated that he provided a breakdown of some of the areas in the Design Review Manual in the Staff Report, indicating where staff thinks the project is appropriate, including its architectural style and character; it has proportion in scale; its height and massing meet the intent in the Manual and Land Development Code, and the materials, textures and colors meet the Manual and Land Development Code requirements.

Nick then indicated that there were some questions about the percentages in the landscaping, and the Land Development Code requires that 25% of all shrubs be both evergreen and native, and in the proposal 100% of the shrubs are evergreen and 51% are native. The Land Development Code also requires that 50% of all trees be evergreen and the proposal is for 72%, and 50% of those evergreen trees, which would be 25% of the total, must be native and the applicant is proposing 61% be native, so they exceed the Land Development Code requirements for landscaping.

Nick pointed out that general comments in the Staff Report include the pedestrian connections to sidewalks and delineations across the parking lot, so if pedestrians choose to use those areas, they are well-defined. Additionally, bicycle racks are shown and there is native stone cladding on all sides of the building on the columns.

Nick explained that the changes since the Conceptual Review are provided in the Staff Report, but briefly, they include the elimination of the six parking spaces along the driveway entrance; the realignment and straightening of the pedestrian stair off of the northeast corner; the finished floor being raised six inches, which reduced the cut into the property; the relocation of the monument sign nearer to the driveway by Walgreens, and the addition of windows in the west elevation of the building.

Nick then summarized the changes made since the work session last week, including the addition of some shrubs near the eating area; the addition of sidewalks along the driveway entrance, and an additional Condition 3.S proposed by staff that says, "Staff shall contact Walgreens' management and discuss options for a joint pedestrian connection." Mr. William Pickett, the Facilities Asset Manager out of Phoenix for Walgreens is present tonight and he is more than willing to talk with us about that connection.

Nick displayed the elevation views and pointed out an island shown on the Landscape Plan. He explained that there will be one or two trees in that area, when looking at the front of the building, and there is also a revision showing a shrub or two in the area at the corner; shrubs and trees are shown in all of the other views as well. Nick indicated that the applicant can discuss the revised Landscape Plan in more detail.

Nick then described the applicant's proposal for pedestrian sidewalks that are delineated on the revised Grading Plan, in addition to the ADA pathway. Nick explained that the changes came out of the work session last week and there is also an area where they are talking about doing a little planting area next to the eating area.

Nick stated that based on compliance with ordinance requirements as conditioned, general consistency with and conformity to the Sedona Community Plan, conformance with the requirements of the Development Review Section of the Land Development Code, consistency with the Design Review Manual and compatibility with the surrounding land uses and the character of

the surrounding area, staff recommends approval of case number DEV2011-1, subject to applicable ordinance requirements and the Conditions of Approval and the proposed revised condition as listed at the end of this Staff Report and as handed out to you tonight.

Commission's Questions of Staff:

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if there was anything about the material for the retaining walls facing 89A and Kallof and Nick indicated that the applicant could address that. The Vice Chairman then indicated that he thought the stone in the picture would be a little excessive, and then asked if there was anything else with the Engineering Department regarding the ingress and egress issues and the discussion about one-way roads, etc. Nick explained that ADOT is going to take a look at it, and then decide what they want for traffic mitigation, as far as accessing the highway. Andy Dickey then clarified that ADOT made a couple of stipulations that if they have an issue in the future, they reserve the right to do something additional, but the main thing is the written proof of a Cross Access Agreement between Walgreens and this development. Staff does have Conditions of Approval in place to ensure those comments are addressed prior to the issuance of permit.

The Vice Chairman indicated that he didn't recall ADOT ever saying in the past that if things don't work out, they will want to change them, so how do you do something like that, like on Kallof we really need a right-hand turn lane. Who is going to pay for that? Andy agreed that he also has never seen that happen, but they said that per this Arizona Administrative Code, they reserve the right to do it, even though he hasn't seen them do it before -- that is up to ADOT. Nick pointed out that is item 3.E in the Conditions where it talks about ADOT's requirements concerning egress and ingress to the site, so that is covered in the Conditions.

Commissioner Taylor asked if ADOT requires a letter signed by Walgreens to permit dual access, so people could turn in from Sunset and go through Walgreens to this market, and would that be required before the architects and owner proceed with the planning for this building. Andy stated no, they specifically say before they can recommend approval of the TIA, the document will need to be provided, and that typically doesn't have to be required before Development Review. The developer needs to work on that document while getting ready for a permit, and that is typically what would happen. The Commissioner then indicated that they need to know ahead of time that Walgreens has no problem with the public going through Walgreens to get into this market. Some people will turn onto Sunset and possibly stop at Walgreens, and then go to the market or go directly through Walgreens, because it is hard to make a right-turn at 89A with people coming from Basha's and turning left into the right-hand lane. Chairman Losoff asked what the question is regarding this project and Commissioner Taylor explained that he thinks the owners of the property would need to have that permission from Walgreens before proceeding with the drawings, because they have to have it to satisfy ADOT.

Andy Dickey restated that typically we stipulate that they need to meet ADOT's requirement prior to issuance of permit, because it can take some time to meet those requirements, and they have a copy of this and are aware of ADOT's requirements. Chairman Losoff noted that is probably Conditions E and F on page 16, "Requirements of ADOT concerning ingress/egress for the site have to be satisfied", and in F, "A right-of-way permit . . . Kallof Place", and then we talk about it later with the new Condition, so he thinks those things can be addressed by the applicant.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that there are power lines on the east side of the property and asked if those are to remain. Nick indicated that he didn't know, but maybe the applicant can address that. Nick then asked if they are just poles without wires and Commissioner Brandt stated that there are lines on them.

Note: Sam Troia stated, "They are not live", from the audience.

Commissioner Brandt then asked about the screening of the loading dock and if it is a typical amount of screening -- just relying on vegetation. Nick explained that there is nothing in the Code that says you have to screen the loading dock; it makes it hard to put any screening next to the travel way, because trucks have to back-up there, plus he is guessing that the neighbor to the south, who is also the applicant's engineer didn't have an issue with it facing his building.

Vice Chairman Griffin referenced 3.G and asked if the Traffic Control Plan is part of ADOT's review and approval process and Nick explained that is for when they do any work on Kallof Place, which is a City street. For example, if they have to cut into the street, they have to have a traffic plan in place with proper barricades, etc. The Vice Chairman then asked if that is strictly a construction requirement and Andy Dickey indicated yes.

David Grooms, Architect with Vega Architecture: Indicated that his presentation is a recap of the presentation given last time, plus a new slide showing the changes. Chairman Losoff pointed out that the public hasn't seen the presentation and asked Mr. Grooms to keep that in mind.

Mr. Grooms then indicated that Natural Grocers is excited about coming to Sedona, because Sedona is a strong and vibrant community known for its healthy lifestyle, which meshes with the mission and personality of Natural Grocers. Natural Grocers will contribute to the community; it offers a community store, which is small-sized and easy to get in and out of; it is very affordable; they buy local certified organic produce from local farmers when it is available, and they want their building to add to the community without detracting from Sedona's beautiful natural landscape.

Natural Grocers was started in 1955 in Lakewood, Colorado by Margaret Isely and the store is currently run by her children as a family-owned company. They sell natural and organic products with 100% organic produce, and to his knowledge, they are the only national retailer that sells 100% organic produce. They are best known for their high-quality products and everyday affordable pricing; they have a 55-year commitment to being environmentally responsible and they have a longstanding commitment to the community, with three Nutritional Coaches and wellness seminars. Currently, they have 49 stores across the western United States.

With respect to green building and green operations, they:

- Have a bag-free checkout
- Use 100% LED lighting, both for general lighting of the store and over refrigeration, and they use occupancy sensors on all of that lighting as well
- Use a heat reclaim off of the refrigeration system, which takes the excess heat to heat hot water and in some cases to heat the entire building
- Use Arius Fans, which are ceiling-hung fans that work to de-stratify the air to allow the building to operate at a slightly warmer temperature with the occupants still being comfortable
- Use solar-powered faucets in the restrooms
- Use polished concrete floors, which saves on a lot of material and doesn't bring in any unneeded chemicals found in bio-composite tiles
- Use 100% post-consumer recycled toilet partitions and low VOC paint
- Use no particle board in the buildings and all plywood used is specified to be formaldehyde-free
- Use a cardboard bailer to recycle all cardboard boxes from shipping; some smaller boxes are put out front for customers to use in lieu of a bag
- All bat insulation is formaldehyde-free.

Mr. Grooms then showed a revised rendering of the store's exterior, looking at the northwest corner, and pointed out the new landscape bed with a schematic shrub and a tree. He also identified some of the changes made since the conceptual presentation, including the elimination of the six parking spaces at the northwest corner of the site to reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflict; the adjustment of the site stair at the northeast corner to align with the corner of the building; the finished floor of the proposed building raised 6 inches to reduce the retaining wall and stair height; the monument sign relocated to the northwest corner of the site; the site lighting now shown on the site plan; building elevations now reflect the actual proposed signage by the tenant that they believe to be in conformance with the Design Review Manual; the addition of three windows to the west elevation of the building; the updated Landscape Plan to match the current site plan; the addition of a new sidewalk to the south side of the entrance drive aisle; the addition of a new planter bed on the north elevation next to the picnic tables; the corrected tree calculations on the Landscape Plan, and the retaining wall constructed of split face masonry in a color similar to the stone on the building. They believe that two-way traffic flow is going to be the best solution for the site, because of the tendency for drivers to ignore one-way traffic flow and the belief that people are going to go where they want to go; this will allow residents to enter the property through the existing Walgreens' curb cut or on Kallof Place, and they can exit the property to the east or west through Kallof Place or Sunset Drive or only east through the existing Walgreens' curb cut, and they realize that the Kallof Place access may be modified if ADOT decides to put in direction limiters at that intersection.

Mr. Grooms showed a drawing of the site plan superimposed over an aerial image of the site and pointed out the sidewalk that was added along the south side of the drive aisle that connects across to a pedestrian-delineated marking at grade. They also have the accessible sidewalk that connects to the street sidewalk, again another delineated pedestrian access, and then they have pedestrian access across the intersection. Mr. Grooms then pointed out the added planter on the northwest corner of the site and another planter next to the eating areas, trying to make that as

large as they could while maintaining two picnic areas. A diagram of their building height in relation to the existing topography was then shown, and Mr. Grooms showed updated perspectives. He then pointed out the clerestory windows on the east elevation.

Vice Chairman Griffin referenced the mechanical equipment and asked if the parapets are high enough at that point to cover the systems. Mr. Grooms indicated yes, they basically have one slope of roof and it is based off of this lower volume, so the parapet walls are really relatively high compared to standard parapet walls, so they are confident they will be able to screen them.

Mr. Grooms then showed the view from the northwest corner and pointed out the added landscaping bed and explained it is just a graphic representation and not necessarily the species that will be involved, and in theory, it will be taller and a little more organic-looking. This view also shows the windows on the west elevation. A view of the southwest corner was then shown and Mr. Groom pointed out the trash enclosure that is designed to mesh with the design of the building and more landscaping beds across the southern perimeter and in the alcove. A view from the southeast corner of the building showed the loading area that Mr. Groom indicated would be painted similar to the surrounding walls, more landscaping beds, and the in and out of the building mass. The view from the northeast corner showed more landscaping adjacent to the building, an open trellis at that point.

Mr. Grooms then presented some 2D elevations with notes that called out the different materials and some site sections to illustrate the differences in grade.

Commission's Questions of the Architect:

Chairman Losoff asked to see the drawing showing landscaping that the engineering offices will see and Mr. Grooms identified the location of the offices and indicated they will also be down several feet, and there is a retaining wall across the southern elevation as well. The Chairman then asked what patrons of the restaurant will see and Mr. Groom displayed that elevation.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that we still would be better off with a bridge instead of the sidewalk that goes to the northwest. If a bridge went to the southwest corner, Walgreens wouldn't lose a parking space and it would make it possible for people to go back and forth without walking in the roadway, which is really a bridge over the drainage swale. The Commissioner then identified the location he was referencing and indicated that there is a railing where the bridge starts, so it would have to come just beyond the end of the railing. More people will go from the grocery store to Walgreens than the reverse, because of the time usually spent in a grocery store relative to a drug store, but he isn't really sure about that, but people driving to Walgreens who also want to go to the grocery store will probably park at Walgreens, and then drive to the grocery store, but people who go to the grocery store will go in there without thinking about it and park, but either way, they should have the capability of walking back and forth. We ask for that in our Design Review Manual, although we don't talk about bridges over swales, but it would enhance both projects to have that bridge across the ditch.

The Chairman asked the representative from Walgreens to respond to some of the Commission's questions at this time.

William Pickett, Facilities Asset Manager for Walgreens in Arizona, Phoenix, AZ: Indicated that he came to view this operation and see what was going on with the store, so if the Commission has any questions that is why he is here.

Chairman Losoff explained that the Commission has had several meetings on this project to date and one of the issues is the connection between Walgreens and the developer's property, and having a bridge versus the added sidewalk. Apparently, there has been some contact with somebody. Mr. Grooms explained that they looked into it, being that at least 50% of the construction would be on Walgreens' property. They sent a letter to Walgreens requesting approval to construct it, and their response denied their participation.

Mr. Pickett explained that there is always a real benefit to joining two parcels; you avoid people walking down the thoroughfares for cars, etc., and it keeps the liability down, plus there is the ease of going back and forth. If you reach ADA specifications, it is a lot easier for people to walk. He read the letter from Cathy Norman that was a denial and for some reason the engineers, etc., decided it was probably not good value for the money to participate. There are benefits to it, but he can see that just because of the way the economy turned, etc., and since they have numerous projects like this, they try to pick the ones that are most visible and provide real value for the money.

Cathy Norman denied this one and he isn't sure why, but he can ask if further information is needed. As far as he sees, it could be a good thing to keep people out of the walkway and join the two properties. He isn't sure about the expense of it, so that is about as far as he would like to go with saying yes or no from Walgreens.

Chairman Losoff asked if he would be willing to help facilitate a discussion between some of the Commissioners, the applicant and himself, plus whoever else we need to talk to, to see if it could be achieved. The issue is that there is nothing in the Code that says this has to be done, but looking to the future and as we are trying to develop a long-range Community Plan, we are saying it would be nice if the property owners worked together to come up with a better project. As you pointed out, it would make sense to have a nice adjacent walk-through. Mr. Pickett agreed, and the Chairman indicated that maybe it is possible that individual just doesn't know Sedona, etc., but now that you are here and see first-hand what we are thinking, perhaps we can facilitate a discussion.

Mr. Pickett indicated he would like to go back to Cathy Norman, the Real Estate Division and the engineers to find out first why it was denied and get further information, and then he could come back with that information without doing anything formal. If there is an inkling that it was turned down for minor reasons, perhaps some language along those lines can be facilitated that may change their minds, but if not, at least you will have an answer.

The Chairman indicated that in the spirit of working together, if there are some expenses involved, perhaps there can be some shared expenses or some willingness by each party to help provide some relief. Mr. Pickett then explained that in many of the co-partnerships between two companies, in-between two parcels, absolutely that is how it has to work. In a lot of cases, they all get together with the City, because the City sees benefits as well, but he will find out why it was denied and get back to the City on a less formal basis, and if they find any way they can possibly make this happen, then he will bring his people and everyone can sit down and talk. The Chairman indicated that his contacts would be John O'Brien and Nick Gioello.

Vice Chairman Griffin referenced the report about ADOT's concern about going through Walgreens' property and asked what the procedure would be for Walgreens and the applicant to get together; would it also be sitting down with the engineers to go over it? Mr. Pickett explained that he is not privy to that kind of information, that is really the Divisions' people, and the way traffic patterns work, etc. If he hasn't heard anything so far from it, there probably isn't any; he doesn't know, but he can ask that question also, because normally, they get to this point and go ahead and raise all of their concerns as soon as they can, so there is nothing at the end of the process. The Vice Chairman indicated the sooner the better, because it could certainly alter some of the design aspects. He then asked if Mr. Pickett would be willing to at least facilitate with Walgreens to let us know what the procedure is. Mr. Pickett indicated that before leaving tomorrow morning, he will contact the people in Traffic and Cathy Norman, etc., to have a conference call, and at that point, if he has a phone number, he will make that contact before leaving Sedona. The Vice Chairman noted that Mr. Pickett will want to take some drawings, etc., back, so they understand the situation, and he appreciates Mr. Pickett's help.

Vice Chairman Griffin referenced earlier questions about elevations from Shephard-Wesnitzer and Troia's restaurant and pointed out that the landscape buffer along the street is also going to be a significant part, because the site view is going to include all of that roadside and retaining wall landscaping too, and that will also buffer the building quite a lot. Mr. Grooms agreed.

Chairman Losoff opened the public comment period at this time.

Ron Martinez, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that he is a 25-year resident of Sedona and he wanted to speak on two points. One is as a consumer who is always trying to eat a little healthier with the cost impact, and as much as he loves New Frontiers, he wanted to be supportive of an alternative and some competition in the community, which he thinks is very positive. The second point is as a business owner and someone involved in the construction industry, he looks at the jobs both in the short-term that are real positive for our construction industry, and then the long-term job potential that this will bring to the community. Additionally, they have been involved in a couple of LEED projects in the last 12 - 18 months, and he is very supportive of what he sees in the direction they are going for environmental sensitivity, so thanks a lot.

Sam Troia, representing Troia's Restaurant, Sedona, AZ: Indicated they are right across the street from hopefully the approved plan that may take place. They are in full support of what they see taking place here for a number of reasons. One, finally after being undeveloped for 15 years

and after the first time going through a development being approved, and then not taking place, which he was very heavily involved in, and now having this taking place, it behooves us all, especially the Commissioners who have to make this decision, to think very wisely about the expediency of getting this done. As costs move on, they go up and they need to get the project done. He would love to see it get done; it creates jobs, jobs, jobs in Sedona, and that money stays in Sedona and gets spent in Sedona, so think about how important that is and getting this thing done. It is a beautiful concept and he hopes the Commission approves it.

Linda Martinez, Sedona, AZ: Indicated she is a 25-year Sedona resident and she serves on the Housing Commission, but she is not speaking for the Housing Commission, she is speaking for herself. It just goes hand-in-hand that we have so many people in this community that are experiencing that huge gap between wages and affordability for housing and many of them also want to have a very good diet, and this would make sense, because it works with what their income is. If you just consider people making \$10.00 an hour or \$21,000 a year, many of them would like to eat in a healthy manner and while they have been supportive of New Frontiers, everyone says they can't afford to stay there and they have to ration what they buy -- you are nodding your head, because we know it is true. She has also surveyed several people on their staff and had a couple say that they are going to go to Trader Joe's in Prescott Valley as often as possible, because they didn't know about Natural Grocers, and she asked them how they would feel about that coming into Sedona, and they were very excited. If they were to go to Trader Joe's in Prescott, it means they will buy their gas there, visit other stores, etc., so it is a loss of economic revenue for the community. When we think of all of the projects, all of the businesses that could have come into that space, this is the most positive project that we can imagine and everyone she surveyed, probably seven people, was extremely excited about this project, so she certainly urges your approval.

Having no other requests to speak, the Chairman closed the public comment period and asked the applicant how many people they would be employing.

Monet Ragsdale, Leadership Circle: Indicated that she believes it was in the Letter of Intent, but the stores typically start with 15 and after approximately five years, they build up to between 30 and 50 employees.

Summary Discussion:

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he is supportive of the project. He read through the Conditions of Approval and they all make sense to him.

Commissioner Hadley indicated that when this project first came before the Commission as a concept, he thought it was a good project, and he now thinks it is a very good project. The applicant and City staff have listened to everything the Commission suggested and you have done it all, so he is very impressed with how you have performed and followed the Commission's suggestions and answered the questions. He is also impressed that even though we don't have any Codes that require sustainability practices, you are doing them, and he finds that very impressive and that it is driven out of a sense of consciousness is something he is very impressed with that as well, so he is highly supportive of this project.

Vice Chairman Griffin also thanked the applicant for listening to some of the Commission's concerns and indicated that if we had a couple of spaces for electric car plug-ins down the road, that would also be something he thinks this community is going to get behind, when you think about the Community Plan and things we are doing -- not that you have to put them in now, but the thing is wiring and setting up for those in advance.

The Vice Chairman then apologized to Commissioner Brandt for being a little curt in the work session about the Design Review Manual. If there is one thing he has learned, we are administrators and there are things like the Design Review Manual that are extremely important for us to maintain consistency in the community, because if Commissions take on their own subjective decision-making policies, we aren't going to achieve some of the things planned that we spent a lot of time on, like the Design Review Manual, so that was part of his concern about not following what was laid out, but he apologizes for his curtness to Commissioner Brandt in the work session.

The Vice Chairman then stated that he is supportive of the project; it has come a long ways and when Walgreens develops a project like this with a mutual driveway, some way it is important for future developments to be able to have an acknowledgement that an entrance is being shared with a joint project. We talk about the inability down-the-road to negotiate walkways, etc., and it would be nice to acknowledge such things when we are approving the project, to allow us a little bit of

pressure to ask that they be involved. It is hindsight now, but it is a shared driveway, and you have to know that you are going to have a neighbor. Anyway, it has turned into a very good project and he appreciates the work the developer has done.

Commissioner Messer stated, well done; he approves of it.

Commissioner Jablow indicated that it is a fantastic project and it is going to be a big success in our community. He agrees with his fellow Commissioners, and as Mr. Troia said, jobs, jobs, jobs. He then asked if anyone could comment as to if the construction jobs will be local, which won't make a difference in the Commission's decision, but we would like to see jobs in the Verde Valley.

Monet Ragsdale, Leadership Circle: Explained that all of their projects go out to bid and they will include local general contractors in the bidding process, but she can't say now who will be selected; however, local general contractors will be included in that bidding process. Commissioner Jablow stated that is fair.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that everyone is full of praise, and he thinks we will let it go there.

Chairman Losoff indicated that the Commission had some concerns in the beginning, but the applicant has responded very effectively to all of the Commission's concerns, and even though it wasn't 100% on everything, there was enough to make this project very worthwhile. From an aesthetic point-of-view, it will make that section of 89A look very well; it will take away that eyesore and there will be a nice looking building there. All in all, it should be a community benefit, employing people, and hopefully local construction workers will be employed. Overall, it will provide some competition in town with some existing businesses. The Chairman then thanked the applicant for the responses and very good drawings, even with a holiday weekend.

The Chairman then indicated he would entertain a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Hadley moved for approval of case number DEV2011-1, based on compliance with Land Development Code requirements, Development Review criteria, and consistency and conformance with the Community Plan and Design Review Manual, subject to all applicable ordinance requirements and the conditions as outlined and as amended in the Staff Report. Commissioner Messer seconded the motion.

Commissioner Taylor asked if something could be put in about the bridge and Commissioner Hadley indicated that it is in there. The Chairman added that the amendment has that and Commissioner Hadley explained that it suggests that staff is going to work with them.

VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 6:32 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

6. Discussion regarding funding for the SR 89A redevelopment plan and possible inclusion in the City's Five Year Capital Improvement Plan. (20 minutes 6:40 – 7:00)

John O'Brien explained that Vice Chairman Griffin requested that this item be on the agenda and it is to resurrect the S.R. 89A Redevelopment Plan that had funding taken away when the economy went south a couple of years ago, so this item is to propose that it be included in the City's 5-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) again. The timing is good, because the Commission will be reviewing that proposed CIP in two weeks and this project could be added as one of the Commission's recommendations. Ultimately, the City Council decides what is included in the CIP and what is funded for the upcoming fiscal year, which would be Fiscal Year 2012 - 2013. In discussing this with Mike Raber, we both felt it made sense to include it in the 5-year CIP, but as far as funding, it doesn't make a lot of sense to fund it until we get through the Community Plan update, so that is staff's uptake on this thing -- get it in the CIP, but put the funding out for a year or two, until we get the Community Plan update completed.

Summary Discussion:

Chairman Losoff noted that the Community Plan will have a component of S.R. 89A redevelopment in it, but we aren't sure to what extent or scope. Given the Community Plan discussion and the fact that we are talking about the CIP in the next meeting, this is really appropriate.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that it was such a powerful thing and so needed, so his issue is that he doesn't know how you can get to a point where everyone is behind it, and then it got thrown out with the trash. City Council members told him they weren't really aware of it; they didn't know about it, so when you have something as necessary as this -- look at this whole stupid issue we went through on purchasing 89A, and if something like this had been in place, it would have been predetermined one way or the other. We can wait on this, but with the Community Plan and things we are bringing up, he would like to have something in the next budget to put some money aside for design and consulting for some type of planning procedure, so it isn't such a big nut to crack, when we get into the next thing. He has said all along if you had put \$100,000 aside each year, we would have had enough to do it by now. The Vice Chairman then asked if there is any way we can have a category to cover this and put some money aside in this next budget, for long-range planning or redevelopment planning. John O'Brien explained that he doesn't know how you can break the project up or what the scope would be for this next budget year.

Chairman Losoff indicated that as background, about four years ago, we came up with this 89A project and put together a pro forma and interviewed several consultants, and it came back with about a \$450,000 price tag to do a complete study of 89A with traffic controls, etc., and at that time, the City Council turned it down because of budget considerations and it was just stopped. We also had a P&Z Working Team working on 89A and that stopped, because the Citizens Steering Committee was being formed, so it was felt that Committee would get involved and 89A would be talked about again for the long-range plan, so we jump-started it twice and it sits where it is today in limbo. We have to wait for the Citizens Steering Committee and the long-range plan to be formulated, which makes sense, but Vice Chairman Griffin is suggesting that we put some money somewhere, so we don't lose it again.

The Chairman then noted that in going through the list of 52 or 53 projects, there are several things in there that relate to 89A, and we have to be careful, because if we just went by that list and approved some of those, it could become pretty fragmented. Maybe we need to look at a bigger picture for 89A before we get to the long-range plan issue, to see if it all makes sense. He noticed the listings for the Coffee Pot sidewalk and the 89A utility undergrounding for \$8 million, etc., so there are a lot of things that could happen, and if you want to do the utility undergrounding fine, but there are other things we want to do as well. Somehow we need a package for 89A to put all of these things in, and then have a line item.

John O'Brien explained that the purpose of the CIP is to be a planning document; you have a 5-year horizon of all of the capital projects, but it doesn't mean that they are all getting funding this next year. You have to match what funding you have available and the staff capacity to do a certain number of projects, so it really needs to be looked at as a planning guide, like the undergrounding of utilities is way down-the-road. Chairman Losoff then acknowledged that it is a priority 3 right now.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that one difficulty we have had in planning is that our planning isn't comprehensive; you can take separate line items and look at them, but how do they fit into the whole picture and what do we really want to do? When we got into lights or no lights, etc., that was just one element of this whole comprehensive plan that we desperately need to get in place, because we are just losing time and possibly potential opportunities. The problem is that when you have a nut to crack that is \$500,000, you are never going to get it approved in one CIP, because it is too much to do. When we want something, we budget for it, so he is talking about setting up a redevelopment budget, so money can be put into it, and he understood that the traffic study was very necessary along 89A and that money was going to be included in the study and not done independently, because when everything is interconnected, it works and you create a master plan, and it eliminates all of the politics of this stuff later on.

John O'Brien indicated that he can look at the projects that are components of the Redevelopment Plan in the CIP and bring back some ideas on the 17th as to how we can package them a little more comprehensively. Chairman Losoff added that there could be an additional item, whether it is for a consultant, development or traffic controls, etc, but some overview. The Steering Committee

has discussed this and the Committee doesn't have any outside funds right now, other than a little in the City budget, but we may want to consider \$200,000 - \$300,000 that would cover an overview for some planning process, so it doesn't get lost.

Commissioner Taylor stated that he is against inclusion of any money for any planning, because he has seen all kinds of plans prepared for this town and nothing happens, and he doesn't see putting money into a big plan. The people that he talks to about it are fed up with this town spending money on planning, and he personally doesn't see the need for it. Out of this plan that is being developed now, the Community Plan, we should be able to come up with something that is good enough for this community, and then all of the individual projects will take care of all of the details. He just doesn't see it happening; he can understand and if we had the money and resources to actually rebuild the whole road and do everything at once, that would be one thing and you would need a plan, but we aren't going to have that kind of money; we are just a little town.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented that nobody has that kind of money and if you look at the history of redevelopment and how redevelopment is done in some of the Form-Based Code seminars, the plan has to be in place, so you can implement it as you go. It is a twenty-year project, but until you have a comprehensive plan in place, you don't know what to do and it is all piecemeal. As an architect, you don't start doing things without having everything decided ahead of time, and we don't have a comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that when he looks at the development along 89A, what is left empty, and the age of the buildings, he can see what could be knocked down, but there are people in those buildings and they might not want to take them down. They aren't that old; this town is not that old, so he doesn't see it as a redevelopment project really. He sees where we need a town center and he doesn't see why in this Community Plan, we can't come up with a good enough overall plan. Chairman Losoff suggested saving that for the next item on the agenda; however, the Commissioner indicated that he is talking about the budget, but has said what he feels about it.

Commissioner Hadley asked, in regards to Vice Chairman Griffin's statement about wishing money had been set aside over the years for the 89A study, if we can even do that and John O'Brien stated no and explained that is not how City budgeting is done. It is just for that one fiscal year, so you aren't going to bank the money into a fund; it really is already banked. We have the General Fund Reserves, the Capital Fund and the Development Impact Fee Fund, so he thinks the money is there. If it is not used in that fiscal year for a specific thing, it just goes back into the hopper and you redo it in the next budget cycle. The Vice Chairman then asked how you withdraw it, if it is already banked. John O'Brien explained it is just in the Capital Fund for that year; it is in big funds, like the Capital Fund, and within that fund you may have certain projects that are funded by the Wastewater Fund or the Development Impact Fees, etc., but if that specific project doesn't move forward in that fiscal year, that money doesn't stay assigned to that project, it is reassessed the next year.

Vice Chairman Griffin agreed that this town is fed up with plans, and that is why we spent over two years and had a Form-Based Code 101 class that a bunch of the City Councilors attended, and we learned about how they are doing the new urban planning, and it is comprehensive and not one of these long processes, but it is very visual, etc. He agrees that people are fed up, but when you educate them and show them -- we had the community behind it, because it is the new way and you create incentives for redevelopment. Nobody is redeveloping, because they are using the existing Codes, which don't work.

Chairman Losoff indicated that this is a very good subject and he wishes we had a comprehensive plan in place before, but what he is hoping for is that the new plan will provide that. Budgeting is probably a little premature right now, because of the long-range plan discussions. We do know there will be a lot of things in there and all of them are going to cost money, and we aren't going to be able to afford everything that will be in there. The Chairman then invited Jon Thompson, Chairman of the Citizens Steering Committee to join the discussion and indicated that at this point, we have said to drive the ideas and not let them be hindered, because we can't afford it. Put the

ideas out there first, and then come back and be practical about them. Looking at the current projections, he is a little concerned that we do piecemeal things. Looking back to Main Street, the improvements were fine, but they were done almost in a vacuum on those two or three streets. If we had also looked at Jordan Road, etc., maybe we could have had a bigger picture for Main Street, but we just did the strip, so as we go forward, he hopes we have a better comprehensive picture.

John O'Brien indicated that the time to do it would be the 17th of January, when the Commission reviews the CIP and he is asking each Commission to identify if there are projects that aren't included that the Commission would like to see added, so if this is one of them, let's get the Redevelopment Plan back and get that going, and if the majority of the Commission agrees, then staff will forward that recommendation to Council.

Chairman Losoff indicated that assuming we have consensus on that, he doesn't know how specific we can be, but it would at least be a message to the Council and the Steering Committee that the Commission feels this is important. He also likes the idea of looking at the line items to see how to package those that relate to 89A.

Mike Raber stated that it is correct that we started this whole look at a Redevelopment Plan almost four years ago, and then two years ago, we were interviewing 24 consulting firms that were all highly qualified and we were down to having a recommendation, and then the economy tanked, and that is where we are today. There has never been a dispute that it is an important item to take on, and it is fine to put it in a 5-year program, but we need to move ahead with the Community Plan and get that direction underway, so we know more specifically what kind of project we will be looking at when we start funding it.

Chairman Losoff noted that with the City Council changing every two years or so, there should be something on the record to say we feel this is very important; each Council has a different take on things, so if it is posted, then succeeding Councils may pay more attention to it.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that one of the trade-offs of doing comprehensive planning is that you package things together so it looks like an all or nothing, so if you put all of the line items together, you run the risk of not getting anything done, even something that wouldn't conflict with other things down-the-road, if there isn't enough money to do it all. It can all get thrown out, so there are trade-offs both ways, which is why he is hopeful that the Community Plan will help solve that problem, because the Committee will be doing a comprehensive plan and it will be something that won't specifically ask for dollars, but it will say that this will be very expensive if we do it all; however, there is no assumption that we can possibly do it all, but we will hopefully address the relationships between housing and transportation, etc., so when the priorities are figured out, the plan will help determine if there are dependencies. You don't want to do bike lanes and then realize that we should have buried the power lines, so now we have to rip up the bike lanes -- we hope we can have both.

Chairman Thompson then added that he worries more than anything that the Community Plan will seem so progressive and aggressive that people won't vote for it, because it will be too expensive. We have to find a way to make it appear that it is going to benefit the community in ways other than just feeling good. Chairman Losoff agreed that it is a little bit of a concern, given the recent referendum, that the City won't want to spend money on anything, so we have to balance that and ensure that it makes sense, so it is something that the community can get behind, and remind people that it is a 20 or 25-year process, so we aren't going to spend everything in one year.

Vice Chairman Griffin and Commissioner Taylor both indicated that they won't be present on the 17th. The Vice Chairman then stated that he would challenge you to be progressive in the Community Plan, because if it doesn't have good teeth in it, then the Commission has no chance to try to implement it. It is a plan; implementation and funding come later, but it has to have a great vision. Chairman Losoff added that he thinks some of the issues will be if we can do private/public

funding; it doesn't all have to come from the City. There may be opportunities on a small scale, like the discussion with Walgreens and Natural Grocers.

7. Discussion regarding the Community Plan Update (30 minutes 7:00 – 7:30).

Mike Raber referenced the memo in the Commission's packet and indicated that the Committee is at a major turning point in the planning effort and moving from a listening mode to trying to respond to what the Committee is hearing from the community. There have been a couple of major milestones completed; one was completing the topic workshops in November, and the other was the opening of the Community Room in November. That room is their active working space and it will be where the public can see the plan as it progresses and also be a place for plan alternatives to be developed in a real-time scenario with the Planning Teams.

Chairman Losoff pointed out that Commissioner Jablow has been the Sergeant-at-Arms for the Community Room and scheduling people to man it. Mike Raber added that he also is doing a lot of other little jobs too and we appreciate what he has been doing.

Mike then indicated that it is a struggle to keep the Community Room manned right now, so they could sure use some volunteer help. They are trying 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. every Tuesday and Thursday, but it has been a little hit and miss with the holidays; however, he thinks the interest will increase as we get into developing the plan alternatives with the community, and the Committee is meeting there now and it has been valuable to meet in that space, because all of the plan-related maps and illustrations, etc., are there during our discussions.

Mike explained that now we need to start understanding what we are hearing and move toward developing plan alternatives. The memo outlines the first steps in looking at the public's comments, and then forming staff working teams and a new public outreach program to get additional participation. Staff Planning Teams will prepare different plan scenarios based on the public's comments, and we discussed having some Steering Committee Members, P&Z Commissioners, local architects, other Commissioners and possibly students involved in those Planning Teams. The plan alternatives will be tested with the community and we still have to determine how we are going to do that -- through workshops, meetings, etc. Eventually, the idea is to take those alternatives and boil them down into a common vision, based on the community input.

Mike indicated that the Planning Teams will be working in the Community Room, and we have a Format Working Team that Commissioner Hadley and Chairman Thompson are on, with a couple of other Steering Committee Members, and they will be developing a template and the Plan Elements, as the alternatives are created. In terms of public outreach, we will be focusing on group discussions with former City officials, non-profits and spiritual leaders, and then also discussions with key community leaders and other institutions and organizations, including HOAs. It is a much more aggressive outreach effort, as a result of noticing the people who haven't been showing up at the workshops, etc., in order to ensure we are tapping those folks in the community who have really been involved in this process in the past, especially former Planning & Zoning Commissioners and City Councilors, so we can ask what we are missing, etc.

Regarding what we have been hearing from the community, both the Commission and the Steering Committee were invited to review all of the public input we have received, and hopefully, you will be gleaning the key ideas from that. We also invited the Housing, Sustainability, and Arts & Culture Commissions to do the same thing. We asked this Commission to have your comments to us by January 10th, so we can review and include that in the packets for both the Steering Committee and this Commission on the 17th.

Chairman Losoff pointed out that attached to Mike's memo are individual Steering Committee Members thoughts and ideas about what they heard and saw, so we don't need a lengthy thesis, just an outline or a couple of paragraphs of what you think, and then give that to Mike Raber by the end of the week. Mike Raber repeated that the date was the 10th.

Mike then indicated that he wanted to get a feel of where the Commissioners are with that; it takes a little work to go through all of that, but Chairman Thompson can help you if you have questions. The Steering Committee is going to meet on the 17th. They took different themes that we heard and divided the job up, and they will go over that on the 17th to arrive at a consensus on the key ideas. If any of you have taken that on, we can take individual comments rather than you trying to arrive at a consensus.

Chairman Losoff asked if the Commissioners had any thoughts to share. Commissioner Brandt indicated that he hadn't looked at all of the pile yet; he went to the opening meetings and heard some wonderful and some crazy things, and then wondered how the herding of cats with a flyswatter was going to come together. Mike Raber explained that is the Steering Committee's next job, and hopefully on the 17th, will be to boil that down to some key elements.

Chairman Losoff stated that we hear a lot about a community meeting place and about Oak Creek and how it isn't accessible. Commissioner Hadley indicated that he also had attended two of the community meetings and he just quickly looked at the comments, but he plans to do that and will get back to staff. Mike Raber indicated that he wanted to get a feel for if maybe over the next month or two, you want to do that exercise, because we will want to hear what you get out of that. He just wants to ensure that you have an opportunity to weigh-in on that.

Vice Chairman Griffin stated that he only attended one of the meetings, but the thing that was a little alarming at the meeting was that he knew probably two-thirds at the meeting, and someone said that Sedona is run by roughly 200 people, so the challenge is to get people to come and understand what you are talking about, when we start having the public hearings on these things, so people will be either excited or concerned about it. Regarding the creek, the Design Group did a study on it 25 years ago and we almost got there and then bam! It is trying to get these things done and that is the super challenge, and he doesn't know how you do it in a community like this -- just like the Redevelopment Plan that was almost done, and then three years later most of the City Council doesn't even know about it.

Commissioner Brandt asked what happened to the Creekwalk Plan and Vice Chairman Griffin said that we had the opportunity to try to reserve some easements, etc., and Marie Brown got the upper area almost done and we had the funding, but it was \$100,000 to finalize this or that. John O'Brien recalled that the Council at that time decided just not to move forward with it; there were a lot of issues like ADA. The Vice Chairman stated that it is not easy and you have to be a community that is willing to grasp that and move forward. The challenge is how to get over that hump; we can do great plans, but then it gets to the point that we aren't going to do it. Commissioner Taylor pointed out that is his pitch about the long-range plan -- Vice Chairman Griffin commented, so don't plan then, and Commissioner Taylor added that if you don't act on it, it is money down the drain.

Chairman Losoff indicated that one of his neighbors had every study done by the City in the last 25 years, and there were like five studies on 89A and they were great, but he was also making the point that we spend money, and then there are new people involved and we do it over again, but he thinks that with the Steering Committee, there are a lot of people who are fresh, aggressive and maybe a little more open to new thoughts, so maybe more things will get done, but it is going to be hard and he thinks the referendum has hindered us a little bit.

Vice Chairman Griffin stated that it is a perfect example of what not to do. Don't try to push something on people without a plan. Chairman Losoff indicated that it may be good and it may be bad, but we have to go forward and do what we think is best and see where it takes us.

Commissioner Messer indicated that it is pertinent that you have the same 200 people coming to all of these meeting and you get the same ideas, and it is not an accurate portrayal of the whole community, because people aren't interested enough to come. The Commissioner then asked if the Committee is meeting at 3:30 p.m., before the P&Z meeting and Mike Raber clarified it will be meeting at 3:00 p.m. at the Community Room. Commissioner Messer indicated that it would be worthwhile to go, and as far as the creek access, he would settle for being able to park under

Midgley Bridge again and go down Brewer Road without someone screaming that you can't park there to go to the creek. You can't even take your dog to the creek without getting into trouble.

Mike Raber asked if the Commission is interested in sending the Committee your thoughts on what you gleaned from the community, and if so, they will take them when they get them, as opposed to you trying to do that as a group. He is hearing different levels of interest in doing that, so that is fine, just send us your comments individually. He just wanted to ensure you had an opportunity to look at that.

Commissioner Messer indicated that it would be more effective for the Commission to do that in a work session to come up with a joint voice, because we are a recommending body and if you get all of our individual comments, what can you do with that versus us getting together in a work session to say what we see as a Commission.

Commissioner Jablow stated that coming from the east coast, he has never seen anything like what you are doing; it is unheard of in the east and he has attended every one of the meetings, because it was new to him and he was totally intrigued and in awe of what was going on. He heard so many comments and to add his own would be repetition of what you have already received, but what is important is that, as Vice Chairman Griffin mentioned, 200 people are really making the decisions; however, he thinks that number is a lot less, but you are going to tap those people who made decisions for the City in your outreach by getting the former Mayors, etc. They are your source of people making the decisions and many of those people are the ones responsible for getting information out for the 89A project, so personally inviting those people will be huge and you will make a big dent in the people who you didn't see coming out. By inviting them personally, if you can get them in one room, it will be a fantastic feat and it will be huge for the Committee. If they come, you will see a big turn-around.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he thought the monorail from the parking lot at I-17 was the best . . . (recording unclear) He has been to all of the meetings and some of the sessions and gone through most of the 100 pages; he almost went blind and it is hard to summarize from the way the comments are written. He doesn't know how the Word Cloud was constructed, but he thinks what you are asking for is what we as individuals hear people saying, so he thinks we should do it as individuals; however, the Cloud actually has a lot to say.

Chairman Losoff indicated that it is fine if any Commissioner wants to give Mike Raber your individual thoughts; otherwise, if the Steering Committee can pare down the themes on the 17th, we can bring them to the Commission and get the reaction of the Commission at that time. Mike Raber added that he was going to ask if the Commission wanted to have that meeting. Chairman Losoff explained that he is getting the sense that we would rather react than be proactive.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he also read Mike's thing on visitors and he thought it was sorely lacking in focus on the importance of visitors in the community; you only went halfway. Mike questioned what the Commissioner was referencing and the Commissioner asked if it was written by somebody else. Chairman Losoff indicated it was somebody else's and Mike Raber thought perhaps the Commissioner was referencing the Committee Members' vision statements; however, the Commissioner indicated no, it was a memo. Mike indicated that he didn't recall writing anything about visitors.

Commissioner Taylor then stated that he had previously suggested to Jim Eaton that they should take advantage of the Film Festival. They show movies every other Tuesday and get a few hundred people, so if you had a little presentation in a film, you probably could work something out with them. They usually have a sponsor that contributes \$500 and they give a little talk before the movie, and he thinks this is a community activity, so they may allow you to say something. There are a lot of really thoughtful people in the audience, because the movies are quite different from what you normally see.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that early on there was discussion about association with communities or places that you liked, and he wondered if that has been utilized to its full extent. People can say they love a house, but they can't say exactly why they love it, so the association of communities or places that you really like -- visual preferences; he doesn't know if you have done that, but it is extremely powerful, because instead of people having to identify certain things, they identify a place that you can analyze. Places along the coast have highways running through them, like Del Mar, so why are they great communities? Mike Raber indicated that he will introduce that idea to the Committee.

Chairman Losoff indicated that in terms of meeting with various groups in the outreach effort, you may want to include visitors as a group to somehow get to them, so we can hear what they are saying about Sedona. Mike Raber noted that was discussed earlier, but we haven't approached them yet. Commissioner Jablow suggested putting a questionnaire in the hotel rooms that people can drop off, so they can see that we are concerned about our community and want their input.

Commissioner Brandt asked if the Committee is still taking comments; he thought the turning of the corner meant . . . Mike Raber interjected that the Committee isn't going to stop, but at some point, the Committee has to start responding. They will continue to take comments to the end of the Plan, but they also have to start generating something. The Commissioner indicated that it is great to continue to do that, because what was important six months ago is now . . . Mike agreed it is always a moving target, but we will get more response when the community has something to react to. Commissioner Brandt then asked about the overall length of time allowed to develop it and Mike Raber indicated it was roughly 2½ years and we are probably a year into it, so we have another 1½ years before voting on it.

Chairman Losoff indicated that with the teams being set up in the next month or so, there will be plenty of opportunity for any Commissioner to become involved. Mike Raber agreed and explained that staff will try to get them established as soon as possible, but we will need probably three volunteers from this Commission to be on those teams, so if you are interested get with staff. The staff Planning Teams are designed to look at different alternative aspects of what we are hearing from the community and develop a holistic scenario, so it is the total Community Plan, not just one element of the Plan -- basically a vision, and it will entail maps, graphics, goals, etc. in the final product, but they will all be a little different, because what we are hearing isn't always consistent. We hear some opposing viewpoints, so we need to figure out what those alternatives will look like. One may be not to do anything; everything is fine now. Another one may be a very visionary alternative and a third one may be something in-between, so those three teams will be focused on each of those alternatives to develop a product with the help of Committee Members, Mike Bower and John Sather, who have volunteered to help the teams develop those scenarios, and we had discussed getting this Commission involved and possibly other Commission members too. Some of you that may be interested may have some architectural background -- Commissioners Taylor, Brandt and Hadley, and Vice Chairman Griffin has had a long-time interest in this, but let us know. A few of the Steering Committee Members may be involved too, and we have also looked at bringing in local architects, like we did with the West Sedona Commercial Corridor Study, when we had several local architects brainstorm and develop a lot of what came out of that, and we also discussed potentially getting students involved, but we have to decide what the maximum is, because we don't want too many people on a team. The idea is to get together and develop those scenarios all the way through, so we can present them to the community, and we are trying to target April.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked what is meant by "all the way through" and Mike Raber explained that it isn't the detail that we would have in all of the Plan Elements, but the vision and what kinds of graphics would get that vision across, what the key goals would be, etc., and there is room to look at any other aspect that is going to make it clear as to what that scenario is to the community. Vice Chairman Griffin asked if he means in the future or . . . Mike explained it would be a potential vision for the Community Plan, but it will be looked at in different alternative scenarios; one might be very status quo and the other might be very visionary, while a third might be kind of in-between. The Vice Chairman asked if you look at status quo . . . at what point? Do you look at it now and

then in 2020? If you don't do anything about 89A, what will it evolve into in 2020? It seems that the vision should be at that point of, if we plan this, this is what we achieve and if we plan nothing, we won't achieve anything, but it won't stay the same. Mike Raber noted that they have to be fairly realistic; you can't just say nothing is going to change, but we have gotten comments that run the gamut, so it is trying to figure out the best way to present what we are hearing from the community in terms of alternatives that the community can then react to.

Chairman Losoff compared it to presenting the best and worst case, etc.; if we just spent the minimum amount of time, effort and planning, this is what it would look like, but if we built the monorail, this is what it would look like, and then something in the middle.

Mike Raber indicated that one example is that we have heard a lot of support for ball fields at the treatment plant and even though that is outside of the City's jurisdiction, our plan talks about sending regional issues to the County or whoever has that jurisdiction; however, the other side is what our plan already says about maintaining open space between communities, and if you bring in active recreation, there are other impacts, so one scenario may be that when you have ball fields, you also have parking, cars, lights, etc. There are other people who support having housing out there, so there is a whole gamut of ideas about what could happen there.

Chairman Losoff summarized that individual thoughts and ideas should be given to Mike by the 10th. Mike added, if they can; we realize that may not be enough time. Chairman Losoff continued to say that on the 17th, we will get a summary of the Committee's discussion and we may schedule a work session after that to have more discussion.

Chairman Thompson indicated that regardless of whether or not you are able to submit anything in writing based on your own reactions, it is important that you continue to monitor what the Committee puts out as summaries of that data. He would hope that you take the time to go through the 100 pages of raw data to get an overall feel for what is there. Articles will be coming out in a supplement in the Red Rock News that boils it down to a one or two-page summary of the workshops and comments, but if you see anything that you don't think is representative of what you saw, let us know right away. The Committee wants to hear from you on a regular basis, if you think something isn't going the way you think it should.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if there is going to be any way that the community will be able to respond to the insert and Chairman Thompson explained that just about every article ends with the website to get more information and comment back, etc., and there will be a questionnaire with an open comment area, or if not, they will put one in, so if people see something in the insert they don't like, they can comment on that too.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that one of the most valuable things is what is behind the idea, because that allows someone else to understand why they want housing in the middle of the sewer plant, etc., do you want affordable housing or you don't like to live in the City, etc., which allows other people to determine how to have a common goal or problem from what has just been expressed differently. You are doing some amazing work and we appreciate it.

Chairman Losoff thanked everybody and noted that we have talked about getting more involved in planning for a long time and we are getting there; the opportunity is there for as much or as little as you want to get involved.

- 8. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and agenda items: (5 minutes 7:30 – 7:35)**
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Thursday, January 12, 2012 | – 3:30 p.m. – Worksession |
| Tuesday, January 17, 2012 | – 5:30 p.m. – Regular |
| Thursday, February 2, 2012 | – 3:30 p.m. – Worksession |
| Tuesday, February 7, 2012 | – 5:30 p.m. – Regular |

John O'Brien indicated that he wasn't planning on a work session on January 12th, because on the 17th, we have the CIP review. Mike Raber added that the Community Plan would be included also. Chairman Losoff asked if anyone besides Vice Chairman Griffin and Commissioner Taylor won't be present on the 17th and there was no response. John O'Brien then asked if the Commission felt a work session on the 12th was needed and two Commissioners indicated that they couldn't be present on the 12th, so it was confirmed that there will be no work session on the 12th.

John O'Brien indicated the meeting on the 17th will be at 5:30 p.m. and the Commission should have a packet on the CIP through an email. He then indicated that he will provide the Commissioners will a hard copy as well. On February 2nd, there is a work session to prepare for the February 7th public hearings for the Safari Jeep Tours and the Tranquil Community Garden.

Commissioner Brandt pointed out that we already had the introductory work session on both of them and asked if that would suggest that we don't need the work session on February 2nd. Commissioner Messer added that they seemed like two no-brainers to him. Commissioner Hadley agreed that it was pretty clear as to what they were doing. Based on the consensus of the Commission, John O'Brien indicated that the work session on February 2nd will be canceled, in addition to the work session on January 12th.

9. Adjournment (7:35 pm)

Chairman Losoff called for adjournment at 7:44 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 January 3, 2012.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date