

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, October 20, 2015 - 5:30 p.m.

1. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE

Chair Losoff confirmed that the meeting had been properly noticed.

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

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Eric Brandt, John Currivan, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer. Commissioner Avrum Cohen was excused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Cari Meyer, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey.

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Sandy Moriarty and Councilors Jon Thompson (arrived at 6:35 p.m.) Angela LeFevre, John Martinez and Jessica Williamson

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF

Audree Juhlin introduced two engineers, Roxanne Holland and Ryan Mortillaro, who will be working with the Commission on all aspects of drainage and traffic, etc.

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

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS BY COMMISSIONERS AND STAFF (continued)

Commissioner Brandt indicated that in regards to the Mariposa Restaurant that is obviously fabulously successful, he doesn't recall the area between the building and the highway being labeled as parking, and he would like to see if they could do some vegetative screening for that area. The Chair suggested saving that item until future agendas.

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

- a. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Development Review approval to remodel the exterior façade of an existing commercial building at 1420 W State Route 89A (Whole Foods Market). The property is zoned C-2 (General Commercial). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the northwest corner of W State Route 89A and Soldiers Pass Road. The lot is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 408-25-044. Applicant: Little Diversified Architectural Consulting (Francis Kwek) Case Number: PZ15-00009 (DEV) Staff: Cari Meyer, Senior Planner**

Cari Meyer indicated that there was a work session on this item on Thursday and this is the public hearing. This is in regards to the Whole Foods building, which was previously New Frontiers, and they are proposing to do a façade remodel to the building, and since this building

was originally required to go through a Development Review, and they are making a significant change to the façade, a new Development Review approval is required.

Cari showed an aerial map of how the site is developed and indicated that the footprint of the building will remain essentially unchanged. The current entry element would be taken down and they would move a new entry element to the west. Cari then pointed out the elements that would change on the site plan, and as indicated at the work session, staff has discussed the west wall with the applicant. She pointed out the roof that would be covering their loading area in the back and that they have a large wall where they are proposing a mural. Staff would review the mural in a way similar to public art requirements, and if the mural doesn't happen, they have provided an alternate elevation to break up the building massing, so it wouldn't remain a blank wall on that side of the building.

Cari referenced the rendering provided and indicated that all of the materials for the changes would match the existing materials as far as colors, rock, timbers and roof materials, so staff felt that it did fit in with the existing building as far as materials and style. They also provided two potential mural artists that they are considering for the mural, and the applicant can speak a little more to that as far as where they are in that process, but staff would be reviewing that somewhat in conformance with the public art requirements. They are not increasing square footage, so they are not required to do public art, but since they are doing a rather large mural, we would be using the same process.

Cari indicated that in staff's review, staff felt that the project does comply with the Land Development Code requirements, and staff did receive a public comment from someone who worked on the original design, and that was provided to the Commission at the work session. After the work session, staff received two more comments from the two architects who worked on the original design of the building, and those were provided to you. Those are the only written public comments received. There were some phone calls, but the majority of those were asking about outdoor use, not necessarily about façade changes. Some questions were asking if they were going to be doing outdoor events in the courtyard area between this building and the Szechuan building, and that is not part of this current application. The applicant was told if they want to do that, they are subject to a Temporary Use Permit or Conditional Use Permit regulations, so if they choose to do something, staff could approve a one-time event up to eight times a year with a Temporary Use Permit, depending on the categorization of it, but if they wanted to do something more ongoing, the Commission would see that for a Conditional Use Permit, but all that is being considered with this application are the changes to the façade.

Chair Losoff asked if those inquiries were related to noise, and Cari indicated yes. Staff talked with the applicant a few months ago about what that would look like, and if they chose to do that on an ongoing basis, the Commission would see that in the future, but it is not part of this application. Cari then stated that as outlined in the Staff Report, staff believes that it complies with the Land Development Code and Design Review Manual, and staff is recommending approval of this request.

Commission's Questions of Staff:

Commissioner Mayer asked about the space between the two buildings as to whose space that is -- Whole Foods, John D. Miller or the other building. Cari explained that it is managed by John D. Miller; he is the property owner of all of the parcels. The Commissioner then asked if he would be the applicant for an event, and Cari explained yes, or he would have to approve an application for a special event in that area.

Commissioner Mayer then indicated that he checked out Whole Foods' website and some their storefronts throughout the nation, and he wanted to ask the applicant if this location in Sedona is similar to any location in another city that has the same population as Sedona -- 10,000 or less.

Architect, Francis Kwek with Little Architects: Mr. Kwek indicated that regarding the architectural features, there is a similar structure with the massive timber in Chandler, Arizona, along the 101 freeway and Chandler Boulevard.

Commissioner Mayer stated that is not the same demographic as Sedona, which is a small community. Chandler is a lot larger, and he was asking if there is a location in a similar setting as here in Sedona. Mr. Kwek indicated no, this is the only Whole Foods. The Commissioner then indicated that he looked at all of the other facades and this seems to be the most generic of all of them. The Commissioner then referenced the pictures and asked if there would be any greenery in front of it or any planters.

Mr. Kwek explained that they maintained the existing landscaping in front, and they are opening the front of it for cart access, but nothing in front of the building. Commissioner Mayer then stated that he listened to Science Friday hosted by Ira Flatow, and there was a book review on "*Places of the Heart: The Psychogeography of Everyday Life*". It was a very interesting review, and they mentioned a Whole Foods store. They said it was a very generic, uninspiring glass front, which doesn't allure any people to go and have a positive shopping experience, so he looked at Whole Foods' website and found the storefronts, and he was wondering if there is anything that can be done to spice it up and make it a little more green in front, not just the landscape along the highway -- just that Sedona punch.

Mr. Kwek indicated that he could express that concern to his client. Commissioner Mayer then indicated that it would be good to read that, because it is very interesting in regards to the impact on the people and their experience; it might be interesting for future designs.

Chair Losoff pointed out that first, the Commission needs to indicate if all Commissioners agree with that before the applicant does anything. Cari Meyer also pointed out that they have submitted a landscaping plan that meets all requirements. The Commission is seeing just the building, but there is some landscaping in front of the store and parking lot, but typically, when you see these, they remove that so you can see the building. There is landscaping in front of the building. Commissioner Mayer then stated that he would like to see planters with some greenery in front.

Cari showed the landscaping plan for the expansion of the parking lot to the west, and another view showing some landscaping in front of the building, but indicated that staff can explore ways to add some additional landscaping through planters, if that is something the Commission agrees to. Commissioner Mayer stated that it would enhance the experience of the shoppers, making it more inviting and green.

Chair Losoff then asked if the Commission was in agreement with that or if anybody was okay with it the way it is. Commissioner Klein and Vice Chair Levin indicated that they were okay with the way it is. Commissioner Currivan stated that he is fine with it, and Commissioner Brandt also indicated that is fine. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he could see some improvements, if possible and if you don't mind discussing it. Chair Losoff then noted that there is a consensus.

Mr. Kwek explained that they have provided landscaping, because they removed some landscaping. He referenced the exhibit and indicated that there is a huge island from the old entry that is being removed, so they are substituting that with landscaping that matches with the existing surrounding shopping center. Chair Losoff noted that as Cari pointed out, the requirements have been met, but anytime an applicant can go above and beyond our basic requirements, it is appreciated.

Commissioner Brandt referenced page 35 of the outline with the items related to the alternate standards, regarding the directory sign and lighting, and asked if all of those had been resolved, and Cari indicated yes.

Commissioner Currivan noted that he sent a question about the mural to Cari ahead of time, because we have a rule that you can't just have a flat side of a building that exceeds 800 sq. ft., so you have to have some architectural features. You can break up the plane, and you need at least 6 ft. in depth if you are going to have two different planes in the building, but it is designed to give some character to the building, so it doesn't look like a big box. In this case, there is a flat side of the building and it is there for historic reasons, because they thought there would be a building there, but there isn't, so the flat side of the building is visible from the street, and the proposal on the table is to use a mural to solve that problem. The question posed to Cari was if the Land Development Code allows the use of a mural to cure the problem with this in excess of 800 sq. ft. unrelieved building plane. He couldn't find anything in Article 9 that said you could do that. We have alternate standards for other things, but not to cure an unrelieved building plane, so he wondered if we wanted to set a precedent for this.

The Commissioner then asked if we have any precedents for allowing a mural to be used to cure a problem with an excessive flat side of a building. Cari indicated not that she is aware of; in this situation, it is an existing wall and staff looked for ways that we could mitigate the size of that wall, and the applicant proposed the mural. Since we don't have something like that as far as art -- most of the public art is sculpture-related, so we thought this was a good opportunity to explore that option, but we do have the alternate elevation in case the mural doesn't pan out.

Commissioner Currivan indicated that he is not opposed to doing the mural, he was just curious as to what kind of a precedent we would be setting. He takes it that we are not really trying to create a new rule here that says if you have a flat side of a building, you can put a mural on it and not have to worry about the unrelieved building plane rule. He then asked if that is fair, and Cari stated that she didn't think we were trying to say that in this case; it is a little unique, because of the existing situation. It wasn't really intended to be that way, but with new buildings, we would expect that as they are designed, they would comply with all standards. The Commissioner then stated that he was satisfied with that.

Vice Chair Levin and Commissioner Klein stated that their questions were answered in the work session last week, and Chair Losoff noted that the Staff Report was pretty thorough, so he would open the item to public comment.

The Chair opened the public comment period at this time.

Dan Jensvold, Architect: Mr. Jensvold indicated that he was the original architect of this project along with Stephen Thompson, and just to reintroduce himself, some of the projects they have done in Sedona as Jensvold-Thompson are Old Marketplace, mixed use commercial; Sedona Station, which is the art gallery turned into a timeshare by Diamond Resorts at Los Abrigados; Sedona Cultural Park, the amphitheater was their project and they planned that also and that is in limbo; Yavapai College; Sedona Arts Center, another one of their projects, and he was intensively involved in every one of these things and presented them to the Planning Commission and City Council, including the Old Marketplace; Miller Brothers office building at Cultural Park Way, which is another Diamond Resorts timeshare sales office; Amadei Sedona Bed & Breakfast on Hozoni; Adobe Inn across the street from that, and the Sedona Creative Life Center.

Chair Losoff reminded Mr. Jensvold that he only had three minutes.

Mr. Jensvold indicated that he wanted to let the Commission know that. He listened to the audio of the last Commission meeting, and he doesn't think it was read into the record, so he would like to read what he wrote. Mr. Jensvold then read the following:

"As the architect with Stephen Thompson of the original Old Marketplace development, I am deeply concerned with the new plan for the destruction of the central arched entrance to the main building. This feature was and is the main organizing element in the site planning of the project, which received extensive review with the Planning

Commission, with John O'Brien and Roger Eastman. It was designed to be the highest part of the architecture, providing a symbol and a landmark for the Old Marketplace, easily seen and comprehended by locals and visitors as they travel on 89A. All site elements including the building massing, the other large taller elements, signage, lights and parking all based off this main axis.

The decision to tear this down, which ironically provides the best location for business signage as is evidenced right now where the Whole Foods sign is, is hard to . . . I don't understand and I haven't heard a good reason for it either. There is no reason that I can see that a creative study of an alternative use for this space, such as an outdoor dining area or whatever could work, and not withstanding putting an entrance at the west side, as long as that respected the existing design language. This project was incorporated into the Sedona Design Manual, so it has been well received over the years."

Mr. Jensvold then stated that based on some comments at the last meeting, he wanted to clarify, so he had a follow-up. He is the architect of record along with Stephen Thompson. He worked extensively on this design approval, and they had a contract with Mr. John Miller to that effect. He is a commercial property owner in Sedona since 1998; he pays taxes here, and the letter of concern was written by him, and that is true, not Stephen Thompson. He has no ongoing relationship with John Miller and Steve does.

Chair Losoff noted that it is over three minutes, and Mr. Jensvold indicated that he would just summarize that his main goal in bringing this up is for the greater good of Sedona. He doesn't want to obstruct Whole Foods in having a nice functioning project, but the soul of Old Marketplace is at risk and there should be a very good reason to tear down the highest element and most iconic thing in West Sedona, as far as he can tell, along 89A.

Chair Losoff asked staff if this building is historic, and Cari indicated no, and the Chair confirmed there is no other designation. The Chair then asked staff to read into the record Stephen Thompson's letter and Cari clarified that was an email staff received Thursday night.

Audree Juhlin read the following email:

"Good Afternoon Cari. I am writing you about a letter received yesterday from Jensvold Associates regarding the above referenced application. Please remove my name from this document and any public reference to my name regarding this project at the public hearing today. I am concerned that without prior briefing, specific Commissioners may mention my name as part of public record, which I do not want to happen. I appreciate your cooperation in this matter. . . Stephen Thompson Architect."

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

Commission's Summary Discussion:

Commissioner Klein indicated that with all due respect to Mr. Jensvold, he goes to Whole Foods every day, and when he walks in, he is not wowed by the arch. He actually likes this design better.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she particularly likes the use of the west-facing blank wall as a canvas for potentially some very good public art, and if the applicant will be relying on the kind of talent that was included in the packet, it could be a great contribution to the community. She is a little concerned, given the fact that the building is set back, it will suffer from not a lot of exposure, but what we have seen in the packet would make a great contribution to the community and could set a standard for other murals of high quality.

Commissioner Currivan wanted to repeat what he said at the last meeting about the question of tearing down the arch. He certainly doesn't want to substitute his personal preferences for the

preferences of the owner and the tenant, so if the owner and tenant have made a decision to change the architecture of the front, and if the architectural change complies with our Land Development Code and Design Review Manual, then he doesn't propose to substitute his own personal preference on that.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that as far as the arch, it was a good way to bring some organization when the building was remodeled back in the 90s, with that aligning up the big pylon that is in the middle of the parking lot, and then the main directory sign, but not a lot is visible from the highway, because of all the vegetation that has grown up around it, so really, the idea was great, but it really didn't get followed through upon, and it wasn't continued and enhanced by the landscaping. The two architectural features at the entrance to the real estate entrance to what would be the Whole Foods bar area are much, much more of a place-making and more of an organizational part of the building, so that really works, and he is neutral about the new addition, the new façade. It has a lot of depth; it is going to be in the sun and have nice shadows; the stonework is continuing, you've got timbers, so it is a good announcement to the entrance of a store. Where the arches are, there is not going to be an entrance at all; it is just going to be an indent in the building.

The Commissioner indicated that as far as the mural, he agrees with Vice Chair Levin in that these examples of the muralists are fantastic. El Mac is an unbelievable artist, but we can't guarantee that this is the work that will be there, and we shouldn't make a precedent to say that any kind of art can take the place of what the facades of buildings should be. He understands that this wall is grandfathered, but he doesn't like the precedent, so he would prefer to see the trellis option followed through. Interestingly, looking at the façade study of the trellis on the last slide, the way that is designed, there are actually two areas and they have two muralists proposed, so why couldn't they just do small murals and have the combination, but that probably is asking a bit much. Under the trellis, there are two Xs there and like two big areas that could be a protected place for the murals, but that might be too much to ask for, and he is not going to go there, but otherwise, he is in favor of the project.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that a touch of green will do in front of it, and Chair Losoff stated that he had looked at all of the comments and he appreciated the Staff Report outline on pages 5 and 6, and the various considerations that the Commission has to take into account, and for all purposes, the applicant has met all of the criteria, so in terms of some of the additional issues, such as setting a precedent, we have to be careful not to, but staff has the responsibility for approving a mural, and we take it in good faith that staff will ensure it is in good taste and not going to jeopardize any of the Commission's feelings. The Chair then asked if that could be a Condition of Approval, and Audree Juhlin asked what the condition would be. The Chair stated as a preference, and Audree stated that she didn't see why not. The Chair then indicated that is something the Commission might want to think about. The issue of the space between Whole Foods and the restaurant has always been an issue, so do we need to make that a Condition of Approval now about a Conditional Use Permit or is that understood? Cari explained that was made clear to the applicant in staff's initial comments and they acknowledged that, and this is clearly only for the façade changes, and everything else would fall under our standard process.

The Chair Losoff then indicated that he would entertain a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Klein moved to approve the proposed development review for Whole Foods Façade Remodel as set forth in case number PZ15-00009 (DEV) based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Development Review findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the staff report. Vice Chair Levin seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Commissioner Cohen was excused.

6. Discussion/possible direction regarding the Western Gateway Community Focus Area Plan (CFA's #1 and #2)

The Chair mentioned that the Commission has had a few meetings on this item already, and tonight's purpose is to give staff feedback as to what staff thinks the Commission said, and following this, they will provide more specific direction.

Audree Juhlin indicated that she would like to start the discussion with a question that staff had at the end of the last discussion in September, and that was a question that Justin Clifton posed that asked which of the two options the Commission would prefer, and the consensus was why can't we have both. She would like to ask the question in a little different way, as it is important as staff begins to build a base for the draft plan. If we were going to start from the base of a more residential focus, would you prefer that or starting from a base with more of a tourist/visitor-based focus? Which one would you prefer, knowing that it is going to incorporate residential, commercial and visitor uses? Which base would you want staff to start from or is it still that you want them equally incorporated?

Commission's Comments:

Commissioner Mayer indicated that you can't really divide the tourist and residential, but you have to start somewhere and he would say possibly the residential might be an easier task, because the commercial has a lot of stuff involved legally, etc., so he would prefer to tackle the residential first.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that if he had to choose, and he knows development always focuses on the tourist base around here, but we should focus on residential and make sure that we have places for people to live in mixed-use areas.

Commissioner Currivan indicated that he has expressed a preference in the past for the public square concept, which combines a gathering place for people, so that would be something that would work well with a residential area around it. It would also allow for the possibility of residences above the businesses there on the square, and he has mentioned that would be a good opportunity to provide perhaps affordable housing for people who work in Sedona, so he is not sure which side of the fence that puts him on, but that is his preference.

Vice Chair Levin stated that we were talking about both the Cultural Park area and health services - the two CFAs and if the emphasis would be on residential first complemented by other uses or if it would be on commercial complemented by other mixed uses, and she really has a difficult time trying to answer that question, because she clearly sees the health services as being directed toward one or two uses, and they would be predominantly residential -- assisted living, aging-in-place -- complementary to the medical land uses that exist in that area. Unless they were to have a few more neighborhood services or mixed uses there, that is entirely different than how she would view the Cultural Park area, and frankly, she thinks she would end up in the same place if she said start with residential and complement it with mixed use, as she would perhaps starting with lodging and a conference center and the public amenities that go with that, that might complement the resident experience in that area.

Commissioner Klein indicated that to some extent he agrees with what Vice Chair Levin said; the area around the medical center is more amenable to the residential part, but in looking at the land use survey we all filled out that was summarized at one of the last meetings, multi-family housing got one vote in the top five and two in the bottom five. Workforce housing got zero in the top five and two in the bottom five. When you asked the question and used "residential", if you were strictly talking about housing, then he agrees with Vice Chair Levin and views the Cultural Park area differently; he doesn't know that he would choose residential for the Cultural Park area. Audree Juhlin clarified that by "residential", she didn't mean housing specifically, she meant the residential focus, so you have mixed uses that are more residentially focused, which could include a square with the housing on top of commercial, but it has more of a residential focus than a visitor-based focus.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she would then answer that differently, and Chair Losoff noted what the Commission is being asked to comment on can't be written in stone, because it is somewhat nebulous and we are coming from different perspectives. Personally, he would like to see more orientation towards tourism, because we have other CFAs, including Soldiers Pass, where we talked about being more apt to be better locations for a residential focus versus the Western Gateway. The Western Gateway should be broad-based with meeting places, resorts, a conference center, etc., and more tourism as opposed to residential. In any case, we have back and forth on both issues; once it is more defined, staff will get a better read from the Commission.

Vice Chair Levin commented that the nuance was changed and she didn't understand it that way when it was posed originally. She would look at that differently; she thinks what is being asked is if there is an ideal proportionality between residential and commercial where both thrive and one doesn't dominate the other, and she doesn't have the answer to that, but we have some CFAs, like the one at Dry Creek, that mixes a lot of things really well, including public uses like the library, pizza place, lodging and an art gallery, and that seems to thrive very nicely. Staff provided data on the mix of housing to hotel units in the CFAs and those percentages were pretty interesting. They dominate in some CFAs with lodging as a greater percentage of the whole, but going back to these two CFAs, if an applicant can come up with a proportionality that enables both to thrive, the resident experience, whether multi-family or single-family but higher density, and other commercially-viable uses that make that comfortable mix in plazas and public spaces desirable, as well as whatever might be construed as neighborhood services, whether it is a convenience market or a café, etc.

Chair Losoff indicated that he goes back to the concept of a western gateway -- "gateway" being a very important word. A gateway is something that says wow coming into town, and he is not sure a residential component should be the main focus. Again, we are not giving staff anything in stone; we are just giving off the top comments.

Mike Raber indicated that in the meeting last week, the Commission engaged in a dialogue regarding land use priorities for the Western Gateway, and as a follow-up staff prepared a summary of what was heard; that is in the packet, and you can test that with how you were just answering. Building on that, staff also prepared a possible Vision Statement and some components of that vision that provide more detailed direction, and those are also in the packet. The idea is that it gives staff something to start building goals and strategies from as we start the new draft plan. We also provided some requested statistical information for future use; it may be helpful when the Commission begins reviewing the new draft, and tonight, we wanted to verify that we are on the right track and that our general vision and components are looking like we are moving down the right road, so we can consider that as a starting point. Staff will continue to refine it as we redraft the plan, so it is not the intent to do any wordsmithing tonight; it is our intent to see if that is the general direction in which the Commission wants us to move.

Mike indicated that staff's next step is to prepare the new draft and that will include the goals and strategies based on the general direction. Chair Losoff stated that the attachments at the end were very good and it gives a good picture statistically of where we are with some of those, so he appreciated having those.

Mike then went through the following points in the summary of what was said in the last discussion:

- There was a real need for public space and public access, but a mix of uses is important for that space to thrive, so the first bullet point addresses that.
- A mix of housing, conference or meeting space, lodging and commercial is appropriate to attract and encourage resident and visitor interaction.
- Even though the survey may not have reflected it, in the meeting, we heard that workforce housing should be an integral part of the mixed-use fabric, and that seemed to come out a lot more prominently in the meeting.
- More conference and lodging choices may provide some relief to congestion elsewhere, and that was a comment that seemed to have some positive nods, and if lodging is included, it

should not be isolated; it should be integral to the community and linked to the mixed-use environment, and also connected to streets and walkways and trails.

- The Western Gateway should make a statement for those coming into the community on the highway, and we have heard that many times.
- The opportunity for recreation should be emphasized, and
- The Western Gateway must be a walkable environment.

Mike explained that those were the highlights that staff got from the meeting last time, and we can move on and look at how those were viewed in terms of the vision. Chair Losoff asked the Commissioners if there were any changes.

Commissioner Klein indicated that in the Community Plan for the Cultural Park area, the first thing says to provide a center for education, research, arts and events, and in looking at the summary, it wasn't on our land use survey either, but he doesn't see anything mentioned about the arts. The Commissioner then referenced the land use survey and asked if it is correct that it was mainly for the Cultural Park area. Mike Raber indicated yes, because staff felt that there was some consensus with some of the other areas in the CFA -- one being the focus on health and wellness, and medical facilities and assisted living. We heard a lot of focus and support for that, so that was one reason it wasn't on the survey. It was to try to get at what the Commission felt were important components of other aspects of the undeveloped area. The mixed-use component in particular was one staff wanted to get a better feel for. In the original draft plan, mixed use was pretty much all that was said in that area and we didn't get into the specifics.

Chair Losoff asked Commissioner Klein how that affects Attachment 1, and Commissioner Klein explained that he was just pointing out that the Community Plan calls for the arts to be in this area and it was not mentioned. One other thing is not mentioned in any of this, but his wife has a friend that works as a concierge at the Summit Timeshares and his wife talked to that lady today, and she said that she is constantly getting comments from guests indicating that they wish there was a shuttle service that they could take to get them to various points around town. It is not mentioned in any of this, but obviously it is something that the tourists would like to see.

Chair Losoff noted that the Commission is still looking at the big picture tonight, but these are some of the issues that we want to incorporate down the road. Mike Raber pointed out that there are a couple of differences between what you see from the conversation last week and what the vision and vision components might have, because we didn't focus on some of those other things last week; it is not that they were not important.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she didn't recall agreeing to bullet #4 and she is not sure that it really adds anything to the discussion if we are talking about dispersing traffic. Mike Raber explained that it was one comment and he thought he saw heads nodding on that. The Vice Chair indicated that for herself, she would see excluding that. She then asked if we want to be that general on bullet #6 about making a statement or would we want to suggest the ways in which that would be carried out. Mike Raber indicated that is something that staff would like to come back to the Commission with in the new draft, because one of the ideas is that staff would come back with the new draft and maybe look at different areas of the CFA in different ways, in terms of performance criteria and some things that might be design-oriented, etc.

Chair Losoff indicated that one of the problems with the process is that staff is getting individual comments, and he thinks there was a strong consensus for that statement. Vice Chair Levin explained that she is not disputing that, and the Chair continued to say that when discussing the Marriott project, it was loud and clear, and again when we started talking about this, so we have to take into account all of us, and so process-wise, deal with it.

Mike Raber stated that he is hearing this is important, but is there another level of detail to it, and he would suggest that would be brought back. Audree Juhlin then clarified that this is really the skeleton that we are working from, and then we will build around this the meat on the skeleton

based on what staff hears from the Commission; this is just the skeleton. Vice Chair Levin noted that in the past, we typically talked about development-free ridgelines and keeping development off of elevated areas of the property that fronts 89A, but that would be just one of a handful that might come forward.

The Vice Chair then indicated that since we are talking about two CFAs, and maybe we didn't emphasize this in our last meeting for land use priorities, but she would suggest adding aging-in-place and assisted living meets a stated community need and is complementary to the area's existing medical facilities. Chair Losoff asked if there were any disagreements with that and there was no response; he then stated that the Commissioners were all in agreement.

Vice Chair Levin then reiterated Commissioner Klein's comment about where are the arts. Mike Raber suggested that when the Commission sees the vision and vision components, there is a little more; this summary was geared toward the Commission's discussion. Chair Losoff then referenced Audree's word "skeleton" and stated that this is really conceptual, so whatever the Commission comes up with is very broad-based. The Vice Chair noted that this is a great starting point, and she really liked that staff put together what the Commission was trying to say in a cogent way and made bullet points out of the majority of the land uses that were discussed; it is a great work. Mike Raber stated thank you and pointed out that all of the staff was involved; it was really great and we got some great stuff. Everybody was paying attention and had some good insights.

Chair Losoff indicated that it is great that everything we talked about was consolidated into just a few bullet points; that is a record for staff. He then noted that when staff discusses Attachment 2, again it is conceptual.

Commissioner Currivan stated that he agreed with Commissioner Klein about the arts; he also would like to see that mentioned. He takes it that what staff wrote down from the last meeting was not intended to supersede or eliminate what was in the land use survey the Commissioners filled out, and there were three top items in the land use survey. One was education, and he didn't see that mentioned. We didn't really discuss it at the last meeting, but he doesn't think people meant to torpedo it, so it should still be there. Also, there is a little bit of tension between conference and lodging concepts, because if you are thinking of hotels, that was at the very bottom of the list as far as the land use survey. It had zero in the top five and four in the bottom five, so it was really at the bottom; however, conference was pretty high. It had four in the top five, so people were apparently in favor of conference centers, but not in favor of hotels. The problem is that you can't really have a successful conference center if you don't have lodging for people, because they don't want to have to take shuttles and travel to get to their conference, so you have covered that in the fifth bullet point, where it says if included, lodging uses should not be isolated, and that is probably what you were getting at. Mike Raber explained that there was a comment from a Commissioner about that, and it was not just that, but also that it is walled off from the community and not integrated, and that was one of the other points, so it was probably both of those things.

Commissioner Brandt added kudos to the staff for bringing together all of these ideas; the skeleton has good bones. The skeleton needs more bones, but the skeleton has good bones. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he sees wellness also related to lodging. People who come here for wellness are not going to just spend one day; they spend four days at a minimum. He was a little involved in the wellness spa business in Europe, and the average stay is about four days, so having housing or lodging next to it or within the whole complex of conference, wellness and lodging would make sense.

Audree Juhlin pointed out that the Vision Statement is a beginning point to get us started. The Chair commented that he doesn't want to take away from what staff is doing, but he thinks it is a little too early to come up with a good Vision Statement, but this is a start and that is okay.

Mike Raber indicated that as staff starts refining it and getting into the new draft, this will be refined as well. He then read the Vision Statement as follows:

"The Western Gateway will be a distinct, active, walkable and vibrant neighborhood where the diversity of land uses attracts both locals and visitors while promoting health and wellness, providing a diversity of housing choices, maintaining sensitivity to the natural environment and creating a sense of arrival to the area."

Mike noted that once again, that was the weighing-in of all of our staff and everything the Commission discussed last week. The Chair expressed some concern about the word "neighborhood"; this is such a big area and a neighborhood is smaller, and he leans more towards more commercial and conference center-type uses than residential, but that is just him.

Commissioner Brandt agreed that it could just be neighborhoods. We are going to end up with a potential for multiple neighborhoods that interact, but it is not just one. Commissioner Currivan added that this may be a result of the decision to combine the two CFAs into one project, so where necessary, we may need to draw the distinction between the Cultural Park area and the medical area. Chair Losoff suggested possibly using the word "area" as opposed to "neighborhood" as a more general broad-based term, and Commissioner Klein indicated agreement with Commissioner Currivan, in that there is a difference between what should be in the Cultural Park area and what should be in the medical area.

Regarding possible vision components, Mike Raber stated that the whole idea is to round out this vision so we can then refine it into some goals and strategies, so that is the next step, and we will use this as part of that framework. Mike then went through the vision components as follows:

- The first three are really centered on public spaces and activity with a mix of uses needed for that place to be active.
- In the next series, we talk about how wellness and entertainment can be attractions to living and visiting. Wellness can and should include outdoor recreation activities; it is not just a static type of thing or a facility. It also involves those other opportunities.
- The idea that was kind of developed through staff's discussion was that there may be a niche for some small residential units for people that consider where they are living to be very outdoor-focused, and those people who may have that interest.
- There is a complementary link between a wide variety of housing choices and commercial and lodging, and education and healthcare. Those things all have kind of a relationship together.
- Lodging with flexible meeting space can provide for a variety of private and public events.
- Sense of arrival is very important, and
- Reducing the need for personal vehicular trips through mixed-use and a walkable environment is also important.

Mike Raber then commented that these were boiled down into what staff thought were pretty big points. It is not a huge list, but a pretty good starting framework, and we know that there are some other elements that need to be added, but from the Commission's comments and the vision, this series of components evolved.

Commissioner Mayer referenced the land use by average acreage and indicated that he doesn't agree with the Chair about just commercial development. He would like to see a vibrant village-type development. When he looks at the space needed for a hotel, shopping, lodging/conference 11.70 acres, specialty retail one acre, and quality restaurant .15 acres, he comes up with residential and multi-family and everything else at about 21 acres out of 41 acres, so that is about half. There is a lot of space that can be used for something that complements all of those items that we have discussed a few times, and he sees like a western gateway, but not only a gateway, a community center with a place to meet, and we discussed it in the Community Plan Update Committee, and all of those things can be integrated very easily. It just has to be a very complementary development - - one thing leads to another and they keep feeding each other; that is what he sees in the big picture.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that regarding the vision components, it all seems to make sense. We already talked about having it considered to be multiple neighborhoods, not just one neighborhood. It is just too big of a place to be considered one walking neighborhood with the timeshares kind of splitting it up. The high school potentially could be considered in there as a neighborhood, and in item 4, he is not sure what we are trying to do with that vision. He remembers seeing B. B. King play at the Cultural Park, and now we are talking about just going out to dinner as good entertainment, so he is sorry, but we need to shoot for the stars and end up with the moon. He also sees that we need more vision components that integrate the things that are already there like the school and the college and how those can enhance this neighborhood and actually be a pivot for the neighborhood, how things can revolve around that and the medical center.

Commissioner Currivan referenced bullet point 4, which is the wellness and entertainment section, and indicated that he is not sure that those two concepts really go neatly into one bullet point. You might consider separating those and have one dealing with the wellness idea and explaining that it is not simply a hospital or emergency room; it has other components to it, and the entertainment part of it also would be a separate bullet point. It says it might be dinner and an outdoor patio before going to a nearby movie theater, and that sounds nice, but did you mean to imply that a new movie theater might be a part of this? Mike indicated yes, that is the implication rather than making another trip somewhere else.

The Commissioner then referenced the second to the last bullet regarding the sense of arrival and stated that is very important. We do want something so that when people drive in from the west and get to that intersection, they feel that sense of arrival in Sedona. We don't want to try to pin you down at this point as to what that would be, but that is something we should work toward.

Vice Chair Levin referenced bullet 4 and suggested either folding into this one or creating a separate one, but she would like to see an expression of interest for music, art and cultural experiences in that area.

Commissioner Klein indicated that Commissioner Currivan and Vice Chair Levin stated what his thoughts were in that wellness and entertainment are different, and music and art should be incorporated into this, and the sense of arrival is very important for the Western Gateway.

Chair Losoff indicated that bullet points 1, 2 and 4 could easily be one for entertainment to encompass those comments. The first and second almost sound together, and now we are talking about splitting out the other one in number 4. This is a good first step; he is still thinking of the word "gateway" and the Community Plan, and to him the Community Plan section on this CFA talks about the vision, and here we are just doing the things that we have already said, and it is almost duplicating what we have in the Community Plan. It is again like the process, we had our survey and now we are doing other things, and you are almost getting conflicting comments from the Commission, so to stay on course, we need to have one consensus as to where we are going, and he would follow the Community Plan. That section on the CFA clearly states what we want out of that CFA in very broad terms, and then he would fit it back into the visual things. Commenting on Attachment 2, it is a good start, but he is not sure it is bold enough. This is the gateway and we need to make it something that really stands out in what goes in it, what comes out of it and how they use it. We have heard a lot about walkability, community spaces, but how do we make this something special in this area.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she went through the same exercise on the land use by average acreage, and it was good to have that, because it enabled her to envision 40 acres is what the high school is and that is what we are talking about in the Cultural Park area, and she went through the same list and added a few that might be appropriate uses in that area and she came up with 21 acres and assumed the rest would be open space and infrastructure, but there were two uses that she didn't understand, and the difference in acreage devoted to each of these perhaps related issues is wide. The Vice Chair then asked what continuing care is as opposed to assisted living,

and Mike Raber stated that he is not really sure. The Vice Chair pointed out that one suggests that you need 14 acres for continuing care and 2.21 acres for assisted living. Mike Raber indicated that he is thinking that assisted living is not like in a nursing-type facility while the other would be, and that may be why there is a bigger footprint.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment portion of the hearing at this time.

Michael Mongini, representative for Mike Tennyson and SATHCUPA, owners of the old Cultural Park property: Mr. Mongini indicated that on the education component, Mike Tennyson pushed forward to resolve some of the college's issues, so that component of education at the Cultural Park is there and hopefully intends to stay there and improve. He was somewhat confused by the neighborhood aspect and the definition of what a neighborhood is. All of us have a different idea of what a neighborhood is, and that wording maybe over-wordsmithed something, but he does know one thing that seems to be important and it has to do with dealing with the marketing as a landowner of a component of that Cultural Park, and that would be the conference and lodging facilities. When we talk about a resort, it is not a gated resort; that is not the theme that is out there that John and Mike have worked on. The theme is more of an open area that is part of an open space; we have listened to the years of discussion involving the Community Plan, and that is the target. They don't want to withdraw anything that was obtained in the Major Amendment in 2007, because that lodging component is significant to the vitality of that area. One of the items, and not to create confusion, is you have a blue line designation in the city of where your lodging is going to be and that blue line needs to move into that Cultural Park area, and not just randomly be put down the section line where it is now, so that is one important item. The trailhead issues coming across there and the proposals that they see with all of these trails crossing and into the National Forest in a different direction; they had a discussion about a 1 1/2 years ago with the Forest Service about concentrating the trailhead to the eastern end near the timeshares, and that would be the trailhead going into the forest. The rest would be reclaimed versus having that big parking area that spills into the forest now, and that is one item that they would like to get everyone on the same page. The other thing is they would like to move this matter forward, and he appreciates the work and particularly these bullet points that staff has put together to add some clarity to all of the discussion, but Mike Tennyson and SATHCUPA have participated in this at the request of the city, so the proposal submitted was based upon what they have seen that the overall Community Plan wanted in the area, so that is the idea they tried to put together. They are not trying to say it is only going to be one or the other. If there is one big user that wants to come in and use the site, they don't want to exclude that use, because that use may be significant.

Mike Bower, representing SATHCUPA and Mike Tennyson, Sedona: Mr. Bower indicated that he would keep going where Mr. Mongini left off. The direction that is coming is good, and it sets up everything that we've been thinking and dreaming about ourselves, in terms of a mixed-use, walkable village and kind of a deconstructed hotel or resort, where it's actually part of the village. The restaurants, the beauty parlor wouldn't be separated; they would just be mixed into the village, but the need that the developer really has could be summarized by going to an extreme, so instead of a very diverse mixed-use village, what if a wellness provider like an Andrew Weil, who is a very famous doctor and runs wellness clinics throughout the country, wanted to acquire the entire 40+ acres and developed a flagship Sedona Andrew Weil Wellness Center? Would that be counter to the vision? When you think about that, that is where Mr. Mongini was going. We're hoping that in addition to these bullet points, there could be some kind of an over-arching vision awareness that encourages the ability for any good thing to happen here. We believe the CFA process is not trying to preclude bad things from happening through prescriptive rules, but it is trying to inspire good things to happen for Sedona. When you think about that extreme example as you work back toward the most fine green village environment, there are probably many answers to the equation that still serve our town, so it complicates the task at hand, but if there is some way of precluding this from becoming a very point to it, that doesn't work document, and becoming more of one where people could go wow, I see the vision, I see this economic development opportunity; it does meet the vision, it is completely different than what I thought initially, but there is still something to it, that would be the added challenge.

Jennifer Wesselhoff, President and CEO of the Chamber of Commerce and Tourism Bureau:

Ms. Wesselhoff indicated that the completion of this Western Gateway CFA is economic development and it is a top priority. They believe that the Western Gateway area has a tremendous economic and cultural value for our city, and in this case, we have a developer who is itching to go and get ready with a multi-faceted project that we believe is in line with our Product Development Committee's beliefs and vision and in line with the vision of the community, and it has a potential to be a model for our community. Depending on the outcome, the CFA process can place the city at the table with an active planner and not just a reactor as we have been so many times to a developer in planning. Our Tourism Product Development Committee is a new initiative that our Chamber of Commerce has taken on about 18 months ago, and we've gotten together a committee of experts in Sedona in the industry to talk to each other and figure out what we want in Sedona, in terms of future tourism product and future quality of live amenities for our residents, and she wanted to share some of the top priorities that their committee has come up with. Those strategic priorities include the following:

- How can we help solve traffic congestion?
- How can we creatively disperse visitor flows throughout the community?
- How do we build demand in off-peak season?

Ms. Wesselhoff stated that she would like to congratulate the staff for taking a huge vision and trying to come up with some good bullet points for future direction. Some of the things we really need to think about is how we can diversify our tourism industry, but also use it as a foundation for diversification, and a lot of the things we are talking about, in terms of wellness center, are part of that. Meeting space is part of that, but she would like to encourage you to remove the words "convention center" or "conference center" from your vocabulary, because that is not what we want. She doesn't think we want a conference center; she thinks we want meeting space, ballroom space that can compete with the likes of Enchantment and the Hilton, and that is actually just meeting space/ballroom space within a lodging component. If you want to do something like that, you need to have a hotel that has at least 200 rooms that can accommodate that meeting space to make us compete. That will help bring business at times when we need it, which is mid-week business. Her question to the Commission is when you are looking at balancing visitor needs and residential needs and all of the CFAs across the community, where else if not at this CFA can we have enough space to actually diversify that meeting space or that tourism product in a significant way? It is not going to happen on Schnebly Hill Road, Biddle's property or Soldiers Pass, and where else is it going to happen if not at this CFA? They see a tremendous opportunity here to really balance the needs and diversify the tourism industry, and they believe that this is the CFA that most directly speaks to that need.

Dick Dahl, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Dahl indicated that a point to be made here is tomorrow night there is another meeting taking place in this facility in reference to the future of the Yavapai College facility here in Sedona, and his concern is that he hopes this direction is not foreclosing on the opportunity for expanded facilities in conjunction with the college. He thinks that is a very distinct possibility; the college is now embarking on a strategic plan for the Sedona Center, as they are calling it, and will be looking at a number of different possibilities that may require additional space or additional land to develop for that purpose.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period at this time.

Commission's Comments:

Commissioner Brandt indicated that, in general, education should be a big part of this and not just accepting what is there, but to encourage additional educational uses. Chair Losoff added that on the educational factor, we have discussed that, at this point, we are focused on Yavapai College, but we should talk about education; it could be Yavapai College or somebody else. It doesn't have to be what it is today; we are talking 20 years from now. Education is a strong component.

Commissioner Klein referenced Mr. Mongini's comment that he would like to see the trailheads concentrated on the east end, and then he may have made a statement about reclaiming the rest,

so Commissioner Klein wondered what that meant. Mr. Mongini explained that if you look at an aerial, you will see the north end of the Cultural Park land where the old compactor site was, and it seems that people park their horse trailers and everything else in that area, and it has kind of spilled into the forest in probably a 10-acre area; it is pretty big.

Mike Raber then stated that he thinks staff has at least a partial answer for Vice Chair Levin's question about the difference between those two uses. Assistant Planner Adam Langford can shed some light on that. Adam then stated that the difference between assisted living facilities and the continuing care is that continuing care just has a lot more to it. It encompasses what would be assisted living with full-time nursing care as well as independent living, so that is why it requires more space.

Chair Losoff indicated that he liked what the Chamber of Commerce had to say, and as the Commission goes forward, we have to be careful in how we develop this. He still thinks we are in the infant stage here, but what are some of the other goals and priorities being discussed by the Chamber, city or whatever, so we come up with a final version encompassing everybody's goals the best we can. We can't appease everybody; there is no way we can appease everybody, but we have to take into account the big picture and not look just in today's world and not look at it in terms of walkability, bike riding and those things we hear all the time. What is the big picture and what do we want to accomplish as a city? Hopefully as we go forward, we think of those big things and put them in perspective as we finalize it. The Chair then asked what the next step is.

Mike Raber indicated that he is getting the sense that we are on the right track in general, and we need to add a lot of detail to this, and that will be staff's job, and then we will come back to the Commission with a new draft plan, and that would be the next step for the Commission. The Chair commented that we have a tendency to have a lot of discussions, and staff feeds back what you think the Commission said, but he thinks we are done feeding back; he would like to see something more specific like a conceptual drawing with various components in it. We've seen a drawing already from the Cultural Park and CFA (audio unclear). He would like to see what staff is thinking about, so the Commission could react to it, but he thinks we are done giving feedback to each other. The consensus of the Commission was in agreement.

Chair Losoff then asked if staff has had conversations with the Chamber on some of these plans, and Mike Raber stated that the Chamber has been active in attending past meetings on the draft, and other workshops leading up to that, and we have discussed some of the statistical information with them too. The Chair then asked about the Forest Service, and Mike indicated that the Forest Service has been very active as well. The Chair commented that the hospital has a feasibility study going, and Mike Raber stated yes. The Chair asked if staff has participated in that, and Mike explained that part of their feasibility study is to determine if they want to move forward with anything, and that is really not in the purview of the Commission. They certainly want to be aware of this planning effort and how that fits with whatever their future plans may be, so there is definitely an interest in being involved in that. The Chair asked if staff is being proactive, and Mike commented that he doesn't know how proactive the Chair would like staff to be. The Chair then stated that it is a major component in the CFA; he knows it is their property, but it would be nice if we compared notes. Mike Raber stated that staff has done that.

7. Discussion regarding the future update of the Sedona Land Development Code.

Warren Campbell explained that this item is on the agenda in case we have a topic to discuss. At the work session last week, we heard comments about the wall plane, alternate standards and murals, so we have those noted.

The Chair asked when the first discussion on the Land Development Code would be, and Audree Juhlin indicated that the earliest might be December and that would be the Sign Code amendments and the Accessory Dwelling Unit amendments.

- 8. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**
- a. **Thursday, October 29, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - b. **Tuesday, November 3, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - c. **Thursday, November 12, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - d. **Tuesday, November 17, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Chair Losoff asked Commissioner Brandt if he wanted an agenda item on what he mentioned earlier, and the Commissioner stated that it was just an observation that perhaps the city could talk to the landowner about screening that parking that ended up being de facto; it wasn't shown on the plan as a parking area, and they did major work to screen all of the rest of the parking, but there are 10-12 cars that are full on, and then there is more parking to the west of that where the utility yard is, and there was parking shown there on the plan, but it seemed like that was a small area behind the building, and the focus was to the front of the building, but now it is actually more visible than any other part of the project. Chair Losoff asked if it should be an agenda item or if staff can follow-up with the applicant, and Audree Juhlin stated that she could follow-up with the applicant. Commissioner Brandt added that otherwise, it is fantastic. All of the work they did there turned out great.

Audree indicated that October 29th is a work session for the Thai Spices application and a presentation on the Brewer Road Master Plan. November 3rd is a public hearing on Thai Spices and two Conditional Use Permits for extensions of the farmers markets at Wells Fargo and Tlaquepaque. November 12th is a work session that will be canceled, since the 11th is Veterans' Day and City Council is moving their work session from the 11th to the 12th, and traditionally, we do not have conflicting meetings. November 17th would be a public hearing and, at this time, we have no items for that meeting; however, that meeting date is not canceled yet.

9. 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.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 7:05 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 October 20, 2015.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date