

**Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, November 17, 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 Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt, Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer.

Staff Present: Roxanne Holland, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Cari Meyer, Ryan Mortillaro, Donna Puckett and Ron Ramsey

Councilor(s) Present: Councilor Jessica Williamson

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

In response to his email to the Commission, Warren Campbell asked Chair Losoff and Commissioner Mayer if they had made a decision as to if they wanted an iPad issued to them. Chair Losoff stated sure, and Commissioner Mayer indicated that he hadn't received a recent email, but he is for it, yes. Warren then indicated that he would be contacting them about the issuance and training on the device.

Cari Meyer announced that the city recently launched its new website, so saved links may need to be updated. We are experiencing some links that aren't working, so if you run into something, let staff know.

4. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. October 6, 2015 (R) | d. October 29, 2015 (WS) |
| b. October 15, 2015 (WS) | e. November 3 2015 (R) |
| c. October 20, 2015 (R) | |

The Chair indicated he would address approval of the minutes in separate motions, since some Commissioners weren't present periodically and, if they weren't present, they can't vote.

MOTION: Chair Losoff moved for approval of October 6, 2015. Vice Chair Levin seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Barcus abstained.

The Chair indicated he would entertain a motion for approval of October 15, 2015.

MOTION: Commissioner Cohen so moved. Commissioner Klein seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Barcus abstained.

The Chair indicated he would entertain a motion for approval of October 20, 2015.

MOTION: Vice Chair Levin so moved. Commissioner Klein seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for, zero (0) opposed and two (2) abstentions. Commissioners Barcus and Cohen abstained.

The Chair indicated he would entertain a motion for approval of October 29, 2015.

MOTION: Commissioner Cohen so moved. Vice Chair Levin seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried four (4) for, zero (0) opposed and three (3) abstentions. Commissioners Barcus, Klein and Mayer abstained.

The Chair indicated he would entertain a motion for approval of November 3, 2015.

MOTION: Commissioner Klein so moved. Commissioner Brandt seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. Commissioner Mayer abstained.

5. **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.

6. **DISCUSSION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:**

- a. **Discussion regarding a request for Development Review approval to remodel the exterior façade of an existing hotel at 2545 W State Route 89A (Super 8 Hotel). The property is zoned C-2 (General Commercial). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the southwest corner of W State Route 89A and Stutz Bearcat Drive. The lot is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 408-24-018. Applicant/Owner: Railroad Inn, LLC Project Contact: Ned Sawyer, Architect Case Number: PZ15-00013 (DEV)**

Chair Losoff asked the applicant to join staff at the table and introduce himself. He then explained the purpose of the work session.

Edward "Ned" Sawyer, Architect introduced himself and asked to be called Ned.

Presentation: Cari Meyer referenced the memo, staff's comments and the applicant's material that was provided to the Commission and indicated that this request is not currently scheduled for a public hearing. The applicant has received staff's comments, but has not responded yet. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that staff is on the right track and did not miss anything, and to determine what the Commission would be looking for when it comes back for a decision.

Cari referenced an Aerial Map and Vicinity Map to identify the location of the site and the surrounding area, and she indicated that there were a number of items in the packet that the applicant submitted, including the plan elevations, color materials board, plus staff's comments. As an overview of the site plan, Cari explained that they are proposing to add balconies to the front and rear of the building, change the color of the building, and try to add some more visual interest to the building. The curb along the back is rather close to the building and, with the addition of the patios, that aisle is becoming narrower, so they are reconfiguring the parking in the back and adding some parking in a different area. The site was built in the 1980s, so there are some non-conforming issues with it, which somewhat limits the extent to which they can remodel without bringing the site into full conformance. The building is a flat surface where they would bring in the balconies to create some more visual massing to the building, without having to do a major structural change.

Commission's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Klein referenced the Land Development Code and stated that if the cost of the project is 25% or less than the value of the building, they don't need to have full conformance of the existing portion of the building, but if the cost of the improvement is more than 25% of the value of the building, it would require full compliance. The Commissioner then asked if the applicant has come up with any numbers as to what the cost of the improvement would be and what the value of the building is.

Architect Ned Sawyer explained that they have some preliminary costs for the addition of the balconies, revising the parking area and repainting the building. He then asked to give an overview of why this is happening, and the Chair stated that the Commission will want to come back to this; he knows that the need for an assessment is a major issue that was in the Staff Report as well, but the feedback could be given first.

Architect Ned Sawyer stated that the reason this is happening is that the franchise for the Super 8 is coming up for renewal, and he was employed to try to upgrade the hotel, so they could consider becoming an independent and drop the Super 8 moniker. Since this was built when it was in the county, everything at that time was in conformance, so there is a little dichotomy there now, because they want to improve this and keep it economical without being a Super 8 or Motel 6, so that idea is good for Sedona and good for the hotel.

Mr. Sawyer indicated that he was going to digress a little, and it deals with the citizen participation report they will file. There were two people who contacted him; he doesn't know if staff received any, but one was the direct neighbor behind the hotel and the other was Tom Sawyer who just wanted to meet another Sawyer. Both of them were in favor of the upgrade of the hotel and he answered a number of questions for the neighbor. She also contacted the hotel assistant manager to ask some other questions, and she was satisfied that this would enhance her property, so she was in favor of it.

Mr. Sawyer then indicated that back to Commissioner Klein's question, there are certain things that they want to do and there are certain things that they don't feel they can do, and he is not sure if the cost of some of the things that they have to do, such as additional landscaping, more parking, etc., go into that 25%, and if that means that to come into conformance, they would have to chop off a floor of the hotel. They need to work with staff to come up with reasonable solutions that benefit both, and the cost in the preliminary bid from the contractor for just what they have drawn, with nothing additional, is \$592,000 plus a fire sprinkler system for another \$150,000 approximately, so those costs plus any other significant costs that might be incurred could make it infeasible for them to upgrade the hotel and just remain as a Super 8.

The Chair asked Commissioner Klein if that answered his question and the Commissioner stated not really. Chair Losoff then explained that the issue for the work session is that it is a legal non-conforming use and there are a lot of complexities to it, and if we do something here, it is going to push something there, but if they are under 25%, they are okay with the current code. If it exceeds 25%, then staff would have to work with the applicant to make those determinations before it comes back to the Commission.

Cari Meyer stated that staff needs to work with the applicant to determine what can and can't be done, but as stated in the memo, one of the reasons we are here is that as we work through this, if it were to come into full conformance, there are a number of things that would need to be done, but if that is not the direction and they are under the 25%, where should the priorities be? They are trying to stay under that 25% threshold, so not everything can be done. Cari then asked if the Commission has a priority, such as landscaping over something else, etc.; that is some of the feedback staff is looking for, because staff needs to work with them.

Architect Ned Sawyer stated that in the reconfiguration of the site plan, they are adding landscaping along the south property line. With the angled parking, they were able to create some triangular planters that meet Engineering's requirements. If you average the square footage, it virtually is a 4 ft. landscape buffer. Plus for the balconies, they are adding additional landscaping on the south side of the building, which enhances that, but if they were to get into too many places where they carve up the parking lot to create more islands for landscaping, they would reduce parking, which is what they don't want to do. They have been able to add parking, so the number of parking spaces equals what it is now, and they aren't adding any rooms or increasing the size of the restaurant, so the condition would be the same.

Commissioner Klein asked if the number of parking spaces provided now conforms to the current code, and Mr. Sawyer stated no, because it was done during the county's time. It was at that time, but they plan to do an analysis, and from that standpoint, they need to understand what square footage of the restaurant would be included -- dining, gross square footage, meeting room, stage, seating area, storage room. They have some numbers and it is easy to calculate the hotel, because it is based on the number of rooms plus 10 more, since they are over 60 rooms with 66 rooms, but he doesn't have an exact number of parking spaces needed. Cari added that one of staff's comments was that we need a parking analysis and will be working with the applicant on that.

Commissioner Klein asked the number of parking spaces provided now and, if they had to comply with the Land Development Code, the number they would need. Mr. Sawyer indicated that they added one space from what exists now, but he can't say how many more are needed until he knows how the square footage is calculated for the restaurant and meeting hall, but based on some preliminary things, some additional parking would be needed. They have maintained and added one parking space.

Chair Losoff then summarized that for the next meeting, Commissioner Klein wants more information on parking and the 25% rule, and Mr. Sawyer indicated that they would be happy to do that and expect to do that. Commissioner Klein then stated that staff raised a lot of points about how the current parking lot doesn't comply with the Land Development Code; the applicant wants to park at a 45° angle and staff recommended changing it to 30°. Mr. Sawyer noted that would eliminate a few more spots. The Commissioner then stated that at some point, it would be nice to know what they are going to do. The Chair then indicated that for future meetings, the Commission needs some of this information that is spelled out in the Staff Report and, before it goes too far, the Commission wants to see the responses to the questions.

Cari Meyer explained that this is really a preliminary work session; staff provided the comments to the applicant and just wanted to ensure that we weren't missing something glaring, but obviously, staff will continue to work with the applicant. The Commission will most likely have another work session, and then the public hearing. Chair Losoff agreed this is very preliminary; Engineering has several comments that the Commission will want to make sure are addressed, plus the Fire District, so there is a lot of deliberation that has to go into some of the basic comments before we get too far afield. He would see at least one more work session.

Commissioner Cohen asked the applicant to address the Fire District's comment that the garbage needs to be moved. Mr. Sawyer explained that he didn't take it that it needed to be moved; it could only be a certain distance, and he thought that was in conformance. The Chair indicated that it is #6 on page 6, and Cari explained that the current location of the dumpster is compliant. The Fire District includes that in case something happens in the site planning and they move it, so it is more of an informational item. The Commissioner then asked if the façade is just what we are talking about in terms of the balconies or if there is more to the façade change proposed. Mr. Sawyer explained that it is the addition of the balconies. The columns set back 4 ft. off of the wall, and the balcony cantilevers out, so there is a lot of undulation in and out, and their locations are dictated by the rooms themselves. With the shadow patterns

that will be created and the contrasting colors and re-coloration of the project, there will be a lot of fenestration. They don't propose to make it any busier than that. If they had the latitude and were designing the hotel, they might have shifted the walls of the hotel and had more, but this seemed to be an adequate and economical way to create some good fenestration.

Commissioner Cohen then asked if the lighting is in conformance with the dark sky, and Mr. Sawyer indicated that they haven't made that analysis, but they walked the site again this afternoon, and they are interested in studying that to see what they can do. Cari added that she did a night visit and there wasn't anything that stood out other than maybe the heights of the parking lot poles, but everything appeared to be fully shielded. Chair Losoff commented that in any case, they need to be in conformance., and Cari stated that would be something that staff would be looking at, especially upgrading existing fixtures.

Commissioner Cohen then indicated that there are two ingresses right now -- one on the street and another one off of the street with the light, and they are proposing one-way out. He then asked the applicant to explain what they are doing with the traffic. Mr. Sawyer identified the location of the light and the main entrance and main exit, and then explained that most of the traffic goes out there for the convenience of the light. He then pointed out the parking and indicated that they are going to sign the area one-way only and put in some directional arrows, so that won't be confusing. In order to create some interest and add some landscaping with the 90° parking along the building, they had to make it one way. If they were doing a new site plan and building a new hotel, they probably wouldn't have done that, but this was the best way to handle that problem and solve it with some signage and arrows.

Commissioner Cohen asked if they have any more specifics on the landscaping, and Mr. Sawyer explained that they will have more landscaping with the increased planter areas, and there is a beautiful area . . . Chair Losoff interjected that Cari had stated in the Staff Report that the Commission needs a landscaping plan, so we might want to wait and see that. The Commissioner then asked if it would include anything along S.R. 89A, and Mr. Sawyer indicated that they had done some, and they can explore enhancing that area. There is an interesting rock outcropping and they thought that could be a nice enhanced area that maybe the hotel users could use. He then pointed out a nice lawn area with mature landscaping and noted that there already is a lot of mature landscaping on site, but they do want to enhance it if they can. Cari then confirmed that the Commissioner was looking at streetscape enhancements, and Mr. Sawyer indicated that they would explore that.

Vice Chair Levin stated that the applicant mentioned that he didn't know whether or not they exceeded the 25% cap, over which they would have to put the whole project into full compliance, and that the city might require the third story to be removed. She then asked Cari to explain if there was any truth to that and if there had been any reason to believe that could ever happen. Mr. Sawyer explained that was the way they interpreted it, because of the height and story limitations. The Commissioner explained that she would like to get an opinion on whether that is an idle threat or not. Mr. Sawyer stated that it was not meant that way, but also in the 25%, are the things that might be required by the city added to the number he provided, because if the things the city requires adds to that, it could trigger that concern, which would obviously be the applicant's concern about doing the project.

Cari Meyer indicated that the code says the entire building or structure and associated parking, so staff would probably want Legal to weigh-in on what exactly is included. The Vice Chair then suggested getting that question answered, and stated that through no fault of the applicant, when that building was constructed, it looked more like a military barracks or penitentiary, and now there is an opportunity to make it more attractive to a potential buyer who would turn it into an independent. Mr. Sawyer stated no, and explained that the owner wouldn't sell it; it would become an independent not associated with Super 8, but they would still own it. They just want to possibly not continue to be a Super 8 and maybe become Andante Hotel of Sedona.

Vice Chair Levin then stated that there is an opportunity not only for the existing owner, but also an opportunity to make this more attractive for the community, and she is not convinced that putting on balconies is going to do that. She would really defer more to Commissioner Brandt who is an architect and might be able to suggest ways on both sides of the building, because on the neighborhood side, it is pretty unattractive. If there are other ways, and you feel you must stay within that 25% cap, that cannot achieve more attractiveness for the community, and you are concerned about going over that by anything the city might suggest, it might just not be enough. She then indicated that it appears to be all one parcel, but there must be an imaginary parcel line between the two uses, so is the parking for the restaurant dedicated only for the restaurant? Mr. Sawyer stated no and confirmed it is full-site parking. The Vice Chair then commented that both uses are taken into consideration there. She then asked if the Super 8 also owns the restaurant, and Mr. Sawyer stated yes and confirmed that both sites are under single ownership.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the parking for the restaurant's square footage is adequate and Cari stated that is something that staff will ensure we get. The Vice Chair then stated that by the estimates, the applicant is at \$750,000 to add fire safety, which it seems would be a number one priority, and \$500,000 to make it more attractive. Mr. Sawyer clarified that almost \$600,000 is the way it is designed, and then an additional \$150,000 for fire safety.

Chair Losoff pointed out that he is not sure that it is for the Commission to decide if it is an all or nothing. If they are under 25% and it meets the Development Review, that is part of the criteria, so he doesn't know if we want to tell the applicant that they have to do all or nothing at this point. The Vice Chair stated that she wasn't saying that; she was just questioning whether this ornamentation would be enough. The Chair then referenced the first three or four pages of the Staff Report and indicated that it spells out all of the things the Commission is asking about. A lot of detailed questions are being asked for a work session, but because a lot of things are not spelled out at this point, it is hard for the Commission to understand how far the Commission can go with this, and we are beating it to death on the 25%, parking and traffic, so it would be nice to have more detail the next time around.

Cari Meyer stated that the Commission will get that, and right now, maybe ignore the 25% and just look at if there is a priority list. Staff recognizes that doing everything would most likely exceed the 25%, so if there is something that would make a bigger impact like streetscape landscaping instead of something further into the site, staff is looking for the Commission's priorities. The Chair then suggested finishing, and then coming back to see if the Commission can summarize on that issue. He personally would have a hard time coming up with a priority at this point; he can't picture what it would look like. He sees a black and white sketch and the colors are not-conforming, so until he sees conforming colors and materials in an actual picture or model, he would be hard pressed to say that it looks better than today or what is more important -- landscaping or parking. Cari then asked if he wanted a color rendering and the Chair stated yes, particularly since the colors presented are not in compliance.

Mr. Sawyer explained that they hadn't revised the colors, but they would be happy to do it. They were happy to meet with Cari on stuff, and . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say he was talking about the next meeting, so we are more prepared to deal with some of these issues, and not just generalize. Mr. Sawyer continued to state that they were very close on one, but they couldn't tell if it really met the lighter color or not. They tried to pick up the whole range of colors in the environment.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that regarding the aesthetics, anything you could do to bring more life to the building would make it seem better, so bringing the balconies to all of the spaces would enhance it. The question would be if those roofs over the top balconies are under the height requirement and that would be an easy thing to measure. Obviously, if they were over the height limit, they couldn't be there, but there probably would be enough height for the balconies on the third floor. Anything you do to enhance this building would be a positive

thing. There is mature landscaping almost all the way around, but it would be important for the residential directly behind to have the screening, as mentioned in the Staff Report, but that can't be accomplished right now, because the parking goes off the property line. Mr. Sawyer explained it was constructed that way and actually they secured some easement on some of the neighboring property, and they would probably try to work with the other homeowner, but it has been there almost 25 years, so it is almost a condition now. He can't give a legal opinion on that, but when something is in that situation for a certain amount of time, it becomes that property.

Chair Losoff asked what is on the neighboring side, and Mr. Sawyer indicated there are some vacant lots and one residence. The Chair then asked if there is some buffer or trees on that side, and Mr. Sawyer stated that there is some mature landscaping on the south side of the property, and with the triangular planters, they will enhance that and create a landscape buffer there. The existing house has very mature trees, and you virtually can't see her house from the property, and she was the lady he spoke with and she was in favor of it.

Commissioner Brandt stated that if there is dense vegetation that might take the place of the Land Development Code requirement, but that needs to be explored. The Commissioner then asked if the Legal Department would like to respond regarding that 25 years of non-conformance, and Ron Ramsey explained that Legal couldn't make an opinion on that; it would be something that would be between the property owners and, at some point, either as he has indicated solved by a mutual easement done with some consideration or maybe even a court order to determine if there was an acquisition by prescriptive use. It is a very fact intensive sort of endeavor that the Superior Court would have to take on.

Commissioner Brandt then noted that the parking area does exist and it is just slightly over the property line, and Mr. Sawyer agreed. The Commissioner then commented that there are a lot of things to iron out in this situation, and considering the size of the property, the buildings there, and the number of rooms, he thinks there is a lot of headroom to come up to the 25%, so that doesn't seem to be a problem to him. He also doesn't think you would want to include the infrastructure improvement for fire safety; that is not something visual that is being improved, so that shouldn't really be part of the work. If we are moving parking to improve the way the building looks or to enhance the ambience for the rooms, then yes, that is part of the Land Development Code and actually part of the work. You could do the sprinklers tomorrow and it wouldn't make any difference to the Land Development Code, and the Commission wouldn't have to give an approval to improve the sprinkler system, so he doesn't think it should be included in the total amount of work for the 25% versus the . . . Mr. Sawyer interjected that is the clarification that he didn't say very well, but they want to get these interpretations so they can make the judgments they need to do.

Commissioner Brandt referenced the parking on the south property line and suggested, if that for some reason isn't allowed to go forward, one of the ways around it would be to not have a patio area on the lower floor and leave everything the way it is, put the balconies up above over the parking and sidestep that issue of rotating or proposing new parking in an existing non-conforming use, just leave it alone. Mr. Sawyer stated that they simply would have to eliminate the balconies. Commissioner Brandt then pointed out that you can drive under balconies, so it is just the first floor; however, Mr. Sawyer indicated that Engineering said that the clearance for fire protection, etc., has to be 13 ft. 6 in. clear, and they are 8 ft. floor to floor, plus the westerly rooms are 2 ft. below grade, so as much as that would be cool to drive underneath, it just wouldn't work. They are 2 ft. below grade in one area and almost at grade in another area, so they don't have any patios on the first floor on the south side, just balconies above. Commissioner Brandt stated that he didn't think the Commission has ever looked at such a squishy situation in a work session, so oh boy, thanks.

The Chair commented that it is complex at best; it opens all kinds of cans of worms. Commissioner Brandt then encouraged the applicant to follow-through. He didn't see anything that staff is missing; it is a good thing to be looking at improvements to the building.

Commissioner Mayer referenced the 25% and asked if that is based on the value of the whole property or what, and asked for an explanation. Cari read, "If the total cumulative cost of any exterior modification, alteration or repair is greater than 25% of the valuation of the building as determined by the director, then the entire building or structure . . ."; it is exterior modifications, so fire sprinklers probably wouldn't be an exterior modification. Commissioner Mayer then asked if exterior modifications just encompasses the balconies or landscaping too, and Cari stated that is something that staff is going to have to work out with the applicant and the director to ensure that we are all on the same page. The Commissioner indicated that when he sees landscaping, that is on the outside of the building, but if it is the value of the building, it should just apply to the balconies or the improvements on the building. If it is the value of the property, he could see landscaping, parking, etc., being part of it.

Chair Losoff noted that each Commissioner has raised this point and we are going in circles on it, so for our next meeting the Commission needs something every specific. Commissioner Mayer added that we don't have a number for the valuation of the building nor do we have a number for the value of the whole property. Cari agreed and explained this is something that staff asked the applicant to provide; it is determined by the director, and we will have more information next time, but again, we are now looking for which direction we should be going in as far as which improvements we should focus on.

Commissioner Mayer referenced the balconies and asked if those are functional or just decorative balconies. Mr. Sawyer responded that they are functional to enhance the rooms inside, and for the overall quality, they are getting rid of the punched window openings and putting in pivoting doors and side lights of glass to go onto the balcony, so that will make the room feel larger and function as well. The Commissioner then asked if the Commission could see some renderings for that; he would like to see something that shows it is enough façade in the front and the back. Mr. Sawyer stated that they did a colored rendering when . . ., Commissioner Mayer interrupted to say a real rendering so the Commission can see the color and the whole thing. Mr. Sawyer confirmed that the Commissioner meant for next time and then stated, "Yes".

Commissioner Mayer indicated that he would like to see the building be enhanced, and he understands the reasoning as to why the applicant wants to enhance the building, because it doesn't look really nice to him. He lived behind it at one time, and probably the inside would be enhanced or upgraded to a different standard than it is now, so he supposes the rates would go up too. There is a lot of homework still on the agenda, and he supposes that we could have all of the stuff for the next work session answered, but he likes the idea of enhancing something that has been there since 1981; it was here before he got here in 1982, so it is grandfathered in like him.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that all of his questions had been asked; he is in the last position seat, and Chair Losoff noted that the Commission is asking a lot of specific questions and we want to get away from the same issues that we are beating to death. We know there is an issue with parking and the 25%, etc., and Cari spelled it out in the report. The applicant wants to know what the Commission sees as a priority. If they did nothing at all, what would you like to see them do, and he would like to see the balconies, because that would make a statement automatically; the rest of it, he doesn't know.

Commissioner Barcus agreed and indicated that he would refine it even further in that if he was prioritizing it, he would want to see the balconies on the north side first, simply because he doesn't think anybody is going to use a balcony on the south side in the summer -- spring and fall they might. Mr. Sawyer pointed out that it would create a little shade and the Commissioner

agreed. The Commissioner then noted that he spent quite a bit of time looking at Article 12 on non-conforming uses and part C. digresses into various kinds of "closer conformance" language, and he is concerned about landscaping probably as number two and color and Light Reflectance Value tied in there. It is like you have to do a little bit of everything it seems. Regarding parking, it would be helpful to hear if parking is a problem during peak periods for both the restaurant and hotel. Mr. Sawyer stated that there really haven't been any complaints to their knowledge, and you could ask Police and staff.

Chair Losoff noted that the Commission isn't voting, just giving impressions and that is two for balconies first, landscaping second. The Chair then asked Commissioner Mayer how he would rank some of those things, and the Commissioner indicated that the appearance and aesthetics would be number one. He has designer background, so that is something that he very much cares for, so it doesn't look completely out of conformance, because it is the height and everything else, and as stated before, it looks like there should be some discount for military personnel, but it definitely would be an improvement, although he would like to see what it really would look like in a rendering; that would definitely help.

Commissioner Brandt stated that the main proposal is the balconies; putting the balconies on changes the parking, and changing the parking requires landscaping by the code, so it is all kind of connected. All of those have to happen if you do the main thing, and then beyond that, having the building painted so that it meets code and the lighting meets the code, those are all important things.

Vice Chair Levin agreed with Commissioner Brandt and asked if the sloped area that is not landscaped now on the south side is planned for landscaping -- the one that reaches the residential. Mr. Sawyer explained that they are creating the planters by the 45° parking. He then pointed out the planters and existing curb, which he explained is over the property line, so those become planters of about 8 ft. x 2 ft., so it averages to the 4 ft. required if you use that as an average, and they thought it would be nice, because they could get some decent higher landscaping in that area. Commissioner Mayer commented that you wouldn't see the headlights, and the Vice Chair noted that was her next question; there would be parking facing south, and Mr. Sawyer stated that there is existing parking there now, so they aren't changing that, but there are fewer parking spots along there.

Commissioner Cohen agreed with Commissioner Brandt's list; it was well said, and he had two more items. One is to add in terms of priority the lighting to be in conformance with the Dark Skies, and the second thing is for those of us who depend on the Super 8 sign to know where we are and when to make right turns, it is a fantastic landmark. We haven't discussed signage, and as part of what Commissioner Mayer asked for in terms of the design, the sign needs to be looked at, because you are changing the name. If you were going to keep the Super 8, he would vote for that, because then he would know where to turn, but otherwise, we need to look at the signage. Mr. Sawyer indicated that he agreed.

Commissioner Klein stated that his ranking would be landscaping, color and Light Reflectance Values, which are significant and would be the most important to him. A good point might have been raised in that if the 25% becomes an issue, maybe then just put the balconies on the north side, and that would probably cut the cost down significantly, so you wouldn't have to worry about the 25% issue. He doesn't know if an opinion from the City Attorney's Office is needed as to what exactly is included when the 25% is figured and when determining the value of the building, but is it just the part that has the rooms in it or the building not including the land, etc.

Chair Losoff indicated that the Commission has asked for a definition the next time we meet; we will need something very specific next time. Mr. Sawyer indicated that the question was asked if there were any complaints on the site now with the parking, and to their knowledge there haven't been any, but when he was here the last time, a school bus even came through

the property to go to the light, and that has never been a problem either. It seems that if logic has anything to do with it, in his mind, they are not adding rooms, so they are not adding people; they are adding balconies to make the rooms better and to help the aesthetics, so it seems that one of the biggest stumbling blocks is how many cars, and as long as they are maintaining the same number of cars, it is going to function the same way. That seems to be logical, but he appreciates the comments; they are very helpful to him as the architect, and they will work those things out.

Commissioner Klein added that he likes the idea of the balconies; they would definitely improve the look of the building. Chair Losoff then commented that S.R. 89A is going to change over the years, and anything we can do to beautify it would be nice. Vice Chair Levin then added, "And the neighborhood". The Chair indicated that Cari's comments are right on in the eleven points she addressed, and Cari then stated that staff got some good direction and will be working with the applicant. Chair Losoff then added that a color rendering would help.

Chair Losoff opened the public comment period.

Jessica Williamson, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Williamson stated that nobody talked about signs except as a wonderful thing, so she just had to tell the Commission that one complaint that she has heard over and over again is the number of signs, and a number of people have told her that they find them unaesthetic and unappealing, so just from the feedback she has gotten that is what she has heard.

Commissioner Klein asked if Ms. Williamson was talking about the number of signs at the Super 8.

Jessica Williamson, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Williamson explained that she was told that the number of signs currently exceeds, but she doesn't know if that is true or not. It is not her issue; it is the comments she has heard from people in West Sedona about the signs.

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

The Chair noted that signs would be discussed under agenda item 7 and Cari explained that staff did look at the signs, and because it is a corner site, they are allowed multiple free standing signs, and each business is allowed a wall sign plus entrance signs, so she believes that the number of signs is compliant under the current code, but staff will make sure. There are different categories of signs, so you can talk about that under the next agenda item. The Chair then requested that staff tell the Commission about that when the request comes back to the Commission.

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

Warren Campbell explained this item is on the agenda in case there are things that the Commission wants to discuss. Chair Losoff stated that he didn't know where we are with the Sign Code and asked if it could be moved up a little bit. Warren explained that staff will bring it to the Commission as soon as staff feels it is right to bring to the Commission; staff isn't delaying it for any purpose other than getting it ready. The Chair then asked if Warren knew when that might be, and Warren stated, "No". The Chair asked about setting a date and Warren explained it would be pretty fuzzy to do that just yet. Staff just received some stuff from the consultant and we are just starting to delve into it, so it is out a ways yet. Chair Losoff commented that it is just that more and more are popping up that don't look like they should be there and we need to do something about it.

Commissioner Klein referenced Section 1202 and stated that if that is going to be revised, we should look at clarifying some of the language as to whether when someone is making an improvement like this, does the 25% apply if they have to add landscaping or add parking spaces or does it just apply to the cost of the actual improvement they are making without what would be

required to conform to the Land Development Code, and then maybe clarify what is meant by "valuation of the building" in a case like this where there are different structures on one lot.

Commissioner Cohen asked where the County Assessor fits in on this and Commissioner Brandt stated they would include the land underneath the building, all together. Commissioner Mayer added not only that, the building too for the taxes, but it has to be an appraisal from somebody who has the expertise or qualifications to do so. Chair Losoff noted that the Commission has talked enough about it tonight and we need a definition and a very definitive answer before the Commission can address this again, so before staff comes back with this project, we need to have that clarified and if it goes into Land Development Code revisions or amendments, we would need to take a look at that.

Commissioner Mayer agreed with Commissioner Klein in regards to the 25% needing to be revisited, because sometimes you are prohibited from making major improvements to a building, because of that 25%. Sedona could use a lot of improvements on certain buildings.

Commissioner Brandt stated that he knows the 25% is to try to minimize the amount of non-conformity, but we don't want to tie the hands of people trying to improve a property like this. The only other word in there is "cumulative", so it is for the life of the building that it can't be more, so maybe it wants to be that there is some time limit as to every five, ten or twenty years. It would also be interesting to know how many of these actual properties there are.

Chair Losoff noted that gives a sense of how complex it is to revise the Land Development Code; this is just one that we are talking about, which could go on and on, so we look forward to some clarification.

Commissioner Cohen stated that for the future he would like to know where the 25% came in; what was the rationale behind that particular number, and when was it done; that might help the Commission understand it better. The Chair then stated that when the Commission gets the report next time, let's include the history on it, and he doesn't want to talk about the 25% anymore.

8. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS:

- a. Thursday, November 26, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session) – canceled**
- b. Tuesday, December 1, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- c. Thursday, December 10, 2015; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- d. Tuesday, December 15, 2015; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

The Chair noted that November 26th is canceled, and Cari stated that for December 1st, we have the first public hearing on the Brewer Road Master Plan to get the Commission's input. They will be looking to see if they are on the right track and have the vision right, and they will be going to the Commission, Council and the public before drafting the Master Plan. Chair Losoff then requested an update on projects, including comments on some projects that have not come before the Commission, but are looking to open soon, like Chipotle and the Manzanita Marketplace, because the Commission is asked about them.

Cari reported that on December 10th and 15th, we have tentatively scheduled an update on changes to the ADU section of the code. Commissioner Cohen noted that he will not be available on the 10th. Cari added that on the 15, we also have a work session on the Western Gateway CFA Plan.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she would not be available on December 1st.

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 6:40 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 November 17, 2015.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date