Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, September 29, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chair Losoff called the work session to order at 3:32 p.m.

Roll Call:
Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer. Commissioners Randy Barcus and Eric Brandt were unexcused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Stephen Craver, Roxanne Holland, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Cynthia Lovely, Ryan Mortillaro and Donna Puckett

The Chair explained that normally work sessions are between the Commission and staff, but later we will open it up for some comments, and the public meeting on Tuesday will be another opportunity for comments. There is a three-minute limitation.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission just received a letter and asked the Commission to take a few minutes to read it. *[Note: The letter from Kris Husa and Pandora Harris plus an email from David Tracy was read silently by the Commissioners.]*

3. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE FOLLOWING ITEM ON THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION'S PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 4, 2016

a. Discussion regarding the Draft Schnebly Community Focus Area Plan Applicant: City of Sedona Case Number: PZ16-00010 (CFA)

Presentation, Cynthia Lovely: Cynthia indicated that this is different than other CFAs in that there is a history of planning, so she will cover the background information, then your questions. She explained this is the third CFA; we had the Western Gateway and Soldiers Pass CFAs that were recently completed. Cynthia then referenced an April work session, when the previous CFA planning process was evaluated to get the Commission's feedback and the decision that staff would bring the Commission a draft that was about 75% to 80% complete on the next CFA. She also noted that we discussed the different phases of the planning process and where we wanted to bring Planning & Zoning into the process, so that is why you are getting a plan that is close to completion.

Cynthia then referenced the history of planning in the area and indicated that there is a brief description in the Staff Report, and she also has some maps. Going back to 1993 when the Uptown Creek Area Plan was completed, there was a vision that there would be other land uses besides residential, which was inherited from Coconino County when the City incorporated, so this is to point out that in 1993, there was discussion of other uses. The Uptown Creek Plan included things like a creekside park, a parking garage, guesthouse rentals, artists in residence, etc.

Cynthia indicated that in 1998, we had the City's second Community Plan, the big circle shown is the CFA area and you can see the National Forest and City boundaries. On the Future Land Use designation, the Plan called for residential, a flood zone, open space, and the grey section was a Transitional Zone where they were calling for a mix of uses in addition to residential.

Cynthia noted that in the 2002 Community Plan, some of the language changed. Instead of "Transitional", they were calling almost the same area a "Special Planning Area", and there was a whole page talking about that area. At that point, we actually had some language written about the vision or desired character of the area that said, "Retain the distinctive historic ranch-style character", which was the first vision we saw in writing for that area.

Cynthia indicated that in our current 2013 Community Plan, we again changed the terminology to "Community Focus Area" and on the map, "Planned Area". They carried forward the open space, residential, flood zone designation, and the Planned Area in the grey. One way to look at a Planned Area is that it is to be determined. If you think about the Transitional, Special Planning Area or Planned Area, they are all future land use designations in the Community Plan that are saying the area should have more planning, and back then, they felt it should have other uses in addition to residential. Otherwise, they probably would have shown residential on the map.

Cynthia added that in the 2013 Plan, you have two different areas that talk about this. The CFA has the Community Expectations section and there are 13 Community Focus Areas, so the Community Plan has a page for each one that shows the general area, and then the Attributes and Community Expectations, and some of those were carried over from the earlier plans.

Cynthia then explained that the other thing that makes this unique from other CFAs is Appendix B of the Community Plan that was basically to be an example of how a CFA Plan might look, based on a workshop done under the Citizens Steering Committee for the Community Plan in 2012. They came up with a proposal and had some illustrations and graphics, and there is a little bit of history on that page. She then pointed out that she highlighted, in bold, the first paragraph that talks about the vision for the area, and again, similar language from the 2002 Community Plan.

Cynthia explained that we got to this particular CFA proposed plan after some of the property owners came in and spoke with the City Manager's Office and said they would like to see this CFA Plan done earlier rather than later. Their argument included the fact that a lot of planning had already been done, and the Vision Statement in Appendix B was already out there, plus they said that they would help staff with the process. There was some discussion about possibly having landowners do the CFA Plan themselves, and at that time, we were thinking that some CFAs could be self-initiated, but so far we have had no takers. The City then said okay, we would do this CFA, and we expect it to be a shorter process, because we already have all of this background information.

Cynthia stated that to kick-off the process, you will remember that with the other CFAs, we had volunteer workgroups involved, and for this one, we had a stakeholders' group, meaning that they all had a stake in the area. There were roughly 12 people that showed up, although there was a much longer mailing list, but we felt it was representative, since there were people from different parts of the CFA on both sides of Schnebly Hill Road and in different zoning districts.

Cynthia explained that to come up with a plan, we looked at all of the previous information she just covered, talked with the stakeholders, and also looked citywide at all of the discussions we've had regarding other CFAs, as to what the appropriate uses were in different parts of town and how we balance those, so there was quite a lot of different things that came into play in putting this together. The point being that it is not Appendix B verbatim; other factors went into this plan as well.

Cynthia then referenced page 9 in the draft plan under Key Issues and explained that the map was put there to show where the vacant and built properties are. The built properties are in grey and the vacant properties are in white, and what is notable is that even though something might be built, for example, on a really large parcel with just one building, you can see a variety of lot sizes. On the next map, we wanted to show the different sizes. RS-10 is the minimum of

a 10,000 sq. ft. lot and RS-18, which as far as zoning is concerned, the CFA is kind of split in half. The one on the top is the closest we could find to a 10.000 sq. ft. lot and the one on the bottom is 19,000 sq. ft. The point of showing those is to say that a landowner that has a really large lot could split those lots, and it is zoned residential, so just to give you a spatial comparison, potentially all of the large lots could end up looking like tiny lots.

Cynthia indicated that they looked at the vision and the desired character for the area, and there is a similar drawing in Appendix B, but Scenario 1 on the left says if it were to develop as residential 10,000 sq. ft. lots on roughly the existing parcel boundaries, that is what it would look like as an example. Scenario 2 on the right would be, taking the vision and the desired character and looking at some alternate land uses. This doesn't specify exactly which ones; it could be housing or lodging, but the idea was to look at smaller boutique hotels, and we have some in town, so we took the footprint from some of those to give you an idea of size and what you could fit in there. It could be a mix of houses; the grey is existing houses, black would be new ones, and that is also following the current parcel lines, but that doesn't mean that future development would necessarily need to follow those parcel lines. Those were just to give you an idea of what could be done.

Cynthia stated that there were some questions about density, so the map shows the zoning that is split with 10,000 sq. ft. minimum lots in pale yellow on the left and RS-18B on the right, and there is a little T-12, Transitional Zone, and the PRD (Planned Residential Development) is where the Gassaway historic house is located. For the question about density, we looked at numbers and broke it out to say that in the RS-10B in the column on the left, there are currently 19 houses, and if you took the gross area or total acreage and said four units per acre maximum, you could have 160 units. Similarly for the RS-18B, there are 19 existing houses, not counting accessory structures, and with a two unit per acre maximum, you could get 88 units in that acreage. The other would be like the Gassaway House and those in the other zoning where there are 12 potential, which takes into consideration the plat for the PRD at Gassaway. Looking at the numbers, today there are 41 houses and potentially 260 houses for the total land area, assuming that even though you might have current parcel boundaries, they have the right to split those into smaller lots.

Cynthia then indicated that another way to look at this would be going back to the Community Plan, which has Future Land Use designations, and there is a fold-out Future Land Use Map and Planned Area is the current designation. If you go to the same type of analysis and run the numbers for Single-Family - Medium Density, Single-Family - Low Density, and Planned Area, we did the same thing by breaking out the existing and projected, with the Planned Area to be decided, which is why we are doing the CFA Plan. We didn't put numbers in there, because the CFA Plan doesn't project exact numbers at this point, but if you add what you could do in the yellow area, there could be 96 potential units plus whatever happened in the Planned Area.

Vice Chair Levin noted that she didn't recall that being in the draft, and Cynthia stated that it is not. The Vice Chair then requested that Cynthia send the Commissioners the charts; however, the charts were handed out to the Commissioners at that time, and Cynthia explained that what she just discussed was in the top two tables. She is now proceeding to the third table.

Cynthia pointed out that this information was requested prior to this meeting. The next request was for some information on traffic and trip generation, and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) is the 'go to' for trip generation numbers and traffic impact analysis information. For this graph, we looked at Single-Family Residential, three different types of lodging, and campground/RV park. The first couple is shown by day, but according to ITE, Single-Family Residential on a Saturday would be 9.9 vehicle trips compared to regular hotel Lodging that would be 8.19, and that hotel is described as being much larger than we had in mind. You also have weekday and some hourly rates to get some more comparisons. An all-suites hotel would be similar to some of the boutique hotels we have in the area of maybe 15 units, and then the standard motel without supporting facilities or at most a restaurant. For more comparisons, the

RV park didn't have any daily data, so we have an hourly rate, and you can see the comparison across the board of .77 vehicle trips per hour to .25 in the morning in an RV park, or higher rates in the afternoon of 1.02 for Single-Family Residential, .6 for a regular hotel and .4 for some of the other uses.

Cynthia indicated that the traffic count information that was requested was included in the handout as well, and those numbers came from the traffic study that is underway, so they are basically just raw numbers with no interpretation yet, other than the fact that the intersection at the Schnebly Hill and S.R. 179 roundabout has a level of service F, and it has some projections saying that it will stay that way. There are some traffic count numbers on current and projected for that intersection. Additionally, there is a stretch of S.R. 179 in the packet and some counts on Schnebly Hill Road as well.

Cynthia then referenced the Vision Statement and indicated that prior to getting into the content of the Plan, the Plan is developed on the visioning, and this vision on the cover of the draft is much more specific than some of the earlier ones from 1998 and 2002, etc. We tried to include every aspect of the vision, not just character, but things like preserving open space, Oak Creek, etc., so the question before you is if everyone agrees that this would be the desired outcome for this area, and if so, then that is what we have in the CFA Plan. If it is not the desired outcome; for example, if we were going to stick with existing zoning, then a lot of the different aspects of the Plan would not be relevant. Therefore, we just want to bring it back to the vision, and then we can answer any questions on the site visit and the plan itself.

The Chair opened a public comment period.

Kris Husa, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Husa indicated that he has lived on Schnebly Hill Road for about 15 years. and the problem he has with this particular plan is that what they are saying looks correct if it is flat, but only the lower part is flat, so the high density they are predicting is not true. It is very topographically challenged, so when you go up into the other area, you are not going to have the high density of residential, so he disagrees with that. If it is a flat lot, yes, but there isn't any except for the lower section. He agrees that if they want to do some business in the lower part, that makes sense, but he has a problem with the RV area. The problem is the traffic; he can't get out of his place, and depending on which way they go, if they go out S.R. 179, it can take one-half hour to get to the Village. The other part they are not talking about is the ITE traffic isn't right. You have traffic that goes up Schnebly Hill Road like jeeps, RVs, and then they come back, so you have all of that traffic and that is not going to change, so you have a lot of traffic impact for just the people who are there. If you bring in additional RVs in the spaces they want, you are going to impact the entire area. That entire intersection is a gridlock now; it sometimes takes him 10–15 minutes to get out in the morning – that is the problem he has with this particular plan. If you go back to ITE and tell them that you have nine or seven roundabouts one way and three the other way, you are going to have a whole different impact. If you tell them that you are going to have nothing but RVs that come up and hold back 30 cars at a time going through all of the roundabouts, that is a problem. Then, you impact the jeeps coming up and down and the RVs, and that is the problem with the area. No other street he knows has that, and that is what he would ask you to look at before making any changes. The lower part of the area that is flat and looks like Tlaquepaque North would probably have a lot of benefits, because that area is commerce and comes around, and those people are going to come in and out. It is the other part of it, so you have to take in the aspect that the people that go up Schnebly Hill Road looking around up there, all come back down.

Max Licher, Sedona, AZ: Mr. Licher stated that he has lived up Schnebly Hill Road a little over 20 years, and he was involved as a volunteer architect in the initial brainstorming on the plan that was mentioned earlier, and his concern at the time and with the group of other planners we were working with, was looking primarily at the lower level undeveloped properties. He doesn't think that the hillside properties are much of an issue in terms of this plan. As he reads it, we are not suggesting in the plan any change to most of those hillside-oriented

properties from current zoning, but the potential for very dense residential that would completely change the character in the lower area is significant, and he has been there long enough to watch some other proposals come forward that would have significantly changed the character of the neighborhood, so their feeling was that by clustering and allowing some higher value uses, we might be able to maintain a greater amount of the old rural, agricultural, metes and bounds properties, open space feeling that the neighborhood has, and the gist of it is looking at the Planned Area. Most of what is talked about in this plan relates to that portion of the neighborhood. It is trying to get at a future that is more interesting and more visually congruent with what we have now. He also knows from working as an architect here and going through a number of different traffic studies before that residential is the highest generator of traffic, so when you look at exchanging a potentially equal number of small residential lots for units in a boutique inn, you are actually going to be decreasing the amount of traffic over the single-family potential development of the neighborhood. He personally likes living in the mix of uses they have there. He enjoys the RV park and the Creative Life Center that is essentially a commercial operation in the neighborhood, even though it was started as a spiritual retreat. It really operates as a business; they bring people in and we have met an incredible amount of interesting people just because they have that diversity in the neighborhood, so he is excited and supportive of the general direction that the plan is going.

Pandora Harris, Sedona, AZ: Ms. Harris indicated that she lives on Schnebly Hill Road and her main reason for being against it is that she believes that they already have commercial in the north Tlaquepaque area, and since that has gone in, the traffic itself has gotten worse. They have been here since 2001 and bought their property in 1998, and the traffic has clearly gotten worse every single year. The traffic for the RVs, the jeeps and the small vehicles that make a ton of noise that go up and down the road are just noisier than they would like, and they don't see that changing. If you put in cheap hotels, more RV spaces and camping, you are looking at another Oak Creek Canyon that has cars on each side of the road. When the Creative Living has a seminar, there are cars all up and down that road and it is hard to get through. It is very dangerous now; you can barely walk up and down that road, especially in the dark, because there are no lights. That is pretty much her main reason. The one picture they showed of the lots the way they are proposing, many homes could actually be changed and have building envelopes with a planning area around it, similar to Mystic Hills or Back O' Beyond or Sierra Ranch, and that is not shown as a possibility, but it could be, and it would make it be a lot less residential.

The Chair closed the public comment period at this time.

Commission's Questions and Comments:
Commissioner Klein referenced the map that showed the Planned Area in grey and asked where that is in terms of where we were today on the site visit. Cynthia explained that we were at the Gassaway House property and drove into the Farley Cabins property, and then everything on the left side of the road and the square going around the Creative Life Center. The yellow is equivalent to the Bear Wallow houses, and then the RV park, and all of that is the Planned Area. The Commissioner then asked how many acres the Planned Area is and Cynthia responded 43 acres.

Commissioner Klein asked how many acres are taken up by the RV park and Cynthia stated roughly 10 acres. The Commissioner then asked about the number of landowners among the acres that are undeveloped and Cynthia explained it would be easier to say that in the Planned Area there are maybe less than 10 owners.

Commissioner Klein stated that he would have liked to see the traffic study before today, because he isn't going to be able to understand this until he goes home and studies it, and there is no way he would want to make a final vote on anything, until he studies this. Chair Losoff explained that today is a work session, so we are not looking at any finality today. This

is a lot of information, so we could probably ask staff for some clarification or additional information for the next meeting, so we could have an update on it.

Commissioner Klein indicated that, other than Cynthia's presentation, he has a lot of questions about the proposed CFA, and he asked if we want to get into that now or just the initial presentation, and the Chair stated all of it; however, Vice Chair Levin asked if staff wanted some consensus of opinion on the Vision Statement first, and Warren Campbell suggested that the Commission start with that.

Chair Losoff then stated that he would entertain comments on the CFA, and then conclude the discussion with the Vision issue; however, Audree Juhlin explained that from staff's perspective, it would be more helpful to have some general consensus on the Vision Statement, because if we don't have the vision right, then it may be less fruitful to go into the CFA itself. The Chair then asked that the statement be displayed again.

Audree pointed out that the Vision Statement is on the front page of the copy of the CFA that the Commission has. The Chair then asked what the CFA in the Community Plan says, because the Community Plan describes the CFAs and their expectations, so we want to be sure they are on the same page. Vice Chair Levin indicated that it is page 8 and Cynthia Lovely interjected that she could show the Community Plan information.

Audree Juhlin noted that in the CFAs in the Community Plan, it doesn't really specify a vision per se, but what you want to see in those areas. Then, we translate that into the CFA vision and the following elements.

Cynthia stated that it is page 45 of the Community Plan, and there are 13 CFAs with a page for each one. This is CFA 9 and it has the Attributes on the left and the Community Expectations on the right. Cynthia then read the following Community Expectations:

- Retain large parcels and rural character.
- Support agriculture as a key character element.
- Support non-residential uses (e.g., bed and breakfast, neighborhood cafe) if tied to the preservation of large land areas and generates less traffic than medium-density residential.
- Retain similarly affordable housing as in the RV park.
- Protect riparian environment along Oak Creek.
- Evaluate potential for environmentally sensitive public creek access.
- Preserve the historic resources like the Gassaway House.

Chair Losoff then indicated that staff extrapolated a vision, so their discussion is if the Commission is satisfied that the vision coincides with the overall vision expressed in the Community Plan, and then as defined in the CFA.

Commissioner Klein stated that he is then a little confused, because if you read the CFA Vision Statement, it is more like a history of the area and it doesn't really say anything about what you want to do with the area. What you want to do is set out in the following pages, but the CFA Vision Statement is just a history of what the area is now. Vice Chair Levin stated that she would agree.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that the confusion is that the Vision Statement and what you read as you go into the plan do not coincide real well. The Vision Statement calls for something that, adding all this stuff to it, does not work. If we look at the stuff added to it and things like the traffic pattern, then it is opposed to the Vision Statement. That is what he is confused about.

Commissioner Klein explained that he is just saying that when you look at the Vision Statement; it is not a Vision Statement; it is just a statement of what the area is. Vice Chair

Levin agreed and added that it describes existing conditions without creating a vision for the area as much as the Community Expectations craft a vision. She would expect to see those floated into the Vision Statement, if we agree that these expectations rise to the kind of planning that has been done in the CFA process.

Chair Losoff stated that there seemed to be a pretty strong consensus that on page 45 of the Community Plan, it spells out more of what the area should look like, and if we can incorporate more of that into a Vision Statement, it would give the Commission a better opportunity to make a decision, because he agrees with what was said.

Cynthia reminded the Commission that on page 3 of the CFA Plan, the Community Expectations are in the green box. Audree then indicated that she is hearing the Commission say to craft a Vision Statement that takes those expectations and synthesizes them into a succinct Vision Statement, which we will bring back on Tuesday.

Commissioner Klein stated that there were two proposals set forth and Proposal 1 would be to do away with the RV park, but how could you do that? Does the RV park own that land? Cynthia explained that currently the RV park is grandfathered; it was there before the City incorporated and it is zoned Residential. The Commissioner then referenced page 11 where it says Scenario 1 – Existing Zoning, RV park replaced with houses, so he was wondering how you could do that. Cynthia stated that the scenarios are only in there as imaginary examples of what could happen; they are not part of the recommendations.

Warren Campbell then added that based upon existing zoning, the property is zoned for single-family houses, so if it sells or even if the current owner chooses not to operate an RV park, the primary development would be single-family houses, unless they rezoned. Commissioner Mayer then noted that is what it could look like according to the existing zoning, if the property owner decided to get rid of the RV park and Warren Campbell stated yes.

Commissioner Klein indicated that the Community Expectations say that you want to retain similarly affordable housing currently provided in the existing mobile home/RV park, so if that is the Community Expectation, why are you listing a scenario of doing away with the RV park? Audree explained that we are not listing a scenario that does away with that; we are demonstrating that if they choose to no longer use that property for an RV Park, their only use they could do by zoning rights is residential; that is the point we are trying to make. We are looking at the CFA and how we can craft incentives if that is an expectation we want to maintain, so it does not go to residential.

Chair Losoff stated that to piggyback on affordable housing; we have to define affordable housing in our expectations for that area, because as was pointed out in the site visit, some of the RV park vehicles were significantly expensive, probably more than his house, so he doesn't know when we talk about affordable housing . . . If we are going to designate an area as such, then we may have to make some conditions of approval or something other than just saying an RV park, because as we've seen, RV parks may not all be affordable.

Commissioner Klein indicated that one of the speakers said something about the owners of the RV park are buying up surrounding property and want to expand the RV park, so could that hinder any proposed CFA Plan or could that happen? If it is now zoned Residential, how could the RV park expand; they couldn't could they? Cynthia Lovely confirmed that they could not right now, and we have not heard that they want to expand. The Commissioner then referenced Scenario 2 where it talks about proposing a new zoning district, the Oak Creek Heritage District, and when you look at the Land Development Code in Article 5, it sets forth all of the different zones, so this would be a new zone and you would have to amend the Land Development Code? Cynthia Lovely stated yes, and Commissioner Klein then asked how the Commission is expected to approve or say that the Commission wants that to happen, when we have no idea what the zoning would look like. In other words, if you are going to rezone this

area how is it going to be rezoned and what is that zoning going to be if you are going to change it from Residential RS-10 and RS-18? He doesn't see anything that gives the Commission guidance as to what the potential zoning would be.

Cynthia referenced the draft CFA Plan on pages 20–22 that describes the proposed new district with a list of permitted uses, accessory uses, and some development guidelines. That would be the general idea, and then when we amend the Land Development Code there would be more detailed guidelines in that. Commissioner Klein asked when we say lodging density of eight units per acre maximum; if you are going to do a new zoning, how many undeveloped acres you are going to allow for lodging? Cynthia explained that if we go with the new zoning district, a property owner would come to the City and ask to rezone. We are not proposing to rezone the entire CFA or the entire Planned Area. It would be voluntary and optional by parcel. The Commissioner then asked if the Land Development Code would be done on a piecemeal basis when someone comes forward wanting to do a project.

Audree Juhlin explained that the Land Development Code sets out the district guidelines, and in this case, we would take everything you see in the CFA Plan and structure the district guidelines based on that. As with any Planned Development Area, however many parcels that wanted to be considered would come forward and it would be a Zone Change request, and they would have to meet the CFA Plan and the zoning requirements. The Commission would look at that application as you would any other zoning designation, and if it met the requirements set forth in the CFA Plan, you could rezone whatever parcels are being considered, to the new Heritage District being proposed.

Vice Chair Levin then asked if the Land Development Code would need to be amended to include the Heritage District as a choice before any of this could be effective. Audree Juhlin stated absolutely. The Vice Chair then asked if it would be an overlay, and Audree indicated yes, but for only that area. It would not be applicable anywhere else in the City. Vice Chair Levin then stated that the Land Development Code must be amended first.

Chair Losoff then asked if it is possible that we could get 20 requests for lodging and Audree stated yes, it is possible; it would be up to the Commission. The Chair then noted that what Commissioner Klein is saying is that it will come in piecemeal, and Audree agreed that it could. The Chair then asked Commissioner Klein if he is suggesting that it be spelled out upfront and Commissioner Klein stated yes. Audree Juhlin noted that is exactly the kind of comments we want from the Commission, because it sets the framework in which the Land Development Code would be amended. If you want it restricted, then you want to set that forth here.

Commissioner Klein stated that he would have a hard time voting on what the CFA is going to be if it is going to change zoning, when we don't know what the zoning is going to be. He wants to see it more specifically spelled out. Chair Losoff then added that he would also rather see a planned plan for the lodging area specifically, not piecemeal or residential, whatever; however, the Vice Chair commented that they could ostensibly be offered up for review concurrently and Audree agreed. Vice Chair Levin stated that it could come on the tail-end of this, but asked if the Land Development Code could go before Council approval or after. Audree explained that only after the Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council would we then go back and bring forward recommended changes to the Land Development Code, but not until we have an approved plan with which to draft that language.

Chair Losoff indicated that one thing he liked about the previous CFAs was that we had specified a lodging area, not the entire district. We specified where they could go and put numbers on them, so maybe something like that – not that one shoe fits all, because each CFA has its own characteristics, but this particular trait should be maintained.

Audree then indicated that what Commissioner Klein is bringing up is extremely important to the conversation. We want to look at the underlying zoning of Residential in relation to the Planned

Area and determine if we are okay with certain areas being residential, and if so, what are those areas? Then, say which areas you are comfortable with for lodging or not. The intent of this area is to try to retain the unique character; it is more rural and agricultural, so if we are not wanting to go to the allowed residential with 10,000 and 18,000 sq. ft. parcels, what do we want to see there and how do we incentivize something other than that in those locations.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the thought about moving the Community Expectations into the Vision and what Chair Losoff said about affordable housing and asked if there is anything about the RV park that would be considered affordable housing and if there is permanent housing there. Audree Juhlin stated that there are a number of spaces that provide permanent long-term housing, yes. The Vice Chair then confirmed that those are mobile homes and asked if they have the wheels off, and Audree indicated that she is not sure all of them have. The Vice Chair then explained that she was wondering if this is misstated, and if so, if our expectations about affordable housing aren't being met by the RV park and if it would be part of the vision. Audree indicated that before Tuesday, staff will get with the property owners of the RV park and determine how many spaces are permanent long-term and which are more for the RV rentals.

The Chair then asked if staff could find out from the RV park owners if the affordable housing is there. Audree indicated that she knows that at one time it was, but she doesn't know the current status. The Chair then indicated that the City has not set out a specific number of units or spaces, and Audree stated no and in this case, it is grandfathered and was used in this way before the City's incorporation. Historically, it provided some mobile units that were more affordable in nature, but it is not held to any regulations or policies.

Chair Losoff then stated that if the RV park went away, there goes a lot of affordable housing, but for all we know, there is no affordable housing there now. Audree again indicated that staff will research that and bring it back. The Chair then stated that he didn't see any mobile homes without wheels; however, Commissioner Mayer stated that he saw them.

Commissioner Mayer then asked if the current property owners of larger lots indicated what they would like to do or what they would like to see in regards to development, and Warren Campbell indicated that if he is speaking for them, no one knows exactly what they want to do just yet. Everyone is waiting; in general, they would like to see the vision retaining their rural character, but everyone knows the existing zoning and the easy thing would be to subdivide and build single-family homes, so we're facing the question of how we incentivize something else if that is what we would like to see in this area. The Commissioner then stated that it sounds as if they are waiting for our vision or approval of certain endeavors or menus on those properties, with Community Expectations based on that. Warren again stated that everyone largely supported the vision, although we heard some disagreement with that today, but yes, he doesn't think anyone knows specifically what they want to move forward with. Commissioner Mayer then indicated that in general they are agreeing to split up their big pieces of property into smaller pieces; however, Warren stated that he wouldn't say that – they don't know.

Commissioner Mayer then referenced the mention of small lots on the upper side versus a bigger piece on the lower and what it would do, etc. Warren clarified which map the Commissioner was referencing and explained that the example was trying to show that if people went with what the existing zoning would allow, that is the size of the lots that potentially would be duplicated. Forget the black lines, rearrange the lines; one side of Schnebly Hill Road is largely RS-10 while the other side is largely RS-18, so we are trying to show the cookie cutter effect that might happen. Chair Losoff then stated that we need some modifications in the vision to reflect the Community Plan more specifically.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the suggestion to do a page-by-page review in the Staff Report and asked if it is helpful to be jumping around or do you want . . ., Chair Losoff interrupted to say that we are not doing a page-by-page review and Vice Chair Levin continued to ask if staff had suspended that. Cynthia Lovely indicated that this is helpful.

Commissioner Klein referenced page 19 of the draft CFA, where it discussed development and design guidelines, and stated that there is a paragraph called Site Layout with two examples and talks about clustering buildings. He then asked if that is talking about this in the area that would be commercial or RS-10 or what. Cynthia pointed out that page 19 is under Development and Design Guidelines in general, not necessarily the new district, so if the new district allowed for some lodging, these are examples of how it could be laid out, but in the example on the left, those could be houses with the road, open space and set-back buildings with an open space buffer. That example could be housing, lodging or any use. Audree Juhlin then added that it would not be applicable to development under current zoning; they could develop as Warren Campbell discussed.

Commissioner Klein then asked, if the Commission approved that we were going to rezone this and allow lodging, would there be any limitation put in as to how much lodging would be allowed in this area. Cynthia explained that on page 20, there were eight units per acre and part of the feedback we would like to get from the Commission is if that should be modified or narrowed down with Lodging Area Limits or a specific line for where it should be allowed, etc.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that the Community Plan talks about sustainability, but in the Visition Statement, he asked himself what we were trying to sustain that the Community Plan wants, but that isn't a question to be answered now. Then going to traffic, the Commissioner asked if anybody had studied the Schnebly Hill Road in terms of what traffic density it can handle and if the road can handle it if we add more development there or will other things have to be done to that road to make it work. He comes from the Village a lot, and when the tourists are here, it can sometimes take 35–45 minutes to get past the area and into Uptown. One of the big hold ups is at that roundabout at Schnebly Hill Road, so what does the traffic study and our Engineering Department say about it, because that would be important in terms of what we want to happen up there, going back to the Vision Statement and sustainability in the Community Plan.

Commissioner Cohen then stated that another area is the creek itself and the City Council has been interested in creek access for people and there isn't a lot of access in this area, so is the plan going to take access for residents and maybe tourists into account? Commissioner Mayer indicated that access to the creek is a top priority amongst the six items under Community Plan development, and Commissioner Cohen noted that he hadn't seen that.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the discussion on Potential Development Scenarios on page 10 and indicated that she is persuaded by the scenario that would allow for lodging and camping as described in terms of cottages and cabins. That is sort of a niche that could be fulfilled in that area and ostensibly be tucked into the natural environment and not contribute to the traffic concerns about dividing it all into single-family lots. She also wanted to say that the Community Plan goals and objectives do a really good job of outlining what the development criteria should mirror. Warren Campbell indicated that is shown on page 3; however, the Vice Chair noted it was on page 19 of the digital draft, and she wanted to underscore that is something that we can fall back on. Cynthia Lovely then clarified that it is the page with the green table.

The Vice Chair then referenced page 20 and asked what the value would be for a property owner under #2, establishing conservation easements on their property, and if there is any buried incentive in that or is it a non-incentive. Cynthia explained that in general a conservation easement is one way to ensure preservation of an area, so if you were a landowner, you could have a building footprint and the remainder of your parcel could be open space. There are some tax breaks from that, so from the landowner's perspective, there may not be a lot of monetary advantages other than some potential tax breaks, but say that they have creek frontage and want it to remain that way in the future after they sell it, that would be one method of doing that, or if you wanted, it would also ensure public access in the future.

Vice Chair Levin then asked if there is a community overarching goal that could be reached by creating conservation easements along Oak Creek in that area, and Cynthia stated that if you look back to the Community Plan goal, there are a couple. The Vice Chair then asked if the City would ever intervene to create conservation easements, and Cynthia stated that it would need to be negotiated with the landowner; we wouldn't impose that upon them. Cynthia then read the Community Plan goals shown under Environment on page 12 of the draft CFA Plan and indicated that as Commissioner Mayer pointed out, in addition to that being a goal, in the front of the Community Plan in the Executive Summary, there were six desired outcomes and one of those was to provide some access to Oak Creek, as well as the preservation of Oak Creek. It was a big theme throughout the Community Plan.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the overlay district would not operate the same way that a historic district would, where you need a certain percentage and Audree Juhlin confirmed no. The Vice Chair then noted that a property owner might have multiple parcels that would have the overlay for which these land uses would apply, and Audree Juhlin added that it would voluntary, so it wouldn't be dependent upon other criteria qualifying for the district. The Vice Chair then asked if there is any value in putting the Heritage District overlay on the entire CFA. Audree Juhlin stated that staff could evaluate that, and the Vice Chair indicated that she would want to know if there are pros or cons to that. Audree Juhlin again indicated that staff would look at that. Vice Chair Levin then stated that the expectations and objectives would seem to apply to the whole, and if you applied it to the whole and wanted to redevelop a parcel that had x, y and z uses, then everything would have that overlay, but if you made it voluntary, you have only put it on those parcels that want to follow that plan, so it ends up being patchwork, but perhaps we only have a few property owners for whom this really has high redevelopment potential. The Vice Chair then indicated that those were kind of a series of questions.

The Vice Chair asked if any of the Main Street Character Guidelines overlap in this area and Audree Juhlin stated that staff will double check, but she doesn't believe they go onto this side of the creek. The purpose of the Heritage District would be to establish those for this area. The Vice Chair then asked if it would get to the same level of detail and Audree indicated if that is the direction that we want to go, yes. Vice Chair Levin then stated probably not.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that it would be helpful somewhere in this document to find the difference between floodway and floodplain. Cynthia Lovely pointed out that it is on page 13 in the green box and Warren Campbell clarified it is page 13 in the CFA Plan. Cynthia Lovely then stated that the floodway definition is, "The channel and overbank areas that carry the deeper, faster moving water during a flood"; whereas, floodplain is the, "Land adjacent to the creek that is subject to flooding".

The Vice Chair referenced page 26 under Pedestrian & Bicycle Network Creekwalk along Oak Creek where it discusses access easements across private property to ensure future accessibility, and asked if staff had any sense of the property owners' point-of-view on that. Cynthia responded that there were mixed opinions; she doesn't know that any have said they would absolutely want it on their property. The Vice Chair then asked if the RV park permits that now and Cynthia stated that she didn't think there was any public access. The Vice Chair asked if there is any dedicated public access in the CFA and Cynthia stated no, even Bear Wallow Lane is a private drive.

Chair Losoff (audio unclear) . . . agriculture and we need to make sure that is incorporated in the vision and in the CFA. The access to the creek doesn't come across strongly in the CFA, and don't we have any idea what impact 200 or more single-family residences might have on the creek to see what sewer or runoff problems they would cause? Stephen Craver explained that from a sewage standpoint, he believes we have sewer facilities down Bear Wallow, so they would be connected to the City sewer, and unless there is a spill, there wouldn't be potential for a septic tank leakage, etc. The Chair then asked about the impact on the creek itself and if there is capacity to deal with all of that. Audree Juhlin explained that Stephen is trying to say

that we have sewer available, so that would minimize any negative impacts to the creek. Septic systems provide the most threat to the creek, so that is mitigated with the sewer system.

Commissioner Cohen asked if the amount of new homes projected could be handled by the treatment facility or would that have to be expanded. Audree Juhlin explained that when the sewer capacity was established a number of years ago, it was based on existing zoning, so even though it is used for something else or not used, it would be based on the allowable zoning. The Commissioner then asked if this plan was taken into account by the treatment center, and Audree replied yes. Those areas that are not sewered have been identified in the Plan, like the Marriott, so they would have to apply for it, but this is included in the capacity; however, staff can double check that.

Commissioner Mayer asked if everyone there is hooked up to the City sewer and Stephen explained that the vacant parcels wouldn't be. They are accounted for in the capacity and typically paying a standby or environmental fee until they develop, and then they would be connected. The Commissioner then asked if the RV park is hooked up and Warren Campbell stated yes.

Chair Losoff indicated that he has mixed feelings. First regarding the vision in the CFA, if we can incorporate what we are discussing today, that would make it a good CFA. He is concerned with the numbers. Although we are not traffic experts, we want to spend more time looking at traffic. We are in an area that is all red, meaning bad for traffic, and now we are talking about 1,100 more daily traffic trips and that is probably conservative. We can play with that figure if there are less residences, restaurants, etc., but it is still going to be more traffic in an area that we already know is a bad area, so are we going to accentuate it by adding more. He understands that there is existing zoning, and if we do nothing, this could happen, but if we are in the process of developing the CFA, now is the chance to come up with some parameters that could perhaps minimize the problem or better yet manage it. Audree Juhlin stated that the Chair is exactly right on; a big portion of the purpose of the CFA planning is to make the area better than it is with the current zoning, so the existing zoning impacts need to be really evaluated, and then figure out how we can make less impact on the environment, traffic, etc., as an incentive over the current zoning. This has to be enticing for the current property owners to down zone their property in essence, so we have less impact.

The Chair referenced the speaker that commented on having to sit at the roundabout and indicated that he could appreciate that. Coming from Chicago, you sit at an intersection for one-half hour or 45 minutes and move five feet, but overall, we aren't going to solve the problem, and the traffic consultants will come up with some ideas, but we have to wait and see whether it is overpasses, underpasses, etc., in that area, although it is not going to minimize the problem of more cars, whether it is 100 houses, 200 houses, restaurants etc. There is going to be more traffic in an area that is all red, E and F. The consultants rate A through F with F being the worst based on volume, safety, etc., so as the Commission, we have to ask ourselves how we can make it better without causing grief on the residents, landowners, etc., so he challenges the Commissioners to see if we can think that through by our next meeting.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that some of the landowners on the hillside have a very sharp angle where they enter Schnebly Hill; it is dangerous as it is, because you cannot see if someone is coming down the hill, so hopefully with a traffic study and improvements, that will change for the landowners or homeowners.

Chair Losoff asked if in the traffic study, they took into account the Center for Life and its activities, and Stephen stated that they are looking at the roundabout very closely, because that essentially is the pinch point that creates the back-up on S.R. 179. He doesn't think they have looked as specifically at Schnebly Hill Road, because that volume is fairly minimal compared to the volume on S.R. 179, but they are certainly looking at the roundabout in detail and will be modeling that to look at ways to improve efficiency.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the Chair was asking what the Creative Life Center contributes, and Chair Losoff stated no, but if the consultants had considered the traffic in and out of the circle based on their activities. Audree Juhlin explained that the Planners will be meeting with the consultants to discuss different areas and land use applications in their efforts, so we can bring this discussion up with the consultants.

Chair Losoff stated that ideally we would say to wait another six months or a year until that is done, but we can't do that in fairness to everyone involved. As we look to the future, if we have an unhealthy situation now, let's manage it better. One question staff is asking is if we want to specify lodging limits. We did that in two other CFAs; he sees heads shaking yes; however, the Vice Chair and Audree Juhlin indicated that they would like more clarification on that. Audree Juhlin then explained that we are talking about the number of acres and densities, and then pulling in the trip generation information, and earlier we discussed residential creating a higher trip generation than some lodging uses, so if we want to minimize traffic, then we need to talk about those uses that are less than residential and one of those is lodging. If we minimize lodging, we need to give a lot of careful consideration and criteria to how we do so, and she would like some direction from the Commission if that is where you want to go, then staff will come back with recommendations for you. Chair Losoff indicated that staff already heard the Commission say yes.

Audree Juhlin then added that she would like to know the balance, and Vice Chair Levin asked about the capacity to introduce lodging with some kind of footprint that still maximizes all of the objectives in the Community Plan. Audree stated that is the balance that will need to be figured out, but going back to the question as to how we want to minimize or reduce traffic generation where we can, what kind of impact do you want to have on traffic for future planning, because that is critical for staff to determine the boundaries for perhaps lodging. If you want to make a small impact, we will reduce that lodging. If you want to make a greater impact in lodging, then we need to discuss a bigger area and connectivity, bicycle and pedestrian paths, etc., that makes the lodging and less trip generations possible.

The Vice Chair asked if that is exclusive of any other commercial uses and Audree indicated yes, but you also want to talk about a restaurant too, because that gets people out of their vehicles and walking, so you would have even less traffic.

Chair Losoff indicated that the other thing about lodging limits is if we are going to talk about both sides of the street or just one side; those are all things we need to take into account. Commissioner Cohen asked who owns Schnebly Hill Road; that is an important question when you look at how we are going to manage traffic. Warren Campbell stated that the City claims Schnebly Hill Road to the cattle guard. The Commissioner then indicated that road is a great training place for runners, but if you run up, there is traffic and you have to be very careful, because there is very little place to get off of the road. He then asked if the road will be studied for what it can handle, and if it can't handle what we are talking about, what has to be done to the road. As Commissioner Mayer pointed out, some of the driveways are quite dangerous, and you need to be able to navigate that as well as the residents. If we put more traffic up there, it isn't just the roundabout; we need to see what that road can handle and what we have to do if we are going to put 200 or more homes there. He is asking if the Planner can look at this and let the Commission know how it fits the plan. In his opinion, the traffic management is a key issue in how this is laid out. Audree Juhlin indicated that Engineering would have to do an evaluation, if they haven't already done so, on the roadway by looking at its infrastructure and not-so-well functioning parts, and then determine what needs to be done and if there are access easements or some widening, sidewalks, etc. improvements needing to be brought forward for City Council approval; that is where we would have to go. It would also depend on the uses, so if we are talking about the existing zoning, infrastructure and sidewalks, we would be responsible, but in the subdivisions, those would be the property owners' responsibility; therefore, it would depend on how we plan this area, and then looking at the road capacity from that perspective, but from every circumstance it needs to be improved.

Commissioner Cohen then stated that if we do nothing different, we need to look at the lighting around the Center, because when there is an event, you need your own flashlight. Audree Juhlin indicated that those are good comments for our Capital Improvement Planning Projects, so we can put it in the pipeline for future improvements. The Commissioner stated that this is an important CFA, because other than the Western Gateway, this one has the most development potential in the City, so it has to be developed in a way that is good for current residents, future residents and most importantly for the entire City.

Audree Juhlin then asked the Commissioners if they believe the existing zoning of RS-10B and RS-18B are appropriate to achieve the expectations and goals of the Community Plan. Vice Chair Levin and Commissioner Klein stated no, and Commissioner Klein then added that when you look at the two possibilities – Scenario 1 with existing zoning and 260 houses or Scenario 2 with a proposed Oak Creek Heritage District, he likes that idea better, because it would result in less residential development and less traffic issues, but he still has a lot of issues with the proposed Oak Creek Heritage District.

Commissioner Klein referenced the language about commercial development and multi-family housing having to be located within 500 ft. of the roundabout on page 21 and asked, once you get past the commercial offices on the left, how much development there can be within 500 ft. He then noted that on the right side, it is so hilly, he is not sure you could do anything. Cynthia referenced the map and stated that 500 ft. does not get you very far and that was intentional. If you are going up from the roundabout, you have the office building on the left and the 500 ft. picks up a small parcel past the office building, and that is it, and a portion of the Gassaway subdivision falls within the 500 ft. as well. We put those limitations on there, because those are high traffic generators, so we didn't want it to go any further into the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mayer asked if we consider the Gassaway House within the 500 ft. limit and Cynthia indicated that she believes it is. The Commissioner then referenced the terrain and asked what you could do there; you are either in a hole or up on top, so wouldn't that place lend itself more to a commercial development, like a B&B or country inn. Cynthia indicated yes and pointed out that in the past it was looked at for a B&B, and it sounds like what you are saying is right now it is platted for 10 houses, but an alternative use would be a B&B.

Commissioner Klein referenced the language about permitted uses and single-family residential with a maximum density of one unit per acre on page 21 and stated that if you did that on a portion of 90 or so acres, that would restrict the number of houses that are going to be built, which is a good idea. The Commissioner then asked how much of the acreage would have the zoning changed to have a maximum of one unit per acre; that is an issue that needs to be looked at. Then, when talking about agricultural uses and park and recreation amenities, if it is all private property, how would that happen? What is the landowner's incentive to make it a park; how are they going to make money on that or a garden or nursery or vineyard? Another question is he saw talk about maybe putting bridges across Oak Creek, so people could get from the Schnebly Hill side over to Uptown; right now, you would have to walk down Schnebly Hill, then up and turn right on S.R. 89A, but to have a bridge wouldn't you have to have the permission of the private property owner, so realistically, how is that going to happen? Audree Juhlin indicated those are the questions that we want to discuss, and how we incentivize that so they would voluntarily work with the City to achieve those goals.

Chair Losoff stated that the issue is preserving or getting public access to the creek and we haven't seen that strongly in the plan yet. We talk about supporting the creek, but that is all it says; it needs to be more specific. Cynthia then pointed out that on page 32 or page 25 in the plan, that entire page is about the creekwalk The Chair then indicated that it says may be or should be, but like with agriculture, how do we preserve it? Unless we say let's do it or somehow have stronger language . . ., Audree interjected that the Commission could do that. You could say that to give this new district any weight and consideration, if you come forward with a rezoning, you shall do this as part of that rezoning. That is where you have your teeth

for implementation of this plan. The Chair agreed and indicated that when we first started the CFAs a couple of years ago, he thought maybe they should be more general and flexible, but the more we look at these CFAs and the more we experience some of the projects in town, the more specific and more limiting we are, the better.

Audree Juhlin emphasized that this one is unlike the other CFAs, because we're really talking about implementation through zoning, and we are going to create that zoning based on what we want, and hopefully we will make it enticing, so someone will ask for that zoning, and then in exchange for that zoning, they would provide the creek access or conservation easement or whatever it is that we are trying to achieve in that area, and that zoning district really gives us the teeth that the other Planned Areas do not provide.

Commissioner Klein referenced Schnebly Hill Road and talk about maybe paving it to I-17, and then stated that practically speaking, there is a good chance that won't happen, because a lot of it is on National Forest land and the cost is outrageous, so he assumes that for our planning purposes, we're going to presume that Schnebly Hill Road will stay as it is and not be paved to I-17, which would significantly increase traffic, although maybe it would be good to help our traffic problem. Audree Juhlin indicated that she thinks that is a safe assumption and the Chair added that we would have no control over it.

Vice Chair Levin asked what the relative weight is between recommendations and permitted uses, because if we don't float the recommendations into the description of the district, she wonders if they stay watered down to the point of access or conservation easement, because you are talking about incentivizing. Audree Juhlin stated that if there are areas that the Commission feels strongly about seeing with a rezoning, for this to achieve something that you cannot achieve with existing zoning, we would modify this CFA to specifically spell that out and give the direction, so when we do create the district that is automatically the first consideration. The Vice Chair then stated that she would like to see public access to Oak Creek out of the recommendations and in the permitted uses or conditions, wherever it is appropriate. She then asked for clarification on assisted living and if that could be assumed under the language for permitted uses or if it needs to be a little more specific. Cynthia Lovely asked if the Vice Chair is saying to add that to the list of permitted uses and the Vice Chair indicated yes, under Multi-Family Residential. Cynthia explained that there was discussion about that and the rationale for not putting it on the list was again looking at the City as a whole, and in other planning processes like for the Western Gateway, it was thought that type of housing would be more appropriate in West Sedona. The Vice Chair asked if even on a small scale and Audree Juhlin explained that part of that consideration was the topography of the area. We have discussed that the terrain is probably not meant for an assisted-living type of residence and that was one of the other major reasons it was not listed as a use, but if the Commission wants staff to consider that, it doesn't hurt to include it as a possible use.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she would like to see that as an option; however, Chair Losoff indicated that he would argue against it. The Vice Chair then explained that her Mom stayed in a lovely place in Bridgeport that was for 10 women and was a converted home, so she could see something like that in this area if it was complementary and economically feasible, because there is walkability to restaurants, shopping and the creek where you would have sociability, and there is such a spectrum of assisted living. Audree Juhlin repeated that it doesn't hurt to include it as a possible use; it is whether people would take advantage of that as a use. The Vice Chair agreed and stated that it would be an option, if we can consider adding that as an option.

Chair Losoff stated that every time a CFA comes up, we talk about the same things and he doesn't know if every CFA needs to be involved in all of those things. That area is beautiful; he understands, but he thinks the terrain and the access would be unsafe for a senior citizen using wheelchairs and walkers, etc. The beauty of that area is as residential with small town character, so he wouldn't like to see that kind of thing involved. The next thing we will be

talking about is other kinds of residences like nursing homes, retirement homes, etc., which to him takes away from that kind of neighborhood. We have other areas in town that would be more appropriate, but we have two different points-of-view. Audree Juhlin asked if there is some kind of consensus from the rest of the Commission.

Commissioner Klein stated that he didn't think it is a good area for it; he agrees that it is too steep of an area. People who are in a home there aren't going to be walking down Schnebly Hill Road; it is too steep. Commissioner Cohen stated that he agreed. Commissioner Mayer added that in assisted living, there is not going to be a lot of walking around; they are assisted, so the terrain isn't an issue.

Audree Juhlin indicated that conversely, to Vice Chair Levin's point, if we are trying to look at reducing traffic, that would be a use where they really would not be driving too much, so that would be a reduction in traffic; however, Chair Losoff stated very minimal and we had a strong consensus. Commissioner Cohen noted that it might be helpful if Cynthia looked at assisted living and gave the Commission her thoughts, because he could be open-minded about it and change his vote. Cynthia Lovely indicated that staff could see if ITE has trip generation data on it; however, the Chair stated that he didn't think traffic is the issue, although Cynthia pointed out that traffic was a major concern.

Chair Losoff then stated if we start talking about minimizing traffic by assisted living; that's incidental. It is a traffic problem at that circle, so five more cars one way or the other or 100 more cars isn't going to make a difference. If you take away the assisted-living resident's car, you are going to have their visitor's car. The strong consensus was that we're not really excited about it. If you want to study it fine, but . . . Audree Juhlin then asked if there was direction from the Commission to further explore it or leave it out. Chair Losoff stated that we had four versus one; however, Commissioner Cohen stated three versus two; he changed his mind, which he said he would if Cynthia would study it and give them an idea of what that means. He is also concerned that if we put a bridge over the creek to give access through that area, then we will have more traffic, because there are very few places where they can access the creek, so it would become a traffic thing, and this needs to be looked at in terms of conditions other than Schnebly Hill Road, with privacy for the people that live there, etc. Commissioner Mayer pointed out that it would be a pedestrian bridge, but Commissioner Cohen stated that didn't make any difference, foot traffic is even noisier than cars.

The Chair explained that the Community Plan spelled out better public access to the creek, and Commissioner Cohen stated that he agrees with that, but we need to look at what that means. Commissioner Mayer indicated that encompasses a parking area, because people aren't going to walk from where they live down to the creek; they are going to want to drive there.

The Chair noted that the Commission was getting ahead of itself; the issue is not parking or bridges, the issue is public access to the creek and how we manage that or incorporate that into the CFA, and whether that means overpasses, underpasses, bridges, no parking, parking, etc., is to come, but the plan itself needs to incorporate public access to the creek. If we find that it is impossible, then it is impossible.

The Chair then stated that regarding community input, the Commission heard from three people today, and he then asked about focus group meetings that had been held, and Cynthia Lovely indicated that there was a stakeholders' group and a much larger number on the email list than those that actually showed up, but there have been three meetings since June of 2015 with the stakeholders. There also was a neighborhood meeting in August with a mailing sent to all property owners in the CFA, and for Tuesday's public hearing, a mailing was sent to everyone in the CFA and to the surrounding area within 500 ft. of the CFA.

The Chair then asked what the Commission wanted for Tuesday's meeting and Vice Chair Levin indicated that the Commission had provided staff with a list already. Commissioner

Cohen stated that he didn't think he would be prepared to make a final decision on Tuesday. There have been so many questions raised, and we are asking for more input, so we ought to push the decision-making back. The Vice Chair pointed out that even if it is agendized for action, the Commission can continue a public hearing, but we don't have to make that decision now. Audree Juhlin agreed and stated that staff is prepared to schedule as many meeting as needed. She then asked the Commission to bring their calendars, because it would be continued to a date specific, and we will meet as often as needed.

The Vice Chair noted that there are two other Commissioners that would contribute a lot to this discussion, and Audree Juhlin explained that staff is going to ask those Commissioners to meet with staff in advance to get their questions and answers addressed, so we don't have to rehash.

Commissioner Mayer noted that he might not be able to attend on Tuesday, and Audree indicated that the same would be asked of him. The Commissioner then asked how much time had been allocated for it to go to the City Council, and Audree stated that the best case would have been Tuesday, but staff would love to have this done with the Commission in October.

Chair Losoff then stated that for the first couple of CFAs, we had a lot of meetings and we were looking at documents that weren't near completion and we were getting caught up among ourselves and taking a lot of time, so this time, we said we wanted to see a specific document that is at least 70% finalized, so if there weren't a lot of questions today, we could have addressed it on Tuesday, but given the kinds of questions and the quality of questions, we will probably need at least one more meeting after that, so Tuesday's meeting can be another conceptual discussion, and then we will see where we go from there.

Commissioner Cohen asked if it would be helpful to have the City Traffic Manager talk to the Commission about the road at Tuesday's meeting, and Cynthia noted that Stephen Craver is present, and he is the lead liaison with the consultant on the traffic study and he can be present on Tuesday as well. Audree Juhlin then clarified that since it is a public hearing on Tuesday, there are specific posting requirements, so we won't be reposting it again; we will be continuing it to a date specific, so keep that in mind.

Commissioner Mayer asked staff to email him what will be created for Tuesday's meeting, so he can study it, since he won't be there, and Audree Juhlin stated that would probably be right before the meeting, because we have a lot. The Vice Chair then asked if the local ordinances are subservient to FEMA regulations, and Audree indicated yes, FEMA would trump our local regulations. Stephen Craver added that it is a FEMA-zoned floodplain.

Commissioner Cohen commended Cynthia on this plan; it is really more thorough than any other initial CFA plan, and it has been very helpful. The only problem is there is so much in it; it takes more study. The Chair agreed, and Commissioner Mayer thanked Cynthia for the guided tour.

Audree Juhlin asked if there were any other critical issue that haven't been brought up that need to be brought forward on Tuesday, and Vice Chair Levin asked if the Commission needed to agree that the district would only apply to the PA section, and Audree Juhlin stated that is one direction the staff will need.

Chair Losoff referenced the site visit and noted that we didn't have a separate meeting on that, but throughout the discussion, we talked about the site visit, so that should be sufficient; it was very good. The Chair then explained for the public that we open the meetings for public discussion and then we close them, and at that point it is hard for the Commission to entertain spontaneous questions from the public, because the session is already closed.

4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

a. Tuesday, October 4, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
b. Thursday, October 13, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
c. Tuesday, October 18, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
d. Thursday, October 27, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)

Audree Juhlin stated that Tuesday, October 4th will be specifically about this CFA plan in more detail. Cynthia Lovely added that October 13th will have an update on the Ranger Station Park Master Plan and Audree noted that the 27th is canceled, and she doesn't have the specifics on the 18th. One that is not listed is November 1st, when we will be bringing forward a recommendation about the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance, which will be in relation to the new Senate Bill 1350 on short-term vacation rentals.

Warren Campbell added that Article 15, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, is also on the 4th, and on the 13th, we also have the Garnello warehouse and one more. Audree Juhlin then added that it is the Conditional Use Permit for wireless communications.

5. EXECUTIVE SESSION

If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:

a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).
b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.

No Executive Session was held.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 5:32 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on September 29, 2016.

_____ _____

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant* Date