SYNOPSIS OF
ALL PUBLIC INPUT OPPORTUNITES
MAY – AUGUST 2009

OVERALL
SYNOPSIS OF ALL
ADU FOCUS GROUPS

Summary of all ADU Focus Groups
June 19, 2009 - July 11, 2009

Eight focus group sessions were held between June 19th and July 11th with a total of 44 participants. Of the eight sessions, participants in five of the sessions were generally supportive of the concept. Favorable comments included the following:

- The ordinance would be a timid step toward providing some lower-income housing, and ADUs would be a positive housing opportunity for seniors.
- The neighborhood impact would be minimal; the areas are already zoned for the density and workers are already driving to work in Sedona.
- It is a reasonable approach that will help bring illegal units up to standard and give the City better ability to monitor units.
- The proposed 176 new units is a modest number, representing 1% of the existing housing stock.

Participants in the remaining three sessions held mixed views of the ordinance, ranging from very supportive to very opposed, and three participants questioned the need for affordable housing; however, one participant who was strongly opposed noted that if this ordinance were to go through, it looked reasonable and far better than the original version. Opposing participants' comments included the following:

- Potential legal challenges and enforcement problems would be created for homeowners' associations with CC&Rs, if the City allowed ADUs and their CC&Rs did not. Many associations don't have the funds to defend their CC&Rs.
- Single-family areas would be changed into multi-family areas with two dwellings on a lot, and ADUs should be counted as a unit, not half of a unit.
- The negative neighborhood impact would diminish their property values.
- The City doesn't enforce the law against illegal units and short-term rentals now; therefore there is a lack of trust in the City's ability to enforce this ordinance.

The following points were raised by some participants for further consideration:

- Enforcement was a common concern and participants stressed the importance of strong enforcement of this ordinance, as well as against existing illegal units. Some participants recommended that anonymous complaints be given equal priority as signed complaints. Additionally, participants indicated that the City Council should determine its desired level of enforcement, such as proactive versus reactive, and commit to the required enforcement staff upfront.
- Several of the focus groups expressed concern that the costs were prohibitive and would be a deterrent for seniors, owners of existing illegal units and the construction of new units.
- ADUs should be scattered throughout the community to prevent them from being clustered in a few subdivisions or metes and bounds areas. One suggestion was to cap each subdivision at no more than 20%.
- The commitment to 20 years was considered too long; five to 10 years would be more acceptable. One suggestion was to provide a fee reduction scale, such as committing to 5 years and waiving 25% of the impact fee.
- There should be flexibility in offering waivers, such as having waivers for seniors with financial hardships, but also having the ability to deny waivers if they aren't warranted.
- "Family" should be furthered defined, and if possible, the number of people allowed in an ADU should also be limited to one person per 200 sq. ft. or two people per bedroom.
- Owners of illegal units should be penalized with a fine, if discovered after the amnesty period.

- Garage conversions should be eliminated, because they would create additional outside parking and storage issues; however, they may be the most cost-effective way to create ADUs and without an oven they are allowed today.
- The applicant should sign that they are in compliance with their CC&Rs. One suggestion was to send a letter, as a courtesy notification, to the homeowners' association indicating that a permit has been pulled.
- Exemptions may be recommended by the Director, but should be approved by a body, such as the Board of Adjustment.
- A size restriction of an "arbitrary number" for existing units will deter owners from coming forward, which will inhibit the effort to have them brought up to standards. Suggestions were to use 33% of the square footage of the primary dwelling unit, or be based on the allowable Lot Coverage or if it is beyond the discretion of the Director, it should go to perhaps the Board of Adjustment.
- There were differing opinions regarding the ninety-day minimum, some participants wanted it reduced to 30 days; others felt it should remain at 90 days or longer.
- All participants wanted the prohibition of on-street parking to be retained.
- Participants questioned the exclusion of mobile homes in areas that already have mobile homes, since stick-built would not be as compatible with the area.
- ADUs should be constructed within the specified lot coverage and possibly prohibited on small lots.
- Further define "kitchen" to clarify the difference between an ADU that is used for an extended stay on a non-rental basis and a guesthouse.
- Participants generally favored the six-month amnesty or "grandfather clause"; however, some participants suggested it should be for one year.
- Some participants indicated that the annual inspections were onerous, while others felt they should be retained; however, there were objections to inspections without notice.

Regarding the restrictions in general, some participants felt the ordinance is now too restrictive and so overwhelmingly comprehensive, compared to other like communities, that nobody will be able to build ADUs, while other participants supported the restrictions up to and including saying that the way it is written is 99% great. Some participants also indicated this issue has gone on long enough and it is time for a decision.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 19, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Practice Session
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona AZ
June 19, 2009

Overall: Of the five participants in the practice focus group session, none were really opposed to the ADU concept and the prevailing view was that this proposed ordinance is a timid step in the direction of providing some lower-income housing that would not have a great impact on neighborhoods.

Appearance: There one comment was in favor of consistency with the look of the house.

1. Participant B - Liked that it requires it to be consistent with the look of the house.

Concept: There was no strong opposition to the concept, and the participants made the point that this is a timid step to provide some lower-income housing in Sedona and if people lived in Cottonwood, taxes would not be paid in Sedona.

1. Participant B - We don't have anybody here that is strongly opposed; what were the people who were strongly opposed saying?
2. Participant C- There is a general problem here; this is sort of a timid step in the direction of providing some lower-income housing. You could call it conservative or not aggressive. Maybe you ought to look at the traffic going back and forth between here and Cottonwood. If Cottonwood builds those 23,000 homes close to Sedona, they will have taken care of half of the transportation problem.
3. Participant B- Yeah, we will just put in a monorail.
4. Participant C - Move Cottonwood closer to the boundary here, and then all of the people can live there and come over here. They won't pay taxes in Sedona, but they don't pay taxes now anyway.
5. Participant B - Just sales taxes, which is probably another issue not related to this, but if I get a construction permit to build onto the house or convert the garage, doesn't that information automatically go to the County? It is not like there are no taxes; we don't do it secretly and if permitted, you've done something to the property to change it.

Cost: Participants expressed concern about the economic feasibility of constructing or upgrading units for rent, unless it is current space or converted, especially if the owners are lower-income people or retired people on a fixed income.

1. Participant B - Don't think you can build an 800 sq. ft. attached or semi-attached residence with a garage and rent it reasonably. It is likely to be current space that is somehow converted. I don't know that you can put a kitchen and utilities in an 800 sq. ft. thing and rent it for anything like enough to make it come out.
2. Participant C - That would be like at $200 per sq. ft. that would be $16,000 or at $300 per sq. ft., it would be $24,000; if you remodel your kitchen it costs that much.
3. Participant B - You will have new construction with some of these units built, and I can see in the high-end construction, you build a place for the caretaker, but I don't know that people are going to build them as a rental unit. I just don't think it is going to work economically.
4. Participant D - The economic impact of converting it to upgrade it to these; most of them are lower-income people or a retired person on a fixed income, and they may have tenants without technically separate living units, like the kitchen and living room are shared. I don't see that you are going to get this big wave of people doing this to create income.
5. Participant B - Not sure you can get a loan to do it.
6. Participant C - There are places like that being converted to higher-priced housing, and my impression would be, like in the Harmony area, if you could relieve the pressure for places

like that to be sold by relieving some of the burden on the owner, you would probably provide more low-cost housing.

7. Participant B - We tend to destroy what low-cost housing we do have.
8. Participant B -Don't think there will be a lot of people wanting to build a whole new structure; maybe people could convert their garage. Just for the economic value of it, as a rental, I am not sure it works. I am skeptical that it does work, in strictly economic terms.

Enforcement: The participants' comments generally focused on questions about the enforcement process, fines, tracking, etc., and that in general, there has not been a big problem and there is not going to be a blossoming of problems, although staff may be busy for the first six months.

1. Participant A - Who is going to take care of policing some of this, like where it says median income for no less than a 20-year timeframe. How would that be tracked or monitored?
2. Participant B - Enough people will come forward to make their unit legal, especially if there is some enforcement of those that don't come forward and that probably would improve the housing of some people and the parking.
3. Participant D - The real crux comes up with the ones that aren't doing it and how do you track them and enforce it? Is there an eviction process? If you have an illegal tenant, what is going to happen to the tenant? How does that process work, when it is rented and the property owner hasn't abided by these rules?
4. Participant E - Would do an inspection to determine if they were trying to create a second dwelling; the only difference between a guesthouse and an ADU is a stove.
5. Participant C - How do you enforce compliance?
6. Participant E - If they didn't comply, they could be fined, but we generally work with the public and try to get everybody into compliance.
7. Participant B - You are not driving the streets; these are all from neighbors complaining or something.
8. Participant C - What is the club though, if you get someone that is basically against the idea of any sort of control?
9. Participant E - The original fine would be $250, and it would be civil, and if they did it again, it goes to long form, criminal, and that is $2,500 per day and up to six months in jail. The only time we do long form right now is if they have repeats.
10. Participant B - If they didn't comply, they could be fined, but we generally work with the public and try to get everybody into compliance. Understood there were more than 100 of these illegal units already, how many people got a $250 fine?
11. Participant E - Probably one-half are grandfathered as long as they continue that use. The other ones probably applied for a mother-in-law home that they are not supposed to rent. Normally that kind of thing doesn't create that much of a problem; the problem comes when they rent it for less than 30 days.
12. Participant B - So, we didn't give out 25 fines or 10 fines, basically the City didn't give out any.
13. Participant C - So, there is not a big problem. There is certainly not going to be a big blossoming of problems.
14. Participant E - It already exists; we are just trying to control it.
15. Participant C - Guess you do have requirements now that could be applied to these places that are not in compliance. They are pretty specific, and the first six months, you may be running around an awful lot, checking out these 200 units that may exist.

Garage Conversions: There was one comment regarding parking issues created by garage conversions.

1. Participant D - Have some concerns about garage conversions; it kind of picks up on the parking issues. I could see some real parking issues. If you convert the garage, then where are those vehicles going to be parked.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): The only comment was in favor of the grandfather clause for existing units.

1. Participant D - Liked the grandfather clause; for existing ones, you have the 6-month period, so you have your baseline to know how many we actually have out there and who is going to abide by the code.

Inspections and Permitting: The participants' comments indicated that the inspections and administrative process would be too restrictive, labor intensive and costly. They questioned why ADUs should be treated differently than apartments.

1. Participant B - Some of it is fairly tough, fairly restrictive, but I like the restriction on the size (of the ADU).
2. Participant C - It talks about issuing a permit every year, having to file a report and have an annual inspection; why are we going into that business after the initial permit is issued; maybe once every five years or something like that.
3. Participant B - Do we inspect every apartment that is rented out? It is kind of an invasion of privacy.
4. Participant C - It is going to cost money, and it is $100 a whack; how much can change in a year? The neighbors will complain if something is really bad. Plus they may know you are coming, so they'll clean things up before your inspection.
5. Participant B - Don't see why it is different than the rules for an apartment owner; basically they should have the same rules; don't see why this is more onerous in terms of inspections.
6. Participant C - Yeah, but the apartment owner usually is the one who does the inspection and everything, when people come and go; it isn't the City.
7. Participant B - The City should inspect it like it was a house to make sure the wiring is sound, etc., under the codes.
8. Participant D - It is very manpower intensive as far as inspections and applications.
9. Participant C - Your requirements are so involved; a lot of people will put off doing anything. They do not want to put up with all of that hassle.
10. Participant C - You have got to keep filing reports every year, sending in permit money and testifying, "Yeah verily I'm doing everything you want".
11. Participant A - If I owned a house and wanted an in-law to stay, I would probably see what these forms were and how difficult the process would be to apply. Would it be a lot of hassle or would it go through smoothly, because it seems like there are a lot of forms involved. I don't know if the application form is long, but there are four or five different items that would need to be turned in, so I would be concerned about how difficult that process would be.
12. Participant C - You could have a facilitator, sort of a one-stop shop that could have all of the forms and you could fill them out.
13. Participant B - Agree with the criticism that having an annual inspection on these units doesn't seem reasonable, if you don't inspect normal apartments or private homes. I don't see any logic that says these units need more inspections, other than when they are created and first improved. Is there any kind of inspection or enforcement on apartment complexes in Sedona?
14. Participant A - But they didn't sign up for a permit that had restrictions to it either. People have to meet these restrictions upfront, and those could change a year or two down the road.

Miscellaneous: One participant noted that a separate garbage pick-up may be necessary and that outdoor storage could become a nuisance.

1. Participant E - Garbage Pick-up - They may need separate garbage pick-ups, because when you get more people, one container isn't enough.
2. Participant E - Outdoor storage can become a nuisance; especially when the second unit is quite a bit smaller, things start ending up outside, but that would require more enforcement.

Neighborhood Impact: Participants' comments indicated that they did not expect a lot of impact on the neighborhoods, because there wouldn't be that many units.

1. Participant C - Can't see much changing, because this is a rather timid thing. All of the requirements are part of it, but it really doesn't add up to much. It is only like 1% of the population equivalent, and our tourism goes up and down 5% or 10% in terms of population.
2. Participant B - Don't think it will have much impact, although if it did make 100 units available that weren't previously, there are 100 places for people to live that can't afford a full-size house.
3. Participant C - It will have a good impact from that standpoint. I don't think there will be much impact on the neighborhoods.
4. Participant C - Don't think it is going to affect the experience of being in Sedona.
5. Participant B - It is hard to see how it would affect the neighborhood, since they are not concentrated. I lived in a neighborhood where every house had a servant's quarters and it didn't have a big negative impact, except there were quite a few cars parked along the street.
6. Participant C - My wife said if we had a bunch of people running up and down Color Cove Road, but even that I can't see as a problem.
7. Participant B - How is it going to be a whole bunch of people? There aren't enough houses that each one could build, and in my neighborhood, the people have big lots, but they're sloped down the hill, so I don't know that they could easily build them. They are houses with space that could be converted, and maybe a few of the houses could add a unit, but most of them couldn't.
8. Participant C - Maybe it is more of a symbolic social commitment to maybe make some living space available for very low-income people.
9. Participant C - It isn't much of a choice, but it is better than nothing.
10. Participant D - There will be neighborhoods that will be impacted (by parking issues).
11. Participant C - You are destroying the housing faster than you could ever do anything with this. Whenever you put something new in, you are going to get complaints. That is another issue, but it is related.
12. Participant B - Liked the fact that it is restrictive to protect the value of the neighborhood, but that is the opposite of providing the maximum low-income housing units.

Ninety-Day Minimum: One participant questioned how the 90-day minimum would be interpreted if a renter moved out early, and two other participants discussed the fact that regardless of what the ordinance says, some will continue to break the rules.

1. Participant D - There is a lot of residential turnover, people move here and can't make it, so they are gone in 30 or 60 days, and the owner wants to re-lease it; can you do that or will you be in violation? It says it is a 90-day period, but how is somebody going to interpret that? You can only have one person every 90 days, but if the tenant leaves early, can you break that 90-day period?
2. Participant D - Some will sign it for 90 days, but the under-the-table agreement is . . .
3. Participant E - No matter what you put in here, you are still going to have a problem with that, because there are always going to be people breaking it. We have people that do that now.

Occupancy: Two participants commented that basically it is up to the neighbors to report it if they think there is a violation.

1. Participant A - So, they could have five families in that 800 sq. ft. later; I think the answer is the neighbors.
2. Participant C - If it is known that they shouldn't have more than one family, and they see two extra cars and 17 people, you would call the Police Department; they've got a drop house over there.

Parking: One participant liked that some parking is required and another participant indicated that some neighborhoods will be impacted by parking; however, it was also acknowledged that we have extended families now with five or six cars and families.

1. Participant B - Liked that it required some parking place – main concern was what to do with all of the cars.
2. Participant D - There will be neighborhoods that will be impacted and a lot of the issues will be parking issues. You have already identified areas where the roads are just too narrow to accommodate the on-street parking, and some of those areas that have very small lots and don't have a quarter-mile round driveway going up. We have neighborhoods where you have a single-family and it is an extended family with five or six cars, and we already have that overflow, and that is without renting it out.
3. Participant B - People with teenagers have lots of cars.

Restrictions: One participant commented in favor of the restrictions.

1. Participant A - I liked that there are restrictions.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 22, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 22, 2009

Overall: Participants were generally supportive of the concept and indicated the neighborhood impact would be minimal, especially if ADUs were spread throughout the community; however, they emphasized the importance of increased enforcement of illegal units and of having parking provided on the property. Differing points of view were expressed regarding the 90-day minimum.

Appearance: Aesthetics were noted as important, although it was also indicated that ADUs would primarily be constructed by converting space within existing homes, because of the cost, so there would be very little visual impact.

1. Participant A - I did see something in there about aesthetics and that is extremely important.
2. Participant D - How many of these units do you think are going to actually be built as a separate casitas-type thing and how many will be part of the existing house?
3. Participant D - (Regarding primarily converting a space within their home) that was my gut feeling, in which case from a visual point-of-view, there is going to be very little change. That would be a good point to bring up.

Concept: The need for diversity and affordable housing in the community for professionals and younger people was acknowledged, as well as a concern about density and a desire for more green construction.

1. Participant A - It would be nice to be able to rent out my guesthouse or at least have my guests stay there.
2. Participant B - This issue is of great interest to me, because a lot of the ADUs were built under different standards than they would be required to have now. They were not allowed to have kitchens, and now they must have kitchens, and I'm concerned about the density.
3. Participant C - Concerned for the same reasons that Participant B is.
4. Participant D - Kind of divided on this; I came here because on one hand, I respect the beauty of the place and respect the density, but on the other hand, philosophically, is the idea having diversity and helping people like teachers and other professionals to be able to afford to live here. I know there are many ADUs under the table, so to speak, and it is about time we do something about it; either allow it or don't allow it.
5. Participant E - Worked with teachers and police who have come and gone and not been able to really afford to be here or live here on salaries, when you can work somewhere for 10 years and still make $30,000 a year on a teaching scale, because we are the lowest in Sedona, so I am interested in seeing the focus here.
6. Participant A - Things that should stay (in the ordinance) are, "provide a broader range of more affordable housing" and "mix of housing that responds to changing family needs and smaller households" . . . I've watched the community grow and finally it is starting to become more of a community than it was, and a lot of the things that are happening are in the positive, not the negative. A lot of people that live here are over the age of 50, and there is not a lot of the younger community here, other than the people who have kids going to school, and the reason they are not here is because they can't find affordable housing. As a community that needs to change, there are a lot of things here for the older people, but not so much for the younger set and that needs to be changed and this would help.
7. Participant A - Building something economic and energy-efficient is really important, especially with the way our world is going and the economy itself is going. Your electric and gas bills are going up and there are ways to make all houses, not just ADUs, more energy

efficient and economic. It is just a matter of changing the way you think about building, and if you are able to do that, I would like to see something about that in there, because that is the direction we are heading. At least you kept the modular homes and trailers out, but it would be nice, because there are some homes in Sedona that were built back in the 1950s that are actually built better than in today's market, so there should be something in there about that as well, promoting that a little stronger.

Cost: While cost was not a major topic of discussion, questions asked included if there would be sewer hook-up fees for existing guesthouses, if increased enforcement would be within the City's budget, and if there was any other way to promote affordability, because it would be a shame if this ordinance went through and more units were provided, but not with lower pricing.

1. Participant B - Does this cover sewer hook-up? So, they would have a separate hook-up fee? Does the legal mother-in-law unit now figure into the sewer fee? I'm talking about the legal ones that are out there; if they are brought in, they (already) should have their own hook-up.
2. Participant A - So, it depends on the size of your lot? What if you are doing it backwards? We already have our guesthouse/garage that we have been living in, and now we are going to build a 3,000 sq. ft. house. If this doesn't get approved, basically we would just have to remove the cook top. It couldn't be rented, but we could have family come and stay in it.
3. Participant D - We're looking at affordable housing here, and you say there is a waiver if you want the special deed. That is pretty strong, but isn't there anything else you could do to promote it; it is what we are looking at isn't it? It would be a shame if this ordinance goes through, and then you would be providing more units, but not with the lower pricing, which is basically defeating the whole idea.
4. Participant A - When you say "low income" what are you saying?
5. Participant A - Is (increased enforcement) going to be within the budget?

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern about the perception that there is no enforcement against illegal ADUs and the citizens don't want to report their neighbors; however, they also were concerned that some illegal units don't fit the requirements and with increased enforcement, some of those existing units may be lost. The desire was to avoid the short-term renters and unlivable conditions in some illegal units. Participants, in general, liked the owner occupancy requirement, but expressed concern that owners of multiple rental properties would not come forward to comply.

1. Participant D - Like the idea that the owner has to be present for at least six months; that is good.
2. Participant D - (Regarding enforcement of illegal ADUs) Page 9, paragraph E., you keep referring to different things in the Land Development Code, what is it, is it a fee? I just want to make sure we address that, and then the other thing is item I (regarding revocation of an ADU permit), the same thing, we need to address that.
3. Participant A - What is non-compliant?
4. Participant D - This is my biggest issue with the whole thing; philosophically, I'm for it. I live in an area where you have illegal units all over the place, and I for one don't want to blow the whistle, but I can tell you that it is probably 30% in my area with illegal units, so this becomes nonsense. What is happening is that the City is either turning a blind eye or . . ., that is what everybody asks me, when I talk about ADUs. They laugh at me and say the City doesn't do anything about it; they allow it to happen. You can't expect citizens here to blow the whistle on their neighbors. It would make it uncomfortable; you know these people, etc., and you don't want to feel like you are doing that. On the other hand, there has to be ways and means or it just doesn't make sense. If you are going to have this, which I totally think is a good thing, and you put it out in an ordinance, you get it legal and allow them, great, but if

you don't do anything about those that are illegal . . . You talk about illegal units, but nothing has been done. It is okay to say, yeah, we are going to do something about it, but what are you going to do? How can you enforce it, because otherwise, it is not going to happen, and there must be ways and means the City can check on things. The other thing that concerns me is that most of the ones that I know about don't fit the requirements of this ordinance for a number of reasons. I know one where they have six units, and none of them have the owners living there, and this is a single-family area, so what is going to happen is you might lose some of those units. The flip of it is if you enforce it, you are going to either put a lot of people in prison or it is going to be hard for them to live up to the cost of this, so there will be nobody living in those places. Besides somebody ratting, isn't there another way you can see these from usage or something? What if you don't have any authorization to begin with?

5. Participant E - How do other cities patrol it? It is nice, if there is a complaint filed and it can be posted on a website for everyone to see and you can see the results from that, but . . .?
6. Participant D - I've asked friends and people I know what they think of it, and that is the big thing they pick on. They say they have trouble and they talk about short-term rentals and people renting illegally, etc., and they claim that they have complained and nothing is done.
7. Participant C - The water and electric companies know a lot. Water use and electric use are clues to marijuana growing in an underground basement; those are things they are well aware of, so you should be able to interact with them. You can't interact and get that data?
8. Participant D -You can't do anything about it if you find out a house is using three times as much electricity.
9. Participant C - It sounds like an awfully good reason to own your own water company, the only moneymaking part of any kind of water operation anyway.
10. Participant A - One of the really good reasons for this code is the ADUs that are out there, that are not even livable, are going to have to come up to the code, and one thing I have seen around here is some of the places where people are living, they should not be living in, and that is more important than enforcing the parking and all of the other stuff. I see that as minuscule in relationship to people living in places that don't have an oven or a kitchen sink or insulation or proper windows, so they could escape if there is a fire, because they are living in something that is not even really habitable. That is one of the reasons I came to this focus group, because I know of places that are that way, and that is one thing that I would like to see changed, because I don't think that is a good thing for the community.
11. Participant C - My concern is that I know there are some owners in town, and you are saying the issue would go away, because they have to live on the property, but there are property owners who own multiple properties and do this sort of thing across the town. They may be living in one of them at most, but others aren't, and those are never going to come out of the woodwork, unless they are ratted on, and that is an issue, because again, what we intend to do is something good, but for every rule there is a loophole.
12. Participant E - Know most of the neighbors, and I think the opposite. I live in a nice area, and my neighbor will complain about the dumpster that is there legally. No matter what it is, I would be the first if I am abiding by this and my neighbor is not, I'll go to my neighbor and say you are not, and if not, I'll call in. I have no problem.
13. Participant C - That is the way our neighborhood is, but I wouldn't do it across the town.
14. Participant D - When I just walk around the neighborhood; we start counting. You can tell; it is fairly obvious.
15. Participant C - It is especially good when they turn the other way as you walk by.
16. Participant D - You can see the way the parking is and the different entrances.
17. Participant C - The owner probably does not live on-site in those instances.
18. Participant D - That is what I am saying, that is a great requirement.
19. Participant C - That gives you the opportunity to pounce on them; that is an absentee.

20. Participant E - What if you, like when it goes into effect, once you give them the six months, use some City resources and go out and walk the areas, knock on doors and do different things, to at least say we are really looking at this, whether to scare them or make them aware of it, whatever the case may be. If you walk in the neighborhood where Participant D is talking about, and if it is apparent, you will know what questions to ask. You can't knock on everybody's door, but if there were a task force of some sort . . .
21. Participant D - I think that is a great idea; you are not breaking and entering, you are just going in there and explaining this is a new ordinance, as your friendly City Security Officer.
22. Participant B - Has there been any talk of ramping up the enforcement division if this goes through? That is going to have to be ramped up, if we increase the use, enforcement is going to have to increase also.
23. Participant C - That would probably be one of the major points to make in the recommendations, that if they approve this, they have to approve enforcement.
24. Participant D - To begin with, you really need to when it is new. There are people who want to be compliant and they will sign-up for it, but to begin with, there are going to be people who think it is okay; the City turns a blind eye.
25. Participant C - I'm only thinking of this from a businessman's perspective; obviously, they could come in and buy up three of the manufactured home lots and put ADUs on them, but then they don't live there for the ownership requirement, but you can see where, unless there is really good enforcement, there will be a lot of lawbreaking going on for an opportunist.

Garage Conversions: There were no specific comments about allowing garage conversions.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): There were no specific comments about the grandfather clause, other than as it relates to enforcement.

Inspections and Permitting: One participant expressed that the annual process is important, to ensure ADUs are built structurally correct; however, it was pointed out that it only applies to those who are complying.

1. Participant A - I think the annual thing is important, because of just keeping everything up to code, and not getting too many people in one space.
2. Participant E - You are talking about annual for the people who are complying.
3. Participant A - Right; that is an issue with the ones that aren't going to sign up.
4 Participant A - The thing that I am most concerned about is that the ADUs are built structurally correct, because some of these garages that you could convert to an ADU are not really worth . . .; they need to be torn down and built up again.
5. Participant E - Isn't that something that has to be permitted?
6. Participant A - Some of these are probably 2 x 4 construction, not even 2 x 6 construction.

Miscellaneous: The only miscellaneous question asked related to how the ordinance would be communicated to the community, if approved.

1. Participant D - What happens from here? Assuming that it goes through, what will you do to advertise it or to let people know, are you going to have some kind of a campaign?

Neighborhood Impact: Overall, participants indicated any neighborhood impact would be minimal, especially if there could be a provision to prevent ADUs from being concentrated in one area; however, one participant expressed a concern about having an imposed neighborhood cap. An anticipated positive impact was that teachers would stay and young people would have a better chance of returning to Sedona.

1. Participant D - Is there any requirement as far as getting a balance; I want to see a balance. I would like to see something in the ordinance that would require so many per subdivision; would it be possible to do that? You need to look at the "blue" area and see what you have there, but I would like to see them spread out, if there is any way of putting something in to see some kind of balance, so you don't get like 10 in one area.
2. Participant D - Seeing a map and being able to visualize it, the first thing that strikes you is there are so many areas that aren't going to allow it anyway, so that is not going to impact them. If you take all of that out and look at the others and see the potential, there are hardly any that say yes, they can, and the others we don't know. As I said to begin with, if you have some way of balancing it, so you don't have a load in one area and then hardly anything in another area, the impact would be minimal.
3. Participant A - I can see that being an issue; if my neighbor wanted to put in an ADU and we live where there are no CC&Rs; he probably has 15 acres, so he could put in quite a few, if he wanted to, but one person is going to get it and the next person doesn't get it, and that is going to be a major issue.
4. Participant D - Have you done some research with some smaller cities, like Telluride, Vail or Aspen?
5. Participant E - (Regarding positive and negative impacts) I think you will see that you will have teachers that stay; we had 24 teachers laid off in May, and many aren't going to come back, because they can't afford to stay here. From the teachers' perspective, I think you will find that they are all looking for a place to live. Teachers coming in don't make a lot of money; they don't have any obligations. Two years ago, I would have argued that I don't think there has been a need for that, because most of the people would say they don't want to live in an 800 sq. ft. box, when they can live on two acres in Cornville comfortably, but with gas prices, etc., I think you will find that people who are here, you will see them working at the local stores.
6. Participant A - Even some of the restaurants, some of the kids that are 19 or 20, you know under 30, need a place to live, and they are good kids and just want a place by themselves, so now you can rent that out. If you have 600 sq. ft., you could rent that out for $400 or $500 per month, and that is better than nothing, and it helps everybody, especially in this economy, if you are trying to make a living, while living in Sedona.
7. Participant D - I agree, I really don't see that it would be that big of an impact, but it is people's perceptions that you are going to have to deal with, and you are going to have a lot of people complain and say not in my backyard, and that is ashamed. I don't feel that way, certainly. I wish the ones on my street were legal and were in compliance, but they will think of things like they will bring in people who are rowdy and not part of the community; that density is too high, which isn't the case when you look at it, but you are going to get that. You will get that from the public coming up with those kinds of arguments.
8. Participant A - You are right, because anytime there is any change in the City, people that have lived here longer than 10 years are going to complain.
9. Participant E - One of the things everyone was big on during the campaign was that you want people that say let's educate our youth and let them go out there, and then come back and contribute to our environment, our society and our economy here, and we are not providing a way for them to even come back. They are either going to live with their parents or they have to go someplace else to live.
10. Participant C - It is the same everywhere though. That is the other latent issue that you are going to get across the community. This issue is not unique to Sedona; it is the same thing in Del Mar and La Jolla, California. It is the same thing in every city, where we used to live. It is not completely going to go away. We can help alleviate it by having this, but it is not going to go away. It never will.

11. Participant E - But that is a benefit, when you say that you think we will attract some. If we attract some, it is more than none.
12. Participant C - The other thing is even though you have some areas on that map, a lot of the areas are already manufactured homes; those lots are so small that you couldn't put a unit on them, so you are eliminating a huge amount of space in some of that "blue" area, and that should be another designation there, because on some of those lots, it would be impossible. Even with redevelopment, the lot size is too small, unless you are going to be like Coronado, California, where people bought two lots to build one house.
13. Participant A - Those modular homes in particular, the only thing I can see is that . . ., is there a maximum square footage anywhere? A minimum, meaning if there is an 18 ft. setback or whatever, and with one of their modulars, they could put on an extra bedroom, which only needs to be 10 x 12, would they be able to get away with doing that, and then rent out that bedroom? I could see them doing that or a little kitchenette; you could do a studio off the back of one of those easily.
14. Participant C - But, they have to live there and the person who is already living there probably doesn't have the money to do that, by and large, unless they are totally retired and have lots of money in the bank, and you are not allowed to put height on and other things, because I know in some communities, they do it by having an over-the-garage unit or over the carriage house and those kinds of things that have become ADUs.

Ninety-Day Minimum: Participants' opinions differed on this provision; some participants felt it could create a financial hardship on the renter and/or the owner and renter could be locked into an undesirable lease for 90 days, while others wanted to avoid short-term, transient rentals; however, participants, in general, did acknowledge that community buy-in would be much more difficult if it was reduced to 30 days.

1. Participant A - Why have you limited it to no less than 90 days? Some people will come in and want to rent it just for a month on a lease-to-lease basis or a year; they usually don't do 90 days. Doing 90 days upfront, and then month-to-month after that is a standard rental thing; there are people that are going to want to rent it on a month-to-month basis, not on a three-month basis.
2. Participant B - I thought this was a move in the right direction; we used to have a regulation or we do now with 30 days minimum, and sometimes that can tend to make some of the people who live there not residents of the area, they are sort of transient, and we have to get away from that, because this is going to be injected into a residential area, and it ought to be made to fit.
3. Participant C - The only thing I wanted to bring up to support both of these is otherwise you are in the short-term rental market, and that means the prices are going to go up, so you are defeating your purpose. You want it to be affordable, and if it is the other way, you are going to be paying $1,000 per week or more.
4. Participant A - The only thing that bothers me about this, and I already brought it up, is the 90-day thing. I think it should be 30, because of the fact of what you just said about a teacher, she comes in and is going to want to rent a place; maybe she moved here from North Dakota, and it is her first time here. She might be here a month and decide she doesn't like it, but she has to pay 90 days in advance.
5. Participant D - She could get a regular rental.
6. Participant A - There aren't that many regular rentals around here, to be truthfully honest. When I came here in 2001, I couldn't rent a place to save my life.
7. Participant C - That was then, nowadays . . .
8. Participant A - I know, but I'm just saying I think that is a restriction that you are putting on the renter.
9. Participant D - I think the arguments against that, on the other side, are far stronger.

10. Participant E - They are paying the start-up of all the utilities, even if they are just there for a month, and if they are a teacher, they have signed a contract anyway and made the commitment to be here for the 10 months, and they probably are going to want a year, so they can lock it in.
11. Participant A - Right, typically what I would want would be a year. The only reason I am bringing that up is I lived in a ski resort in Alaska, and basically, I rented to different groups of people, and most of them didn't want to go for a year, most wanted month-to-month, and this is to a certain degree a transient community. It is a resort community and I see that as an issue for the renter. They want to stay here for 30 days; they may have come here three or four times and they love it here, but after they have been here a month, it is too small and they want to go to Flagstaff or Phoenix, and locking somebody into 90 days is quite a bit to ask, especially for a 20-year-old.
12. Participant D - We went from the short-term rentals, which are now illegal, to our 30-day minimum and most of the City supports that, and the very reason that was done is the same reason that we don't want to offer these like that, because we are looking at communities here that don't want a transient renter. They want to have people who are going to stay for a while, so I think it would cause a lot of issues against the concept of an ADU, if it was felt that these are just for temporary people coming in and out. The whole idea is that these people are going to contribute to the community and therefore three months is not too long, especially at a lower rent.
13. Participant A - Some people are going to think they have to pay the rent in advance and that is a lot of money.
14. Participant D - They don't need to pay it upfront. They may have to put a deposit down.
15. Participant C - But, they might end up having to pay the three months, if they don't stay.
16. Participant A - That is where I see the issue for a 20-year-old that is making maybe $14,000 a year, if that, and they have to come up with that chunk of change.
17. Participant C - In general, we had to help both of our daughters put down their first deposit, and we told them if they reneged, it was theirs to pay.
18. Participant A - Usually you will ask for a month and another month, but you won't ask for a third month. That is a lot, but that is just my own opinion.
19. Participant A - I see the other side of it, and I see people objecting if it gets into the short-term rentals. The same objections would be that this is another way of having these as short-term rentals, and that is not what it was meant to be, so I think the 90 days is right.
20. Participant C - I would support that, having rented here for a month or longer for 10 years at least, and I can tell you that when we looked for a home, we didn't want to live in those neighborhoods. That is why we live where we live. It was deliberate; it is called property value protection, and you do have to keep that in mind.
21. Participant A - I think that is one of the things that you are going to see happen. People are going to come in and get their one month and their other month, but they are not going to ask somebody to stay there three months, because most of these ADUs are going to be within a few feet of the regular structure, and if they don't get along with that particular person or they're rowdy or whatever, they are stuck with them for three months.
22. Participant E - Maybe if you have something in your lease agreement and they do something with the lease.
23. Participant C - There are friends that have rentals in Miami Beach and they wrote a very tight contract. If it was a young person, they were suspicious from the beginning, and they made deliberate choices, but they never put up with anything, and they made sure it was very legal.
24. Participant E - You are going to have a much harder buy-in in the community, if you say just for 30 days, because where I am living, if someone said this is a minimum of three months, that is great, let them be in there, but if they are going to be 30 days, I don't want them in and out and see different cars racing up and down Soldier Pass doing their thing. That is the other

side of it, if we say it is a 30-day visit. We could get a lot of 30-day people. I don't think we want that as a community.

25. Participant A - I'm not wanting that myself, but I'm just seeing it from how I was when I was in my 20s, and $1,500 at a pop is a lot of money to come up with; you can usually do a month and a half or a month that you have to come up with.
26. Participant C - Yeah, but rents are $1,500 per month.
27. Participant D - They wouldn't have to come up with three months, maybe one month and a deposit.
28. Participant A - Then you are saying that they have to lease for three months.
29. Participant D - Yes, but they don't have to pay until the second and third month. The only problem would be if for the second month or third month, they didn't want to rent for the rest of the time. Then, they would be liable if there is some kind of restriction in there.
30. Participant A - One of the things I have seen and have had happen is you get somebody in there and they signed a lease, and there really is no reason to get them out. They have to stay in there for the entire lease, so you just have to put up with them for three months, because once they are in, they are not that easy to get out.
31. Participant C - That is where your contract comes in.
32. Participant A - I had a really tight contract, but it doesn't matter. Getting them out of the place is a lot more difficult.
33. Participant E - That is the issue though of just having rental property. See what the other groups say too.
34. Participant A - I'm just saying that is an issue.

Occupancy: Participants expressed concern that although the allowed occupancy is not changing; the creation of an additional unit could increase the possibility of having more unrelated occupants on the property. While it was acknowledged that the small size of the ADUs would be a limiting factor, there was a desire to also cap the number of ADU residents according to the square footage provided.

1. Participant D – (Regarding the definition of family) On E. at the top on page 4, the third paragraph down, what is Article 2 of the Land Development Code? I'm totally with you; that is good. I'm really with most of this stuff.
2. Participant B - Regarding E on page 4, what if a large family lived in the main part of the house; how many can live in the ADU? I didn't know there was any limit on the related.
3. Participant D - It might not be a bad idea to consider that for the ADU. You are not changing anything right now, but most people don't have a 4-unrelated single unit now; it could be the case if you have an ADU, so maybe we are looking at this from the wrong side. The ADU changes that maximum to the fact that the four, plus the related, could be anything. My preferred option would be to go with the same; not exceeding the occupancy limits we have now, and add on that the ADU cannot exceed so many people per square footage; combine the two and have a maximum on the ADU itself.
4. Participant A - If you have a 2-bedroom and you are going to rent it out to somebody, I would assume it is going to be four people. You can only get so many beds in one space.
5. Participant C - You're saying a 2-bedroom ADU, but they could be minuscule; I've seen them, and if a 2-bedroom was only 425 sq. ft., then I would say that still limits it to two people. That means none of the ADUs should have more than two people. With 800 sq. ft., you could do a 2-bedroom, but you couldn't if it were 350 sq. ft. or 400 sq. ft.
6. Participant A - The one I'm living in right now is 600 sq. ft., and it is our house at the moment; we are getting ready to build our house, but it basically has a kitchen area, a living area, a bedroom, and a bathroom and that is it. You can only get pretty much two people.
7. Participant C - That is exactly what I was trying to say.
8. Participant D - I'm just saying that you need the rule.

9. Participant A - I would assume people are going to be somewhat realistic to a certain degree. I know because I live right off of the Schnebly Hill House below us, and I don't know how many people rent that place; I'm sure there are at least six or seven people in there, so I understand that, but at the same time, I see what you are saying, there does need to be a rule, but it is also kind of based on square footage.
10. Participant C - I'm not thinking of us as individual homeowners; I'm more worried about the person who comes in and buys up properties and does this. I see a grand gap for business opportunities.
11. Participant B - Would the size of the septic tank have any bearing on how many people could live there? What if they are right up to the limit, and then somebody has a baby or two?
12. Participant C - When I take very long walks, through a variety of areas north of 89A, I wonder when I see a trailer with eight trucks parked out front on a regular basis, how many people could live in that, and if they are all related, there still has to be some code violations, as far as I am concerned and it disturbs me, because it is destroying even the integrity of what is supposed to be a reasonably-priced home, which I don't care, that is perfectly fine.

Parking: Participants indicated parking would be an issue for a lot of people, and it definitely should be provided on the property. Having extra units could exacerbate parking issues on narrow streets.

1. Participant D - There are comments on the parking that I'm a little concerned about; I do like the idea that there should only be one unit per and one parking space. I think parking is a huge issue; I think a lot of people have that issue of making sure there is enough parking and not too much, so you don't have four or five cars parked in the street.
2. Participant C - Parking has to be within their lot; it can't be on the road.
3. Participant D - The other thing with parking is if you have visitors parking, but that becomes messy and I don't know what you can do about it. When you have more units in a house, more parties, that becomes another issue. I can vouch for that.
4. Participant B - Isn't there a difference in the classification of the streets as to whether or not parking is permitted; a striped street you cannot park on?
5. Participant D - I live in an area with very narrow streets and there is parking on the streets; it doesn't make sense. You cannot get two cars by each other if there is parking on the sides, and it is a big safety issue all the time. Having extra units would exacerbate that, and even more so when their kids play in the street; they are blocked behind cars and you are driving.
6. Participant B - As far as parking is concerned, now I think the City relies on the driveway as being a parking space, but if it is two families living there, you can't rely on that being a parking space. You couldn't coordinate who is going to park last, and how does the car in the garage get out of there.

Restrictions (In General): It was noted that while this ordinance provides many answers to the issues, there is this other underground thing going on with owners of multiple properties that won't come forward, and unless they are brought into this, it ruins neighborhoods.

1. Participant D - What gets me is I know a house that was sold to one of these people, and then it was divided into four apartments; you could see it being done. It happens almost regularly, and it has gotten worse. This is good; this is great. It provides so many answers to this issue, and yet you have this other underground thing going on, and I can't see a solution.
2. Participant C - Unless they are brought in some way, it ruins neighborhoods.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 24, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 24, 2009

Overall: Of the six participants, two were supportive of the ordinance and three were strongly opposed to its negative neighborhood impact and the associated problems that would be created for homeowners' associations with CC&Rs; however, it was noted that if it were to go through, it looked reasonable and far better than the original version.

Appearance: There were no specific comments about the architectural appearance requirement.

Concept: Half of the participants were opposed to the concept and one participant also objected to an ADU being counted as half of a unit. A differing point-of-view was that we have workforce housing needs and we don't have a sustainable economy, if workers can't afford to live in the area, plus Northern Arizona is no longer considered a viable location for new projects, because commercial builders are tired of being held hostage to providing affordable housing, etc.

1. Participant A - I felt like the realtor voice needed to be heard, because we hear from new home buyers, their wishes, concerns and what they are already doing, and I'm not sure that you're hearing what is really happening, as opposed to what is proposed to work.
2. Participant B - I might consider using something like this, as long as it is not too governed.
3. Participant C - I am adamantly opposed, because I think it would be detrimental to those of us who live here.
4. Participant E - Foothills North is the development off of Dry Creek Road. We've got 21 lots and 15 houses. We are zoned RS-35 and we prohibit rentals; it is strictly a definition of single-family and as of last January, we now allow owners to lease their house for a minimum of one year.
5. Participant F - The Chair of the Architectural Review Committee for Las Lomas asked me to represent him; he lives next to the only lot along Bristlecone Pines Road that has a guesthouse, and they have had some very bad situations in the past. I'm opposed to the whole thing. I moved into a neighborhood that is single-family, RS-35, and that is what I expect there, single-family residences. It was never designed to be multi-family or have two structures on the same lot. We have a parallel situation right now in Sedona and the state, where the state is talking about making sparklers legal, which is a crazy thing to do in Arizona; Sedona is looking at an ordinance to prohibit it. Their concern is the state law is going to be that you can have it, so then tourists come, well what is legal and what is not? It adds to confusion, in our area we do not allow these structures to be rented out, but now this law would put up a situation where the City allows it, but we don't. An attorney told me if you want to enforce your CC&Rs, it is going to cost you $30,000 in legal fees if it goes smooth. I think it opens a can of worms, because we have too much conflict and right now it makes it easy for us to enforce the CC&Rs, because I just call John O'Brien. I'll be blunt about it, it is hard to enforce CC&Rs and when the City overlaps the CC&Rs, we love it, and when the City has something else going, it creates problems. If it were to go through, it looked reasonable to me, but I would add that the owner of the property must be able to show from CC&Rs that it is legal for them to do so. I want the City to take some responsibility for making sure I don't have to fight for the CC&Rs. I understand that is tricky for the City, but you also understand that you make it tricky for me.
6. Participant C - When you go back to the City's Land Use Code, which I think is what Participant F was really referencing, according to the City's Land Use Code, what you folks are trying to accomplish here is illegal and it doesn't fit, it doesn't work, it doesn't comply

with your own definitions. The City's Land Use Code says, "Single-family residential units are zoned one dwelling unit per lot." The single-family dwelling is defined as, "A detached dwelling unit." Multiple dwelling unit is defined as, "A building containing two or more dwelling units or a combination of two or more separate single-family dwelling units on one lot or building site." As soon as you start talking about Accessory Dwelling Units, you are talking about putting two dwelling units onto one property, and as Participant F just said, one of the things we trust, when we move into a community is the definition of single-family dwelling. That is for me a real basic; it never even occurred to me that a City would rezone single-family into something that would allow multi-family, and according to the City's definitions, an Accessory Dwelling Unit would make single-family into multi-family. (Regarding a possible argument that we are not affecting the current impact), that is not your definition. Your definition of multiple dwelling and single-family dwelling is not the number of people on the property; that is not your definition. Your definition is the units that people will live in. (Regarding changing that), many of us don't want you to do that. We want single-family to exist as single-family; we don't want multi-family in our single-family residential neighborhoods. With regard to the Land Use Plan, if you keep going with this proposal, the result is that you will allow higher density development on your single-family residential properties that are zoned RS-10a, RS-10b and RS-6 than you currently allow on RM-1, Medium-Density, and Multi-Family zoned properties. You are allowing greater density on single-family than you allow on medium-density residential, and that is not right. The third point and last, with regard to the Land Use Plan, is it really upsets me when something is not quite honest, and when you call an ADU a half a dwelling unit, that is not honest. According to, once again, your own definitions, multiple dwelling is, "A building containing two or more dwelling units or a combination of two or more separate single-family dwelling units." Dwelling unit single-family is, "A detached dwelling unit." Dwelling unit is, "Any portion or portion of it which contains living facilities, including provisions for sleeping, cooking and sanitation." Your definition of an Accessory Dwelling Unit is, "A second dwelling unit that is located on the same parcel as the primary single-family dwelling unit." All of your definitions say an ADU is a dwelling unit; it is not half a dwelling unit and I know why you want to do that; it is because you want to limit the impact to the Sedona Growth Management goal. I understand why you want to do that, but it is not right. An ADU is a dwelling unit by all of your definitions, please don't count it as half, please count it as a dwelling unit. I understand you are trying to limit the impact, because Sedona's Growth Management goal is to not increase the number of dwelling units, so by counting it a half, you cut your increase by half.

7. Participant A - I so appreciate your comment that we want to keep things honest, and that is really the reason why I want to participate in this, because this group is likely comprised of a higher-educated more affluent group and that is not the entire demographic strata of Sedona. We have workforce-housing needs, and these people who work in the area have to live somewhere, and they cannot afford probably where all of you live, so what do we do, because we have an issue where we don't have a sustainable economy, if we can't hire employees who are willing to work for a wage that will allow them to live in the area. Fine to live in your chosen subdivision where your CC&Rs prohibit that activity, they probably wouldn't want to live there anyway, but where are they going to live, and I can tell you that from an honesty standpoint, this is going to continue to happen. If you want to let it continue to happen in an illegal fashion that cannot be taxed or monitored or have statistics revealed on it or handled in a way, shape or form that you would really prefer, then maintain the attitude you have. Otherwise, embrace it and put it where it should be, where it is legal, where it is monitored and where the City actually has some authority, because right now they don't have any, because it is secretive, and that doesn't make sense to me.

8. Participant D - Like the fellow from Bristlecone Pines, I'm really opposed to the whole thing, but I'm a realist after 23 years.
9. Participant B - Reading through this, I see that you call it "the Director"; so if this is passed, then you're the one that could change the code however you wanted to, by being the Director? Other than that, I think it is written well; I don't have a problem with any of it.
10. Participant C - While I really don't like this, the current code is far better than the original version and Audree has done a really good job.
11. Participant F - To summarize what Participant C said, it seems like one dog is barking here and the whole rest of the City Code is going to have to dance to that bark. If we have to start modifying this and that in the existing City Development Code to bring this in, then that just throws a red flag up to me that it is making everything else do a dance to accommodate this and that doesn't make sense.
12. Participant A - It is hard, but I think what this Commission has done is they made a valiant attempt to match reality with some kind of enforcement capability for the City or the code, because every week on Thursday, I tour 26 to 35 homes that are on the market, so I see the converted garages, and the guesthouses that people are living in, and I don't think you have any idea of the scope and the width that this is already going on, and if you maintain an unrealistic approach to allowing it to happen, it is going to continue to happen, and then there is no potential for regulation or no attempt to bring it up to a standard where something like that might not happen.
13. Participant F - All of this affordable housing stuff; I wouldn't live in one of these places and I was a teacher for 30 years. I've got a Master's degree and I'm not going to live in an 800 sq. ft. thing and raise my kids in somebody's backyard.
14. Participant C - Going back to your Land Development Code, it outlines what the City wants to achieve through its single-family residential zoning districts, and these are some of the things that the code says are protected by having one dwelling unit per lot, "Adequate light, air, privacy and open space for each dwelling, to minimize traffic congestion, to protect residential property from noise, unsightly odors, smoke and other objectionable influences". That is why the City initially said we want single-family zoning in these areas.
15. Participant A - I don't think we have had the opportunity of discussing why do this; what is the benefit of more affordable housing units, and I would have been totally against allowing rentals of ADUs until I attended a conference in San Francisco some years ago that the National Association of Realtors held about sustainability of resort communities with the housing issues, and people have to afford to be able to visit your resort area or they won't come back. There are so many options; actually on a global basis, people have many more options about places to go and visit, and there is no question that our economy here relies on tourism. If it costs you $500 per day to stay here and you can stay in Aspen for $300 or Santa Barbara for $300, I'm not sure you are coming back to Sedona, and they have solved the affordable housing issues or they have affected it. It affects you; I promise you, you may not feel it today, but if we don't make a place for people to live who are our service-based workforce, you will feel it ultimately, and we have to care about that, and I don't think we have touched on the benefits of providing this housing for people, and maybe it is a good time to do it.
16. Participant D - Something that troubled me is that people who want to work for the corporations here, like the resorts, can't the City make some regulations requiring anyone who opens a resort, to provide facilities and spaces on their property for these people who are going to be the cooks, service people, and people who do the clean-up, rather than the homeowners who bought a house in a residential district. The burden is put on them rather than people who are opening tremendous resorts. (Regarding employer-provided affordable units) that seems to be a more fair resolution.

17. Participant A - Just make no mistake that that cost will get passed on to the consumer, and not long ago, I attended a commercial industries symposium, where several commercial builders from all around the country were there to discuss where projects were viable, and it is no longer in Northern Arizona. There will be no building in Northern Arizona for this very reason. They are tired of communities holding them hostage to build libraries and affordable housing, and things like that, when there are places they can go and that is not required. When you have these additional dwelling units, unless there is a complaint or a problem, there is no added cost to anyone, only a benefit to the homeowner to provide housing for someone who can now afford to live and work here. I ask you the next time you eat at a restaurant, look in the eyes of your servers and ask them where they live, how are they getting by, and how is it working for them? Personalize the issue for yourselves.
18. Participant D - I don't think the onus of providing a home for these people who work in the community should be left on the other homeowners in the community. We have Cottonwood nearby; I had to take two buses and a subway to get to college, and I didn't go complain to the City and say, "Oh, I would like to have an apartment on Park Avenue right near my college; you owe it to me".
19. Participant A - I was of the same mind, but then we have the environmental issues of our entire workforce community making 30-40 mile round trips on a daily basis too.
20. Participant F - We have an interesting experiment coming up with the Huberman [sic] project. I think if that goes through, it is going to really finally give us some feel for what affordable housing is and what it can accomplish and if it can accomplish. It is 176 affordable housing units; they are like 600 to 800 sq. ft. and he specializes in not putting in granite cabinet countertops; he puts in Formica countertops, and he buys the cheap cupboards, so he can build an inexpensive unit. That is going to be a great experiment for the City.
21. Participant D - That would make a provision for a parochial school over there too.
22. Participant F - The master plan includes a school.
23. Participant A - I don't think changes in zoning, based on your expectations when you bought a property, should be affected by a need for the City. You can live where you want to live, and if everyone in that community agrees that we don't want this here, so be it, I don't think that should be pushed down their throats, but conversely, I don't think they should be able to say clear across town that you guys can't do something, because I wouldn't have it in my neighborhood. You bought your property fee simple; you can do what you want with it and if a group of you want to have a certain scenario, fine, but leave us alone over there, because we want to do something different, and it works for us, and that is what America is all about.
24. Participant C - Two things, the first is that the goal of this started out to provide workforce housing and then it kind of became more inclusive than that, and I continue to think that this is not the best way to address that issue. I think apartments are appropriate and I know that there are all kinds of issues about how do you get apartments built, but I don't think anyone who is opposed to the degradation of our neighborhoods through carving apartments out of our houses should be guilt-tripped into thinking we are doing something bad for the community. I think it is a very legitimate point-of-view to say we don't want apartments in our single-family residential areas. Last year when we had a lot of focus groups, there were two teachers who came and teachers have been one of the groups that said we need to provide housing for teachers, and the two teachers who came said, We don't want that; we don't want to live there", and a fireman I talked with said that he didn't live in Sedona, and they we are raising families, and I think he said one fireman lives in Sedona. He said, "We don't want to live in Sedona; Sedona is not the kind of community in which we want to raise our children. We work hours that allow us to commute and it is not a problem, so we don't want to live here"; so to some extent, we are solving a problem that doesn't totally exist as sometimes it is presented. I don't think any of us should feel guilty about not wanting ADUs.

25. Participant C - You asked what we might suggest you do differently and it didn't happen in today's meeting, but I've heard a lot of oh, it is just renting out mother-in-law suites and guest homes, and that sounds very innocuous, but in reality, there is a huge difference between accommodating your own family or loved ones on your property and developing an apartment that you will rent to people you probably don't know. There is a big chasm there and it isn't just, oh I'm going to rent these two things out, in fact, you have to do a conversion to a guesthouse if it is a legal guesthouse. You have to add that kitchen facility to make it a legal ADU; a mother-in-law suite, you might have to do something with, but I would like to see this presented to the public, because most members of the public have not studied this yet. They are just going to read it and wonder what they have against that. Just to be a little clearer about what it is, and at this point, it could be a garage conversion.
26. Participant B - I do believe it is essential that some kind of an ADU Ordinance be passed and wouldn't it be lovely if all of a sudden through the back door, the ADU requirements turned the existing units that are being rented into some legal units.

Cost: Some participants indicated that the associated cost would mean that few people would build a separate unit, and people who would participate would need some motivation to be involved. Additionally, there was a concern about keeping rents low enough to actually help the workforce; however, one participant indicated that perhaps the $100 annual fee should be more.

1. Participant C - I question the annual fee of $100, if that is likely to cover the actual cost of monitoring, paperwork, visits and violations; I suspect you need more than $100.
2. Participant A - It won't pencil; you won't be able to cover the cost of it for what people are willing to rent them for. Unless you already have one, it is not a good investment to go do that, so that won't happen.
3. Participant F - Well it would with me, because I would build the structure myself and I've owned rental properties in the past and know when you hang onto them for a long time, you make a lot of money, and so you can talk about the theory of costing it out, but I've done it for 30 years and I can make it work; not that I would do it, because it doesn't fit in my neighborhood.
4. Participant A - Every community is stressed for funding right now; you cannot add staff or programs or anything like that, unless you can fund it. This may be a way to fund additional staff. You have to give the people who would participate in the program motivation to be involved in it. That has to be a facet of it, but this could be a way, if you could get enough participants, to then fund an enforcement person, so that there was a better level of this activity, rather than an ignored or secretive level of it.
5. Participant E - For these ADUs, what would be the rent that would be charged? What the market bears, but are these going to end up at a price that local workers can afford or is it going to be attractive . . .?
6. Participant A - (Regarding a waiver if you are willing to do it for 20 years) does that pass with the property if they sell it? Interesting.
7. Participant E - That is the concern, will it be helping the local workforce?
8. Participant B - I very much doubt that anybody is going to pull a permit for an ADU to build it as new for $400 or $500 income on a $100,000 addition to your home, but wouldn't it be nice if all of a sudden the units that exist under the radar would have to comply with an ADU.
9. Participant A - Realistically you could expect 20% to 25% participation.
10. Participant B - (Regarding about $16,000 in fees to pull a permit) I read that those were being waived.

Enforcement: Participants were concerned about lack of enforcement, and suggestions for improved enforcement included the revocation of the permit after more than two

complaints in six months; a clear statement of the specific reasons that would result in permit revocation; the strict adherence to the City's safety regulations; the acceptance of unsigned complaints, and limiting the number of occupants in the ADU. Participants liked the requirement for the owner to reside on the property and suggested making illegal units legal before allowing others to be created; however, it was noted that people couldn't be denied their current right to build a guesthouse.

1. Participant D - I live in a neighborhood on Brewer Road and there are homes with accessory dwellings and they are not owner occupied. There are three units, and they have different people there a week at a time; there is no or very little enforcement. I have a Madole studio rented on the property, and when I bought it, it was already rented, and they said it was legal to rent it. A neighbor of mine died and her daughter and son-in-law rented the three buildings out, and they keep asking why I'm fighting this, and she even blocked my entrance to my garage one day. With reference to enforcement, I have talked to City Hall many years, no enforcement, the guys would ride down, up to the foothills and up to the Palisades and make sure they had a certain amount of trees and everything else to enforce the Code and get money for the City for a Certificate of Occupancy, and they would bypass all of these little houses and garages that had weekend visitors all the time, with their garbage out on the road; some had garbage cans out there, so how is it going to be enforced, the City needs money. I know the people in the area, I have a studio, have had it for years, but I was told it was absolutely legal and I've had wonderful tenants; the people in the neighborhood know them. It is going to be an impossibility to enforce it; we don't have the money.
2. Participant E - One thing in there that is good, if it goes through, is to have the owner of the property in the residence, as a resident owner.
3. Participant A - My thought is the City should be equipped to have some teeth with regard to complaint-based statistics; if more than two neighbors complain in a 6-month timeframe, then their right to rent might be removed or something, but be specific as to what happens under complaint conditions, because my experience has been with these types of situations, that the whole neighborhood doesn't either notice they are there or they don't mind that they are there. In those situations that are problematic, if they were given specifics as to reasons to remove their right to continue to rent, then that could be helpful.
4. Participant C - Because of Proposition 207, this initial code has to be as strict as possible, so if there is a mechanism that is legal for limiting the number of people in an ADU, and I think there is, then that needs to go in right away, because if it isn't there initially and it is added in a year or two, somebody is going to say wait a minute, you're taking away my property rights. You can always loosen it a year down the line. You can say this is working great; let's loosen it up, but you cannot restrict it further.
5. Participant F - I like the idea that the owner must live on the property, and also on the strictness of what does a complaint consist of. I was in education for 30 years and we watched the judges continually throw out that you didn't specify that, and the only people that come out ahead, when you don't specify stuff is the lawyers. It really does need to specify this is our definition of a complaint. There has to be very good clarity; otherwise, you're going to end up in court.
6. Participant D - If you sent a whole squad of inspectors up and down the streets in Sedona, there are already 176 of these, so why bother to do all of this work? You said it is going to sunset.
7. Participant E - The idea of the density that Participant C referred to earlier may be another measure that could help, because the existing RS single-family has some inconsistencies. Additionally, it seems the City's Zoning Code, in terms of safety, etc., has become increasingly stricter over the years. There was housing for local worker populations that was substandard, and I remember a fire in a rooming structure, which was not up to code, about

25 years ago on Mackinac Island and a number of people were killed, so it is important that the City stick with its increasingly strict safety code, etc.

8. Participant C - Could we hear a response from Audree or Jim regarding current regulations? Participant A was just saying it is all out there and we know it is; we see it in our neighborhoods. It is unregulated and nothing is happening; it exists.
9. Participant F - If we are trying to make the existing units legal, then what about saying if you don't already have a guesthouse on your property, you are not going to go out and build one and meet this. Let's work on getting the ones that are illegal legal, because with this, I'm still young and I'm going to need some extra income; I've got an acre, so I'm going to go build a guesthouse and get in on this. Before we start building more guesthouses, if we are talking about getting rid of the illegal market, let's give them an opportunity to become legal and just make it for existing units.
10. Participant A - You can't restrict people who currently have the zoning to build a guesthouse, should they so want one.
11. Participant F - It would not become this.
12. Participant C - Echoing what Participant F just said, staff and Community Development have said that there are more than this many ADUs out there; we all are aware of where these are in our neighborhoods. If the City put forth a real effort, not just waiting for complaints, you could do it through newspaper articles, the Community Connection newsletter; you could do it if you said people don't have to sign the complaint. Right now people are afraid; they have to sign it and they don't want to create a problem in their own neighborhood. If you really wanted to take care of this, there are things you could do that would help, and I would far rather see these illegal ones caught, addressed and perhaps made legal or go by the wayside, and then after going through that process, move forward and accept new. Instead of open the doors and first come first serve, first open the doors for those that are illegal, see what those are, and then have real enforcement. Enforcement is a big issue among people who live here. I know there are staff members who say, "Oh yeah it is enforced, it is no problem", but among the members in the community, we see illegal, after illegal, after illegal, and among the members of the community, there is little trust in enforcement on ADUs and vacation rentals. Last year, I know you were saying it was hard to get into a house; they have to invite you in . . ., and that was a real barrier to enforcement, I don't know if you can figure out a way to get around that. Is there a time that you stop? Do you stop at 5:00 p.m. or do you work in the evenings when people are home? Do we need more Enforcement Code Officers?
13. Participant A - (Regarding possibly writing that in this case anonymous complaints will be treated the same as any high priority complaint) I think that would be fine as long as the complaint is specific and written; it doesn't have to be signed, but it can't be that I don't like them. It needs to be specific on what the problem is, if it is a violation. (Regarding one ADU that has to be gutted) Is it a licensed contractor?
14. Participant E - I feel strongly it is a good idea to have the owner be a resident in one of these; that is going to increase the chances that the property will be maintained.
15. Participant F - If they say it is owner-occupied, but you know it is not, contact the bank. They'll deal with it.
16. Participant D - The thing is that property owner doesn't do anything outside to make it look nice. Some of the other owners that do not live on the property have fixed their places up, but some of them haven't, so it is not a general statement that every one of them that have ADUs and don't live there keeps the property very nice from my experience.
17. Participant E - Are kitchens allowed in these units?
18. Participant A - They are actually required, right?
19. Participant C - It is the difference between a guesthouse and an ADU.

Garage Conversions: Participants were not in favor of garage conversions, because garage parking would be eliminated.

1. Participant C - You are going to hear a lot of objections to garage conversions and things like that.
2. Participant C - Do not allow garage conversions; that would dump the ADU and the primary residence vehicles out onto the property, which is a negative impact.
3. Participant F - The garage conversion was a very good point, because now you have doubled the number of cars, and you have put them all out in the yard somewhere. (Regarding the second floor above the garage), that is a different issue. Of course, then you've got code problems with the living space over a garage, but that is their problem.
4. Participant D - On the other corner from where I live, there are two garages that were made into rentals, and in one of them, the fellow has a great big white truck and he can't get it into the garage and there is a pole holding the roof up on the garage, because I can see it when I walk around the block, and lately he has had a big cement mixer in front. It was converted in the last 10 years, when they converted the second garage, so I think to appease me they have the one on the corner with the guy with the cement mixer out in front. They seem to have people in there with a year's lease, but I think he always jacks the rent up so they don't stay, and he can get someone else to pay the higher rent. Once I get a tenant, I don't raise the rent, and I've had a lady for eight years. One of them gave me an increase in my rent. He said he was a real estate guy back in Chicago and he said he wasn't paying me enough money, so he gave me two increases.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): Participants were in favor of the grandfather clause, but suggested making it for one year rather than six months.

1. Participant A - I do love the idea of the amnesty, because I think that is a motivating factor for a short-term timeframe for people to come forward and be legal, and those property values would go up, because we are no longer doing something that the realtor has to very carefully disclose is currently being used in an illegal fashion. Try to get that escrow to close these days, so if we can make something legal and motivate the people to do this now to come forward, then you can study it, monitor it and have a list. All those things are great.
2. Participant F - I sense a direction of trying to go after the currently illegal; make the amnesty a year. Give them some time to think about it. If that is our real goal, give them a little extra time to make the decision.
3. Participant A - It will take six months before people hear.
4. Participant C - Yes, and a lot of them don't even live here.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants indicated a permit should not be issued if CC&Rs prohibit rental units.

1. Participant E - Looking at the proposed revision, this proposed ADU would include, by my quick check, all of the zoning districts that are called single-family zones. In other words, it could go everywhere, and I don't think that is good. Just representing my neighborhood, I think it is good if there is some wording put in there about, if existing CC&Rs prohibit it, then the City would not permit that.
2. Participant A - Isn't that true anyway though.
3. Participant F - I would like to build on what Participant E said and I said earlier, somehow a tie-in of some sort to the CC&Rs, so we don't open up a can of worms there.

Miscellaneous: Participants' suggestions included not allowing the "Director" flexibility to change the code, polling existing property owners with guesthouses to determine potential participation, and exploring ways to get more people involved at the beginning of the

process. Participants also complimented staff for having a very democratic process and doing a good job.

1. Participant C - I applaud the process you folks have undertaken. My first meeting was when we were sent these little postcards, and they said come and share your ideas, and then we got there and it was no, you can't ask questions. The only thing we want is one representative from the table; you answer this one little question. It was totally shutdown, and that raised my ire and got me involved, and since that really bad start, you are to be applauded for handling this in a way that could not be more inclusive, and while I respectfully disagree, I am very respectful of the process and the people on staff that have been involved with this.
2. Participant A - Is there any possibility of polling the people that own potential ADUs, can we get a mailing list of people with guesthouses? If they are showing up in County records as having a secondary dwelling, is that a searchable criterion? I would ask if their primary residence is owner occupied and the days per year that they actually use it, would they consider renting it, and how they feel about that. I think that might be an interesting study. You could find out how many more would participate or how many more would say they would never consider it. If you have a guesthouse or secondary dwelling there is higher potential there, so it might be worth a shot.
3. Participant F - I don't know how you solve it, but in a school district we had the same problem; you get eight people here, you do something, and then 100 show up. I went to the cultural park thing; Monty Fitch and I became good friends, because there was nobody else there. That is something to explore with other cities, how do you get people involved in the beginning instead of the end?
4. Participant D - Thank you John; this was very democratic; you didn't sit in a big room with everybody raising their hand wanting to speak.
5. Participant E - I've been working with the city and you do a great job here; I find you and the staff very helpful.

Neighborhood Impact: Concerns expressed included allowing greater density on single-family properties than are allowed in RM-1 and Multi-Family areas; increasing sewage, when the City already has a sewage problem; not having a limit on the number of ADUs allowed in a neighborhood and a tie-in with CC&Rs; lowering property values, and creating a negative visual and noise impact. Another point-of-view was the concern that some people are renting their extra dwelling to make the payments on their property and foreclosures adversely affect property values.

1. Participant D - The first City Manager has weeds growing across the road and last summer I was trying to get rid of the weeds right on Brewer Road across from the church, and I spent $40 to keep the weeds down.
2. Participant C - With regard to the Land Use Plan, if you keep going with this proposal, the result is that you will allow higher density development on your single-family residential properties that are zoned RS-10a, RS-10b and RS-6 than you currently allow on RM-1, Medium-Density, and Multi-Family-zoned properties. You are allowing greater density development on single-family than you allow on medium-density residential, and that is not right.
3. Participant D - When I walk up about 150 ft., the smell, you would think I was in the bathroom. The stink of the sewage is terrible, and I wonder, all of these people who are renting down the road and nearby, don't they notice it or what about the visitors that spend weekends there, don't they notice, so there is that much more sewage going in and the City has trouble with a sewage problem already.
4. Participant C- Limit the number of ADUs in any one neighborhood.
5. Participant A - The other thing that is important for you to consider is that some of these people are renting their extra dwelling to make the payment on their property, and they

couldn't otherwise. I don't know if you realize the foreclosures we have here in Sedona, but it affects your property values. Every time a property is foreclosed on and put back on the market by the bank at a huge loss, the average price range for all Sedona properties continues to go down, and if people, in a way that is pleasing to the eye and acceptable to others in the neighborhood can avoid foreclosure, there is a side benefit of that for you. I would ask that you take that into consideration, until we get through this recession and this really hard time.

6. Participant D - Some of those out-of-towners came in and had a few bucks, and they bought property, and then they turned them into weekend rentals and that lowered the value of all of the houses nearby. These people don't think about the people who are affected and have lived there for years and bought a single-family home with a studio or an accessory dwelling.
7. Participant A - It doesn't change the outcome, if that did happen.
8. Participant D - I mean neighborhoods change. The street where I live, people lived there 25 to 40 years; it was the first development in Sedona, and the elderly people died and other people came in and they made a rental out of their garage, and so on, but it lowers the value of the homes around it.
9. Participant A - Not to the degree foreclosures do however.
10. Participant F - The foreclosure situation is a temporary situation; this is a permanent situation.
11. Participant A - But property value decreases are a long return.
12. Participant C - I think the primary impact is very local; if House A decides to do a garage conversion next to House B and House A is a typical Sedona house with 2.1 retired people living there, they are quiet and have two cars parked in the garage and all of a sudden they do a garage conversion, and you have four cars dumped out onto the lot, and you've got whoever happens to move in. It could be two lovely quiet people and you never see them or it could be two, three, four or five loud people; they could be workers and come and go at odd hours. (With additional cars parked adjacent to their property), when the time comes for Property B to sell that property, there could be a significant loss in the money they would get for their property. I know I am describing some negatives; it is not necessarily negative, but generally rental properties and the upshot of rental properties are not positive. I know staff has said they have researched and found that there is no loss of property value, but I would question how that has been done. I would question the methodology and make certain that whatever methodology you are using stands up to scrutiny. For example, if what you are saying is citywide they instituted ADUs and that their average property values have increased, that is not an acceptable methodology. What you really have to look at is Property B; did Property B lose value with Property A adjacent to it? The concerns are property values and visual impact
13. Participant F - Noise impact; let's face it, a lot of the workers get up early and a lot of them have cars that are not real quiet.
14. Participant A - I've observed and my experience has been that long-term renters are the nightmare you suspect short-term renters are. Short-term renters tend to be more affluent, care for the property better and the owners of the properties that allow short-term rentals tend to be sure that the properties stay in an aesthetically beautiful condition, so they can continue to rent them for the highest possible price. It is your long-term renters that, unless you ban rentals, which I guess is an option; those are the ones that get multiple cars, extra family members and the trashy appearance of the property. They have no motivation to improve or maintain the exterior or interior of the property.
15. Participant C - Participant A is absolutely right. When you look around our neighborhood, it is the rental properties that stick out. You can tell they are rental properties; there is a difference.
16. Participant E - The fact that it includes all single-family designations in the City Code in not good. There needs to be something about density or whatever, getting back to neighborhoods that have CC&Rs.

Ninety-Day Minimum: Most participants wanted the 90-day period or longer, to avoid short-term rentals; however, one participant favored reducing it.

1. Participant D - I have had the same person there for eight years, then four years and two years. We had an architect in there and right now I have a gal who was a day trader in New York, and she has been there for four years, so I wondered where you got the three months from. When she (the neighbor) asked why I am objecting to it, I said if I wanted to sell my house, and they asked how the neighbors are, we don't know who the neighbors are, because they are different every week or weekend.
2. Participant A - I would actually reduce the mandatory minimum number of days or months that someone can stay.
3. Participant E - It is good to keep a longer term for the rental, because we don't want to turn this into a way of getting around vacation rentals, and make sure it is actually for whom it is intended. One thing that is not in here is maybe no subletting, but I don't know the legality of that.
4. Participant C - Keep the 90 days for the reason that was just given. The intent of this code is to provide long-term housing for people; it is not to provide vacation rentals, so please keep the 90 days.
5. Participant D - We've had the one for 30 days, and these people come and stay weekends, and I questioned one of them, and she said, "Oh, I have a lease", and she stayed five days and was gone. I asked if I could see it, and she said, "Oh no, it is at Foothills" and I never saw the lease. They sign a 30-day lease; they can't help it if the person moves away in five or seven days. If people want, there are ways of getting around all of this stuff. Three months is not going to solve any housing problem for the people who work in the different resorts. They want a place where they can stay for at least a year, not 90 days.
6. Participant D - (Add to the ordinance) a one-year lease.
7. Participant E - The object is to help the workforce in the community, so a longer minimum time is going to help them more than a month or shorter. It should at least be 90 days or longer; that should stay the minimum.
8. Participant A - On a socio-economic basis, the workforce housing tends to be more transient; it is just a reality, so I don't know if that would serve the purposes realistically, what I like about this again is that it is honest and matching code with reality and enforcement with what is really happening,

Occupancy: Some participants suggested having a limit on the number of people in the ADU, using perhaps one person per 200 sq. ft. or two people per bedroom, in addition to the current definition of family.

1. Participant C - Limit the number of people in an ADU; right now, there is no limit on the actual number of people. It is 4-unrelated adults with all of their grandfathers, uncles, aunts, cousins, the whole nine yards. There is the law according to the property, but you're doing something more limited on the property and there might be a way to, within the law, limit the number of people on a square foot basis, like one per 200 sq. ft. or something, but put something in this code.
2. Participant B - One thing that might solve a lot of questions and concerns about huge families moving into 350 sq. ft. is to use an enforceable limit on the number of people that can live there.
3. Participant A - There is a state code with regard to that.
4. Participant F - Under Fair Housing you can't.
5. Participant A - Oh, yeah.
6. Participant B - Yeah, you can limit it on the ADU, I'm almost sure.
7. Participant A - There is a state code that limits the number of people per bedroom.
8. Participant B - Well, those are not enforceable.

9. Participant A - We're talking about it and the Emperor has no clothes here, so why bother? It is two per bedroom; it is in the state statutes; I'm not sure what section, but we can find it.
10. Participant B - Is a studio apartment a bedroom?
11. Participant A - A bedroom is defined now as an area designed for sleeping, and I think you have to have a minimum of an 8 ft. ceiling, but you don't have to have a closet, as long as you have an armoire.

Parking: Parking was a concern with garage conversions (See additional comments under Garage Conversions).

1. (With a garage conversion), the cars are going to be parked adjacent to your property; you look out the kitchen window and instead of seeing nice landscaping, you see the brick wall that is built and the bad car that is sitting on what used to be nicely landscaped property.

Restrictions (In General): There were no general comments about the restrictions, other than those reflected under Concept and Enforcement.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 25, 2009
FOCUS GROUP
(NOON)

Synopsis of the ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 25, 2009 - 12:00 p.m.

Overall: Participants supported this concept as a reasonable approach that would provide a positive opportunity for seniors and help bring illegal units up to standard. There were concerns about committing to 20 years, having size restricted to an arbitrary number, and requiring inspections without notice. Participants also indicated there should be some flexibility regarding waivers, "family" should be further defined, and non-rental extended stays in ADUs should be further distinguished from guesthouses. Additionally, Council's desired level of enforcement and required staff should be established upfront.

Appearance: There were no specific comments regarding the appearance requirement.

Concept: Participants indicated this concept is needed for seniors and there are advantages to legalizing the existing illegal units.

1. Participant E - I've been nagging the City Council to look at it, because a couple of years ago, we built a big addition onto our home and we thought if one of us was widowed, we could rent that out for companionship or for extra income if anything happened, so we built about 900 sq. ft. onto the house, and at the end of it, when we were getting our permit or whatever, the City made us sign a statement that we would not rent it out, so here we are in the middle of construction and we already had 220 and vaulted ceilings in it, because it was our garage, and they made us take the 220 out. We thought that could be for a stove. I have heard of widows especially, who have big old houses, their husband dies, they don't want to move and they can't necessarily afford to, and when they move somebody in, if a neighbor tells on them, then they can't do it. I know of a special case where the woman had to leave her home, because she could not rent out a unit like that in her house. We should have the right to do certain things with our property; but of course, it would have to be constructed and looked at, so you don't move big families in, but for one or two people, I don't understand why we can't do it.
2. Participant A - I mirror Participant E's issues and there may even be some additional to that. I'm not an attorney and I don't wish to sue, but when they told me the same thing, when we built our guesthouse, you are imposing upon me, if in fact you ever change the law, to come back and have to retrofit to upgrade the house. I don't know that you should be able to stop her from putting 220 in. If you are going to build the structure, you plan it for long-term use in the future. No, it is not multi-family, but let's say that you go on vacation, you are still with your spouse and everybody is happy; if you have someone renting there, you can offset rent and they can be caretakers, caregivers. There are lots of benefits to having the ability to have an Accessory Dwelling Unit on your property that isn't just geared to how much profit I can make, so there is a lot more stuff to talk about. In general, those issues are what it is about, not just that I can rent it; there are deeper facts involved in having it.
3. Participant A - I think there is an advantage to legalizing existing, whether that is good or bad; it is an advantage that it at least puts it on record, and you folks have knowledge of things. It quantifies the uses and it potentially improves the building code requirements, if it starts to upgrade some of these. The new ones automatically comply; the older ones are going to be forced to upgrade, so there are some strong advantages to having this take place. Obviously for the negatives, it would be the "I would love this, but not in my backyard" or "As long as they did it in another subdivision, instead of beside me", but you've got some built-in things. You've got zoning, which allows for guesthouses, you've got sizes, you've got other conditions that limit the ability to do it, and you've got CC&Rs, so that number you are after is automatically reduced, because of some of these limiting conditions, and the

advantage is that it gives you a record and it upgrades the quality possibly of the units that are there, so there are some pluses to doing it.

4. Participant B- I do think it could have positive impact on the seniors in our community who own houses that are too big, who almost want to move into the smaller unit and perhaps rent the house, so it has implications for senior housing.
5. Participant A - That is one of the biggest selling points; as you know, today is fine, but what if we get in a car wreck and can't get around; all of a sudden, those opportunities look pretty good.
6. Participant E - I love about this the idea that you are doing it. I've been howling about this for years, because people kept hollering about affordable housing and I keep saying that we all have it with larger houses; we all have it available, especially when we are widowed, and there it sits, we can't do anything with it.

Cost: Participants indicated that the permitting costs would be a deterrent, and some flexibility should be allowed in determining if waivers are warranted. Additionally, committing to 20 years is too long and possibly a fee reduction scale could be used, such as granting a 25% reduction in the Development Impact Fee for a 5-year commitment, etc.

1. Participant D - In 918.09B, where the City appears to be creating incentives by waiving fees, impact fees and that sort of thing, in order to identify a category of lower-income to be tracked for 20 years. That to me is social engineering, whereas the whole thing is technical up to that point. Okay, to me, it was a bit off the mark as far as everything else I read.
2. Participant A - On that same item, in 918.09A, it says subject to all applicable fees, including building permits, and I put a note in, except for 918.08C above; in other words, there may be some that shouldn't get waived or this basically is all encompassing, and it says they will be, and there may be some exclusions you want to consider. Then on 918.09B, it says an Area Median Income for no less than a 20-year timeframe and I said, is that rental time or earning years? What does the 20 years relate to?
3. Participant D - (Regarding the cost of about $16,000 to pull a permit for one of these), but what about conversions? You could waive it.
4. Participant C - Now that you tell me it is going to cost $16,000 to do one of these, I don't think there will be many of them converted. I think you will have a hard time getting 176.
5. Participant B - One of the other impacts that I think we will see is related to getting the Development Impact Fees waived and being required to rent it at the 80% for 20 years; that means that if you sell your house, you are now obliging the next person who takes it over to continue with the same rental policy. I don't know how you came up with 20 years, but that seems like an extraordinarily long period of time; I guess 10 years feels like a reasonable time. When you think about people owning their houses for twenty years, it is somewhat exceptional. People tend to move a little more frequently than that. I think it is totally discouraging to do something like that and say 20 years, if in fact, you really want to get some of these rented for 80% of the median.
6. Participant D - If you are going to have to come back and pay retroactively if you sold your house in 10 years, that is also going to discourage people wanting to do the 80%. How many people live in their place for 10 years?
7. Participant B - Suppose I was willing to do it for five years, would you give me 25% less on impact fees? I think people are more inclined to say I want to do an Accessory Dwelling Unit and I'm willing to do this for affordable housing for five years, and you have a scale for a reduction on the impact fee.
8. Participant D - Would the City have the mechanism to enforce that upon sale of the property? (Regarding a lien on the property) okay, that makes it easier.

Enforcement: Participants noted that guesthouses converted to ADUs that then have non-rental extended stays clouded the distinction between guesthouses and ADUs. Participants were very supportive of the owner occupant requirement, but indicated the desired level of enforcement and staff required need to be defined upfront. (Note: Participants opposed the City currently requiring people to remove 220 from their guesthouses.)

1. Participant C - I am concerned about enforcement of parking and not using street parking, and I would like to know the definition of cooking, as far as that category goes. Does a hotplate constitute cooking?
2. Participant B - Maybe that needs to be spelled out.
3. Participant C - This definition does not cover that.
4. Participant E - You would have to have 220, right; what we had to take out.
5. Participant C - How about sanitation, could they share a bathroom with the house? Does the City allow room rentals now?
6. Participant A - If a person has a guesthouse on their property and it has no cooking facilities installed per the code, could these be incorporated into this as being an extended stay and enable the kitchen facilities to be installed in that unit, but not for rent? Could you put a stove and oven in there, if this gets adopted? Then, let's say it is not rented; they built a facility that doesn't have cooking facilities installed, but they would like for mom and dad to live there and have them cook on their own, so they would like to put a unit in there. Right now it is prohibited as a guesthouse. Then, let's go back to the orange ones (on the map) where it says ADUs would be prohibited in the subdivision; you aren't doing it for rental, so could someone who had a guesthouse in one of those subdivisions put in kitchen facilities as long as it is for extended stay? The CC&Rs that we did for the subdivision in 1981 was for a county subdivision, and I don't think the county ordinance even addresses guesthouses; it is minimal stuff.
7. Participant B - That seems to cloud the issue, because if there is not a clear definition of a guesthouse and you can put a stove in it, then chances are you are going to rent it out, even if you are renting it for three months. Will there still be a guesthouse specific definition for specific uses? Then, if you convert that guesthouse to an ADU and you don't want to charge someone rent, that is fine, but maybe two years from now, you may be charging someone rent. If they are prohibited, then you have now created a situation where something prohibited is done.
8. Participant A - Prohibited is saying it is an ADU; it is two different issues, one is cooking facilities and one is ADU. It has already said that an ADU in point cannot be leased or rented if it is a guesthouse. Now, let's not say that a person might or might not break the law and do it; that is not the point. Per the law, there is a guesthouse per the ordinance, and because of CC&Rs, ADUs are prohibited. I'm talking about extended stay, non-rental, not that I might not a year from now rent it, because no one is seeing me, but following the law, can I make it an extended stay unit by putting in cooking facilities?
9. Participant E - But that is what we were told; that was their judgment. If we had the 220 in there, we would rent it, which wasn't true. We wanted the right to do that someday, but we had no plan. We said we would sign that we wouldn't rent it, and they said take out the 220. It was in there from our garage, because it had been a garage; we didn't put it in, it was there and they didn't say don't use it, they said get it out of there.
10. Participant B - Are you finding that there are CC&Rs that allow the guesthouse, but don't allow the ADUs?
11. Participant E - Are the rules going to be the same for an ADU in a house and a separate guesthouse? I can see where there might be more flexibility; like you said, you don't want two big units on one property. Ours is one unit, so nobody can tell there is an ADU in it. I would think they would be a little bit different. What is a Proposition 207 waiver?

12. Participant A - They just want you to say you won't sue them, as a result; that is what the waiver is.
13. Participant E - Oh, so you have to sign it.
14. Participant B - (Regarding the owner living on the property) I think that is a good idea.
15. Participant B - Do you have any idea how many amnesty units there are?
16. Participant E - What would you count an ADU that is not being used as one, like mine for example? So, it would be new.
17. Participant B - When you look at enforcement, you could be enforcing 600 of these, and how would you handle that? That is a big question.
18. Participant D - Do you want 600?
19. Participant B - The 176 sounds like a manageable amount. If we can't, then this is academic, because if you can't enforce it . . . Somehow the enforcement needs to be defined, because you are saying yes, we are going to enforce it, but the reality is that you may have to enforce it at a very minimal level if you have too many of them, and I wouldn't be happy as a community member, knowing that the enforcement is not going to be strong. (Regarding if Council wants proactive enforcement, more bodies would be needed and we would want clarity from Council on that issue), that is not something to spell out in this?
20. Participant D - Of course, if something is illegal and existing right now, Prop 207 probably would not apply.
21. Participant E - I would hate to see you adjust down the new ones because of the illegals; that pushes the illegals to the front of the line.
22. Participant B - As far as the HOAs that do not permit this, HOAs right now are under enormous pressure and they are losing cases one-by-one, so I would venture to guess that if some of the residents wanted to do it, a current HOA that does not permit it could be sued to allow owners to do it, and the way HOAs and CC&Rs are going these days, they are getting knocked down on various issues, so I think there is that possibility.
23. Participant E - How would that work if you moved into your own ADU and rented out your house; would your house be an ADU? My ADU is an illegal size. As long as there is flexibility, I'm just one person, but other people have to have special circumstances too.

Garage Conversions: Clarification on the screening requirement for one entrance was requested and one participant was concerned about safety when a portion of the garage is used as an ADU.

1. Participant E - Under garage conversions, item M. on page 5, I don't understand that about doors, where it says solid screening is required to screen at least one of the entrances from the street.
2. Participant B - Some of the pictures of the existing guesthouses still look like garages, is that what they have done; one looked like a 3-car garage? There is a door on the side or the back, is that the idea?
3. Participant E - The converted garage; I am not comfortable with c. under that. It talks about where garage space is converted to an ADU or if a portion of a garage space is converted to an ADU and the remaining portion still functions as a garage, a garage door may not be required to be replaced, and I don't like a garage and a house being in a garage; it is not safe.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): Participants expressed concern about limiting the size of especially existing units to an arbitrary number and suggested using 33% of the square footage of the primary dwelling unit, or if it is beyond the discretion of the Director, it should go to perhaps the Board of Adjustment or be based on the allowed Lot Coverage. Participants also suggested making the amnesty period one year.

1. Participant B - Is there a minimum square footage on an ADU?
2. Participant E - Our ADU is 900 sq. ft., and we are going to be penalized, because it is too big.

3. Participant A - That is my biggest issue, the arbitrary size of 800 sq. ft.
4. Participant E -Yeah, because this is 2/3 the size of our house.
5. Participant A - I was thinking like no more than 1/3, and you address 33% of the house in there in some places. Let's say for the sake of mathematics, with a 3,300 sq. ft. house a 1,100 sq. ft. guesthouse is the upper limit or some other arbitrary number. If it doesn't fall within that, unless there are other special circumstances, you may have a guesthouse that has been on your property 15 years; you are not going to cut off the edge of the building. That is what I am proposing.
6. Participant E - How about cutting it off at half, because ours is a converted big garage, so it is half the size of the house.
7. Participant B - You are grandfathering the ones that already exist, as far as size is concerned, but seeing that all new construction must abide by new rules. If they exist, there should be some discretion.
8. Participant A - They are allowing you as the Director the discretion, if it is greater than that, then all of a sudden, should it go before somebody?
9. Participant B - (Maybe it is the Board of Adjustment) that sounds like a good idea.
10. Participant E - What would be wrong with a large ADU; what would be the negative, because it is part of our house. We can't un-build it; we made it big, because we're using it, but we won't always. If it is your garage, your garage is what it is, and we have a good size garage. It is probably bigger than average, because we have a lot of storage in it.
11. Participant D - You said 900 sq. ft., and that would be 30 ft. x 30 ft.; I don't think I've ever heard of a garage that is that long; it may be that wide.
12. Participant B - That sounds like a Board of Adjustment exception.
13. Participant A - Exceptions need to be addressed.
14. Participant E - There needs to be some flexibility anyway, unless there is a good reason that something wouldn't fit the ADU.
15. Participant B - (Regarding a 1-year amnesty period), I agree that is probably a good idea.
16. Participant E - Does the City really expect them to come forward? I can't see it. If money is involved, I think they will. (Regarding the underground units becoming less desirable, which forces them to come forward), in that case, you would need a year probably for that to happen; that's a great point.
17. Participant D - That open-ended number is pretty scary, whether it is existing or underground or not. They are under the rug right now, but we are about to pull the rug off to see what you can get.
18. Participant B - Suppose you have a high number, then could you adjust the 176 down, so you are only looking at 100?
19. Participant A - Your verbiage says that at a certain time, you are going to look at it, because it may need more.
20. Participant A - I commented that I felt the size limit was potentially too small, back to what I said, maybe no more than 1/3 for either existing or new. When you say 800 sq. ft. that may or may not . . ., I would like to make it based on some other evaluation, not an arbitrary number, and some of the suggestions are one-third of the size of the primary dwelling unit. If they are going to go in with a permit, you have got it right there or also based on some of the zoning constraints, for example, if you've got 35,000 sq. ft., you can only cover 40% combined or 70,000, but when you have 10,000 or something like that, I don't think the 10,000 ones should be allowed to have a bigger unit, and I'm not qualifying the whole thing, I just think the 800 is an arbitrary number.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants indicated the inspectors should give notice prior to showing up for an inspection. Additionally, participants indicated that enforcement should be somewhat more proactive at first. One suggestion was to reexamine the ADU if

something wasn't right or there was a complaint, rather than annually and there were differing thoughts on the $100 annual fee; however participants noted that the tougher restrictions would make it more acceptable to the community.

1. Participant D - There is a requirement for a renewal every year; is there an inspection involved with that or is that just a reapplication?
2. Participant A - I don't think the way it is written is appropriate. I don't care when they do the inspections, but the way it is written, you can come this afternoon at 3:00 p.m. and get entrance to my house for your inspection, and that is not appropriate.
3. Participant E - You want them to make an appointment?
4. Participant A - They should, just like a landlord or anyone else has to give some notice. Of course that tells the 15 people they better get out of there, because he is coming tomorrow at noon, but my side of it is they shouldn't be able to just show up whenever they want and say they have access to your home.
5. Participant E - I agree.
6. Participant D - That would almost constitute an illegal search and seizure.
7. Participant A - Yeah, the way it is written enables you to do it, and I'm not . . . as I said, at least generically provide how to notice it; there is some verbiage that is going to be appropriate.
8. Participant D - As soon as you get the notification issue settled that might be all you need, because you will be looking at building compliance as well as the general, if it looks like 15 people have been living there.
9. Participant A - It is 918.06E on page 8.
10. Participant D - If you have 176 potential units, does that mean that the City would have to add manpower to accomplish that? In the course of a year, would annual inspections decline or be even?
11. Participant B - If you only do it by complaint, you are going to have a lot of people unhappy at the end of this. It almost seems that you need to be doing a little bit more proactively. If you really want this to work and have the community feel good about it, then I think the City needs to plan to be proactive across the board, because otherwise, neighbors don't necessarily snitch on neighbors, and before you know it, somebody else is saying do you realize how illegal everything is going on here, and you have a real intent in what you are trying to do here, but if you just leave it to the complaint process . . . I would say for the first five years, you need to monitor this really well, so it works and accomplishes what you are trying to accomplish, in terms of sizes, who is occupying it, the parking, the infrastructure, how it is working in terms of overuse of whatever.
12. Participant A - A suggestion to mitigate it is let's say you do the annual and you go through and everything looks perfect versus going in and saying something isn't right; I'm going to come back in three months. Maybe there is a revolving that if you see something that is marginal, you are going to be back again.
13. Participant D - If there is a compliance issue, you need to reexamine it.
14. Participant A - So, something that is not like they are forced to do . . ., I'm not saying you shouldn't, but there's an opportunity during the course of that investigation or examination to find multiple questionable things, so you give them a repair list. Then, you are proactive to the ones that you know, or you have determined, are wrong and you have still got the other opportunities.
15. Participant E - I assume you interview the owner, when you do these inspections. I'm just wondering about something like parking, to see if that is working; you're not going to know unless you talk to the neighbors, right? Because I'm going to say it is fine; my renter is going to say it is fine. That they have the space, but not where they are parking.

16. Participant A - For the notes, maybe you are trying to tie two things together, a permit that will have a list of conditions, and you need to make sure that those conditions match with the landlord's lease. The lease may say I have open access anytime, and if that is the case, maybe the City can gain the same access. Something to combine the two that this ordinance is stricter than the lease or the lease is stricter than the ordinance. One has to supersede, and I'm assuming the City's ordinance will supersede the leases.
17. Participant B - I think Arizona State Law has certain requirements as far as a landlord being able to go into an apartment.
18. Participant D - You can go in for an emergency under any circumstances, but otherwise you need to give proper notice.
19. Participant B - Are we only dealing here with 176 units? So, that 176 will be made up of some of those that are already existing that would be now defined as an ADU. Newly built?
20. Participant D - (Regarding that pertaining to new ones only) it doesn't say that, does it?
21. Participant A - (Regarding checking a request to state that if the HOA prohibits it, the City wouldn't issue the permit) . . . without approval or authority. That has been a comment in other meetings. At the rate HOAs are losing some cases, be prepared for something like this.
22. Participant A - I didn't like the annual fee, not that I dislike an annual fee; I thought the $100, when you can have a business registration fee for $25 . . .; someone picked the number, but it seems onerous. What about a one-time fee that is even more significant; in today's economy, it is another expense and the $100 may seem like nothing, but how do you get the $100, you add it to the rent, so now you are affecting the rent stream. It is only $100.
23. Participant B - Would you waive it for that 80%?
24. Participant D - I have a counter thought for that. Part of what makes this palatable to all of us is the fact that it is tougher than a normal situation. If I'm renting a house, which I own and don't live in, do I have to get a license, no. Do I have to do this, no; is there an inspection, no. This is a totally different thing, but this ordinance is so much politics and so much crying from people who don't want any. They are talking about density, poor people, and all the ugly issues we can't talk about, but what this does is create a business-like approach to the whole thing. That inspection needs to be performed, and $100 can offset a piece of it, not all of it, but I think I would leave it, because of that inspection factor.
25. Participant C - I agree with Participant D, you need that in there to help pay for the upkeep.
26. Participant D - The idea that floats through here is that the increase is not a case of trying to make people wealthy by renting their Accessory Dwelling Unit.

Miscellaneous: Participants commended staff for their good work.

1. Participant A - I think a lot of work has obviously gone into it, so compliments to those that have worked hard to get to where we are.
2. Participant D - Good job Audree.

Neighborhood Impact: There were no separate comments about neighborhood impact.

Ninety-Day Minimum: Participants questioned locking landlords and tenants into 90 days, if there were problems, but indicated 90 days would have greater community acceptance.

1. Participant A - I was questioning the 90-day limit. I know why; but why not keep with the rest of the ordinances, which is 30 days. An owner may want to go month-to-month with a renter for a number of reasons. I sign a year lease, and I start to dislike that renter for some reason; I want out, so I know why we did it, but . . .
2. Participant D - I think that is a compromise for people who don't want it at all. I haven't discussed this with anybody in my neighborhood, because we don't have any ADUs, so it is kind of an academic thing, but it would strike me that this would be much more acceptable with the 90-day figure, because of the stability factor.

Occupancy: Participants indicated that with the definition of "family", the number of people allowed in an ADU should be spelled out.

1. Participant A - Relative to that number four that is defined in the code, if I have a main house and a guesthouse, there cannot be more than four unrelated people in the total. If you have a husband, wife and child in the main dwelling and you have a guesthouse with one or two bedrooms, and everything else is in compliance, you couldn't let a husband and wife rent. You could; then there are five people. So there could theoretically be three in the ADU and five children, husband and wife; that answers it for me; I was just after the number.
2. Participant E - So, how would you restrict that number then, like a family of six or eight?
3. Participant B - Isn't there something about bedrooms?
4. Participant E - That is part of the fear that people have, you know the density, if you have a big family in there.
5. Participant D - It can work in both directions, because if somebody has a small guesthouse, I'm picturing one at the corner of Antelope and Badger. You probably don't even know it is there. It is small and it is probably a couple of hundred square feet or something like that, so what if somebody comes that is a couple or a small family or a single mom with two or three kids, you can get into the issue of pressure being put upon the owner to allow them to rent that space, even though there is inadequate space by most definitions. I think one of the things I would be a bit concerned with is how far the Fair Housing laws go, as far as protecting the renter or the potential renter.
6. Participant C - What about extended families, grandma, grandpa, aunts and uncles?
7. Participant E - I just think it is exceedingly important that you spell out how many people can be in a family, because that would be a big fear. I want people to have their right to have one or two people in their ADU, but you don't want a family of 14 next door. I'm not (going to rent to 14), but what if my neighbor is; my neighbor has an ADU. The neighbor doesn't live there; (they have to live there) by the law, but they don't all go by the law.
8. Participant A - That begs the question of enforcement, that's all.

Parking: Participants supported prohibiting on-street parking and suggested posting no signs; denying permits, if the lot is too small, and limiting the number of cars allowed.

1. Participant B - I just think that the on-street parking that is prohibited is good.
2. Participant A - Regarding on-street parking being prohibited, there may be an opportunity for Public Works to say, because of this circumstance, when you are making your application, there may be signs posted or something to say no on-street parking. Off-street is no problem; you don't want them, if it is a small enough property to now have two or three cars parked on the main street, and one of the issues may be to post on that street that you can't park there. The Police would have authority at that point to ticket them.
3. Participant D - If the property is too small, you might deny the license in the first place.
4. Participant B - Is there any possibility of putting like the number of bedrooms, no more than two bedrooms, is there any opportunity to say no more than a certain number of cars?

Restrictions (In General): Overall, the participants thought it was a reasonable approach and the proposed ordinance was well written.

1. Participant B - My general impression was that I thought the ordinance seemed to be clear and well written. It distinguished between the guesthouse concept and the Accessory Dwelling Unit concept, which is interesting. In general, my impression of it was that it was a reasonable approach to the issue.
2. Participant C - I don't think that it is a bad approach or a big problem.
3. Participant A - It seems pretty inclusive.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 25, 2009
FOCUS GROUP
(EVENING)

Synopsis of the ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 25, 2009 - 5:30 p.m.

Overall: Participants were supportive of the ordinance and indicated 176 is a modest number, but the cost will keep owners of illegal units from coming forward. Additionally, applicants should indicate compliance with their CC&Rs, and the exclusion of mobile homes in existing mobile home areas was questioned.

Appearance: Participants questioned the exclusion of mobile homes in areas that already have mobile homes, since stick-built would not be as compatible with the area.

1. Participant C - I like the part about having the buildings conform to the main building and having a main look that isn't going to be an eyesore.
2. Participant B - On page 4, 918.04D, "Mobile homes, travel trailers or recreational vehicles should not be used as ADUs", and my only question is in many of the communities you are going into, there are already mobile homes, and if that is the case, I would almost think a stick-built free standing structure would not co-exist as well and be incompatible with the existing area, so you might just consider that if it is an area with existing mobile homes, then you might allow that as an ADU. On the same page, item G, "ADUs shall be designed so that the appearance of the structure maintains, to the extent possible, the appearance of a single-family property", and that can be either very positive or negative, because it is so vague and open to interpretation.
3. Participant D - I don't understand the mobile home issue. If you have a mobile home, there are structures that are prefabricated that you can put on your property, and they look like mobile homes; they are one room and have a kitchen and whatever, but they are like one unit, so I'm wondering when you say mobile homes, what is the vision of that? I don't understand; are you saying that if you have a mobile home that you can't have an ADU or are you saying that an ADU can't be a mobile home? Not like the park models; I'm thinking about the house I owned before. It was a doublewide mobile home and when you look at it, it doesn't look like one. I owned the land and a quarter-acre over on Concord, so there are a couple of places where I circled mobile homes, because I didn't understand. I understand that somebody shouldn't maybe pull up an RV and say this is my ADU, but I don't understand how it was written. (Regarding not having two mobile homes on a lot) that almost seems like common sense; that is something I could agree with. I know of two right now where the owner lives in the front and she divided the back of the mobile home into two separate units; it has a full kitchen in both of them and they have a bath in both. The walls are thin and you wouldn't want to bring a lady over, but that is how she pays her mortgage, by renting out the two back areas. You talked about the blight sir, and the one thing I feel about Sedona and the residents here is that we all love this place, and people are going to create something they want to rent out, so they want it to look nice. They want to rent to a tenant that is going to take care of their place, especially if they are living there. I think that is a huge thing; that is even more so if you live in a place. I have a friend on Andante who lived in her house and rented out two rooms for eight or nine years, and she moved over to Jerome with her boyfriend, so she hasn't been there for a while and the grass isn't being watered and things aren't occurring, so that is a situation that doesn't fit into anything we are talking about; she rents it out now and she isn't there, and now she needs a new refrigerator, etc., but she is going to do that, because she wants to rent it out. It is just something she wasn't aware of until she went to the house. Somebody living there is going to make sure those tenants are . . .
4. Participant E - They can still be horrible even with them living there.

Concept: Participants were supportive of the concept and indicated it presented an opportunity for senior care. One participant questioned the need for it to be so restrictive at this time and indicated that 176 was a modest number, representing 1% of the existing housing stock.

1. Participant A - I had read the draft ADU about a year ago, and also the proposed ordinance about increasing density on multi-family. I'm also a member of our homeowners' association, but I'm here on my own.
2. Participant B - I'm here because I want to hear more about the Accessory Dwelling Units, but I'm also in support. In early 2003 or late 2002, the City put together a task force to look at affordable workforce housing for about six months, and I was on that initial focus group that looked at that, so housing has been an interest of mine for some time.
3. Participant C - I'm dealing with people moving, buying and selling, and I also have an interest in the vacation rental aspect of things, so there are a lot of economic concerns that feed into all of this, in terms of our community that I would like to learn more about that.
4. Participant D - I'm now renting at the Oak Creek Mobile Lodge, and I'm debating whether to stay, because I understand that if I stay there, when they sell that place and take out all of the affordable housing, I have an opportunity to buy one of those units or at least be in the lottery to buy one. That is probably one of the only reasons why I'm staying. I feel like this ordinance really addresses affordable housing. This is one avenue and I would like to see it done well, and that is why I'm here.
5. Participant E - I volunteered because I think it is a good idea, but I also have looked over the materials and had some thoughts regarding them.
6. Participant B - The general impression for me was that I liked it, and the surprising thing to me was that there were only 176 units, and is it 1% of the existing housing stock or 1% of the completed housing stock? If I had a concern about density or that they were going to be all over, I actually was saying that is nominal, but it is a great start. My question would be do you want to legislate something at this point in time that is going to restrict it that much?
7. Participant C - That is what I thought.
8. Participant B - (So it might be too restrictive) yeah, like I said to put it in print right now, you don't have any flexibility; it might be very popular and give a number of people a real opportunity to find housing in town that otherwise might not be able to obviously, and to me 176 of them just seems small. I was kind of looking for that percentage ratio to be 5% or 10%, which I thought would still be easy to sell to the community.
9. Participant B - On page 3 in the 4th bullet, "Provide a means for residents . . ."; I would add seniors there. This is an opportunity for senior care and for the primary resident to actually have an opportunity to have senior care.

Cost: Participants expressed concern that the cost will keep existing units underground and discourage the creation of ADUs without incentives, especially when one violation could result in the removal of improvements made. One suggestion was to focus this ordinance on the creation of new ADUs with incentives and address existing illegal units separately. Additionally, the requirement for a 20-year commitment was questioned, and it was noted that having utilities included in the rent helps renters determine if a unit is affordable.

1. Participant C - I have clients, for instance, who converted garages to live in or to rent out, and they didn't put kitchens in there, and that was the law, and a number of different things, so I think it would be hard on a lot of people, especially in these particular times to switch things up and get them up to standard.
2. Participant A - I wasn't sure what the 4th line from the bottom of page 1 meant, "ADUs are not required to be connected to the same utility service . . .", but may be required?

3. Participant B - If you decided to rent it out and wanted to charge that renter specifically for the utilities, you meter it separately so they know, instead of running it through your own meter.
4. Participant D - As a renter, if the rent is connected to the utility service, you know monthly what your bill is going to be, and you don't have to play guessing games. For somebody who is short of money or who doesn't have money, with this connected to their service, the person who owns the property determines what the rent will be, and at least I can determine that I can afford this or I can't afford this. I'm dying right now on my utilities, and it is just one of those things that will help somebody who is on a budget. It gives you a better outcome, like you have a job that has a salary and you know exactly what you are getting every week, but if you wait tables, you don't know what you are getting, and it just helps that person that doesn't have the money to decide if this is the right unit.
5. Participant B - If it is an ADU, do you have to pay an additional capacity fee?
6. Participant E - And additional property taxes?
7. Participant A - On page 8 item G, "City may require the owner to remove any improvements added to establish an ADU, in the event any Condition of Approval is violated." People are going to invest $30,000 to make a place ready. The word is "may", but my point is that is pretty heavy handed. On page 8 again, under 918.07, "Cancellation may be accomplished by the owner filing a request with the Director." What if the Director denies the request? In that case, are you going to require the owner to remove all of the stuff? Page 9, 918.09B, Fees, most people don't have a life expectancy left of 20 years. Page 11, 918.13 Sunset Clause, again I would wonder why anybody would make an investment in an ADU knowing that there is a sunset clause in five years.
8. Participant D - One hundred seventy six times one hundred is what? That is $17,600 and maybe that is the incentive to get these people to sign up. Maybe you say if you sign up, the City is going to give you $100.
9. Participant E - (Regarding the cost to build one of these) that is why most of them are going to stay underground.
10. Participant D - This needs to focus more on creating more ADUs and not focus on the ones that already exist. The idea is that people will know that they can build these if they choose, whether converting their garage or whatever. Ones that are there are already there, and trying to get one ordinance that focuses on both . . .; it is two different issues, so this ordinance needs to focus on encouraging more affordable housing and give incentives for people to be able to build those; $16,000 for permits is not an incentive. There is a way right there that you could say if you want to build an ADU, we have a deal for you - here is $100.
11. Participant B - Take out the $16,000, then what do you find so oppressive about this and why do you think it discourages someone from putting an ADU up?
12. Participant D - Well $16,000 is one of them, and I don't think it so much discourages, but here is what I like about it. I like the idea that it is now legal to do that, I like that they can now build this and maybe what I'm really saying is about the existing ones.
13. Participant B - I agree with you and maybe you separate it.
14. Participant D - It discourages these people from coming forward and being a part of this program. Maybe on the flip side, it would be nice for the people who want to follow the law and moving forward that it allows it to be legal, but there needs to be a little more encouragement.
15. Participant E - The people who want to create ADUs or have them now are struggling; they would never do it, if they were economically doing very well. They are doing it to make ends meet.

Enforcement: Participants' indicated that the owners of illegal units won't come forward, because of all of the requirements and applicants should indicate they are in compliance

with their CC&Rs. Additionally, the participants indicated that the level of monitoring was more to satisfy those that don't want ADUs at all and one participant questioned the cost to the City. There were also differing opinions regarding a suggestion to get concurrence from adjacent neighbors.

1. Participant D - Could you clarify the 176 number?
2. Participant B - At the bottom of page 10.
3. Participant E - I have a couple of questions; one is the 80% that is mentioned below some income level, do we know what that is? The other question was I guess you've chosen areas now that don't have it in their homeowners' association or the metes and bounds that aren't already in conflict with this, but let's say they prohibit them and it becomes legal here, what happens? Already there are things that they make stricter rules on than what the City has; that is common in a lot of areas.
4. Participant D - This would not supersede the homeowners' associations? That is kind of interesting.
5. Participant A - The onus then becomes on the HOA.
6. Participant E - What that comes down to then is it is going to stay as it is right now, because the ones that exist in the homeowners' associations that don't allow them will continue to stay underground, and the ones that don't have a homeowners' association will be legal, but they still exist and are already doing that anyway, so I don't see much changing.
7. Participant D - It seems like, just in my world that I live in, the government would supersede. What if they decide in their HOA that they don't need to register their dogs? Where does the water come from, where does it run downstream?
8. Participant B - There are many homeowners' associations that have stricter guidelines than the City does, so when you buy there, you just know it is either don't buy here or if you do these are the rules you play by.
9. Participant D - When you were looking to see if maybe you would exempt the ones where this wouldn't apply, what would stop another homeowners' association or another group in this City from forming another homeowners' associations, and then outlaw these?
10. Participant A - Probably the date of the ordinance.
11. Participant B - That is a point; if the ordinance passes, I don't know if that is true.
12. Participant E - They are allowed to adapt their CC&Rs regardless. Even if the ordinance already exists, like the Brewer Road area could decide to make a homeowners' association and make stricter rules to protect their properties.
13. Participant D - So they could basically make this moot.
14. Participant A - Page 2, Article 6, are these definitions every residential area in the City or are there some residential areas . . .? Okay, that is every single-family, so there is none excluded. My question was if this was all encompassing. On page 3, 918.03, the Criteria, "Property owner must either occupy the primary dwelling or the ADU", and then you talk about occupancy as being six months, so it means that potentially a home that has an ADU could be without the landlord for a 6-month period.
15. Participant E - What is the purpose of that one? What if they live in Sedona?
16. Participant A - Why only six months if you are renting your home?
17. Participant B - You also have to be considerate of the number of snowbirds we have in Sedona.
18. Participant A - My concern is the absentee landlord.
19. Participant E - What is going to happen to all the ones that are already breaking all of these things and they have been going on for years? It feels like it is going to be tough. We have talked about it; there are hundreds of them in wealthy neighborhoods, and I'm sure they will stay underground.

20. Participant C - There are people who don't stay for six months; they stay for three months and have five houses, and they have someone who lives in there, and then their sister comes from Cincinnati and stays in their house for another two months.
21. Participant B - I looked at the other side, at the positive, and I would think maybe three months because of the snowbirds, and I looked at it as if I was a homeowner and I had multiple homes and I knew the person that was in the ADU. Many of the people who are snowbirds have people they pay to go check on their house to make sure things are going okay, and now I've got somebody right next door, and they could play that same role, so I actually saw it as a benefit to maybe shorten it, so you don't exclude the person that is gone even more than six months.
22. Participant A - My initial thought was the ransacking of homes that are going into bankruptcy, when no one is around. After six months, I'm gone; I'm taking the appliances with me, and the refrigerator, all of the copper, etc., so it is just maybe the presence. I don't understand on page 4, D. at the top of the page, "A home occupation may be conducted", it sounds like the Nazis.
23. Participant E - That is what I've been feeling the whole time.
24. Participant D - That one really bothered me.
25. Participant A - I don't know what it means. I suggest maybe you clarify. (Regarding zoning districts where ADUs could be developed), on page 4, you answered the question under A. My concern was about deed restrictions, but I think you have addressed that. Page 6, item P., "On-site wastewater systems required to meet current standards as reviewed and approved . . .", is that before or after the City grants this ADU?
26. Participant E - Is there any restriction with sewer?
27. Participant A - On page 7, item 5 near the top of the page, "Signed Proposition 207 waiver", I understand Proposition 207 about taking of property rights, so I'm assuming that the waiver says that when I apply for an ADU, if it devalues my property in some fashion, I'm not going to come back to you. My concern was the property owner applying for it is probably the least one concerned. I would say that the applicant ought to have a signed 207 waiver from everybody within a 300 ft. radius, like our contact now that says okay if you do it, I'm not going to sue you, because it will either enhance or degrade my property. Basically, most of the court cases have been that your actions caused me a grief. It seemed to me just the opposite of what you are asking for.
28. Participant E - Maybe you are saying you would like to see that added in.
29. Participant A - Yeah, I would like to see that an applicant has concurrence at least from adjacent neighbors. Along with the question, maybe there is a #7 that says that the applicant indicates, by applying, that they are in compliance with any deed restrictions and that they know there are declarations of restrictions. The applicant says I know them and I am complying with them on the application, so if it ends up that they are not complying, they've falsified the application.
30. Participant D - If someone is doing this already or if someone is already in a deed area that is not allowing this, he has no reason to come to the City and say I want in on it, because he knows he is already not in compliance, and now he has to fill this out. Again, we lose that person and that unit maybe or maybe he just doesn't allow it to be monitored by the City. That is what this is about, it is about monitoring, and the idea is to have some sort of control over this type of dwelling, and with that provision, people won't have an incentive to come forth and be monitored.
31. Participant A - On page 7, item C.4, "The owner of record occupies either the primary . . .", so the permit cancels on the sale or death of the owner. If it goes to an estate, for instance, does that mean the tenant is evicted?
32. Participant D - When you rent that is also a given. The landlord says here is your 30 days notice, and you are out. They don't have to have a reason, unless you have a lease. If these

people have a lease, that is something that needs to be looked at and maybe honored, regardless of the time limit.

33. Participant A - Page 10, 918.11, Report to the City Council, I think quarterly. Annually is too long; you need to do this quarterly or more frequently.
34. Participant B - I would just like to go on record and say that I am opposed to the 300 ft. I think having to give notification and get approval of your neighbors underlines an opportunity to circumvent what we are trying to accomplish.
35. Participant A - I would just reiterate under item 2, that under the application, somehow the applicant should acknowledge that they have looked for deed restrictions and that they are in compliance with them. It is one thing to plead ignorance, but if you put it on the requirements and they ask you to sign it, then you have to do some homework to find out if there are restrictions.
36. Participant B - There is nothing I would add. The question is what the cost is to the City. When we say "code" what does that encompass, signage to everything?
37. Participant A - Not building inspections.
38. Participant E - That would be a full-time job.
39. Participant C - What inspired this?
40. Participant B - My perspective is it is probably more than I would have, but I think it is a good step toward those that want a ton of people out there enforcing, to show them that there is an active approach to trying to monitor what is happening. It also sounds like when you look at the number of communities that have already done a lot, they monitor themselves. There is a self-monitoring process that is already happening.
41. Participant E - The ones that want very strict restrictions are those areas. They think it would go into their neighborhoods, the ones that already have the strong CC&Rs, and the ones that don't aren't as picky. They should look nice; we don't want junk anywhere in Sedona. (Regarding current substandard units) why do they rent it, if it is substandard? Why don't they move?
42. Participant B - Because they can and people need money.
43. Participant A - Participant C made me think of when I first read this, why? Why would we enact this ordinance if we know what is going on and we are not going inside to enforce it? Basically, that tells me we are going to drive by places and count cars in the driveway or that are parked on the street; we're still not going to know whether they have smoke detectors in the house, etc. I understand that the building code calls for it, but my point is the stuff that exists.
44. Participant B - If a number of these are already in the Foothills South community, they are not going to come out, because of their CC&Rs, and it is illegal for them to do it.
45. Participant C - (As a realtor, when you know a unit is illegal) it is a separate conversation, and it is an interesting one, because people have all kinds of set-ups in their homes, and I personally feel it is their property and their right to do what they want in their home, and I did understand at one point, that a person, any place in Sedona, could build a guesthouse on their property.
46. Participant E - So, as long as you didn't have a kitchen you would be legal.
47. Participant D - The idea is to create more of these or you could just do an ordinance and say go ahead and build and we are going to turn a blind eye.
48. Participant E - I think that goes on at the City now, like somebody made a complaint on a house that I sold; it had a mother-in-law studio, and anything I created has been really upscale, but it wasn't legal with the homeowners' association, so when I had it for sale, they saw my for sale thing and what I had on there and made a complaint. The City sent me a letter and I called them and said they don't have cooking facilities, and they said you are fine; do they have access to the main house and I said if they want it, then the City said its fine don't worry about it. The City doesn't want to get involved in all of these little things; the last

thing they want to do is get bogged down by all of that, and it could create work and get a lot worse than it is now, if you have legals and illegals, and the legals saying why should I be legal with all of these illegal ones. I would never come forward if I had to do all of this.

49. Participant B - If someone right now wants to build a guesthouse, they can do that; if someone wants to build something that is a stand alone with its own kitchen facility, they can't. They can't build it no matter what they do, so now we are talking about how we are legislating this approval for them, and that is what this is trying to do. They are going to have to go through all of the current building codes and regulations and probably P&Z and everything else to build something.
50. Participant E - And, if they happen to move away, then they could not have anybody in there.
51. Participant A - On the development applications, have you denied because they didn't conform to the ADU standard? I mean how many people applied and were denied for something that violated the current guidelines that would be allowed under the ADU? In other words, have you turned down 300 applications a year, because people wanted to put a kitchen in a guesthouse?
52. Participant E - Do you tell them they can't have a kitchen or they just can't have an oven or cooking?
53. Participant A - The point of my question was whether or not there are people lined up just waiting for this ordinance to take effect, so they can get a building permit.
54. Participant B - You could probably talk to the architects, because normally someone is going to go to an architect and say they want to do this, and they are going to say sorry you can't do it.
55. Participant A - We keep talking about ADUs as dwelling units, but how many people come in with a plan for a home, that is basically divided into a live-in plus a rental? So, if this ordinance were in place, you would approve 10 or 20 a year? That is a guesthouse; I'm kind of going to the main residence. Who would build a home and come to you and say I'm really building a duplex inside this house, because I'm going to rent it out? And, you would deny the permit now; that number is 120? I'm trying to get a feel for the pent-up demand. Is it 300 people a year that want to do this? Okay. (Having a parent live there) is not an ADU by the definition of this ordinance.
56. Participant A - (Regarding just requiring what people would have to do on a normal basis without all of the extra stuff), even the square footage requirement; it is roughly one-third.
57. Participant B - The smaller the unit, the easier it is to look like a single residence.

Garage Conversions: There were no specific statements about garage conversions.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): Participants indicated that moving forward is a positive step, but there has to be more incentive for owners of existing units to come forward, and suggestions included grandfathering existing units or allowing stair-stepping by renting units without a full kitchen.

1. Participant E - Legal guesthouses don't have cooking facilities on purpose, and it might be difficult to transform them, and it seems like it puts people who were obeying the rules at a disadvantage. I'm looking from that point-of-view, and I thought well why not have it some way that people can cook, but not necessarily with a stove and oven, since you weren't allowed to have that. What is the difference, I mean why would that have to be in there? Let people rent a unit without a full kitchen, because there might be a few existing in town if they snuck those in, but if they have them and were going by the rules, they didn't, so it might be tough to switch them over. They might have a microwave, toaster oven, hotplate and refrigerator, and people wouldn't have to rent it if they didn't want to, but they could.
2. Participant D - It allows for the stair-stepping; I can take this unit that has a half kitchen and pay this amount. It kind of sets the market, and then someone might have a place that has a

full kitchen and it allows them to charge more. With the upfront charges in order to get your unit in accordance with the ordinance, it seems that there is a lot of money that may be involved to bring it up to the standards, and I really like the idea that if you do have one of these units, there is a 6-month grace period, so you have an opportunity to have those fees waived.

3. Participant C - Prior to living here I lived in Marin County, which was structured very much like here, in terms of many people having auxiliary units on their property, like a guesthouse or converted garage, etc., and I know that there are a lot of those around. I'm sure you know that too, like where they are, what they are and what they are doing, but it felt like at a flash that maybe the ones that exist should be grandfathered, instead of having them have to perform surgery or whatever they need to do, to get it to how you want it from now on. The area those are in is every area; maybe you would want to register them.
4. Participant A - It seems as I read through this that a detached dwelling made sense; it is hard for me to believe that someone would take an existing residence and divide it in such a way that basically a second family is living in it with complete separate kitchens. I can see people building Accessory Dwelling Units being outbuildings, set aside. It is hard for me to believe that someone would take an existing building or that they could even do it in a fashion that made a lot of sense. You have common hallways that you cut off; most people have two bathrooms, so a bath is probably not an issue, but most people don't have two kitchens.
5. Participant E - You would be surprised how many exist all over Sedona. I've seen many, and I think people do it predominantly to be able to live here, and they have been creative. The house I bought already had it. You see a lot of upstairs-downstairs type things and most of the ones I have seen are done nicely, and they have provisions for parking, so you don't see a lot of cars, but then again, I don't know everywhere, but I've seen them around town all the years that I've been here.
6. Participant B - They might take a room or a couple of rooms and add it to the garage or partition it out; I've seen that too.
7. Participant E - Even in expensive areas, I've seen them.
8. Participant C - Yes, they are everywhere.
9. Participant E - I just see a couple of problems; I keep considering the existing ones. Right now, they exist without any of this at all, so why would they ever want to come forward? There is no incentive to do that at all, so they obviously won't. Then you will have ones that are legal and ones that are illegal; all the ones that are illegal will still be there, and then the legal ones will say I have to do all of this, so why shouldn't you, and then they will start complaining about the ones that don't and there will be like this battle going on.
10. Participant D - There has got to be more incentive.
11. Participant B - I look at it for moving forward; to go back and try to legislate and pick up everything that has happened in the past is going to be very difficult. I see this as a positive step forward. The people that want to come forward will; the people that don't and want to stay underground with it will. They have been doing it for a number of years, and that will be their choice, but the statement by the City that says we are acknowledging and approving these now, under these conditions, is a positive move forward from my perspective.
12. Participant D - Of the ones that already exist, that are providing housing for people; they are doing now what we want them to do. They are occupied and with the lack of complaints, lack of knowing where they are and trying to fish them out, those should probably just be set aside, and deal with them in another ordinance, but let's encourage people to want to create more of these in the areas that they can. That is what it should focus on and I don't see that here. I don't see why anybody would want to come out of the woodwork or build a new one, but the incentives are possible. Maybe there is federal, state or local grants that can help people create those, with the caveat that they are going to be paying taxes on the rental. When I was thinking of renting my house I had to contact the County and start paying taxes

on that, so maybe enforce that and make sure that they pay their taxes, when they are renting it out, so there is some reciprocal melding here.

13. Participant B - I agree with your perspective, but when you look at this in the totality of our City, we have to have something that creates security for those people that the last thing they want is to approve an ADU. There are those that might not be as supportive of this ADU concept as you are, so as a City, to implement it and appease their fears a little bit, you need something that is easily structured so they feel it won't run amok.
14. Participant D - I hear that.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants objected to inspections without notice and indicated that the annual application and fee are onerous; it seems that "Big Brother" gets too involved.

1. Participant D - I have two that just make me uncomfortable. Page 8, E and F, "The property owner agrees to periodic inspections at the discretion of the Director . . .; I have a real problem with the government coming into my house, because you take a vacation, and I think there could be a better way to get the information you need that is less intrusive, but I don't know exactly what that is. We talk about the permits you have to get every year, maybe that can encapsulate the information you are trying to get. It is a tough one; it is a private home. They are conducting a little bit of business, but it is also a living space. It is somebody's home, and that word I don't take lightly. When you go into restaurants or a certain type of business, there are certain requirements that they need to follow, I understand that, because they are dealing with the public, and yes, you are dealing with the public here, but there has got to be a better way, and I don't know if they do that in apartment buildings, maybe they do and the Fire Department comes in and inspects.
2. Participant A - I would just add that if you do sign up for this, forget about the fee issues, but you are signing up for a yearly inspection and a yearly application that you must submit, and those are pretty onerous requirements. When people rent their home out for a year, there is nothing; nobody checks on whether the tenant has minimum income and qualifies. There are a lot of restrictions in here that normal landlords don't go through.
3. Participant E - Even to just rent your room out.
4. Participant A - Well, then of course there are issues there about kitchens, but yeah, if you rented a bedroom to someone and let them use a hotplate in the bedroom, you wouldn't have any of this. The ordinance tends to put a wet blanket on it.
5. Participant D - I agree.
6. Participant E - And then, the people who wouldn't mind probably wouldn't be the ones that would build it in the first place.
7. Participant A - People that are doing it probably would say I don't need your ordinance, I'm doing it, and guess what, it is working. I can find tenants; they pay the rent that I ask, so it must not be too much, and if it is they move. By the same token, I put up with tenants who stay for a month and then leave and skip out on a 6-month lease; I take that on as the landlord. This just seems like "Big Brother" gets highly involved in it, and I don't know that that would make people want to do this, as opposed to not want to do it.
8. Participant C - Is that part of the focus, to encourage people to want to do it? Is part of the intention to actually encourage people to create affordable housing?

Miscellaneous: There were no miscellaneous comments.

Neighborhood Impact: Participants expressed concern that ADUs could end up being clustered in older subdivisions and metes and bounds areas, which could lead to blight. Additionally, the 176 number should to be clarified.

1. Participant A - My concern was whether or not this was going to fractionalize the City. Many subdivisions have CC&Rs and restrictions that will preclude them, which seems that the 176 will basically be focused in areas that are metes and bounds, older subdivisions, so I think there is a concern there that leads to blight in these older subdivisions.
2. Participant B - It is a really good point Participant A, it is going to be very dense, if those 176 end up being in the three green areas that we have now.
3. Participant A - Of the 176 units, if you think there are 100 illegal, you are going to do all of this and end up with 76 new units. So, the 176 is new and if you bring 300 non-compliant ones in, you develop 476 units. My point is a couple of hundred may come to light plus the 176 new; I think you need to revise your numbers to let people know what they are signing up for. My concern is I think these green areas are going to get plastered.
4. Participant C - I talk to a lot of people, and some of the things that come up are things like I don't want anybody living in my neighbor's converted studio, because they have an air conditioner in there that is too loud, and it keeps me awake at night, or they didn't take their trash in right away. It is stuff that people have their own personal agitation about regarding an issue with a neighbor that really isn't consistent with cars parking on the street and things that people imagine will happen. They are personal things and one person said if I complain on her, she will complain on me, because I like to do this, so there is all this neighbor stuff that goes on.

Ninety-Day Minimum: Handling the need to evict a tenant within the 90-day period was a concern and one suggestion was to allow a 30-day period.

1. Participant A - On page 1, rental of an ADU for a period of less than 90 days is prohibited; that is fine, but what if you have to evict someone for non-payment or if they are a nuisance tenant and destroy the property, does that mean you have to keep them? I think there needs to be something.
2. Participant B - My question was if the 90 days is to protect the timeshares and lodging?
3. Participant B - I just thought if you had it shorter, it is a great entry venue for someone who is coming into town to make a decision; they may be looking for a place. My kids just moved to Baltimore and they are taking a place for 30 days to learn the lay of the land and where they want to be.

Occupancy: A participant suggested including a summary of the definition of "family" in the ordinance.

1. Participant A - (Regarding definition of "family"), under E. on page 4, it references Article 2, but does anybody know what that number is? It might be helpful for people to have that summarized someplace in this one, because people won't have reference to the other document.

Parking: A concern expressed was if ADUs are clustered in old subdivisions on smaller lots, there will be negative visual impact from cars parking outside.

1. Participant A - (If ADUs are clustered in older subdivisions), they become four or five cars in front of every residence and smaller parcels. I am glad though that you considered the impact of areas. For instance, I don't see Foothills South have many of these rental units, so I think you are going to find that it is going to be clustered in areas, and those areas are going to tend to be the blighted; landscaping will give way to parking spaces for cars off-street and those kinds of things, so that is one of my concerns.
2. Participant B - Just remember that the ordinance requires that they have parking on-site.

Restrictions (In General): Participants questioned the need for so many restrictions and indicated that the things people normally have to do would be sufficient.

1. Participant E - I like it in general, but the one thing is that since guesthouses or mother-in-law studios have been legal, if you didn't have cooking facilities, a lot of the current ones will have to get that to become legal.
2. Participant E - There are so many restrictions.
3. Participant C - Wasn't the City incorporated in 1988? So we are about 20 years old as a City and one of the nice things about living here is that there is a little flex, a little opening to do this or that. There is a little more permission, and one of the reasons people like to come here is because of that. The restrictions feel a bit much; never mind trying to enforce them, which is a whole other megillah, but just having them, when you explain to someone that if you buy that house there is this, this and that, and if you want to do this, you have to do these things; it doesn't help matters. It wouldn't turn somebody on, although on the other side of that, having units be legal is also a benefit for some people, but what level of restriction and invasion do you want to build into that?
4. Participant E - I think the overall solution would be that maybe it is made legal, but not regulated; the normal things that are normally regulated would continue to be regulated like parking, outdoor storage; things that would bother neighbors or bring down the look of the neighborhood, things that are going to impact in a negative way. I like what you said about it is people's own business. The things that people would have to do on a normal basis would still apply, without all of the extra stuff.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 26, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 26, 2009

Overall: Participants' perceptions of the concept differed from it being on track to it not being needed and creating negative impacts. Opinions about enforcement also differed, ranging from this being a good idea with logical requirements, to concerns about the lack of enforcement now and this creating more "Police Power". Additionally, participants opposed garage conversions and suggested allowing anonymous complaints; one participant indicated there would be tremendous negative neighborhood impact overall and ADUs would diminish property values.

Appearance: There were no specific comments about the appearance requirement.

Concept: Participants' opinions varied from saying that the City is on track with this to one participant's view that it is not needed anymore, it will lower property values, it is changing single-family to multi-family, and we should go back to short-term vacation rentals.

1. Participant A - I'm interested in this because I have various real estate interests in town that might be affected by the ordinance, so that is why I'm here.
2. Participant B - I do think this has an impact on a lot of our properties, so I'm interested in finding out what we can do.
3. Participant C - I'm interested for two reasons; one is I think we need a diverse population, and two is I'm concerned about the way development is galloping along in the City.
4. Participant D - I'm head of the Architectural Board in Sedona Meadows II. I've been here 23 years, and I've seen a vast amount of change in 23 years.
5. Participant E - Basically, I was interested in getting involved
6. Participant F - I too think this is a very interesting topic and it needs to be addressed with some thought.
7. Participant C - Just so we don't all have to reread the Community Plan, while we are defining this, "To maintain consistency with the City of Sedona Growth Policies as recommended", what is the growth policy? That is on page 3, the last bullet in the first section.
8. Participant D - Technically, we only have so much property left that hasn't been developed, so I think we are pretty secure on that, as long as there is control.
9. Participant F - I know when this process started, but can you give me a date when this whole thing started, the concept of ADUs? Just to make note of this; four years ago, houses were being sold at the rate of every hour, and now you are lucky if you have one a week. Has somebody reviewed that Sedona has totally changed, how many houses have gone into foreclosure and how many people are losing houses? Right now, you're looking overall to put more housing in here, when we have a lot of housing that is now being freed up and at lower prices, so in the long picture, if this started five months ago, it would make sense. This was started as a boon. (This idea has been around for 10-15 years), it has been, but it became active, and an overall comment is I don't think it is needed anymore.
10. Participant F - You know exactly how I feel. I think that you are killing the real estate market, which is already . . .; go back in history and find out how many people who own five and six houses here and use them as vacation rentals have lost their houses. We know those figures and see the people who have paid mortgages, but because the 30-day law started to be enforced . . ., and we can just keep going backwards. People bought houses and rented them out, they paid the mortgage, the City had people coming in, the City had more visitors; people complained and we enforced the 30-day rule, and most of those owners have lost all of those houses. I'm going backwards in history and trying to take you back from 2009 to when this

started, for someone to re-look at this entire project. Your focus right now, from what I'm getting is this is a done deal, and we are going here, let's just refine it, and as a real estate person, who is seeing house after house empty here; there are houses in the middle of Sedona for $250,000 and you could walk-in today and buy it. I understand, but there are communities all around; again, we go back to are they commuting in or not, but Sedona never catered to people that work here, and they always were in little ghettos or whatever, and they still are, but I think you are behind the curve on this entire thing. If this would have worked and you enforced it in 2006, you might have made it work. I think the curve was there; the curve is down here down, and you are trying to put in more little houses and all of these people own homes here with value that has gone down, and I think you are taking the value down lower.

11. Participant C - I like this a lot better than the general development plan I've seen in the Housing Commission, giving developers fee waivers, etc., for promising to build something that they may never build, and with this cap of only 176, I think the people who are afraid of it, think it is going to be every house on the block, and that is not going to happen, so I'm really much more pleased with this than with giving one more developer a waiver of fees to put in some kind of complex that is probably never going to really address the affordability issue. There have been affordable housing developments in Sedona before that are no longer affordable. I've read all of those things and I like them; I like this strategy a lot better than that one, because that one has no way to enforce the developer putting in the affordable units, and it is such a tiny percentage of the overall development; it is 12% of the additional, not 12% of the total units. I thought it was 12% of the ones that are above the amount that would have been allowed under the previous zoning. Oh, okay.
12. Participant F - Let's look at this; I go back to having a single-family residence and you now have a rental unit on your property and you live next door; that is a zoning change.
13. Participant C - In essence, it is . . .
14. Participant F - It is a multi-family unit; you have changed the neighborhood zoning, and you're opening a huge can of worms. You now have a rental unit; it was your mother-in-law suite. In the County, if I needed to and my parents were infirm, I may put in a dwelling unit or build a unit or a manufactured home for the period that they need to be there or for a caregiver who would come into the house; however, one year after their passing, that needs to be removed, so it is not a zoning change.
15. Participant A - Is this actually a change in land use?
16. Participant F - Yes. You're not (looking at it that way) but I think you need to look at your attorneys, because you are changing . . . They are saying that you can now have a rental unit next to mine?
17. Participant A - You are really handling this like a Conditional Use Permit with the exception that there is no hearing. That is kind of what you are doing with the steps used. You have the permit . . .
18. Participant F - I'm still not moving next to his house, because he has a rental unit, so you might be making more money on a day-to-day basis, but you are devaluing your own property and you have now devalued mine.
19. Participant D - I have a good suggestion, go ahead and start to reactivate your CC&Rs in the neighborhood.
20. Participant C - I don't want to, because I'm hanging my clothes on a clothesline now and it wasn't legal then.
21. Participant F - In France this week, they have announced that they are encouraging all homeowners to do B&Bs in their homes, because it encourages people to come. We've alienated the visitor by taking away these beautiful homes they could rent for a couple of thousand dollars; they spent money in our community, but now we are changing our focus to a totally different person and it is not as upscale a person.

22. Participant B - That is well said; it is something we need to go back to.
23. Participant D - We don't want that. I don't want somebody renting out the home next to me and they are there for one week. Who is taking care of the home, because most owners are not there?
24. Participant B - Okay, but this is the one thing that people come up with. The companies that rent these have gardeners, maintenance people, cleaning ladies; the properties are kept in a lot better condition, because nobody is staying there. There are not things stashed there behind the garage, because there is nothing in there.
25. Participant D - I'll talk to you afterwards; you need to read about one three weeks ago.
26. Participant A - I think the City is on track with this personally. It is a piece of your affordable housing puzzle really; it is just a piece.

Cost: Participants' comments focused on cost or lost revenue to the City, by possibly needing additional enforcement staff and increasing sewer input, but waiving the sewer capacity fees, and then the owner having a recorded "contingent liability" on the property if it is was sold.

1. Participant F - One of the things here on page 10 is on septic; I understand the City wants to make money and it says, "The property owner may request that the sewer capacity fee be waived, if the ADU is constructed . . .", so right now you own a 2-bedroom home and you are hooked up to the sewer at X amount of dollars. You are now putting an ADU in your garage or building another one or two bedrooms and you aren't going to have to pay the sewer hook-up fee?
2. Participant F - Then, you are going to have to regulate that. I understand that you are encouraging people, but you are also encouraging an extra house on a property and doubling the sewer input, not money, in any of these situations.
3. Participant A - The City is not going to rely on that. To get a waiver of the Development Impact Fee, what happens if I decide to do a qualified rental under your requirements, and you waive the impact fee, which is $4,200 or $4,500, and then two years later I sell the property? So, you are going to have to require that agreement to be recorded. It would have to be a deed-recorded item; otherwise, it is not going to show up.
4. Participant F - It is almost a lien.
5. Participant A - It would be a recorded agreement, like your CC&Rs or something.
6. Participant F - You sold it in two years and you waived $4,200; I'll convert everyone on the block and waive my fees, so there is a way around that, unless . . .
7. Participant A - So, you record that and it shows up on the title report and the buyer is noticed that it has a contingent liability.
8. Participant A - I think you better be prepared for the question that City Council will ask, and that is how much is this going to cost staffing-wise, etc., at some point there is a cost-benefit analysis.
9. Participant C - Do you need another whole person or a half a person?

Enforcement: Some participants indicated that this is a good idea with logical requirements to avoid adverse impacts. Additionally, the enforcement staff possibly should be increased; however, enforcement should start with the neighbors, and the public should be educated to notify the City of problems. Suggestions included clarifying the complaint process and the precedence of CC&Rs, and notifying associations of pending permits. Other participants expressed concern that problems are not enforced now and this would create more "Police Power". In addition, anonymous complaints should be allowed; home occupations should be allowed in both units, if they are "invisible"; compliance with setbacks may be difficult for existing units, and lenders could call a loan if a business use is added to a residential property.

1. Participant D - Our CC&Rs state that they are single-family dwelling units and you can only have single-family in there, even if you have a building. You can't rent it out; you can put your mother or dad in there, but then they have to come into your house to eat.
2. Participant E - What supersedes a City Ordinance or CC&Rs? (Enforcement of the CC&Rs) oh, are not up to the City, so if they have the issue, the homeowners' association has to enforce it.
3. Participant C - I think we should add what was mentioned about the septic tanks, just because you say that we normally inspect that; it should be in the code. Oh, it is in the code; okay thanks.
4. Participant A - What is the logic behind requiring ADUs to have an owner-occupant?
5. Participant D - That makes sense.
6. Participant A - Self-policing of property.
7. Participant A - I think you refer to LEED as your required standard, or such as, so you are not saying that LEED is the requirement. It would be easier to pay the sewer fee than go through LEED.
8. Participant A - If the City proceeds with this, you are going to have to really provide some information to the community, so the community-at-large, not just those who have an Accessory Dwelling Unit, understand the requirements. If you do that and encourage people to advise you of problems that occur, it might help with your code enforcement issue, because I think the enforcement issue is the tail wagging the dog on this thing. I think it is a good idea and you've developed some logical requirements to make it palatable and avoid some of the adverse impacts it could create, but for enforcement, you are going to have to have help from the neighborhood. They need to understand what is not allowed, like the parking things that come up.
9. Participant E - I am in total agreement with Participant A; I think the other thing is clarifying the differences with the CC&Rs, what takes precedence and the procedure that the City is going to use to say if there is a complaint, this is the process.
10. Participant C- I would suggest that the names of reporting individuals be kept private; that the person who is finked on can't call City Hall and ask who reported me, and then take out their vindictiveness on the person, and that is happening right now. Anybody who gets reported can find out who is reporting them, and that creates all kinds of bad feelings in neighborhoods, so that needs to change. Oh, they can file without (giving their name). Are they told that when they call? Is it not possible to have City ordinances that go beyond what State ordinances do?
11. Participant A - Not about federal Fair Housing. The complaint is a public record is what you are trying to say. If someone gives you a complaint, and they provide their name and number and you fill out the complaint form, that is a public record. I don't know that your concern could be addressed. In a criminal matter like Crime Watch; they can keep the people confidential.
12. Participant D - They find out who you are anyway. I recommend that they give Jim and John another person. It is tough, and they are good about calling me back. I try not to make a nuisance of myself, because it is very possible with one person, and they are going to need help, if you are going to do this. I have a real problem when it is thrown on our back that we have to be the one to proceed against the person that is not following the rules.
13. Participant E - I take issue with that, because we are the ones that live in the community. The City is there, but it is really our responsibility to say something is wrong, and then the hope is that once we turn it over to the governing parties, they will also do their part, but I really think it starts with us first. We are there next door to people who may not be abiding by the ordinances.
14. Participant D - We already started the process, and then we expect Jim and John to call, and then I tell my people, do not call me. I have 86 places in the subdivision and I tell them don't

bother calling me, unless you call enforcement first, and then I will call and back you up. It is the only way I can do it.

15. Participant A - It depends whether it is a violation of the City Code or your CC&Rs too, because the City is not going to get involved in the CC&Rs.
16. Participant F - We're talking about enforcing something that is not in effect, and we are hearing at the table that we know of places where there are 10 people living in one garage, so how come it is not enforced now? You are looking to do something more, more enforcement, and I can point out five or six places right now that have a bunch of people living in them, and I don't even live in town. A neighbor is not going to call-in that the garage next door has people sleeping in shifts. When you see six cars outside of a garage, doesn't that . . . I know it is hard, but you are looking at more police power here. I think you are opening the biggest can of worms.
17. Participant C - That would need to be disclosed in the real estate transaction, wouldn't it?
18. Participant B - In escrow at the closing, would the title company be notifying you when there has been a transfer in ownership of the property with the ADU? That would be one way of being in compliance and putting you on notice, but are they going to be doing that?
19. Participant F - An ADU wouldn't necessarily show up on a title search.
20. Participant A - The only way you are going to see it is on a seller property disclosure, which is required.
21. Participant F - But you are going to see, at the end of the month, everything that is sold. Somebody has to check everything that is sold.
22. Participant A - Can I ask what the applicable fines and/or enforcement actions would be if I do not register an ADU, considering the 6-month grace period? I just decide to ignore the City. So, that is your order, but it could end up in a lawsuit.
23. Participant E - You said you have heard this repeatedly in previous focus groups, but it is the enforcement of this, and all of us know of people who are renting out successfully community-wide; nobody knows.
24. Participant C - On page 4, D., Home Occupation, "Home occupation can be conducted in only one of the two properties". I'm assuming this is addressing traffic, but what if people are working online and nobody ever comes to their house? Maybe the home occupation that attracts customers or like the one in my neighborhood where the Flagstaff Paving Company was storing their pavers and stuff on Quail Run constantly, doing landscaping in Sedona, is a big impact. If it's invisible . . .
25. Participant B - You probably wouldn't even know.
26. Participant C - Am I reading correctly, on page 10, that you are capping ADUs at 176?
27. Participant A - Hypothetically, it is probably going to become a reality; it says that the ADU has to follow all of your development codes, setbacks? A lot of ADUs are probably converted outbuildings, so I have an ADU, it's an illegal ADU and I want to make it a legal ADU, but I only have a 5 ft. setback and it says 10 ft., what are you going to do?
28. Participant C - But, you would rather him come forward with it and make it legal; you can't slide it over 10 ft.
29. Participant A - So, you have 10% of a setback within your authority.
30. Participant F - The Board of Adjustment is going to say is it impinging on anybody that lives in the neighborhood, so if Participant B lives on one side and you live on the other, and you now have brand new neighbors where there was a garage; it is impinging on your privacy rights.
31. Participant A - That is one physical reality of the accessory dwellings that exist that you are going to maybe have an issue with, because you can bring it up to grade and do some improvements in the unit to satisfy the codes, but setbacks aren't so easy to do.
32. Participant A - One more suggestion on enforcement is that when you get an application for an ADU, if this goes through, I would recommend that you notify the neighborhood

association, if there is one, because you can't deny the permit based on that application. You have to issue the permit, and you have already said that you are not going to enforce CC&Rs, so if I come in and comply with your ordinance and demand a permit, you are going to have to issue it. I don't know if you want to post a notice, but if you have a list of the homeowners' associations within the City and you get an application, you just write a notification saying please be advised that there is an application pending, and we will not deny or approve it based on your CC&Rs, and this is a courtesy notice; just to be aware of it.

33. Participant D - We had that happen and we do not collect any dues, so we don't have the background or money that can resist something. The City went ahead and the sign is right there as they walk in that says they must check, so I said well why in the world can't they just say to whomever is applying, have you talked to your neighborhood for the CC&Rs. I think they started that.
34. Participant A - In this case, you might want to step it up, with a little more notification.
35. Participant C - I live in a great big giant blue area that has no CC&Rs, Chapel area, Red Chapel Vista. I don't know about down Vista Bonita, but in that whole middle rectangle, all of the CC&Rs of Chapel Bells Estates and all of those related neighborhoods have expired, so like Participant A's idea, I would like a stake in the ground, just like they do for an alcohol permit, that says this property is requesting . . .
36. Participant E - You are asking for public comment, if you are not under CC&Rs.
37. Participant A - I would just do it to the HOA period; if there is no HOA, then there is no public notification.
38. Participant F - To go along with that in the County, it was 300 ft. and I believe it is now being moved up to 1,000 ft.
39. Participant A -That was for a zoning action and this is not a zoning action.
40. Participant E - I don't have any real particular concerns with the ordinance. My issue is, being a resident for four years, I have no confidence in this ordinance being enforced. The City of Sedona turned their back, and I do have issues with the property management companies that knew they were not in compliance with the law and that they weren't allowed to rent for less than 30 days, and I owned one in the Midwest. So, what is the confidence that I would have as an individual that this is going to be more than a piece of paper?
41. Participant F - I agree with her; very good.
42. Participant C - And, because we have a history of non-enforcement of a variety of things in this town.
43. Participant C - What would be an incentive? The City gives you $100 for registering?
44. Participant A - I'm not saying there is a valid incentive; I've had a lot of years in this business on that side of the table, and I can tell you that people shy away from getting involved in regulating their properties, unless there is a hammer over their head, and it is ready to drop. Somehow there is still going to be a lot under the radar. If you are doing a good job with your ADU now, let's say I've got an ADU and I do a good job, the neighbors don't even know it is there and nobody complains, single occupant, they come and go, the property is kept nicely, why would I want to come forward. The only good thing it would do for me is I could sell the property and not have to disclose a non-conforming use. That is the only thing it would do for me.
45. Participant C - And, registering if it becomes State law that we have to start paying sales tax on rentals, which is being discussed; that would be another reason not to report it.
46. Participant A - (Not dealing with the existing ones and just addressing them if you get complaints) is not a bad way to go.
47. Participant F - As a previous lender, if Participant B has a house and she decides to do an ADU, they can call her loan, because it is illegal. She purchased her home with owner occupancy, and she now has a rental and a business use, and they can pull her loan. There are enough problems here again, but if they find out that Participant B has a rental in the garage,

they will call her loan and she will lose her house. It is not a matter of being legal, they rented to you as a primary residence, and did not rent to you as a business, and once it is on public record, all they have to do is call her loan.

48. Participant A - It is hard to say what they would do, if the mortgage is current, I doubt they would do anything.
49. Participant F - That is correct, but she needs to know that if she took her house today and decided to move in with me as a roommate, because she needs to save money, and rents it, they can call her loan.
50. Participant C - Well, I bet Wells Fargo would loan me another loan to build an ADU on my property, and then I could pay two loans instead of one.

Garage Conversions: Participants opposed garage conversions, because of the elimination of enclosed parking and storage areas. One participant also questioned the safety of partial garage conversions.

1. Participant D - When I was called, the lady said that we are even considering garages; what are we doing with the extra cars that come in with people? On Roadrunner, about seven or eight months ago, a friend of mine has nothing behind her house and she can see right across; there were so many teenagers and there were cots in this garage, and this person that owns the house is well known in Sedona and owns businesses, and they would stand there and yell at some of the neighbors, but these were kids, saying why don't you come over and I'll give you some marijuana or something. (If that is something you feel strongly about . . .) I do.
2. Participant A - I think the garage conversion is something that the City needs to think through a little more. There are a lot of issues related to that that go beyond the cars, because the conversion of a garage is going to be the most cost effective way for somebody to create an Accessory Dwelling Unit, and when they do so, there is more than just cars that are going to be displaced. There is going to be equipment, storage; if you drive by the average garage in town and look at what is in it, a lot of garages don't even store cars, it is everything else, so one of the concerns that needs to be thought out is if you are going to allow conversions of garages, is there adequate indoor storage? It is a hard thing to regulate, but the downside is a lot of this stuff ends up on the side of the house or junk piled over here or whatever, so it is something you better think about.
3. Participant F - To go along with the garages, I don't think that would be a good way, because of what Participant A just said. Garages are storage bins in 90% of the homes, and if you are storing, where are you going to put that. Then you are going to have more storage bins built in town.
4. Participant A - Or, you are going to have stuff scattered all over the side of the house or in the backyard. If they want to construct an adequate indoor facility to maintain some storage, but I think you are going to end up with some issues, trailers, boats, etc. I know you have some regulations about that, but this would create more.
5. Participant C - The partial garage conversion is a really bad idea; how are they going to even have healthy air in there. I have a neighbor who has already lived in a garage that was not insulated, no heat and no air conditioning, and enforcement didn't help her at all, when she called to report this rental. I don't think we follow-through on inspecting stuff like that.
6. Participant D - Eliminate the garage deal.
7. Participant E - Is it the garage or the size?
8. Participant A - It is the loss of the garage and the effects that has on the whole property. I think another kind of hidden issue is going to be that, as a potential, if I were to put myself in the shoes of a potential ADU owner that has several of these around town, and I had to weigh, do I come in and get involved with the City on this or do I just cruise along, I'm not sure. You have created some incentives, but if I don't need a building permit to do anything,

then there is no waiver of that, and maybe I'm only there four months a year, so I don't want to be telling you whether I'm living there or not.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): The limited comment on the grandfather clause indicated that six months is a reasonable period.

1. Participant F - Do you have an amnesty program, if right now it went into effect, and you have three of them, would you have an amnesty program to come forward, so you could comply without . . .?
2. Participant B - Six months is reasonable.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants' comments were generally focused on understanding the provisions; however, one participant indicated that some periodic inspection was supported.

1. Participant C - On page 8, item E., it says "The property owner agrees to periodic inspections at the discretion of the Director". Who is the Director? Does this mean that the inspector can actually knock on doors? If you are one of the people that is choosing to rent out an apartment on your property, do you want to say you have 72 hours to get the 13 illegals off of your property? Can you knock on doors now for enforcement, or do you just have to drive by and see? Essentially, a person who is renting an ADU is starting a business. A person who is renting out an ADU has a business, and there are certain responsibilities with businesses. They are going to benefit from the income. I support some form of periodic inspection, even if it is just a drive by, because you can sort of tell. You can drive almost any neighborhood and find somebody standing in the street or walking and ask how it is going, and ask if there are any problems with the ADUs.
2. Participant A - You have a few things in here that kind of make sense from the standpoint of keeping a handle on this, but don't make sense from the standpoint of enforcement and administration, that I am just going to throw out. There is a provision in here that each year, the ADU permit is effectively renewed, is that the way this would work? Okay, so that is how you keep track of whether the same person that filed and obtained the ADU permit still owns the property, because the transferability of this is a little awkward. The provision is if the property is transferred, essentially the ADU permit is null and void. So, the ADU permit effectively stays with the owner; however, the improvements that might have been established by the ADU permit . . . The only reason you are requiring the permit is that it is a tracking system, is that right? So, you have your contact person and you know whom you are dealing with on the ADU, but you aren't really going to be in a position to not issue another ADU permit, if the premises are in compliance. Whatever stipulations are associated, would they be variable to different properties?

Miscellaneous: One participant noted that some CC&Rs may allow guesthouses, but not ADUs and another participant suggested considering common themes expressed through all of the public outreach.

1. Participant A - As you refine your map, you might want to consider the fact that in the neighborhoods that have CC&Rs, in a lot of cases, the CC&Rs say that you can have a guesthouse, but you can't have a rental unit. A guesthouse means that your guests have separate quarters, whether attached or detached, but in a lot of those cases, it will also say that you can't have a rental unit. There is a subdivision here that I developed and you can have a guesthouse, but you can't have an accessory rental unit. You have it blue right now; it is Tierra Verde, just to the west of Sedona Meadows.
2. Participant A - You'll have to look at comments that are repeating themselves, kind of a common theme.

Neighborhood Impact: One participant indicated that renting units may not help people stay in their homes, because the lenders are lending on one single-family residence and this would diminish property values and be a can of worms. Another participant noted that it is not the ADU itself or a few additional people that are the problem; it is the barking dog and additional parked cars, etc.

1. Participant F - (One thing that would help people stay in their home is the ability to rent the unit), not necessarily; the lender doesn't want to see . . .; the lender is lending on one building on a single-family residence, and you bought in Sedona, because it is a single-family dwelling and that is the regulation for the area. You are now taking their values and diminishing them, in general.
2. Participant B - I want to address that, but I think what we are trying to do is find out what comes in and out, so that is the question.
3. Participant F - You are looking at no impact on the neighborhood, but I only see this as tremendous impact. I understand Fair Housing, but the four unrelated can bring in more and there is no cap.
4. Participant A - Just a general concern, and it is really not the ADU that is potentially going to cause a nuisance in the neighborhood; it is the other related things, like the tenant's dogs barking, the cars parked on the street and the outside storage, so what could potentially happen is some of the enforcement issues are really not even zoning issues. A lot of them are police issues or Superintendent of Streets' issues. The ADU itself is just another little piece of the building; it is the use of that and the nuisances it could create. I think that is where your rub is going to be. I don't know how to separate it, but that is the reality. I really don't care if a few people are sleeping over there, as long as they are quiet, cars aren't coming and going and parked on the street and their dogs aren't barking, or they don't have a mini-storage, so their stuff is stored on the side of the house. That is the reality of this.
5. Participant F - But, you are living in Disneyland.
6. Participant A - No, I'm not living in Disneyland. I'm explaining what the potential problems in this ordinance are.
7. Participant F - That's right; it is going to be a can of worms.

Ninety-Day Minimum: One participant indicated it should be 31 days for consistency.

1. Participant B - You say a rental period of not less than 90 days and I think that is different than the current thing for renting a house, and those should be the same; no less than 31 days. It just seems consistent to have it; it would make more sense.

Occupancy: Participants requested clarification on the definition of "family" and questioned the enforcement capability and one participant indicated there would be tremendous impact. Additionally, the 20-year commitment was considered to be excessive and five to ten year commitment was suggested, with the possibility of the owner paying the balance of a waiver, if the property was sold during that time.

1. Participant C - On page 4, "Definition of a family as described in the Land Development Code", so if those could just be repeated? So, it is a limit on the number of residential buildings? That was a fixed number?
2. Participant C - Can these four-unrelated adults have family members with them? So, there is not a total maximum number of unrelated people. They could have their parents, grandparents, kids and grandkids
3. Participant E - When you are talking about family, your other stipulations on sewer capacity would essentially control the number of persons in a dwelling, or not? Have you determined how many potential ADUs there are?
4. Participant D - How do you prove that there are seven different people living in a place; how do you prove they are related or not related?

5. Participant F - My question is with the sewer buildout, when it is complete, does that take all properties in Sedona off of septic or 90% or 80%? That takes precedence if somebody is on septic, you can't add residents to that property; it will definitely be a big issue.
6. Participant C - What is the thinking behind the "4-unrelated adults" family definition?
7. Participant A - That is Fair Housing and the City can't do anything about that.
8. Participant F - If you have 4-unrelated adults, there is a home adjacent to mine in the country, and they rent the garage which is an illegal rental outside of Sedona, but I can't tell you how many cars are in there, because there are four young gentlemen, and how many dogs and how many times during the day they come and go.
9. Participant C - I don't want any more dogs in my neighborhood. I really don't; they poop in my driveway. Can we add that no dogs ever leave the house? Everybody has three dogs.
10. Participant C - Explain this, they have to rent it to qualified tenants for no less than 20 years, is that what this is saying? Well, you are talking about an elderly population here, 20 years.
11. Participant A - I think it is going out there a little too long.
12. Participant C - Excessive.
13. Participant A - Ten years would be the maximum.
14. Participant C - Five or ten years.
15. Participant B - Have the balance paid at the time of the sale. You waive it for the present owner, in ten years, they've got it, but if they sell it before then, they pay the balance. That is better for the City too.
16. Participant E - Have you determined how you are going to qualify the tenants as far as being 80% of the median? You said you had a formula; I'm just curious as far as the total income and thinking about the retired people. A lot of people have a wonderful nest egg, so are you talking about the interest?
17. Participant F - How do these people with ADUs evict a tenant? Is this now under real estate rules or is this under private rule or . . .?
18. Participant B - Landlord-Tenant Lease.

Parking: One participant indicated there should be a maximum number of parking places for the ADU, and participants agreed on-street parking should be prohibited and enforced.

1. Participant C - I don't think the parking should say there should be "at least two off-street parking places for the primary dwelling"; there should be a maximum of parking places, because not everybody chooses to have two cars, so why should they have to support two parking places. If they have an ADU, and the person in the ADU has one car and the primary family has one car; put a maximum not a minimum on the ADU and the primary; well, I don't know if you want to put a maximum on the primary resident, but I don't think there should be a minimum. Put a maximum on the total parking places on the property. Okay, I see; then put a maximum on the ADU.
2. Participant D - What about this "on-street parking is prohibited". I'm having a real problem with that. I know people that actually own a home, and they have got a driveway on the street below, and they park up on another narrow street, and it is a real problem. People have to stop both ways, before they can get past those cars, and the man actually said to me, "Well, I don't want to walk up the stairs in the back", he walks though the garage door and up the stairs. One is a cul-de-sac and I've talked to Dan Neimy about it. I understand that as long as there is 20 ft. left to get past, it is legal, but also they have to have part of the car off of the roadway, but that is ridiculous if there are two streets involved, and there is a wide street on Roadrunner and a narrow cul-de-sac, and they park their cars up there. Okay, what about on-street parking is prohibited? If they are renting out one room of their home? They told him he needed to park up there, not down below.

3. Participant B - I think on-street parking being prohibited pertains to the ADU, so I see it as a benefit, keeping two cars off the street. Maybe one is on, but one has to be off, the renter, so I don't see where it is adding to the problem; it is taking care of it.

Restrictions (In General): Participants indicated that a lot of enforcement ideas have been included and it is good to have qualifying guidelines; the way it is written is 99% great; one participant indicated that short-term rentals would reduce a lot of the anticipated problems, so timeframes should be removed.

1. Participant B - I basically think you have put in a lot of enforcement ideas here, and I am not seeing the problem. You can have them remove improvements, you can revoke permits, and it has to be renewed annually with an inspection, so I think you have covered a lot of the bases.
2. Participant C - I like the limits on the total.
3. Participant B - I like the fact that you have addressed a lot of the concerns that would come. I think this is happening already and it is good to have qualifying guidelines, and we do need housing in this town that is affordable or usable by people who want to work here and don't want to commute from the Netherlands. I think it is a good idea; I think what you have written and the way you have addressed it is generally 99% great. As far as what I would like it to relate to, would be also to look at the short-term vacation rental situation, because if you have people coming in for a week once, maybe once a month; we are not so lucky we would be able to do that all the time, but that really cuts down on a lot of these problems. You have people there and then gone, instead of having six cars there all the time, so I would like to see that addressed too. Take off any of the timeframes on it; I would love to go back to having that. Like Participant F brought up, a lot of homes had been doing that, then they weren't allowed to, so they have lost their homes, because of it. I think it is a hugely needed service in this town.

SYNOPSIS OF
JUNE 30, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
June 30, 2009

Overall: The participants' primary concerns were enforcement issues and two participants questioned the need for affordable housing. Participants also indicated that the costs were prohibitive and owners of illegal ADUs should be seriously penalized if discovered after the amnesty period; however, there should be a waiver for seniors that show financial hardship. Application of the size restriction to existing units and the definition of "kitchen" were questioned. Suggestions included having exemptions approved by the Board of Adjustment, limiting the number of ADUs in a subdivision, and prohibiting new construction of separate ADU structures on smaller lots.

Appearance: The requirement regarding front doors was questioned and suggestions included having the Board of Adjustment involved in the approval process and removing ". . . or an improvement to the appearance of . . ." on page 4 in paragraph H.

1. Participant D - I didn't understand, to be perfectly honest, all the emphasis on where the doors should be; I think it depends on the structure of the building as to where the door can be. Back east, it is very common to have the front of the building have two front doors; you have your main front door and you have another one that goes into the kitchen or something, and I couldn't understand why they were so insistent about always putting it on the side or the back. It depends on the structure of the home and what looks best. If they blended-in, I think that would look better than having one on the side, especially if it is a corner unit, where when you turn the corner, you've got what is this? To me, that would look more like a duplex than if you had the two front doors and they match and one looked like back east, where you often have entrances into a mudroom or carport or kitchen versus also the front door. It depends on the structure of the house and how it is designed on the lot.
2. Participant B - (Regarding the idea of a manufactured home), where it says that the exterior of those Accessory Dwelling Units need to be in keeping with the exterior of the architecture of the home on the property, that probably wouldn't likely happen with a manufactured home, unless extensive exterior remodeling were done, and I would hate for one to be put next to me, where he said, you know that is too expensive and somebody on staff agreed with him. I understand the rationale. My only concern is it not be limited to an individual decision. The Board of Adjustment; that is my point, rather than go to the Director of the housing; perhaps you would be the first point, and then final approval would be through that second group to screen it. The alternative could be having a little more specific rule about how far you could go.
3. Participant C - Page 4, paragraph H, last line, the phrase, ". . . or an improvement to the appearance of . . .", who determines what "improvement" is? What it means is different things to different people. My suggestion is take it out. I think "similar to" gives you that option.

Concept: Participants indicated that whether people supported the concept or not, there were concerns about enforcement. One participant indicated that it is time to stop giving lip service to affordable housing and decide if we want it or not; two other participants indicated the need has not been established and the talk about teachers, etc., is the sales pitch. Participants' suggestions included the City buying foreclosed properties and selling them at that price and a 2% loan, and areas where ADUs would be allowed should go through a zoning action.

1. Participant B - I've been working hard to get informed and try to find out the facts.

2. Participant D - In terms of recruitment of staff, it is always nice to know what might be out there for affordable housing or smaller units for single staff coming up for a summer or a one-year period for internships and things like that.
3. Participant F - I thought you might as well have some input from the real estate side of the fence, so here I am.
4. Participant G - I am primarily here as a voice for seniors, so that is my primary focus and a lot of my comments will be based on that.
5. Participant D - I didn't necessarily agree with some of it, but it wasn't confusing.
6. Participant B - John would you like to start with clarifying the total number of units and also what Audree was commenting to me about it was taken into consideration in the Land Development Code about total density, and what happened there? And Audree, you talked about buildout.
7. Participant B - I'm not in favor of ADUs; I'll say that upfront, because of the enforcement issues, but it seems that if the City is going to go ahead and do it, let's at least try to make it practical.
8. Participant B - It is worth mentioning that we have people who support it and people who oppose it, and they are both concerned about enforcement; that is important to note.
9. Participant B - If we're actually changing the zoning of the single-family areas to multi-family, and the effect is that we actually are, because the definition, according to the City, of a multi-family dwelling is a unit with more than two dwellings or a property with more than two structures, and that is exactly what we are doing with an ADU, so it is a change to the single-family definition. If we are going to do that, why not take each zoning parcel and have a zoning hearing at which people could come in and talk about it? For each area that you are planning to allow ADUs in, go through a rezoning process, and involve people. Everybody is saying no, because I think they know what the residents are going to say. This is a major redefinition of what single-family resident zoning is.
10. Participant F - An amendment to the constitution is a major thing.
11. Participant B - You are saying that if we pass a Land Development Code amendment saying that we can have 10-story buildings, we got them without going through anything else? There is a significant number of people that oppose this ordinance, and I think you have seen that at all of the various meetings, and part of it is fear that it is going to happen next to them and it is not going to be controlled, and they don't have any say. Being more open and more transparent and saying yes, we are not amending the Land Use Code, we are creating a new zoning area, and let it fly to see if it works. There would probably have to be somebody come forward and say I'd be interested in doing this or whatever, but it would require that the area go through a rezoning. We obviously have people that want this, otherwise, there wouldn't be this process, or do they want somebody else to do it in somebody else's neighborhood? Let's be realistic about it, we bought into single-family residence areas that were zoned single-family, and our expectation is that unless there were some zoning hearings and major changes, they would stay that way. We are talking about land values; I know that the Housing Commission has made a lot about average home values in cities with ADUs have not been depressed; well, how do they know they couldn't have gone up further, and also what about the property next door? There is only anecdotal evidence about the City as a whole; there isn't anything about the properties on either side of the residence with the ADU. I have to agree with Cole Greenberg, there is an impact, and I don't agree with what Cole says a lot, but he has a point. We're raising issues that you need to deal with; you opened Pandora's Box and what is coming out isn't always pretty.
12. Participant C - Following up a little on what Participant B said, just about everybody I've talked to shares most of those fears and concerns, and they aren't sure what may or may not happen. I would say anecdotally that people I see are very much against the ADUs.

13. Participant B - Maybe after 7:00 p.m., I would be interested in hearing what the proponents of the ADUs, their reasoning, as to why the benefits outweigh some of the things we have been talking about. To be honest with you, I have been to a number of these things when they are talking about density and ADUs and I've never heard anybody say anything favorable about them, except an ADU designer, because of the money. That is what I'm struggling with here, why would we want to open this Pandora's Box; what are the advantages? I need to have some input.
14. Participant F - Back to the rationale of why would you want to do this, you are always going to be faced with NIMBY, but it goes back to the fundamental issue. I've been a resident here for 18 years myself, but it seems that we've had a lot of lip service to affordable housing over all of that time, and I think there is some fundamental rationale for seeing that we aren't so exclusive, in terms of the level of population that can't afford to buy a home here or whatever. I certainly don't want to see us get into subsidized housing and that sort of thing. The question is do we honestly want affordable housing in Sedona or not, and that is the key question, and if we don't, then we don't, but let's stop giving all of this lip service to make our hearts feel better or whatever.
15. Participant C - It is back to that feel good legislation, and affordable housing is an issue that is occurring all over the country. In my little hometown up in the north woods of Wisconsin, you can go there and buy a house for $70,000, and they are going through the same kind of issues of, "We've got to have affordable housing". Everybody seems to want to do it.
16. Participant B - May I relate a conversation that I had with Cliff Hamilton this afternoon? We've been addressing affordable housing as though it is the problem. We have not defined the problem as to why we have to have affordable housing here. There has not been any rationale developed that would sell the idea, and affordable housing would not be the only solution, but we've not communicated to the community why we need to have affordable housing; it sounds more like a little feel-good thing than a solution to some well-defined problem, and it seems to be going backwards. Let's do affordable housing, and then figure out why we did it later. (Regarding a lot of work done on the needs assessment), then why are there so many people that have no idea what the problem is?
17. Participant D - I thought the main reason was that when you look at firemen, police, teachers, nurses, and they can't live near their job, the firemen are not going to keep coming here if they have to drive two hours from Phoenix to get to work, even if they do spend 48 hours here, and then get to go home. With the gas prices going up, it is going to get harder and harder to lure those type of people in those fields to the City, so what are you going to do, when all of a sudden you've got three policemen.
18. Participant C - That's the sales pitch that everybody uses for affordable housing. That's the mantra, but most of the police, firemen and teachers get paid sufficiently that they can afford something; they maybe can't buy.
19. Participant B - (Regarding teachers starting out at $13.00 per hour), but they are not going to live in a garage.
20. Participant F - I've said it myself, our affordable housing is 16 miles down-the-road, and that sounds harsh, but that is the reality.
21. Participant C - That is the way it is in most cities; you can't live in the ritziest part of town.
22. Participant F - When we get back to $4.00 or $5.00 per gallon for gas, even commuting from Cottonwood is going to be prohibitive.
23. Participant G - Aspen has affordable housing and so does Santa Fe.
24. Participant F - Yeah, you have to qualify for making less than $150,000 to get affordable housing in Aspen.
25. Participant D - The City should buy all of the foreclosures, and then sell them to the people at that price and a 2% loan; solved.
26. Participant F - I was glad to see that you took out the rent control idea; that scared me.

Cost: Participants indicated that the impact fees are prohibitive and owners of illegal units shouldn't get a break. Additionally, there should be some waiver for the elderly; this revised version makes affordability questionable, plus market conditions are addressing affordable housing now, and even a garage conversion wouldn't be economically feasible.

1. Participant F - One concern I have is about impact fees. I just want to be clear about when that comes into play, so that is only going to come into play if somebody is building a new structure on the property, is that correct? Which amounts to roughly $16,000; I guess my sense of that is it is sort of prohibitive and nobody is going to want to do this. It might snuff out the whole initiative to start with. (Opportunity to have a waiver), I saw that.
2. Participant B - Is it fair to give the illegal ones a pass on that?
3. Participant F - Just a question to clarify that? So, if I were going to build a guesthouse and not plan to turn it into a rental unit, I would still be paying that same impact fee? So, what is the rationale then for imposing that impact fee on the rentals? My understanding also is that you are not going to allow any more density on that property than would be allowed in the code anyway, right? So, theoretically, it would seem to be the rationale for the impact fee that it is adding to the services that the owner is going to be getting from the City, blah, blah, blah. If that is already factored into the service, what is the additional impact? My point is I am concerned, because I do generally like the idea, and it sounds like that is going to quietly kind of cut its throat.
4. Participant B - I don't see an upside in having this ordinance, because for someone that is interested in legally doing an ADU, the costs are almost prohibitive with a $16,000 impact fee, the inspection and the paper, whatever. If I were contemplating having an ADU, why would I do that? I am also concerned about rewarding the illegal ones. I don't think they should get any breaks.
5. Participant E - If you try to get them to be legal and if it is income producing and they pay the $16,000, down the road, they are going to make it back.
6. Participant D - I would like to see some other clause in here that for the elderly, where they are trying to pad their income and it is more of a financial issue, because they need the income, that you waive some of these fees. If you say somebody is over 70-years-old and they can prove that it is a financial hardship for them, if they pay these fees; they're not going to be able to do it. They only have this amount of money and this is what it is going to cost to convert or build this, and they need this, because they have healthcare issues now, and blah, blah, blah, and they need the extra income, then there are provisions there.
7. Participant B - Is that legal; when we were exploring the sewer problem, some people had to have a grinder pump for $6,000 or $8,000, and through no fault of their own; it just happened to be where their property was relative to the level of sewer, but the City cannot gift them that grinder, so isn't this the same thing?
8. Participant G - I've been listening to everything here, because I actually have written to the Mayor and the City Council in favor of ADUs; however, after reading this latest edition of the ordinance, I have to say as far as looking at it from what originally ADUs were meant for, an alternative to affordable housing, which our group has certainly been a proponent of, we need affordable housing in this town and this was one way in which the Housing Commission looked at bringing this on board. . .
9. Participant B - It is not affordable.
10. Participant G - Exactly; when I've looked at everything here and at the impact fees, and as far as the feasibility of this, I don't see how; in fact, we have to look at it not only from the occupants of who the ADU units could be for, and one of them was for senior housing as an alternative, but the other part of it is you have to look at the people in those homes that may have and have been here 30 or 40 years, where they have had ADUs, as they are looked at today, but then it was just another little unit, so what are you doing to impact them, as far as

the seniors and the ones that are aging in this community, by imposing yet another whole stream of things they have to apply to, so I don't know that we are doing a lot. . .

11. Participant C - I just looked at my house and said if I were to convert to add an ADU, what might it cost me, and then I went through the paper to see how many rental units were on the market currently, and when I penciled that stuff out, there were 30 apartments at less than $900 a month, so I think the economy may have done more for the affordable housing end than all of these efforts that the Housing Commission and everybody spends time trying to do on paper, while the market is doing it.
12. Participant G - (Regarding that being temporary), exactly, but that is true right now, you can buy homes, you can. . .
13. Participant C - I'm not one that thinks the economy is going to bounce back fast and far.
14. Participant E - Did you pencil out what it would cost you to build it and what you can get in rent?
15. Participant C - If I converted my garage and put in a little kitchen and bathroom, and a room off the garage that could be a bedroom, it didn't make sense financially to do it.
16. Participant A - I looked at the Sedona Pines unit, when they started putting them in, and how much they were; they were $50,000 a unit and if we could bring that onto the property, with all the costs, we were looking at $75,000 easy, to put something manufactured on our lot. For stick-built, we calculated the cost between $75,000 and $80,000 easy.
17. Participant F - What is the alternative? What I like about this is that it is something that is likely to be immediate, although I have to agree that the impact fee basically guts the thing, so you don't have to worry about it, because it is not going to happen, even if they pass it.

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern about the current lack of enforcement and potential enforcement issues with this ordinance and indicated owners of illegal units should be assessed a penalty or have to pay all or half of the impact fee after the amnesty period. Additionally, applying the size restriction to existing units and the definition of "kitchen" were questioned. One participant indicated exemptions should be approved by the Board of Adjustment or have more specific rules; however, another participant noted that would add more layers of bureaucracy.

1. Participant A - I'm concerned about code enforcement, since a lot of the things that are happening in Sedona right now don't seem to be code enforced, so I want to see how the impact of this group of new housing and new additional impact in the area is going to be policed basically.
2. Participant C - I second Participant A's concerns of code enforcement being lax on current issues.
3. Participant A - The other thing I just want to clarify, I believe you said it earlier, is if the CC&Rs preclude an ADU, then nobody can go around it based on City Codes, is that correct?
4. Participant A - I like the whole section on development standards; the way you laid it out that there is one per parcel, the mobile homes are not allowed, and you've actually spelled it out very clearly and very easy to read. I like that whole section.
5. Participant C - I do have one comment on that section; it does say mobile homes, travel trailers and like vehicles, but it doesn't address manufactured housing specifically, so is that intentional and are you intending that manufactured housing can only be permitted in that zoning classification where it currently exists?
6. Participant A - For instance, like the units down at Sedona Pines, like one of those units, would that be okay?
7. Participant B - I'm a little concerned about the process for getting exemptions, and from what I understand from reading this, that would be up to the Housing Department. Yeah, where to put the door, if there is going to be a second curb cut, all that kind of stuff about things needing a decision. I'm wondering if that might not be an issue that would be better left to a

group like the Planning & Zoning Commission or something, rather than to an individual staff member. I understand the rationale. My only concern is it not be limited to an individual decision. The Board of Adjustment; that is my point, rather than go to the Director of the housing; perhaps you would be the first point, and then final approval would be through that second group to screen it. The alternative could be having a little more specific rule about how far you could go.

8. Participant F - My overall concern, and this speaks to that, is more layers of bureaucracy to get this thing done. If you are going to do it, I would like to see it, maybe making things more specific, so you don't have a lot of discretion, but to have it sent through various boards and things is going to add more layers of bureaucracy, which heaven help us.
9. Participant E - One of the rules is that the owner has to occupy either the main house or the small house; what happens if there is a house and small dwelling now that is not owner-occupied, but they are being used as rentals, does that get grandfathered and they can keep doing that? I know some of my managers, they don't do it now, but I've been to their home, when they were living there a couple of years ago, and that is how it was set up.
10. Participant C - What if the owner is an LLC or corporation of some kind?
11. Participant F - Why is that so inflexible; I don't understand why is that being so inflexible, because obviously we've got certain situations here? It just seemed like we had a lot of varying opinions on that. In K.1 on page 5, what happens here on a pre-existing unit? In the example I have here, let's say 1,670 sq. ft. is the main house, but the actual ADU is 800 sq. ft.? I'm concerned about some that are already pre-existing in this whole equation and how you are going to work with that. So, is that person supposed to take down some of their property that they have? So, if they don't do it, they would not be in compliance should this pass? Then, are you requiring the property owner to scale back their . . .? Really.
12. Participant B - I, like the others, am very concerned about the enforcement issues, and I would like Jim maybe to speak to that.
13. Participant B - So upfront, they would have to pay, so they are further discouraged.
14. Participant E - Are they supposed to tell you they're using it that way, when they come in?
15. Participant D - When you say that it should meet all technical code standards, including building, electrical and fire, does that mean that you have to have separate utilities; in other words, your air conditioning and heating unit is not going to heat this?
16. Participant C - On the meters, but I think on the question on HVAC, the IRC requires that each unit has its own air conditioning or heating unit; you can't intermingle the air from the two.
17. Participant A - Correct.
18. Participant C - Which makes it quite difficult to convert an existing unit, without adding another whole HVAC system, but that is part of the IRC and I heard Jim say that . . .
19. Participant D - The reason I asked that is there is one in our neighborhood, and he converted his garage, and he is not sure if his unit is too small now to heat and cool this whole house and this extra converted area or what the deal is, but his air conditioner runs 10 to 12 minutes out of every 15 minutes constantly, and he knows that is the reason. His is under cover and all of that good stuff, but that is one of the reasons the noise issue is there. If you don't monitor and make them put on a separate unit, then you can put a huge strain, because their air conditioning wasn't meant for an extra 800 or more square feet of living space, so now it has to run almost constantly to try to cool the house, and it is a lot of noise. A couple of neighbors have complained and said, "You know the thing just never shuts off, 24 hours a day". I asked him who did his insulation job, because I don't want them to do it on our house; they did a lousy job, because his air conditioning . . ., and he said, "No, it is not that, the unit can't handle the converted rental in my house and it is all one unit, so that is why she was asking. You might want to consider forcing them to separate it, because of the nose issue.

20. Participant B - To make enforcement worth everybody's time, why aren't there any penalties listed in here. It seems to me that if someone has been illegal for a long time, and is discovered, maybe they should be assessed the impact fee or something. Jim sends me a letter and I go . . ., and then what?
21. Participant B - (Regarding provisions already being in the code), do you exercise them?
22. Participant A - If a unit is currently illegal and they do not comply and come forward to say that they have these units, then how will the City deal with it? Will it give you more ability to go after these people and say you haven't complied and this is illegal, so cease and desist? Where are the City lawyers going to get involved, and then what does the community and the neighborhood have to do to actually give information to you, so you can follow-through without your hands being tied?
23. Participant D - If you can't go on the property, and I don't know who came up with that, but that to me is the dumbest thing I've ever heard. If somebody makes an allegation towards a neighbor that they are doing something illegal, the City should have the right to go on the property, just to verify if it is a true allegation or if it is just a neighbor hating a neighbor, and if they are going to be wasting your time by calling every week complaining, because they just want to make his life miserable by using the City. If you can't go on the property to verify that there is a unit that is being rented out for vacations or long-term, then how are you ever going to enforce it? You can ask them and say that you've been notified. The City lawyer told me that it would be pointless for me to take pictures of license plates, because he said we have no way of knowing that you didn't just go down to Safeway parking lot and take pictures of license plates on cars and say these are all of the license plates they've got at the house.
24. Participant A - I know that there is someone on our block that has two kitchens in his home, and I don't have a problem with that. He rents it out; the person is quiet, but it is against our CC&Rs, but then he builds seven extra bedrooms, with so many bathrooms, and then he has 200 people coming and going from his house, and we have taken pictures and talked to the City, but that is not enforced, so it just concerns me that this is going to be a whole other area, and I am for the ADUs, because I see the need for them, but it just concerns me about the enforcement, when some of the other laws that are already in place aren't being enforced. Yeah, it's a tricky one, but again, that is the concern of our whole block, because it is tricky. If somebody says you cannot come on my property, then what?
25. Participant F - If you have a probable cause, can't you get a search warrant?
26. Participant B - This issue isn't severe enough; if it were drugs or something, it would be a different case.
27. Participant B - (Regarding building an illegal unit), they aren't going to catch me, even if they do . . ., so I see this ordinance encouraging more illegals rather than bringing illegal ones into compliance. It would have to be significant to say, well I'm not willing to take that risk; I'm going to go through the hoops, and you might even sweeten the deal by instead of having a full impact fee, have a percentage. You talk about it being a half-dwelling unit, so maybe it is a half
28. Participant C - I would strongly second what Participant B just said. Any of the legislation at the federal, state or local level, that you pass just to make yourselves feel good, because you passed legislation and don't really take it seriously and enforce it, is just another pile of paper that everybody will ignore, and the reputation then becomes, well do it if you want, because they won't do anything anyway. I wouldn't want Jim's job under any circumstances.
29. Participant E - Is there some way to bring the IRS into it, if someone is collecting the rent, are they reporting it? That is another way to verify whether they are actually using it as a rental.
30. Participant C - If you've got their social security number, the IRS has got an informer's fee; you actually collect personally.
31. Participant C- Even for the ones that are legal, do a good strong, firm job of enforcing.

32. Participant B - (Regarding the community benefit by remaining affordable and deed restricting them), and then she sells the property, then what? Would these ideas be written down somewhere?
33. Participant A - For clarification, are we talking that an ADU specifically has to do with it having a stove and an oven in it, because we have a lot of units here that have a microwave and a cook top, so we are not really talking about those, correct? We are just talking about if they want a full oven and stove in it.
34. Participant B - They have units that are all self-contained with a refrigerator and stove, and that constitutes a kitchen, which is what they took out of the house next to me.
35. Participant C - Jim might need more help.
36. Participant B - (Regarding double fees, when people have constructed stuff without proper building permits), would that include the impact fee? Why don't you quadruple the impact fee?
37. Participant D - I wish there was a way to write some ordinances and laws in the City that would make it easier for when an illegal one is reported, like for you to go in and investigate it, because a lot of people will say they haven't done anything to me yet, and I've been doing it for 10 years, so I'm not going to worry about it; they haven't caught me yet. Tourism is the only business in this town; everything fuels off of it, and it is shame that the City can't figure out a way to catch these people that are doing vacation rentals and things like that, and then get the tax off of them. Not stop them, but get the tax off of them. It would make a huge difference in our budget and everything. (Regarding City Council's decision to prohibit them) yeah, and to me that doesn't make any sense, especially during hard times. If your only business is airplanes, you don't restrict your flying; capture the money that is just down the tubes; it really isn't that much more with the taxes on a vacation rental.
38. Participant C- Can you hire a Code Enforcement Officer on a commission basis?
39. Participant D - Whether it is true or not, I hate to say that I think the majority of the people in Sedona are under the impression that the City cannot enforce 99% percent of the rules; whether that is correct or not, that is the opinion of most of the people, and the City needs to work really hard on changing that around.
40. Participant B - It would be nice to know what kinds of things happen; we know that ADUs and short-term rentals are a big problem. I understand you had a stack with the short-term rentals, but why not publicize a few success stories, at least to give the people the feeling that Sedona is making an effort and having success. We never hear about the success; we hear about the failures through little reports to people.
41. Participant C - Do what the police do and show their arrest records.
42. Participant A - This is what we've encountered in our little subdivision, so many times in the last 20 years. If they say I'm going to do it anyway, I don't care what the CC&Rs say, this is what the City Code says; it requires the HOA to then sue that person, and if you don't have that kind of money behind you or you are not collecting dues, it puts the pressure on the homeowners that are existing, and it is very difficult in some of the neighborhoods, like our neighborhood, so it becomes an issue, because we don't collect dues. We only have meetings when there are issues, so it becomes an issue.
43. Participant C - The liens are pretty easy to do though.
44. Participant B - Yeah, but you have to have justification.
45. Participant C - You have to have a legal basis; we do it for failure to pay homeowners' fees.
46. Participant B - I would say that is probably the underlying fear, even of those who want it, because they are afraid of the enforcement issues.
47. Participant B - What is the minimum definition of a kitchen? (Regarding preparation of food), that can be done with minimal . . ., a microwave and cook top and small refrigerator and sink; I'm in business, so why don't we define a kitchen as being a food preparation area? Food preparation sounds like a kitchen to me; how about meal preparation?

48. Participant F - For clarification, I was under the impression that it was the oven or cook top; is that the actual definition, because if you pull the stove out, then it is not a kitchen? It isn't the stove that defines it as a kitchen, as we were thinking, that is not it? Otherwise, your office is a now a habitable space.

Garage Conversions: One participant expressed concern about garage conversions, but another participant indicated that without an oven, they are allowed today.

1. Participant C - Let's not encourage that kind of behavior of building in front of somebody or doing something by making this too easy for folks, and I see it as being an open invitation for a garage conversion, which in some of the neighborhoods creates many of these problems with traffic, parking off-street and on-street. Garage conversions are definitely a concern. The way this is written is an open invitation to do it; there is too much of, "Here is an idea, why don't you try a garage conversion?"
2. Participant A - This might be semantics, but from code enforcement, if I have my house and want to put a dwelling on my property or in my garage, as long as I don't have that stove and oven, I can do it, so we are talking about semantics here. We are talking about an oven, aren't we? If I decide to build a piece of property on here and put a microwave in it and a cook top, all I need to do is follow the general code enforcement, pull permits and build my unit, am I correct? It seems like it is semantics here; I can convert my garage anyway, if I don't put the oven in, then I don't need to pull these permits, so I'm having a little trouble with that.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): Participants indicated that after the amnesty period, illegal units should be penalized with liens equal to the impact fee and the amnesty period should possibly be shortened to three months.

1. Participant B - What is the downside of not seeking amnesty if nothing is going to happen; nothing has happened in the last 10 to 20 years. (Regarding action taken on an illegal ADU), I understand that, but that is because somebody documented it and complained, and that doesn't seem to happen very often. (Regarding disclosure of an illegal unit at time of sale), that has not stopped them before. (Regarding still being subject to enforcement), such as we have.
2. Participant B - (Regarding the amnesty period), for six months, I could probably buy into that, but after that, if they get found out, I think there should be some serious penalties, like liens against the house for the value of the impact fee, so when they sell the house, the City collects all of that money. It just seems that without some enforceable and collectible way of having a penalty, I wouldn't bother.
3. Participant B - (Regarding making penalties on ones discovered after the amnesty period extreme), with a stop loss.
4. Participant D - I would also shorten the amnesty down to three months; I think six months is ridiculous. They know there is something wrong, and if you broadcast it and say between this date and this date, if you come in, we will waiver, or you are going to be socked and we will lien, and that would be the other thing by forcing separate utilities, an address has two meters and you can verify that through APS, etc., then you know there are two dwellings on that property, because most people don't set up their homes to have two meters.

Inspections and Permitting: There were no specific comments about annual inspections.

Miscellaneous: There were no miscellaneous comments.

Neighborhood Impact: Participants expressed concern about concentration of ADUs in certain areas and their impact on views. Suggestions included limiting ADUs in any

subdivision and providing notification to neighbors when a permit is pulled. Additionally, new construction of separate ADU structures should not be allowed on smaller lots.

1. Participant C - I spent some time looking at other ADU codes and the AARP models and things of that nature, and one of the concerns I have on that 176 is the distribution within the various areas of the city.
2. Participant A - Yes.
3. Participant C - I think it would be best if somehow it could be written such that they all don't end up clumped in one area. Take a look at Seattle, because they did it on 20%; you couldn't have more than 20% in any subdivision or something.
4. Participant C - I had the distribution question, which we talked about already, and also I would suggest maybe notification to the adjacent neighbors that a permit has been pulled. So, they can come down and beat on you.
5. Participant F - On that, maybe an ADU fact sheet or something, instead of having to plow through the whole code.
6. Participant A - Is it addressed anywhere about blocking somebody's view, when you put new ADUs on your property, because some people built their homes in specific locations, and now all of a sudden the density will increase, and somebody may lose their view.
7. Participant B - I think it is going to be variable; it depends on where you live. If you are in a single-family zoned area, with small lots of one-quarter acre or less, they are going to be impacted a lot more than the people who have 35,000 sq. ft. lots. I don't know if that is fair. (Regarding possibly saying small lots can't have them), that would be a start.
8. Participant F - My sense is that, that is probably where the majority of ADUs are right now, in the smaller lots.
9. Participant B - The lady last night was saying that when you have more cars in a more limited area, and more people in a more limited area, the impacts are greater, and the noise, because you are closer together. It is future slum generation, because the property values become depressed and the people who buy don't want to buy into that; everybody comes out a loser.
10. Participant F - What I like about your approach is, if there is an operative homeowners' association, and in many cases there is not, because the older neighborhoods don't really have HOAs, but I like the idea of bringing back the decision to the local group, which is the homeowners' association, and if there is an issue and the neighbors are getting up in arms about the impact, they have the right to squelch it.
11. Participant D - Is there a way that you can also restrict it according to the lot size? For instance, if you are talking about a quarter-acre lot or one-third acre lot, that it has to be an existing unit, like an existing garage or something like that, that can be converted; you can't add another building that would block somebody's view or anything, because there isn't enough space there and you are going to get a lot of congestion in that area. If you are talking about a one-half acre or acre lot, then you could add an extra building, so restrict it like that. If you have an existing garage or building on the property, but the lot is a very small lot, you don't let them add another building, you can take the existing garage or existing building, so the neighbors know that their view is going to stay the exact same. If you have a much bigger lot, where you can say this would block the guy's view, but if I put it on this side, it would not, so you have a little more . . . If it is over a half-acre lot, then you can add a separate building or something like that. If you ruin somebody's view, like that new school is doing to a lot of our homes; everyone moves here for the views and if you take that away from somebody, you have affected their home value drastically. (Regarding that happening six months after building), I'm not saying it is illegal, but it is very upsetting and your home lost some of its value.

Ninety-Day Minimum: There were no specific comments about the ninety-day minimum.

Occupancy: One participant referenced a discussion at a City Council meeting regarding more than 4-unrelated adults living in a unit.

1. Participant C - I even heard an esteemed member of the community, during the Council meeting, admit that maybe there was a situation occurring where there were more than 4-unrelated individuals living in a particular unit. Everybody knows where it is, because it came up at the Council meeting and I saw it on television and on Sedona.biz; Spector's new thing.

Parking: There were no specific comments about parking requirements.

Restrictions (In General): Participants indicated the proposed ordinance was well written and very clear; however, this revised version became very cost prohibitive, and one participant acknowledged that Code Enforcement eventually addressed two concerns.

1. Participant D - I thought it was well written and you could easily follow it. I thought it was pretty straightforward and very clear.
2. Participant F - It just grew from five to eleven pages.
3. Participant G - (Regarding comparing it to the previous version), when I got this and saw how many more things had been added, it concerned me, and depending on how this comes down the pike, I may have to readdress my letter to the City Council, because of those concerns. All of a sudden, it became extremely cost-prohibitive and a lot of different things. I came in really supporting this thing, and then I see it where it is now and I'm really concerned.
4. Participant B - In fairness to Jim, I did have two concerns about ADUs and eventually they were addressed; it does get done.

SYNOPSIS OF
JULY 11, 2009
FOCUS GROUP

Synopsis of ADU Focus Group
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
July 11, 2009

Overall: Although one participant was adamantly opposed, most participants supported the concept and acknowledged the need for affordable housing in the community. They also indicated there would be minimal neighborhood impact, but on-street parking should be prohibited and garage conversions should be eliminated. Most participants also indicated this ordinance would give the city better control and ability to monitor, and they were not concerned about increased density or traffic, because the zoning already allows the density and the workers are already driving into Sedona.

Appearance: In addition to the appearance of the structure, one participant added that the placement on the property should not eliminate the entire yard.

1. Participant E - I'm sure there is an Architectural Review Committee; it has got to look like the original structure.
2. Participant B - There were no ADUs in the first place, so I don't know what you are looking at.
3. Participant A - My concern is not just whether they look alike, but where they are on the property and how the property is used up, because if you park that second piece in a wrong part of the property, then the yard is not usable.

Concept: Concept was a major focus of discussion and most participants supported the concept, because there is an obvious need to provide housing for professionals; Cottonwood and Camp Verde now have their own affordable housing issues; commuting will become more difficult with rising fuel costs; housing prices have dropped, but people can't qualify for mortgages; and people can already build a guesthouse, so there would be no major impact on the community; however, one participant was adamantly opposed, because the City is trying to commercialize residential properties, affordable housing is the businesses' problem, kids and families coming in would destroy the residential character of neighborhoods, and there is a lot of land available in the Verde Valley 10-15 miles away.

1. Participant A - I've seen similar building issues in Jersey where they've got two residences on a too small plat, sort of making it like a fenced-in, prison-type area, and I really don't want to see that for the area.
2. Participant B - I think this is a serious issue where it is a change in Sedona; Sedona is getting to buildout, as we all know, and this is a move now that the City is taking to handle buildout, taking residential areas and commercializing them. I'm against it in any way.
3. Participant C - The School Board supports the affordable housing units; we believe that will help us recruit highly qualified teachers. We have been blessed so far in our district with a very seasoned staff that is getting ready for retirement, that came in like she did 20+ years ago when Sedona was somewhat affordable if you were diligent. We've lost a lot of good teachers already, and I think this is something that would help address the future. Also, looking at the Fire Department and City staff, there is about the same attrition rate of retirement going on for those two entities as well. I've spent a lot of time in Durango, Aspen and other communities that have handled this. I think the reason they are successful is they adhere strictly to their setback requirements and the density on their lots. I also believe they are being utilized illegally, and this is a way to ensure that our building codes, setbacks and density maximums are being adhered to.
4. Participant D - I am a realtor here in town. I don't have any clients that have one of these things, not in this manner at least, and I was interested in coming today, because I went to the open meeting at Poco and it seemed to be pretty one-sided, and I want to potentially pose a

different opinion on it. I'm not completely one side or the other; I just wanted come in and see what other people have to say.

5. Participant E - I'm a builder and a realtor at the same time; I've lived in Sedona for 13 years. The need for this type of dwelling is obviously for people who want to live in the community and can't really afford it, but we need for them to live here or they go away. The retailers can't keep people in their shops, we can't keep nurses, teachers, firemen and policemen; they don't live in the community that they serve. I think that is a horrible situation; there is no community pride in the people who give service to the community; although, I wouldn't say that firemen don't have pride in their work. Anyway, this is going to be a very volatile issue; there are people who resist change of any kind, and that is fine. I got mine, now go get yours, but go get it someplace else, and we can't have that kind of attitude in a growing community. It would provide a lot of employment, and it would also help people on limited income to recover some of their lifestyle as a result of having these available. That is where I am coming from.
6. Participant E - Obviously, the ordinance is extremely well written; again, we can stay within these boundaries and not get into situations like New Jersey, where they just crammed stuff together and made it unsightly.
7. Participant B - I think the whole ordinance should be eliminated. You have an affordable housing problem, which is basically a business problem; business people can't get people to work, they can't afford it, so why do you come into residential subdivisions and trash their property by impacting their privacy, security and value of the homes of residential homeowners. They have nothing to do with the business in Sedona. Sedona is business and residential; residential people don't have a word in this town. The City is run by business, because they get all of the revenue from business, I understand that, but this ordinance gives the City the right to go into subdivisions, where someone bought residential property and is living there happily, and in comes the City and gets people building little units and lower his property. Kids coming in, families coming in, it destroys the residential character of the neighborhood, and I don't think the City has a right to do that to property owners in subdivisions that are residential. So, the whole ordinance to my mind is a problem. I don't see why; this is a business problem, why can't you take commercial property and build dedicated buildings, apartments subject to affordable housing.
8. Participant C - As many of you, I am a long-term resident. My husband and I moved here as a young couple, we have raised our kids here; they are off out in the world doing some pretty fabulous things. Sedona was founded by pioneer families, we have never been a retirement community; we have always been an inclusive community built with retired, young families and in-between generations, so we are not Sun City West; we are a completely inclusive community. I live in a subdivision where it is a high amount of retirement, and we have block parties on a regular basis. We know all of our neighbors, so I think it is important to keep that alive. I'm grateful that my children grew up with surrogate grandfathers and grandmothers, in a community that valued our family in their neighborhood, and I want that to be kept alive for the next generation. As a property owner, I'm a complete freeloader as far as the infrastructure cost of running this City, and we have been completely dependent on the business community to pay our way, so they provide our parks, they provide my sidewalks, and in many aspects this community looks better than it did 25 years ago, as far as mobility. I can now walk safely and I'm less dependent on my car. Looking into bringing in employees that we need for health, safety and welfare, are some things that have to be looked at. When I talk to our like communities that value their property values, that value their lifestyle, Durango, Aspen and Santa Fe, I keep getting the message back, "You guys are over thinking this; it works, you have ordinances, they are non-negotiable, there are no loopholes. You stick with your basic ordinances and you move forward." When I look at cities like Telluride that have been doing this for over 40 years, they look at their oldest and how it has

transitioned to today's ordinance, and there have been some modifications made. All those modifications were not to loosen it up, but often to strengthen the ordinance in existence, so I am at 180 with you. I think there is room for all of us in the community, and I think our family's experience, living within a retired section of the City, has been a fabulous experience.

9. Participant B - I can't afford to buy a Mercedes, so I don't drive one.
10. Participant C - And neither can our family.
11. Participant B - The same applies to Sedona; you've got these red rocks.
12. Participant C - But the reality is when Cottonwood and Camp Verde are scrambling and running to create their own affordable housing ordinances, we no longer have bedroom communities to send our teachers, firefighters, and our City staff out to; they don't exist. Even with the adjustment to the economy, it doesn't exist, so where are we going to send them?
13. Participant E - I attended the affordable housing meetings as well, and that got shot down, because of all the "I'd like to have it, but I don't want it in my neighborhood" problem, so that issue didn't get solved. So, now we turn to this as an alternative way of doing the same thing, and I think it is a better application than building apartment buildings, because with an apartment building, now you do have a parking problem. You have tremendous impact all in one area. I'd build a 3-story apartment building and put 100 units in there, well now you have 100 cars all in one spot, so nobody wanted that either. There has got to be . . .
14. Participant B - There is a lot of land available in the valley, about 15 miles, 10 miles.
15. Participant E - Then they start talking about the cost of gas and all of that, and it is hard to drive in. I work in Cornville and I have to drive 13 miles a day, but there is other land available, there is no question about it, but there are ways to do this to make it affordable. Right now, some of that stuff is not affordable. With the market the way it is, as you well know, the average price of the homes in Cottonwood has dropped from $280,000 to $200,000, some even less, that becomes pretty affordable for all of the folks, but they can't qualify for a mortgage, so it is catch-22.
16. Participant A - I don't see anything detrimental so long as everybody follows the rules, but again, I am disagreeing with a lot of people. I would like to see a couple of small-scale apartment buildings for that reason. I have other issues that I would rather not put out in open air, about the reasons for the need for the lower-income housing, but if all the rules could be followed and everything is really proper and traffic and child safety is maintained, then I don't see why not.
17. Participant C - I think we have beaten this topic. For me, it has been 14 years; I'm exhausted by it. When I look at other communities, they have said the same thing over and over, we've done this, we've been doing it for 25 years, we have a high approval rating; you are over-thinking this, move on, pass it and get it going, and I'm hoping that we are finally to the point that we're willing to just step up and do it. I think regarding ADUs, the economy, the revenue stream in the City, let's just make a decision. As property owners step up and say we want to have property tax and be less reliant on the business community or follow other like communities that just said we enjoy a lifestyle in our resort community, and we understand it is paid for by out tourists, and we are going to embrace and intermingle with them. The impact would be that we would finally be able to start moving forward and addressing some of the housing needs for our professional workforce, and they are there. We have needs; when we bring in a 23-year-old graduate that wants to serve in our school, our police force or in the City, they have gotten knocked out of Cottonwood, Camp Verde and the surrounding communities. I want working professionals in our community, and I want to see an opportunity for them to stay and raise a family. We are not Sun City West and I want us to be an inclusive community. Can we provide housing for everyone and in every income

bracket? Not now, never will we be able to, but we should be able to for our young working professionals.

18. Participant D - The impact on Sedona, I think we are looking at this, and there are a lot of people that are saying that we are going to have major affects from this; I don't really see that. Due to the cost in building, it is primarily going to be in nicer subdivisions, and they either already have a guesthouse out there or they've been thinking of it or they've got in-laws coming to town, and you know, with the restrictions in here about the owner has to be in there more than six months out of the year, and the size of the unit, I mean I think it is really going to be used for service staff or people to keep an eye on a house, or you know, whether they rent a guesthouse out to a new Police Officer, because they are not in town all the time, and wouldn't it be great to have a cop living in your guesthouse on your property to watch over things. I really don't see it being used as a commercial aspect; I look at it more as people in the median to upper brackets keeping a better eye on their properties.
19. Participant B - Well, that is the point of their own inspectors, to have it used by people who are low-income working in the City.
20. Participant C - But, low income working in the City is a beginning wage, professional wage. I mean there is such a disparity, until they get a foothold in the community and can build up their longevity at their employment, whether it be the School District, City, Fire Department or the Police Force, they need a foothold within the community. Is this going to resolve the issue for someone making $8 an hour, no. Are we ever going to be able to resolve the issue of someone of making $8 per hour, I don't think so.
21. Participant B - It is up to the businesses to do that; this is a capitalistic system.
22. Participant C - As a capitalist system, nationwide, people have addressed affordable housing very poorly. Refer back to the 60s and 70s of the HUD projects and the failure of that through current day transition to integrated, dispersed modest affordable housing pockets that when you drive by, you don't know you have just driven by an affordable housing unit, and that seems to be the solution, after many, many years out in the communities, that people can find acceptable within our community.
23. Participant B - Yeah, but you know, a guy comes to Sedona, he has worked for 30 years, he is successful, he has bought a house in Sedona retiring, very nice. Then you have got ADUs coming into his subdivision; there is no right to do that to a person. I don't care; I'm so old it doesn't matter to me, but the fact is I hate to see Sedona slipping like this.
24. Participant C - What I don't get though is unless their CC&Rs address it, they already can today; they can already go in, to that man who has worked hard for 30 years and retired; they can already build a guesthouse on their property.
25. Participant B - Yes, but not to rent; that is the whole key here.
26. Participant C - Well, back to the same cycle.
27. Participant A - I think his fears are unfounded, because basically, what are you going to have. How many houses do we have in this City or how many pieces of property do we have?
28. Participant A - Everybody has a right to live where they want to live.
29. Participant B - If they can afford it.
30. Participant A - If they can afford it, but what you are trying to do here is create basically an elitist society, alright.
31. Participant B - Yeah.
32. Participant A - And, that is not the United States of America.
33. Participant B - This is red rock country.
34. Participant C - But no, I'm going to respectfully disagree. Again, we perpetuate this belief that we are an exclusive community, that we are an elitist community, that we are a community of wealthy, and that is not true today and it wasn't true 25 years ago, when I entered it. We have always had, living within the City boundaries, a wide variety of incomes, and I will prove that simply by looking at our schools, where over 48% of our kids are on free

and reduced meals, and that isn't something that just started happening; that has been long standing, but more importantly, we have been, from the founding of our community, a family-based community. We are not Sun City West, and if you ask around the residences I have, they don't want to be Sun City West. They said over and over again, if I wanted to live in a locked community and forbid children and young families I would have done so, so there is the minority that often seem to be newer residents that believe thank God I got into paradise, lock and bolt the gates and nothing is ever going to change.

35. Participant E - This has been worked on and talked about for a long time; it is time to just get it done. You know we've talked about it, there have been focus groups, there have been meetings with everybody, and the ordinance is well written, let's get it before the City Council and let's move on it, yeah or nay, but let's get it done.
36. Participant A - I think I'm fine with what we discussed. It seems like we are all basically on the same page going in the same direction at this point. I don't think this is going to have any major impact on the community at all. There are going to be some people that may object to what is going on next door to them, but so long as everything falls within the guidelines of the draft of the ordinance, there shouldn't be any problem.
37. Participant E - Here is another thought, I just did a survey in my business, offering a casita, an auxiliary dwelling unit, now we can't legally put a kitchen in it and we won't; it has to be connected to the main house, under the same roof. That's the rule on the size of the property we have. The number of people who are facing a situation where they have an elderly parent, who is not wanting to go into a home, but wants to be near the family, that appealed to them very much, to have that thing there. Unfortunately, there are a number of kids who have come back to the nest, so to speak, because they have gotten in trouble, so they have no place to live. Those are things that, we did a survey of how many people wanted this on their new house, and every one of them we surveyed did except one; one person said no.
38. Participant B - Most subdivisions permit guesthouses, it has come up when they take care of extended family or that is the purpose of them; it is already in the law, we can do that. I would love to see that held, and they are useful, certainly bring in your son and everything else, but they are allowed and good. This doesn't change it.
39. Participant E - Well, there are good reasons to have them then that are not necessarily for rentals.
40. Participant C - I agree with Participant E; we've looked at this and we've been out to the community, we've beaten it to death, get it in front of Council, pass it or fail it; it is enough.
41. Participant E - I think it is going to be a very hard fought issue; I think the citizenry is going to have a lot of objections to it, for whatever reasons. Unfortunately, some of those reasons may be ill-founded, but . . .
42. Participant B - The citizenry unfortunately is scattered, they don't get together and speak with one voice. We don't have community in this town any more.
43. Participant E - We used to have the newspaper that had a little . . .
44. Participant D - It is because we push them all out and we make them live out in other places, so they can't afford to live here; that's part of it.
45. Participant C - I would also like to keep some perspective, when we built Big Park School, the Sheriff's office had to escort us into the meetings; the community rioted, I'm not kidding you. I am not exaggerating; their property values were going to plummet, they were leaving the Village; we destroyed their way of life. Go out, look at the property values, after the school, they came up to much closer and equal to Sedona, where they were vastly different, and more importantly, go around the neighborhood, petition the Village residents. They will brag about their school, so you know, we have been a community that is always fear-based on any kind of change. We always breakdown and gnash our teeth and cry and scream, yet, more often than not, in the end, we love what we feared we would hate.

46. Participant B - I have a comment on affordable housing anyway; one of the opinions expressed last year was Cottonwood would be a better place to have affordable housing, and you look at that, and you say a person, okay, they get an ADU, and then they are in Sedona, their family lives in Sedona where the cost of living is high, they have to have a car to drive from the ADU to their workplace. If they lived in Cottonwood, the family would live in Cottonwood where the cost of living is less, and the bus could drop people off at three or four different points in Sedona, and they could probably walk to the workplace.
47. Participant C - And, you have a group that is trying to fight and shut down the bus system as well.
48. Participant D - Who is going to pay for the bus system?
49. Participant A - Who is paying for the buses?
50. Participant E - Well, now there is a new deal, you pay $1 a ride or $2 to ride all day, and that is all over Cottonwood and here as well, isn't it?
51. Participant A - No, that is just around town; that is the Cottonwood transit.
52. Participant D - Like a circulator?
53. Participant A - Yeah, it is being used and they think it is real successful. Again, I would just caution people to remember that when Camp Verde starts climbing on board, "Oh my God, we have to have affordable housing", we need to stop. The argument of 10-20 years ago or 15 years ago is dead. Those communities that we depended on to house our employees, our professional employees, already have their own problems.
54. Participant B - Okay now, this is in Sedona; it is a high-end town, let's face it, and businesses should be prepared to pay higher wages in Sedona than they pay in Cottonwood. Why not?
55. Participant C - And again, if you are looking at revenue stream, there are one or two choices; either accept that your businesses are paying my way, that I am a freeloader in Sedona as a property owner, I contribute nothing to the services that I receive, so I'm dependent on my neighbor that is a business owner to pay my way, so we continue under that model or we say we do not want our businesses, we do not need our businesses and we are willing to take on, as property owners, that cost and we set our great City Property Tax and pay our own way, but what I don't understand about that argument for the last 10 years is be damned the business owners, while we live off of their revenue stream. One way or another, it is just a choice as a community that we need to make.
56. Participant A - Let me give you a reality check, the house that I sold in New Jersey was 1,600 sq. ft. on 1/4 of an acre, and the kids that bought it are paying $7,200 a year in real estate taxes. My house here is 2,100 sq. ft. on 1/2 acre and I pay $2,600.
57. Participant C - My point exactly, let's just make a choice. If we want our lifestyle and our low property taxes, then we as a community, non-business owners, we as a community have to look at the health and welfare of our business community, to continue to pay our lifestyle, just like Santa Fe has, just like Telluride has, just like Durango. You know name all of the like communities and they just accept, as a community, who is paying their bills. Have they given them a free ticket to do whatever they want, certainly not, but have they accepted the fact that they are paying for their lifestyle and they have to get along, I think better than we have.
58. Participant B - The business owners, like property owners, have a free choice; they come here, they choose to come here, they choose to open a business under the circumstances that exist, and they have got to figure out how to make it work; that is capitalism. You don't open a store and expect to make a profit on four items or something; you know it is business.
59. Participant E - There have been a lot of businesses opened in Sedona that were hobby businesses; they were retired and mama wanted something to do, so she opened a little jewelry store, and they were not really good business people and they failed. The Uptown merchants . . .; first of all, this is a real far out aside, but ADOT should be shot and hung for

what they have done to the Village and what they did to the merchants in this town. There really should be a class action suit by the merchants of Sedona against ADOT.

60. Participant C - Over the roundabouts?
61. Participant E - Over the whole project. They sold that road completely wrong.
62. Participant C - (Back to ADUs), get it in front of Council.
63. Participant A - Get 'er done.
64. Participant A - One little piece of trivia, talking about having these people drive in from Cottonwood and stuff like that, last year AAA figured the cost of operating a vehicle at 45 cents per mile, that is maintenance, fuel, insurance, wear and tear, the whole bit. That is 40 miles round trip, give or take a little bit, so that is a lot of money a day.
65. Participant B - That is what buses are for.
66. Participant A - There are no buses.
67. Participant B - There are buses, going back to Cottonwood.
68. Participant A - There are only two of them, what do you do with people that are off shift?
69. Participant C - You also have to keep in mind there is a very active group that is working very hard to shut down what little transportation options we have. They do not want it, and the Mayor has concerns about them as well, they don't want the buses running; they want it shut down.
70. Participant E - That is so ridiculous.

Cost: One Participant indicated that it is cost prohibitive and it wouldn't make sense to build a unit to rent for $800 per month.

1. Participant D - I looked at it, being in real estate and knowing what building costs are; it is really cost prohibitive for anybody to do that in a modest neighborhood. It doesn't really make sense for them to do it.
2. Participant A - If the footprint is big enough on the garage, you could second story it, but that is about it.
3. Participant D - To build a second story on top of something, first you have to have it engineered, but I mean building costs are so prohibitive that it doesn't make sense to build another unit, and then rent it out for $800 per month. You are not going to cover your cost if you do that.
4. Participant B - With short-term rentals for vacationers you could.
5. Participant D - This isn't for short-term rentals.

Enforcement: One participant questioned the City's ability to enforce this ordinance, when it hasn't controlled short-term rentals; no one has been taken to court in nine years. Other participants indicated that legalizing these units would give the City some control and ability to monitor them, and if they don't live by the rules, pull the permit. Additionally, the owner occupant requirement will help ensure the properties are maintained.

1. Participant B - Shouldn't it include enforcement? How are you going to enforce the restrictive rentals, fix the rental price, fix the term of the rentals and make sure they rent it to people who work in the City?
2. Participant C - There is a section in there for terms, dollars no, but terms yes.
3. Participant B - We have hundreds of people renting their homes in Sedona now for short-term vacationers and the City is unable to control it. Either their Zoning Ordinance or the Short-Term Rental Ordinance, they are unable to control it; they admit they can't control it, so what is your proposal that would make this controllable?
4. Participant B - I think it is so basic that you have to be able to control it; otherwise, you can get people who build an ADU, rent it out for profit, which they are entitled to do if they put the money into the building, and you can't control that. Yavapai County is prosecuting people for short-term rentals. You haven't taken anybody to court yet in nine years. I talked

to the lawyer just two weeks ago. On the other hand, there are people litigating against you saying you don't have the authority or the right to control it.

5. Participant C - And, they lost.
6. Participant B - I wouldn't like to see this happen unless we knew we could control it; that is a basic problem.
7. Participant E - (Better enforcement language), I agree with that.
8. Participant B - Why don't we do that to residential homebuilders who have to live by the code no shorter than a 30-day rental and they rent it for shorter periods. They are defying the law and they will continue to defy the law until we do something.
9. Participant E - I understand; that is another situation that requires a different solution. Those are all illegal units out there, and the people are doing that. We're talking about legalizing these units and at least have some control over those. You can't obviously control the ones that are doing it now, because they have been doing it for years.
10. Participant B - You build a house right now to rent, not an ADU, you have a legal obligation to follow the zoning law, and you don't, and we are not able to enforce the laws and that is what bothers me. If the City was able to enforce the laws, I would say I don't think crowding in subdivisions would be so much of a problem.
11. Participant E - I build houses in Sedona and you can't violate the zoning laws.
12. Participant B - The houses you build may be rented right now for weekends, and you don't know.
13. Participant C - That is existing homes. You are kind of proving what we are saying; those are not permitted, there is not a list that the City can turn to and say we are going to prosecute these homes. They are uncovering them as people turn them in.
14. Participant B - I looked and it has been 9-10 years, and they haven't actually sued anybody yet, over 10 years; why would they change now? Their authority is still questionable, is the City able to do this?
15. Participant A - The front page of the Red Rock News two issues ago was about the couple in the Village and they are going to get nailed; this is a cross between Yavapai and Coconino.
16. Participant B - Why can Yavapai do it and not the City? I have heard estimates of several hundred homes being rented in Sedona illegally; how can you possibly control it?
17. Participant B - The person who builds a residential home and rents it also has a permitted process; when he builds his home, he has zoning laws controlling what he can do, and the City has done nothing for 10 years. That's the experience.
18. Participant A - Let me back up 10 years, in 1999, I bought my house over here in Broken Arrow Heights. I bought it with the intent of renting it, until I could afford to retire. When I went into that process, and started talking to the management companies, this is what I was told, "You cannot do 30 days, you have to do 6-month contracts, 12-month contracts, whatever, and this is the way it goes; otherwise, your tail is in trouble, and not only was it through that, it was through the finance company with the mortgage and it was through the insurance companies. So, there is a whole bunch of steps there that either somebody is not watching somewhere along the line or . . .
19. Participant B - They don't want to, but the people are not in trouble; that's the point, they should be in trouble, but they are not.
20. Participant A - As they are getting caught; first, they are being told, "I caught you, fix it", you have got to give them a period of time to fix it. If they don't fix it, they are in trouble.
21. Participant B - But nobody has got into trouble.
22. Participant A - They have.
23. Participant B - Who? When? I just talked to Mike a couple of weeks ago. He says they have sent out letters; hundreds of letters, nothing, no step has ever been taken beyond the letters. Nobody has taken any steps.

24. Participant C - But even if it was revoked, you would have an address to monitor, to make sure it didn't turn into an illegal ADU. And again, we don't have any of that ability with existing ADUs.
25. Participant E - We can only fix what we can start, not what has already been done.
26. Participant C - That's right.
27. Participant E - That's a good point; pull the permit. I think it is great; pull their permit. I mean, you know, you've got a permit to do it and build it and if you don't live by the rules, it is pulled.
28. Participant D - (Current removal of an illegal unit) was that a garage before? It was a shed.
29. Participant B - We had the same conversation a year ago; nothing has changed since then.
30. Participant D - But, if you are living in the unit full-time, do you want people who are going to trash the property? I mean if you are there six months or more of the year, theoretically, you are keeping an eye on what is going on. You are not going to rent it to someone who is going to degrade your property values or your neighbor's property values. It is in your best interest to keep an eye on those people, and I think that by requiring that the people are in there six months, that should take care of it.
31. Participant B - Can I ask one question? The ordinance restricts the number of units to 176 I think, and you were talking about that. You review it in five years time; in five years time, they could bring in 1,000 units on the same basis under the same ordinance. We have no control over that; once the ordinance is in, it creates a precedent, like a tax comes in at 2% and in 10 years time, it is 8%; we have no control over it. It comes under impact; it was part of my dislike about the draft ordinance.

Garage Conversions: Participants indicated that garage conversions should be eliminated, because of parking and outside storage issues.

1. Participant E - I have one objection to a part in here, converting a garage; that should not be allowed; then, where do you put your cars? That's not good.
2. Participant E - I would like to remove that you can convert a garage.
3. Participant C - I was hoping the garage conversion . . .; I can't tell you how many young people I know that are renting a garage with no facilities for $500 to $600 a month, so my hope by leaving that in there is there would be incentive to at least provide a bathroom, a place to wash their hands, some basic living, and I have been kind of surprised how many people have converted, and the assumption I had made about the neighborhoods they were in was wrong. They were, for lack of a totally better word, in the better neighborhoods, so anyway that is just my concern. I don't know if it overrides the whole big picture.
4. Participant E - How many illegal units do we have in Sedona right now, you know you can drive around and see them.
5. Participant C - It may not fit in the overall big picture, but I know people are doing that.
6. Participant D - I think I agree with no garage conversions, just because that is opening up a different kind of demographics that is going to want to do this. When I went to the last meeting, it seemed like a lot of the resistance to this was people in so-called modest neighborhoods that didn't want additional units being built behind them. The only way they could do it is to convert a garage, and then you run into parking problems and so forth, so if you cut the garage out, you are probably going to be reducing the pushback from the modest neighborhoods that seem to be the big problem.
7. Participant E - (Where storage would go with garage conversions), more storage units.

Grandfather Clause (6-month amnesty): There were no specific comments.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants agreed that reports should be provided and if they aren't, the owner should be fined, and these units would be easier to track than the

illegal units and short-term vacation rentals. One participant noted that the ADU owners would be restricted in what they could do, but a regular homeowner would not.

1. Participant E - I have a thought, if you apply for an ADU permit, part of that permit is once a year you submit your records for the year, who rented it, for how long and for how much.
2. Participant B - People don't do it.
3. Participant E - But, if you've gotten a permit for an ADU, you are a registered ADU landlord.
4. Participant E - If you get an ADU permit, then you are agreeing, as you said in the language, that you are subject to providing records, and that should absolutely be done. There should be some incentive for them to do that. If I am an ADU permit guy, and I've got an ADU, I did that so I could make some money hopefully, building costs notwithstanding. I should feel that I'm contributing to the community as a result of doing this, for all the reasons we've talked about, the benefits of it, and I wouldn't mind supplying a report every six months, every three months, whatever is required to do that, and if I don't do it, I get fined like a son-of-a-gun.
5. Participant C - Unlike the legal rentals, we don't have a list of what homes those are; this would be permitted. If we are just sticking with the ADU conversation, legal units, this is a permitted process, and in that permit, the process has limitations and code enforcement involved in it, so it is in my mind a little easier to track versus the illegal vacation rentals versus the illegal or non-regulated ADUs that we have today.
6. Participant B - So, these ADU guys now are restricted in what they can do, but a regular homeowner is not.
7. Participant C - That's right; that is correct, because this is a permitted process.
8. Participant A - These ADUs; the people that are going to be getting involved in this; let's say there are 200 permits issued; they are on a list. The City can require them to keep records, and say annually to keep the bureaucracy down, give me a list of who was here, how much they paid, and they can follow it through, and if they find out that there is fraud on the list, then you are charged with fraud.
9. Participant D - Is it similar to a Conditional Use Permit in that it can be pulled from somebody if they are not in compliance? So, you can make whatever rules you want to, that they have to provide an annual letter, as far as who they are letting in or what they're . . .?

Miscellaneous: Topics discussed included the need for a slumlord ordinance, ADOT's design of SR 179, the need to change the time of City meetings, legal cases regarding illegal rentals and a group working to shut down the public transportation we have.

1. Participant C - Maybe the garage gets addressed under what I believe Sedona needs, which is totally different than we are looking at today, and that is some slumlord ordinances that prohibit owners from taking advantage of their renters, and maybe in that concept it could address people renting garages under substandard conditions, with no heating, no air conditioning, no restroom facilities and no sanitary facilities.
2. Participant E - ADOT should be shot and hung for what they have done to the Village and what they did to the merchants in this town. There really should be a class action suit by the merchants of Sedona against ADOT.
3. Participant C - Over the roundabouts?
4. Participant E - Over the whole project. They sold that road completely wrong.
5. Participant C - Well, you know I stayed involved in the process for two years on the roundabouts, and the Voice of Choice stood up and screamed everyone else out of the room, so the community did turn out in large, but a very local, very loud minority shouted the rest of us out.
6. Participant E - Geez okay, now I . . . anyway, that is a total aside.
7. Participant C - I know me too; I'm with you Participant E.

8. Participant A - I thank you for this meeting today; the gal that I talked to actually listened to me. One of the problems with the City and the City Council is that they made all of those blasted meetings for the highway and everything else during the week, when the retired people who have nothing to do can sit down and talk.
9. Participant B - That is right.
10. Participant A - I work from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and one Saturday a month in Flagstaff, I can't get to these meetings. I had to leave two hours early to get to some of those night meetings for ADOT.
11. Participant C - It didn't matter if you were there; I attended 75% of them and I am not exaggerating, when I say you were screamed out of the room, if you had a differing opinion than the core group.
12. Participant A - The working class can't get to these meetings to voice their opinions.
13. Participant B - Yeah, you are right.
14. Participant A - I was very fortunate that my boss let me get loose to do some of this stuff, because he understood some of the importance of it, but we need to have these meetings either at 8:00 p.m. or on weekends, when the rest of the people in this town can get to them, because all you are going to get is professionals that are able to walk away from their office or the retired people who, and I'm sorry this is kind of a nasty comment, but they either have nothing to do or in three to five years, they are not going to be here, because they are going to move back with their families in the other states, because they can't care for themselves any more.
15. Participant B - We didn't fix the meeting dates and times. I think you are right, they should be; everybody should be included. But the roundabouts you know, we are so late. America is so late in getting roundabouts; they have been all over the world for years.
16. Participant E - There is nothing wrong with the roundabouts; they are great. The problem is that they . . . let's not get started on that, forget it.
17. Participant C - It is all over when the undersize starts by 60%; that is the problem with it.
18. Participant A - The road should have been four lanes too.
19. Participant E - They sold it as a 4-lane road, but it is only four lanes for two miles.
20. Participant A - The four lanes should have been a continuous thing . . . but that is a dead horse.
21. Participant B - What does the City feel about this business of it is unconstitutional that a property owner should be restricted on the use of his property? That is being challenged in court now. I mean the guy who is being sued by Yavapai is saying that his constitutional right is to use his property as he sees fit, and the guys who built in our subdivision owns a house who sued the City. That was never discussed; they had technical problems, so the issue never came up, but I wonder what the outcome of this will be.
22. Participant A - The problem with the people in the Village is that they went ahead and did what they wanted to do, and the ordinance was in place before they bought the property, so they overstepped their bounds. They're wrong, no matter how much they fight; they're wrong.
23. Participant B - But, according to the couple that owns this house in our subdivision, and they own five other houses in Sedona and several other houses in Oregon. They are in the business of renting homes, and I think it is a perfectly good business; there is nothing wrong with that, but they are renting homes in a manner that is illegal in the subdivision. They apparently are part of the National Vacation Renters Association, I think, who say they have won many cases all over the country, where they have challenged cities and municipalities that restrict them, so it is an open question.
24. Participant D - So is your problem with the City for not enforcing them or the HOA for not enforcing against those people?

25. Participant B - Oh, the HOA enforced the rules, and these high-priced lawyers sued us for amending our CC&Rs to include rental restrictions, so not only were they fighting the City law about the ordinance and the zoning requirement, they also were fighting the CC&Rs. Look if anybody has enough money, if a big organization comes in with money and sues us, a small homeowners' association, and says we are going to sue you, because we don't think you have the right to do this. We can't afford a long-term litigation; you cave in, you can't do anything about it. You have only a few thousand bucks that are contributed by the owners, and you don't build up a huge legal defense case; you can't afford it, so you are going to cave in and say okay, we'll take it out. What else can you do? And, that is happening all over the country, settlements out of court.
26. Participant C - You also have to keep in mind there is a very active group that is working very hard to shut down what little transportation options we have. They do not want it, and the Mayor has concerns about them as well, they don't want the buses running; they want it shut down.
27. Participant E - That is so ridiculous.
28. Participants D - That is always the case in the City; there is always a vocal minority that comes out against.
29. Participant A - It is always a cost negative, if you make it cost neutral, then it is fine; that is where the big issue is. It has been a big negative since day one, Coconino County and the people that run the buses in Flagstaff that are operating these also said it is going to be a big black hole.
30. Participant C - But we knew that day one. We went the same round with performing arts; we didn't want it subsidized; well, Mesa subsidizes theirs. Communities that are 100 times larger than ours still have to provide a subsidy, if they want it as part of the lifestyle of the community, and it is also true with transportation.
31. Participant E - Speaking of the cultural park?
32. Participant D - Thank you for working on your day off.

Neighborhood Impact: Participants discussed the need to adhere to lot coverage, setback requirements, etc., to retain yards for children. One participant indicated that subdivisions will be impacted by commercial renting, with extra density, buildings and the type of people it might bring, which will adversely affect property values. Other participants indicated the areas are already zoned for the density, and by staying within that footprint, you are not looking at increased density. Additionally with the restrictions, there would be minimal impact, plus the workers are already driving here. There is no difference between putting up a second dwelling and adding one car and two people to it, to having your next door neighbor have three more kids and three more cars.

1. Participant A - I would like to see adherence to property size, the offsets and how any new structure is put in, in relationship to driveways and the walling off or fencing off of the areas. What I saw back east was you had 50 x 150 lots or 100 x 150 lots, where the primary house was on the right front of the property and the driveway went right down the side of the property line to another house in back, and that eliminates play space for kids. I understand the situation that is going on here with the retired people and stuff like that, but look at the resale of the place afterwards. Those retired people are going to go out, and the younger people are going to move in with families; their kids are going to end up playing in the streets, if the property size is not watched, the two structures versus the size of the property and how they are laid out. My uncle is one of those landlords back east, and their five kids ended up either in the street or going next door. We don't have playgrounds and stuff in the neighborhoods for the kids to go to for the future owners.

2. Participant C - Haven't we, from the first draft forward, established that all existing lot coverage and setbacks will be . . ., so the setbacks would prohibit. We couldn't ever have done a buildout.
3. Participant E - What is the formula for that? Well, that should eliminate that hopefully, if it is written properly.
4. Applicant A - You know just architecturally planned out, the way the layout is, what it looks like, how the buildings are on the property, and that kind of stuff.
5. Participant C - That is all part of the permit process, you submit a plan for review.
6. Participant B - I don't think it would bother Sedona, but I think would bother the people whose subdivisions are impacted by commercial renting, with the extra density and the buildings and the type of people it might bring into a private subdivision.
7. Participant C - I don't have concerns about extra density, because we are not looking at extra density, if a property owner cannot maintain zoning as it exists on density, then they are not going to be able to pull a permit to build, so I think that has been addressed.
8. Participant A - How many of them are going to do this, 200 maybe 300 out of the 8,800, with these types of restrictions on there, it is minimal impact. It is seriously minimal impact; you are going to add, if at the max, you are talking about 800 cars, 800 families coming in or you've got the workforce that is here moving in out of Cottonwood and Camp Verde and stuff, to stay close to home, and they are going to be able to afford more now, because they are not paying transportation costs. I have to drive to Flagstaff to make a decent living; I can't work in this town.
9. Participant B - Then, you should move to Flagstaff.
10. Participant A - No, I bought this house; I own this house flat outright, alright; I could not afford to work in this town and live in this town as it stands right now.
11. Participant B- So, why should you? Do you have a right?
12. Participant A - Yes, I do; I have a right to live wherever I want to live.
13. Participant B - And, buy whatever car you want to buy.
14. Participant E - I have to agree that the impact is going to be minimal. The number of people who own homes that will fit the profile to allow an ADU to be built there is not going to be that many, unfortunately. We need probably, 800 would be good, but that is not going to happen. If we get 150 or 200, that would be a lot, which would help. Do all the Fire Department, the whole Police Department, you know everybody that works at the hospital, get them all in here, but the impact is minimum. The traffic is minimal; they are already driving in here from someplace else anyway, so I don't think there is going to be a big impact that way.
15. Participant B - I don't like the ordinance imposing on someone's property rights by increasing the density of their subdivision. It affects the value of their property, their privacy and the security, and they have nothing to say about it.
16. Participant E - In so far as that is concerned, the density is already zoned; it wouldn't really increase the density, because you have a footprint that you are allowed to put on that size property, and if you are staying within that footprint, you are really not technically increasing the density.
17. Participant B - Oh, come on.
18. Participant E - Technically, you are not.
19. Participant B - You are bringing in a second home on the property . . .
20. Participant E - But if it is big enough to hold it, I mean that is why there is coverage on a piece of property; there is 20% coverage, 40% coverage, wherever it is, and you have only covered 20%. Participant B, I understand what you are saying, but to argue density is going to change dramatically is . . .
21. Participant B - Of course it is; there are more cars on the street and more people on the street. I bought a single-family residential home; one family per lot and that is what all these guys

have bought who can have the ADUs put on their properties, and I don't think they have a right to do that.

22. Participant A - What is the difference between him putting up a second dwelling on his property and adding one car and two people to it, to having your next door neighbor have three more kids and three more cars? There is no difference.
23. Participant B - There is.
24. Participant A - There is no difference, it is the same number of people, and it is the same number of vehicles increasing in the neighborhood.

Ninety-Day Minimum: One participant noted that 90 days is more restrictive than for a regular home rental.

1. Participant A - These are 90 days or better.
2. Participant C - The rental for 90 days or more is more restrictive than what we have for regular home rentals; it is 30 days.

Occupancy: There were no specific comments regarding occupancy, other than as reflected under Concept and Enforcement.

Parking: Participants indicated there should be no exception to the rule of no on-street parking.

1. Participant E - The parking issues are a big issue.
2. Particpant A - I would like to see a no exception rule to the parking. On-street parking can be a problem, especially in some of these lesser-traveled neighborhoods, where kids do ride their bikes and play in the street. Parking on the street causes visibility issues and safety issues for kids.
3. Participant E - I would think that if adding a unit forces people to now park on the street, they should not be allowed to put one in.
4. Participant A - There was a loophole in there, and that is why I was . . .
5. Participant E - (You have some issues with the width), you can't park on it; you can, but you have to pull off to the side, in the dirt.
6. Participant A - There has to be an allowance for people having a party or something like that, but by the same token, that same car can't be on the street for a week.

Restrictions (In General): One participant expressed concern that it is overwhelmingly comprehensive compared to other like communities and that nobody will be able to build it.

1. Participant C - All I know is, of everyone who has done this, I can't find another community that has it as comprehensive as what you are now proposing. Most of the communities are similar to the one you put out two years ago, 2 pages, and so, I just think this is so overwhelmingly comprehensive, that I'm worried that we will pass it and nobody can build it, but as far as addressing issues, I think we have done a really good job of going above and beyond what like communities have done.

OVERALL
SYNOPSIS OF ALL
ADU INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS
JULY 7 AND JULY 23, 2009

Overall Summary of ADU Informal Discussions
July 7, 2009 and July 23, 2009

In July, two informal discussions were held and the majority of participants was supportive of the concept and recognized the need for more affordable housing options in the City. Two participants questioned the need to change things; however, some of their concerns seemed to relate more directly to the short-term vacation rental situation, which is reflected in the synopses. Additionally, participants indicated that few people would create legal ADUs, because of the high fees. Some of the representative favorable comments from the two informal discussions were as follows:

- The ADU ordinance is hitting the right market. I'm a realtor, and right now homes at and below $329,000 is the "affordable housing" market. Two-thirds of those are in escrow and there were multiple offers on all of them. You need to make the situation clear to Council. People who support it and are in business are terrified to speak up and support this, because they're afraid they'll lose business if they do.
- The lack of affordable housing is a crushing blow to my school teacher friends. Their pay runs a year behind the economy, and they have to deal with real things about housing. One of my school teacher friends asked me "Where am I supposed to live?" I'm working with her on finding a house, and we're looking at manufactured, but those are hard to find, too. It's dismal out there. We're looking in Jerome, but there's not much there either. She also has to look at her commuting costs. Investors are swooping in; they know the market will come back. (Regarding ADUs), when the market comes back it'll be all about renting.
- I've looked at about 30-40 properties, all under $329,000. Of those homes that had units, I estimate that about half have stoves. At the lower price range, they tend to convert a garage or a carport. I think there are more foreclosures coming, and there will be some good buys, but there will be three to five offers on them, which pushes the prices up $20,000 - $50,000.
- We're brand new to Sedona and I think this is a very good idea. It seems to me that if the fees can't be lowered, it can be great on paper, but very few people are going to do it. It seems to negate a lot of the good things that are said in this document, about allowing people of lower income here and allowing people who may have some problems renting out a second house they have and that type of thing.
- I think the point about this is not whether people are enforcing the current or whether citizens are going forward or not; the point about this is are we as a City going to open up the City in a different fashion to allow people who may not make as much money or have as much money as you, you or you, to live here, not only work here, but also live here. It is my impression that people, who are doing different services, like somebody that may be washing dishes, have to drive to Montezuma or Cottonwood and are not able to live here.
- I have a guesthouse that I would like to rent out, but I'm not going to do it, unless I can do it legally, so yes, I would very much like to see this passed. I don't know about data or complaints or anything else, but the point is I'm not going to do it, unless it can be done legally, so I'm not doing it. I don't need code enforcement or anything else; that is just the way it is.
- I just want us to be very cognizant of not being discriminatory, when we talk about the dishwashers and the help, the landscapers, etc., because they are a community that works very, very hard and should not be living in garages without heating and toilets, etc., but for a very long time have endured in that fashion. I like the idea of Accessory Dwelling Units for 3 reasons; I call it the 3Rs, and I was just thinking about it when I was here. I like the idea of regulation. I understand that the office is understaffed and I believe that we, as citizens, once this is put into place, should be very cognizant of being aware of what is going on in our neighborhoods, because the Police and City Government can't do it all, and that is the beauty

of this area. There isn't that much government. We are the government; we are that part in a democracy. I like it for the sense of risk reduction; I can't imagine what kind of risk might be involved, if you have an illegal unit. And then last but not least, from a Human Rights perspective, it is really the right thing to do. Whether you look at it in terms of "feeling good" or what have you, it is the right thing to do. There are many other affluent communities that have been doing this for almost 30 years; I think it is something that we can do here, but you are right, we must be very methodical and deliberate in what we are doing, and it sounds like you have been researching this based on empirical data, that these numbers, these plans are not coming from pie-in-the-sky notions. You are getting it from what has worked and you are also holding these forums for people to voice their opinions.

- It seems that if the property owner is living on that property, it just solves all of the problems. Why would a property owner let things get out of hand on the place where he is living?

Representative comments from participants in the two informal discussions who were opposed to the ADU concept were as follows:

- I have a couple of questions that didn't come up in your presentation, but maybe you can help me with them. First of all, I understand the affordable housing, and we probably have to be honest that nothing has worked to date; everything that has been tried has not worked, so the probability of this not working is high. That's a fact.
- How many people are living in that "affordable" with your formula that we know of, because I know they used to keep track of that? I think it is only a handful. When you work with the developer and they are going to put in so much affordable housing; you have to be watching to see if they rent those, or for 2 or 3 years, they have been empty, so now can we drop the affordable, because we have given it 2 or 3 years of trying, and they have been vacant the whole time? Is that not a fair . . .? So, we are doing all of this to try and increase that one.
- (Regarding sunset clause) that would be nice after people paid $16,000 to put that in, and in 5 years, they come out and say we are going to drop the program.
- You're not supposed to have a kitchen in your guesthouse; I understand that, so you are charging $9,200 to put a kitchen in a guesthouse.
- The only problem I have is how we can work around the impact fees, because I would suspect 9 out of 10 people are going to say if I have to spend $16,000, and I'm getting $500 or $600 a month rent, my payback is so long just to cover that, not counting extra utilities, not counting converting part of a garage or a second home that needs a range or a few thousand dollars work. If we can't find a way to reduce that through regulations, by saying if you have something that is ready to go, except putting a range in, the impact fee can be X amount, since there is really little cost to the City and little change in the actual physical environment.
- I can see it for new construction and so on, you know the things you charge them, but I just can't see it on existing units. Those fees were paid when it was built.
- Unfortunately, that information isn't attached to this, so we don't have complete information to start with. The other thing is obviously the way things work now, if you did get empirical data, how many houses have been fined or cited for that type of problem? I didn't see that empirical data, but I haven't heard of anyone being cited under the present conditions, is that correct? How many cases have someone had to pay a fine or something? How many letters have you sent out in the last year or two? Seven, which is low; the empirical data suggests that things aren't working that bad. If that is the empirical data, why are we changing the code?
- Getting back to my original thing, I would ask you to look again at that 90 days; 30 days sounded good, but I don't have any reason for it. I'm just saying I would like for you to review it.

The following points were raised by some participants for further consideration:

- Since we just recently incorporated, we know we'll have to play catch-up regarding grandfathered ADUs. Some people will come in, remodel, make everything legal. We need it all taken care of with rules in place; we need an amnesty program. Let people who have ADUs know that there will be an amnesty period and they need to know if their ADU is grandfathered. People who have existing ADUs are reluctant to speak up publicly on the issue; they're afraid they'll be shut down.
- Obviously the City has some cost, and we know that in these times, the City is doing as well or poorly as the rest of us, but if we can't minimize those fees, unfortunately, all of your work is going to go for naught, because you can make this regulation, and there might be two people that do it or very few. I can understand the sewer if you have to put in a separate sewer line, because there is a large cost to that, but I suspect a lot of these places, especially if they already exist, are probably on the same line or the line already exists.
- I would think that if you could waive, in part, if you have an existing structure that needs to be inspected, whatever that would be, especially if you don't need the sewer connection. If you had a $1,000 fee, I think you would have a lot of people do it; that is a whole different ballgame than $16,000.

SYNOPSIS OF
INFORMAL DISCUSSION
JULY 7, 2009

Synopsis of Proposed ADU Ordinance
Informal Discussion
July 7, 2009

Overall: There was only one participant in this informal discussion. The participant was supportive of the concept and felt it would hit the right market. The participant also asked for the City Council to be aware that "people who support it and are in business are terrified to speak up and support this, because they're afraid they'll lose business if they do."

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept:

1. The ADU ordinance is hitting the right market. I'm a realtor, and right now homes at and below $329,000 is the "affordable housing" market. Two-thirds of those are in escrow and there were multiple offers on all of them. You need to make the situation clear to Council. People who support it and are in business are terrified to speak up and support this, because they're afraid they'll lose business if they do.
2. Realtors can help with information about the CC&Rs. In my neighborhood, the CC&Rs were put in place and automatically renewed, but when the time came the original builder wanted to turn them over to the neighborhood; the neighborhood wouldn't take them. They no longer exist.
3. Realtors can help with information about the CC&Rs. In my neighborhood, the CC&Rs were put in place and automatically renewed, but when the time came the original builder wanted to turn them over to the neighborhood; the neighborhood wouldn't take them. They no longer exist.
4. People need to understand the information they are getting, otherwise misinformation gets passed around.
5. The lack of affordable housing is a crushing blow to my school teacher friends. Their pay runs a year behind the economy, and they have to deal with real things about housing. One of my school teacher friends asked me "Where am I supposed to live?" I'm working with her on finding a house, and we're looking at manufactured, but those are hard to find, too. It's dismal out there. We're looking in Jerome, but there's not much there either. She also has to look at her commuting costs. Investors are swooping in; they know the market will come back. (Regarding ADUs), when the market comes back it'll be all about renting.
6. I've looked at about 30-40 properties, all under $329,000. Of those homes that had units, I estimate that about half have stoves. At the lower price range, they tend to convert a garage or a carport. I think there are more foreclosures coming, and there will be some good buys, but there will be three to five offers on them, which pushes the prices up $20,000 - $50,000.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Cost
Enforcement
Garage Conversions

Grandfather Clause:

1. Since we just recently incorporated, we know we'll have to play catch-up regarding grandfathered ADUs. Some people will come in, remodel, make everything legal. We need it all taken care of with rules in place; we need an amnesty program. Let people who have

ADUs know that there will be an amnesty period and they need to know if their ADU is grandfathered. People who have existing ADUs are reluctant to speak up publicly on the issue; they're afraid they'll be shut down.

Inspections and Permitting: There were no comments on this topic.

Miscellaneous:

1. Sedona has to do what Phoenix did with illegal B&Bs. They had so many illegally operating they had to do something. Council wanted the B&B ordinance knowing they needed it. It went through amid vocal opposition, including picketing on the day of the vote. Two days after they voted it was over, nothing further was ever said.

Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy
Parking
Restrictions (In General)

SYNOPSIS OF
INFORMAL DISCUSSION
JULY 23, 2009

Synopsis of Proposed ADU Ordinance
Informal Discussion
July 23, 2009

Overall: There were seven participants in this informal discussion, and overall most participants were supportive of the concept. Two participants questioned the need to change things, if there have only been 7 complaints in the last 18 months; however, some of their concerns seemed to relate more directly to tourists and the short-term vacation rental issue. Another participant pointed out that with the owner living on the property, it seems to resolve the problems. The fees and estimated costs, especially for existing units, was a major concern among the participants; one participant commented that they are basically talking about a stove.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: Overall, most participants were supportive of the concept and recognized the need for more affordable housing options in the City. Two participants expressed concern about changing things; however, some of their concerns seemed to relate to the short-term vacation rental situation.

1. I have a couple of questions that didn't come up in your presentation, but maybe you can help me with them. First of all, I understand the affordable housing, and we probably have to be honest that nothing has worked to date; everything that has been tried has not worked, so the probability of this not working is high. That's a fact.
2. I just wanted to ask about the illegal part of it. The criterion that you seem to have is it has to be owner-occupied; I know of several right now that aren't, and you mentioned the actual unit, not the guesthouse unit, but the unit that is part of the main unit. Does that have to have a cooking facility in that or not? It is a little confusing.
3. Are the codes on the entrances the same as a normal rental, like the Fire Codes, you have to have two entrances, in case there is a fire?
4. We're brand new to Sedona and I think this is a very good idea. It seems to me that if the fees can't be lowered, it can be great on paper, but very few people are going to do it. It seems to negate a lot of the good things that are said in this document, about allowing people of lower income here and allowing people who may have some problems renting out a second house they have and that type of thing.
5. I thought you had to have a kitchen. So, it is detached from the main unit.
6. It doesn't matter whether it is detached or not.
7. Is there a restriction on size, the square feet? I thought I read it in here somewhere. Is there a minimum?
8. If you had a house that was 1,700 sq. ft., how big could . . .? Okay.
9. I think the point about this is not whether people are enforcing the current or whether citizens are going forward or not; the point about this is are we as a City going to open up the City in a different fashion to allow people who may not make as much money or have as much money as you, you or you, to live here, not only work here, but also live here. It is my impression that people, who are doing different services like somebody that may be washing dishes, have to drive to Montezuma or Cottonwood and are not able to live here.
10. You make my point, you don't have to go any further; you just made my point. We are going to have a dropout of these "illegals" or whatever you want to call them. Number one, those "illegals" are people, who are tourists that come in here, and we certainly need the tourists' money, and we certainly need the taxes, and for our workforce that is coming up here, there

seems to be availability to them at the correct price. The things that we are adding onto here are making that so it is not affordable to people that are working here and people that want to do that. We have been wrong on everything we have tried to get the housing going. Not one thing has worked, and I'm saying, have we thought this through? Will it work or will it be another good-feeling thing that we sent something through, and we do that. That is where I'm coming from. We depend on those tourists, we depend on that 10% tax and we depend on keeping people living here, because when they go get groceries, they pay the taxes. The second thing being that it seems that you are not getting many reports, because it is a guesthouse with 12 people sleeping in there. There is no empirical data that says that is the case, so why all of a sudden do we want to put all of these restrictions on people and their homes? (Regarding what he would like to see happen), without further study, I'm a citizen here and I've read this and I'm coming in with my comments. First, I would need another 2 months to brush up on it, but I think we have to think this through, because this sounds like the old Obama health program. We are trying to do a 100% change, instead of looking at segments that need healthcare and try working on them. That is all I'm saying; you are asking for feedback and I'm here to give feedback, and whatever you come up with, we are going to have to adhere to. I didn't see you talking to one city that has no code like that and they're being productive. We always go to the California places to get our feedback; you know that. If you are going to make a code, you have got to make it from like empirical data or something; you can't just go with everybody feeling good or feeling bad, and decide that is the way you are going to make the code in the City.

11. I have a guesthouse that I would like to rent out, but I'm not going to do it, unless I can do it legally, so yes, I would very much like to see this passed. I don't know about data or complaints or anything else, but the point is I'm not going to do it, unless it can be done legally, so I'm not doing it. I don't need code enforcement or anything else; that is just the way it is.
12. I look at this from that standpoint and one other, and it is cover your butt, because right now, it is still open to the public to do what you want. If the neighbor is not going to complain about it, you got away with it. This way there is a set of standards in place to begin with, so at least we have some guidance along the way. If something is wrong with it, it can be fixed after the fact; it can be amended, but at least get a set of rules in place.
13. I just want us to be very cognizant of not being discriminatory, when we talk about the dishwashers and the help, the landscapers, etc., because they are a community that works very, very hard and should not be living in garages without heating and toilets, etc., but for a very long time have endured in that fashion. I like the idea of Accessory Dwelling Units for 3 reasons; I call it the 3Rs, and I was just thinking about it when I was here. I like the idea of regulation. I understand that the office is understaffed and I believe that we, as citizens, once this is put into place, should be very cognizant of being aware of what is going on in our neighborhoods, because the Police and City Government can't do it all, and that is the beauty of this area. There isn't that much government. We are the government; we are that part in a democracy. I like it for the sense of risk reduction; I can't imagine what kind of risk might be involved, if you have an illegal unit. And then last but not least, from a Human Rights perspective, it is really the right thing to do. Whether you look at it in terms of "feeling good" or what have you, it is the right thing to do. There are many other affluent communities that have been doing this for almost 30 years; I think it is something that we can do here, but you are right, we must be very methodical and deliberate in what we are doing, and it sounds like you have been researching this based on empirical data, that these numbers, these plans are not coming from pie-in-the-sky notions. You are getting it from what has worked and you are also holding these forums for people to voice their opinions.

14. What exactly do we mean by "affordable housing"? The description that you just gave is different from what I think of. I certainly don't want to be discriminatory, but I think if we are discriminatory toward tourists, because many tourists come here and don't have a lot of money, and they come here and fall in love with the place, and they are practitioners, providers, etc., because that is what attracts this type of people here, and we were tourists when we first came here, so I know many tourists who come here just fall in love with the place and they are in kinds of . . ., because those people that work are who we want. People, who came with their money, probably are not going to be as plentiful as in the past, so you have a lot of that. I'm just confused, because we have been approached by elderly women; we have had one or two women come to us who, for whatever reason can't afford, and they have asked to rent our place. Of course, it is our mother-in-law suite, and they can't stay there, but I want to be careful too, that when we are talking about affordable housing, are we just talking about having laborers? I think it is very unfair for us to pigeonhole who is going to be part of this affordable housing, so what is affordable housing, what does that mean? Do I have to have a certain amount of no income or low income to be considered? What does that mean?
15. How many people are living in that "affordable" with your formula that we know of, because I know they used to keep track of that? I think it is only a handful. When you work with the developer and they are going to put in so much affordable housing; you have to be watching to see if they rent those, or for 2 or 3 years, they have been empty, so now can we drop the affordable, because we have given it 2 or 3 years of trying, and they have been vacant the whole time? Is that not a fair . . .? So, we are doing all of this to try and increase that one.
16. I just wanted to ask you now, these ADUs, is the property owner living on the property, is that a requirement?
17. It seems that if the property owner is living on that property, it just solves all of the problems. Why would a property owner let things get out of hand on the place where he is living?
18. You know on your site, you put some nice pictures on there for accessible housing; do you also have some pictures of ones that don't meet the code? We are talking about how they are all bad; do you have some pictures to put out there that show the bad ones? You found the good ones; you are the ones that are saying that there are ones that are awful out there.
19. You said there are, and you said the realtors said there are lots of them.
20. In terms of that, I don't know the answers, so my question is when you are looking at this, is the assumption that there aren't going to all of a sudden be a lot of people building 2nd houses on their property, but rather the thought is that the existing properties are the ones that are going to come forward with this.
21. What is your measure of success? If you go through implementing this and it is implemented, what is the feedback number you are going to want to see that is going to say this was successful?
22. I saw in there where they are going to ask for the cost of the rental, but is that looking at how much you are charging? In a competitive environment, nobody goes and reports those things. One reason, you're saying we are going to let it be competitive and let it go, and the second thing is, well we want to know how much you are charging.
23. You have to see it both ways; that is part of the empirical data that you have been asking for; if they don't ask some of those questions, a year or two years from now, sitting at this table, we won't have the answers on if this is successful. Part of the success is going to be if we find out that the units are $1,200 per month; I would say that doesn't sound real successful, because people are charging an awful lot for a 500 sq. ft. home or something like that. If they are saying it is $600, then I'm saying that sounds about half of what a house would be, and

that means there is some success in the program, because you have some homes that somebody who is making a modest income can actually live in.

24. My input would just be if you would look at that; again, just to look at it, because I think if you are an entrepreneurial person or something, you are going to make a deal. I could tell you $750, and if someone comes in and says $700 or $725, I might decide to go $725.
25. That information could also be in a lease that you are signing, and they should have a copy of the lease to verify that it is leased out for a period of time, so that is in your Lease Agreement and it is automatically public knowledge.
26. Upon gathering this information, the different rents, it is not like you are going to make it public information.
27. It would be statistical.
28. (Regarding sunset clause) that would be nice after people paid $16,000 to put that in, and in 5 years, they come out and say we are going to drop the program.
29. If this passes when it is going to be submitted, and if it is okayed, when does it take effect? I personally think it is an excellent idea and about time.
30. Has the Planning & zoning Commission seen this and had any comments?

Cost: Cost was a major concern, especially for existing units, and participants indicated that if the costs were not reduced few units would be created. One participant indicated they are really talking about a stove.

1. Regarding sewer fees, if it is feasible to tie the one unit into the supply line from the primary unit, then you don't have to tie into the street and have a hook-up, so you might look at the sewer fee, if it is possible to just tee into the existing sewer. It all depends on what kind of piping and stuff is there to begin with; maybe a modification to the primary, so you don't have to dig up the street and all of that kind of stuff.
2. I don't know much about the Development Impact Fees, but I thought the idea about the sewer hook-up was good, if you can use the existing line, can they waive the sewer hook-up fee, because you are not talking about additional construction costs or many more costs for the City anyway? My question is, in terms of the Development Impact Fee, I don't know what that is and how that would impact a unit, especially if there is already a second unit on the property.
3. This impact fee on an existing unit; I'm having a lot of trouble with that.
4. You're not supposed to have a kitchen in your guesthouse; I understand that, so you are charging $9,200 to put a kitchen in a guesthouse.
5. Wait, wait, wait! Are you sure that is correct?
6. The only problem I have is how we can work around the impact fees, because I would suspect 9 out of 10 people are going to say if I have to spend $16,000, and I'm getting $500 or $600 a month rent, my payback is so long just to cover that, not counting extra utilities, not counting converting part of a garage or a second home that needs a range or a few thousand dollars work. If we can't find a way to reduce that through regulations, by saying if you have something that is ready to go, except putting a range in, the impact fee can be X amount, since there is really little cost to the City and little change in the actual physical environment.
7. No change whatsoever. We are talking about a range here.
8. Obviously the City has some cost, and we know that in these times, the City is doing as well or poorly as the rest of us, but if we can't minimize those fees, unfortunately, all of your work is going to go for naught, because you can make this regulation, and there might be two people that do it or very few. I can understand the sewer if you have to put in a separate sewer line, because there is a large cost to that, but I suspect a lot of these places, especially if they already exist, are probably on the same line or the line already exists.

9. It is on the same line, not even sewer in the area, and the advanced fees have been paid on the property as well.
10. Are these fees comparable to the communities that have been studied? Did they have to pay such fees?
11. I can see it for new construction and so on, you know the things you charge them, but I just can't see it on existing units. Those fees were paid when it was built.
12. Even at that, you already had an impact study and stuff done on the existing facilities, even if they were minimal. The only thing that you are doing now is you are going to have somebody come in and go over the plans and start over again, with that one little piece. The drainage has already been checked and the street access has already been checked and all of that, so there is no justification for as big a number as they've got.
13. No, I agree.
14. Who is setting these fees?
15. I would think that if you could waive, in part, if you have an existing structure that needs to be inspected, whatever that would be, especially if you don't need the sewer connection. If you had a $1,000 fee, I think you would have a lot of people do it; that is a whole different ballgame than $16,000.

Enforcement: A significant portion of the participants' discussion focused on the requirement to not have a stove, and one participant referenced the fact that there have only been 7 complaints in 18 months and asked why the City would change things, if they are working. Additionally, if it is not being enforced now, the participant asked what would this be enforced later.

1. Unfortunately, that information isn't attached to this, so we don't have complete information to start with. The other thing is obviously the way things work now, if you did get empirical data, how many houses have been fined or cited for that type of problem? I didn't see that empirical data, but I haven't heard of anyone being cited under the present conditions, is that correct? How many cases have someone had to pay a fine or something? How many letters have you sent out in the last year or two? Seven, which is low; the empirical data suggests that things aren't working that bad. If that is the empirical data, why are we changing the code?
2. We built a mother-in-law suite, and I got a building permit and everything here. I'm saying we put a kitchen in and we put a bathroom in. I had the drawings here and they came out and inspected. I don't have a stove, but here is what everybody does, they use a hotplate, so you have a microwave, refrigerator and sink; you have everything but your stove, and you use a hotplate that you plug in; that is all legal.
3. I can give you an example, because of what is going on in my neighborhood right now. There is a lot being developed that is ¾ of an acre; the guy built his garage on one side of the property, and he is building a small house, which is going to be a casita on the other side, and eventually, he is going to put a residence in the middle. When he completes the residence in the middle, the cooking facilities in the casita have to come out. Otherwise, he is in violation of the code.
4. The stove has to be removed, but everything else can stay. Now, that is ridiculous.
5. Now you have a microwave, a broiler on the top; you have basically a full kitchen.
6. The convection oven and broiler violate it; the microwave doesn't and the hotplate doesn't, but either one of those two do.
7. How about a toaster oven, does that violate it too?
8. That is a portable plug-in; the other two pieces that you are talking about are built-ins.
9. Not necessarily.

10. No, they are not. I just bought a little convection oven and I use it all the time in my house.
11. (Regarding that being a loophole), you say that like we are cheating; some people have mother-in-law suites instead of guesthouses and there is a big difference.
12. I'm saying you have to go by empirical data. Everybody has an opinion, and you can put opinions anywhere, so if it is working now, why are we looking to change it? Address the whole concept. Why, if it is working now? In this, it doesn't say any more people for enforcement, and you are not enforcing it now, so what would make you enforce it later.
13. I'm new, but even though there are only 7, part of the enforcement has to come from the citizens. I mean if you see somebody in your neighborhood that is renting a property illegally, I would assume it is my responsibility to contact the City. The City can't hire another dozen people to go block-by-block, in order to find where people are renting their house for a week, instead of whatever the regulations are.
14. That makes my point; obviously, people aren't calling in, because there are only 7 violations, so you can't assume that there are violations and nobody is calling in. I have to go with the empirical data that says there were 7 people in 18 months.
15. To say that we don't need to do anything like this, because people are doing it and it is not causing a problem now; I don't know that that is necessarily the case.
16. Well, with the last guidance code on this; there was no enforcement. We've got evidence that it fell on its face and now we are updating it again. The old one that we had . . ., I don't have it with me right now, but there was an old code thing that we followed. I'll have to get it for you. When we put our mother-in-law suite in, there was a code.
17. Yeah, but you can't rent it.
18. From the viewpoint of the person who is renting, if they find out they are renting illegal housing and they're in a 12-month lease, can they break it, because it is illegal? What happens to the money, like all of your deposits and all of that?

There were n comments on the following topics:
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause
Inspections and Permitting

Miscellaneous: The following comments were unrelated to the proposed ordinance, except one participant asked about similar communities where the concept has flourished.

1. I would like to see the first blocks behind commercial put up two or three-story apartment buildings, if their setback is far enough behind the commercial stuff, so as not to interfere with the views. If you were to take out the first section behind the commercial, on the up side of the street, and move the cross street back a couple of houses, then you could take 10-12 properties and turn them into 30.
2. I would like for you to share maybe two communities similar to Sedona where this has flourished and been successful.
3. What is the status of the . . . I don't know, but there is a gentleman I guess that lives in Florida and if this is implemented, he is looking at suing the City; do you know anything about that? I'm surprised that you don't know about it. He has quite a few rental units.
4. That has to do with Foothills, I think.
5. Well I mean this guy is waiting to pull the trigger.
6. But that is vacation rentals.
7. Well we can't live on fear; I mean if we do that, there is no progress.
8. You know he might have some good points too though

Neighborhood Impact: There were no comments on this topic.

Ninety-Day Minimum: Participants expressed concern about the 90-day minimum and suggested 30 days; however again, there seemed to be some confusion with short-term vacation rentals.

1. The other thing is the 30 days and then the 90 days. Under the old, it was 30 days, but this will take it to 90 days. The type of people we are trying to attract with this accessible housing; if we want a "dishwasher", using your words, they are going to have to sign a 3-month lease minimum, to be able to rent your accessible housing unit. So, what we are saying now is, going from easier, it now became harder, because we have a gap between 30 days and 90 days; there is a gap there where you can't rent. Again, empirically, I'd like to see some empirical data of where we decided on 90 days? So, the 90 days came out of the air? If a dishwasher signs a 3-month (lease), they could care if they sign a 3-month or not, because if they don't have the money, they are leaving. They're leaving, they are not going to be here, so the people and the tourists . . .; you are not going to get any tourists to come up with 90 days rental; it is going to be a stretch to be 30 days.
2. If a tourist wants short-term, let them do a timeshare; that is what I did; I bought a timeshare in this town, when I first came here, and owned it for 6 years, before I bought my house and moved out here. That is what vacationers do. It should not be in a residence like that.
3. That is your opinion.
4. Getting back to my original thing, I would ask you to look again at that 90 days; 30 days sounded good, but I don't have any reason for it. I'm just saying I would like for you to review it.
5. It just seems strange, because for instance in most leases, someone generally signs a lease for 6 months or a year, and after that lease runs out, they are basically on a 30-day month-to-month, so even though you say you have had someone live there and rent from you for 5 years, they maybe don't want to sign a lease, especially now-a-days. They don't want to sign anything, because they don't know how things are and they are staying 30 days at a time anyhow, so it just seems strange.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Occupancy
Parking
Restrictions (In General)

OVERALL
SYNOPSIS OF ALL
ADU MEETINGS WITH
ORGANIZATIONS
MAY 13 – JULY 16, 2009

Overall Summary of Meetings with Organizations
May 13, 2009 - July 16, 2009

Presentations were given to over 150 participants in eight organizations between June 19th and July 11th. While many questions were asked regarding details of the ADU Ordinance, participants in seven of the eight organizations expressed support for the ADU concept. Favorable comments included the following:

- City is behind the curve. Everyone is already renting out guest homes. With the current financial stresses, they can make more money renting their homes as short-term rentals than as long-term rentals, but it is a great ordinance to have on the books to allow long-term rentals.
- Affordable housing is necessary for sustainability of a resort community. We need affordable housing to support the community. We need affordable workforce housing to support our resort community. We depend on tourists, and they need services. If there aren't enough services, or if the services are more expensive, because of the lack of workforce housing, tourists will go elsewhere. Having legal ADUs will also help our property sales. We can say to a purchaser, "It's legal". It is important to support the ADU effort.
- We're in favor of the ADU option. We are not in favor of layers of regulation.
- I lived in the Bellevue and Mercer Island area in Washington, and these worked well for college students and mother-in-law units, and there was no detriment to the neighborhoods.
- ADUs could benefit the elderly and physically-challenged as well; would you consider a preferential universal design that works for both the elderly and physically challenged? It seems like ADUs would appeal especially to young professionals just getting started here in Sedona and not so much for families. ADUs would seem to fill that niche.
- It is a good idea; people buy homes and want to live in them full-time, but would enjoy having added income.
- I know that a lot of homes are being designed with a space that could easily be turned into a suite for a caretaker for when we get older and need help. That would allow us to age in place and still be taken care of.
- How soon can we have this?
- I think that is nice; a lot of folks would look into that then.
- We are going to move into one of those
- I think it's a wonderful idea and would yield many benefits.
- This is a great idea. Why would anyone be against it?
- It would be wonderful to have it made legal.
- A major issue that you will hear from the community is enforcement. We want enforcement, but we don't want to become a policing agency. A few owners will abuse the privilege of having an ADU and will allow things to get out of hand, but we'll just have to deal with that. Short-term rentals are a problem, partly because they're investments. The integrity of neighborhoods comes first. Some people don't want anything to change. I'd rather have an ordinance that protects neighborhoods than illegal ADUs. People have rights; the City simply can't knock on doors and demand to be let in. As we know, up to 4-unrelated adults are currently allowed in a single-family home, but there is no limit on related adults. We need to remember that the City does not enforce HOA regulations; that's up to the HOAs. ADUs fill a need the City has. The City has a hard time hiring. If we want to be a true small town, we need to solve these problems.
- I think it's great to legitimize ADUs. I also think that vacation rentals should be decriminalized so the City gets the taxes. I don't see the difference between long-term and short-term rentals.

- I understand that this is an attempt to satisfy the need for affordable housing because real estate is simply not affordable in Sedona. I think that resistance is moving aside because of financial issues.
- What possibly could the downside be?
- I'm a renter. The options for people who rent in Sedona are fewer and fewer. It is not true that renters will destroy property or that owners will allow renters to be disruptive and destructive. We need to give the property owners options to do what they need to do to keep their homes. We need to have faith in property owners. We all love and care about Sedona and the City.
- Let's back up a little bit about (this myth) that it is going to hurt our property values, you have a house that is in one of these subdivisions, and let's say it is worth $400,000, if you add a guesthouse that can be a rental, you just increased your property value a whole bunch.
- I agree; if the house is still worth $400,000, without the guesthouse, the house's value next to it is not going to change . . .
- If you just brought up your value, they (the neighbors) benefit also.
- I think the idea is a good idea, very good idea, and some of the restrictions may need a little tuning up; too restrictive.
- Village residents care a lot about what goes on in Sedona; the commute back and forth isn't bad; however in this community, the discussion is all about workforce and diversity, but still at a relatively high income. What's being done to address the needs of service workers at 30% to 40% of median?

In the eighth meeting, there were no positive or negative comments regarding the ADU concept; however, there were two comments regarding concerns about code enforcement; a third comment regarding the addition of another layer of guidelines from another meeting is also listed. Cost was discussed in five of the eight sessions and was the major concern overall. The three comments regarding code enforcement and various comments regarding cost were as follows:

- Regarding illegal ADU rentals, does the City have a new strategy for controlling rentals? It hasn't been successful so far. The City has no ability to control it now, and this will make things worse.
- Concerned about the City's ability to enforce. Code enforcement is an issue.
- Why add a layer of guidelines, e.g., vehicles, occupancy? There are already regulations on the books for that. It is just asking for trouble. There is already uneven enforcement of regulations.
- Regarding impact fees, this is obviously something the City wants, but what is the benefit for anyone to put one in? Why would anyone consider it?
- Did you say the fees were about $16,000? That's ridiculous; obviously the city doesn't want these to happen.
- If people don't feel they're getting something from paying the fee they'll continue to operate ADUs illegally.
- Upfront fees will kill it, but I didn't think the annual fees were . . . Cities have a great way of justifying impact fees. I would think the company that does impact fees has been approached before, to give a rationale of why it can be reduced in a situation like this
- If you get in the business of having to keep records of going to credit, and when you sell your house, and if you do this, you are just going to have a nightmare on your hands.
- How do other cities handle ADUs? Do they have all these rules?

The following points were raised by some participants for further consideration:

- If they are limiting the size of Accessory Dwelling Units based on the total size of the property, why wouldn't they assess that same percentage to those impact and sewer fees, so

that you are only paying 1/3 of what the sewer fee is, as opposed to the whole amount? It is even less than that one-half, didn't you say the minimum 33%, so I would say it is one-third. If you want them affordable, it should be the same as whatever the requirement is for the size of the property.

- Given the high cost of creating an ADU, there should be some funds available to help people do that, especially if they agree to rent it affordably.
- I'm not sure how this would work, but the fees, instead of waiving them, build it and we will defer your fees.
- (Directed to another participant), what sort of tax breaks does somebody get for having a legal rental as opposed to an illegal rental?
- I really caution you, of the City going into "too much business" here. Going back to the sewer fee, there is no rationale in the world as to why that should be more than a maximum of $1,000 for a hook-up fee. There is no sense for it; I'm just picking that figure, but . . .
- You should have a proposal about the enforcement staff this is likely to take. Instead of just we have 1½ people. It is going to take; I mean it will change, but you have to be ready to engage more people as it arises. You don't want to hire big at the start, because you don't know what you are going to have.
- If they choose not to come into compliance, they just stop renting the place out or they do what they have to do. Maybe the City can make those loans to them.
- If you are really going to try to bring people on board, grandfather them, the ones that are in noncompliance, you have to really make some attractive options for them. (Like?) I don't know, the numbers that we just talked about, it is going to cost this and this . . .

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
LUXURY RE PROFESSIONALS
MAY 13, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With Luxury RE Professionals
May 13, 2009

Overall: At this ADU meeting with Luxury RE Professionals, four comments were made in support of ADUs and seven comments were made regarding short-term vacation rental properties in Sedona. A total of twenty comments were made by participants at this public meeting.

Appearance: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Concept: There was support expressed for the concept of ADUs. Seven of the twenty comments were regarding this topic.

1. City is behind the curve. Everyone is already renting out guest homes. With the current financial stresses, they can make more money renting their homes as short-term rentals than as long-term rentals, but it is a great ordinance to have on the books to allow long-term rentals
2. Are you limiting what people can charge for and ADU?
3. I understand that this is an attempt to satisfy the need for affordable housing because real estate is simply not affordable in Sedona. I think that resistance is moving aside because of financial issues.
4. Affordable housing is necessary for sustainability of a resort community. We need affordable housing to support the community. We need affordable workforce housing to support our resort community. We depend on tourists, and they need services. If there aren't enough services, or if the services are more expensive because of the lack of workforce housing, tourists will go elsewhere. Having legal ADUs will also help our property sales. We can say to a purchaser, "It's legal". It is important to support the ADU effort.
5. We're in favor of the ADU option. We are not in favor of layers of regulation.
6. I think it's great to legitimize ADUs. I also think that vacation rentals should be decriminalized so the City gets the taxes. I don't see the difference between long-term and short-term rentals.
7. I'm a renter. The options for people who rent in Sedona are fewer and fewer. It is not true that renters will destroy property or that owners will allow renters to be disruptive and destructive. We need to give the property owners options to do what they need to do to keep their homes. We need to have faith in property owners. We all love and care about Sedona and the City.

Cost: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern about enforcement. Three of the twenty comments were regarding this topic.

1. How many illegal guest homes are there in Sedona and how many complaints do you get yearly?
2. Sedona already has homes with many people in them and I know a couple that has 12 cars. We're not policing them. Too many regulations about ADUs will put the City in a situation where we're targeting enforcement.
3. Thanks to the City for reaching out for comments. Why add a layer of guidelines, e.g., vehicles, occupancy? There are already regulations on the books for that. It is just asking for trouble. There is already uneven enforcement of regulations.
4. What is stopping ADU's if there are only four to six complaints a year?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause

Inspections and Permitting: Participants requested clarification on the permit process. Three of the twenty comments were regarding this topic.

1. If ADUs are legal, could HOAs refuse to permit them? If so, what's the problem?
2. Why will a permit be required?
3. Will the City check to make sure that the HOA's CC&Rs allow ADUs?

Miscellaneous: Several miscellaneous comments were made short-term vacation rentals.

1. I suggest that there be a focus group on short-term rentals.
2. The Council has an unfounded perception of short-term rentals. The Council should be encouraged to open their minds. Vacation rentals attract upscale people who spend lots and lots of money in the community. Vacation rentals could bring a lot of money to the City coffers.
3. Would the City approve vacation rentals if they pay the lodging tax? Vacation rentals are very important to the real estate industry, and the real estate industry is an important stakeholder in Sedona. Everyone's real estate values are affected by a ban on vacation rentals.
4. The City can get a lot of revenue for vacation rentals that it doesn't get from long-term rentals. The City needs additional revenue and this would be one way to get it.
5. Why is the City wasting time and money suing over vacation rentals? Why isn't the city suing illegal ADUs and illegal B&Bs?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy
Parking

Restrictions (In General):

1. How do other cities handle ADUs? Do they have all these rules?

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
DEMOCRATS OF THE RED ROCKS
MAY 21, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With Democrats of the Red Rocks
May 21, 2009

Note: The Mayor discussed his challenges since becoming Mayor and Mike Raber discussed the Community Plan and Sedona's growth policies, in addition to Linda Martinez's presentation about the ADU ordinance; therefore, most of the public input was in the form of questions on topics other than ADUs.

Overall: Thirty eight participants were present at this meeting with the Democrats of the Red Rocks. There were four questions related to the concept of ADUs that indicated interest in the community's responsibility, the needs of workers at 30% and 40% of AMI and the benefits that could be provided to the elderly and physically-challenged. Ten of the fourteen total comments made by participants were about topics unrelated to the ADU Ordinance.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: Three participants expressed interest in the ADU concept and one participant indicated ADUs could be of benefit to the elderly and physically-challenged.

1. Do you think the community has a responsibility to provide housing for people who work in Sedona?
2. Village residents care a lot about what goes on in Sedona; the commute back and forth isn't bad; however in this community, the discussion is all about workforce and diversity, but still at a relatively high income. What's being done to address the needs of service workers at 30% to 40% of median?
3. Is there a limit on the size of ADUs?
4. ADUs could benefit the elderly and physically-challenged as well; would you consider a preferential universal design that works for both the elderly and physically challenged?

There were no comments on the following topics.
Cost
Enforcement
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause
Inspections and Permitting

Miscellaneous: There were several comments/questions on topics unrelated to the ADU Ordinance.

1. As a resident of West Sedona, the community is beautiful, except around 89A, and she wants a boulevard with medians, not daily accidents in the "suicide" lane, etc., so what is your vision?
2. Expressed frustrations with the inability to get a decision from the fire district regarding the construction of a fire station in the Chapel area, and asked what the Mayor and Council is doing to get the fire station put in the Chapel area to serve 900 people. The expectation is for the Mayor and Council to support it as strongly as they can. The new Fire Chief doesn't start until August, and it keeps getting pushed down the road, now it is waiting on the new Fire Chief, and in the meantime, they have no protection.
3. Regarding Windsong, the community plan calls for 12 units per acre and 2 stories, but this proposal is for 4 stories with underground parking.

4. Is there a chance of having no lights on SR89A? Is there an alternative of having a center divider versus lights?
5. Have traffic lights and roundabouts been considered?
6. Will there be a crosswalk across SR179 by Tlaquepaque?
7. Around the Cultural Park property, will there be wetlands for a birding area and preservation of the overlook on Cultural Park Drive?
8. Referenced the West Sedona corridor, the lighting in the Safeway parking lot and the general quality of life in that area and asked, is there the possibility of a traffic light at Andante; there is no place to cross, where are we with the traffic light?
9. How does undergrounding of utilities on 89A in West Sedona fit into the plan?
10. How much would that cost the City, $1 million or $10 million?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy
Parking
Restrictions (In General)

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
ROTARY OF THE RED ROCKS
JUNE 3, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With Rotary of the Red Rocks
June 3, 2009

Overall: Twenty nine participants were present at this ADU meeting with the Rotary of the Red Rocks. Several questions were asked about the concept; however, of the six comments, none were negative. There were a total of thirteen comments/questions, and seven of the thirteen were questions about ADUs.

Appearance: No comments were made regarding this topic.

Concept: Participants were interested in the impact of ADUs on building and remodels in the community and there were no negative input.

1. If CC&Rs trump the ordinance, how many subdivisions have CC&Rs?
2. It is a good idea, because maybe it will reduce the Mexicans in my rental from six to four.
3. As far as impact on future building of homes, will there be more of an inclination to build because of these?
4. So, these are not just extra bedrooms, they are complete living quarters, but can they be in a house?
5. Can the owner live in the smaller unit?
6. From this, there may be an increase in remodels, but if this is a draft, then technically are they not legal now? Not that I know of any.
7. It is a good idea; people buy homes and want to live in them full-time, but would enjoy having added income.
8. I would want to do it, but not my neighbor.
9. A major trend now is for 40-year-old kids to move back home.
10. Could you convert a guesthouse, but not rent it?
11. I think there actually will be a small number of these, because of CC&Rs.
12. I lived in the Bellevue and Mercer Island area in Washington, and these worked well for college students and mother-in-law units, and there was no detriment to the neighborhoods.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Cost
Enforcement
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause

Inspections and Permitting: One question was expressed regarding this topic specifically.

1. If these are similar to casitas in building permitting, you can't have a kitchen, so how can you rent them?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Miscellaneous
Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy
Parking:
Restrictions (In General):

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
KIWANIS
JUNE 16, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With the Kiwanis
June 16, 2009

Overall: Fifteen participants were present at this ADU meeting with the Kiwanis. There were a total of eleven comments/questions by participants, and there were no negative comments regarding the concept. Overall, participants were very supportive of ADUs.

Appearance: No comments were made on this topic.

Concept: Overall participants supported the concept of ADUs and suggested segments of the population that would want ADUs.

1. Is the county looking at adopting an ADU ordinance? I think it's a wonderful idea and would yield many benefits.
2. Will there be rent control?
3. Will the City provide lists of ADUs to people coming into town? That might be helpful.
4. What's your target market? It seems like ADUs would appeal especially to young professionals just getting started here in Sedona and not so much for families. ADUs would seem to fill that niche.
5. This is a great idea. Why would anyone be against it?
6. It would be wonderful to have it made legal.
7. ADUs would be wonderful for people who want someone to look after their pets when they travel. That's a real selling point.
8. I know that a lot of homes are being designed with a space that could easily be turned into a suite for a caretaker for when we get older and need help. That would allow us to age in place and still be taken care of.

Cost: One participant indicated that owners need to feel they are "getting something" or they will continue to operate ADUs illegally.

1. How much will the permit fee be? If people don't feel they're getting something from paying the fee they'll continue to operate ADUs illegally.

Enforcement: One question was asked about fines if the owners come forward.

1. Will the owners of illegal units be fined if they come forward?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause

Inspections and Permitting: One question was about inspections.

1. Will the units be inspected by the City?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Miscellaneous:
Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy
Parking
Restrictions (In General

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
THE LIONS
JUNE 16, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With the Lions
June 16, 2009

Overall: Thirteen participants were present at this ADU meeting with the Lions. A total of nineteen comments were made by participants at this meeting, and overall participants were supportive of the ADU concept.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: Overall participants were supportive of the concept and one participant asked how soon it would be available. Additionally, one couple remarked that they were going to move into one.

1. I think that is nice; a lot of folks would look into that then. (Regarding incentives), discounting the permits would be one.
2. Are these separate buildings or can they be attached?
3. How soon can we have this?
4. The retailers would benefit from this and they are a strong group with associations and political punch, and this could be a benefit in their employee package.
5. If you have a guesthouse, what would it take to be involved in this?
6. Three members of the audience nodded in approval, when they heard that the owner must live on-site.
7. We are going to move into one of those

Cost: Participants asked about subsidies and incentives, and one participant indicated the fees were "ridiculous", so the City must not really want these to happen.

1. Are you talking about legal guesthouses being made into ADUs or building new ones, and is there any subsidy where the City is putting some money into these?
2. So, you are really just encouraging investment in the real estate.
3. Are you doing any incentives for building ADUs?
4. Did you say the fees were about $16,000? That's ridiculous; obviously the city doesn't want these to happen.
5. How much would it cost to do that?

Enforcement: Participants asked what is considered illegal and how many there are.

1. You mentioned illegal dwellings, what is considered a legal unit now?
2. How many of these illegal ADUs are there?

Garage Conversions: One participant indicated support for garage conversions.

1. I like the idea; it would help the homeowner, in general, as another income for changing the garage, and after maybe 5 years, it would help pay on the home.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Grandfather Clause
Inspections and Permitting
Miscellaneous
Neighborhood Impact
Ninety-Day Minimum

Occupancy: Two questions were asked related to the definition of "family" for occupancy.

1. What do you consider for the density of a single-family home?
2. Are the 4-unrelated adults for this?

Parking: One question was asked regarding the number of cars.

1. How many cars did you say for these?

Restrictions (In General): There were no comments on this topic.

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
SEDONA COMMUNITY CENTER
BOARD
JUNE 19, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting
With the Sedona Community Center Board
June 19, 2009

Overall: A total of seven comments were made by participants at this meeting, and five of the seven comments were questions. One participant asked what the downside of the concept could possibly be, and another participant indicated enforcement would be a major issue, but the preference would be to have an ordinance to protect neighborhoods rather than illegal ADUs, and ADUs fill a need in the City.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: One participant asked what the downside to the concept could possibly be.
1. Will they have different addresses?
2. What does it do to County taxes?
3. What possibly could the downside be?

Cost: The one comment was that with the high cost, there should be some financial assistance, especially if they agree to rent it affordably.
1. Given the high cost of creating an ADU, there should be some funds available to help people do that, especially if they agree to rent it affordably.

Enforcement: Although one participant indicated enforcement would be a major concern, the participant preferred having an ordinance to protect neighborhoods rather than illegal ADUs, and indicated that ADUs fill a need in the City.
1. A major issue that you will hear from the community is enforcement. We want enforcement, but we don't want to become a policing agency. A few owners will abuse the privilege of having an ADU and will allow things to get out of hand, but we'll just have to deal with that. Short-term rentals are a problem, partly because they're investments. The integrity of neighborhoods comes first. Some people don't want anything to change. I'd rather have an ordinance that protects neighborhoods than illegal ADUs. People have rights; the City simply can't knock on doors and demand to be let in. As we know, up to 4-unrelated adults are currently allowed in a single-family home, but there is no limit on related adults. We need to remember that the City does not enforce HOA regulations; that's up to the HOAs. ADUs fill a need the City has. The City has a hard time hiring. If we want to be a true small town, we need to solve these problems.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause

Inspections and Permitting: There were no separate comments regarding Inspections and Permitting, other than the comment shown under Enforcement.

There were no comments on the following topics.
Miscellaneous
Neighborhood Impact

Ninety-Day Minimum: One participant asked about a minimum rental period.
1. Is this related to short-term rentals? Is there a minimum rental period?

Occupancy: One question was asked regarding this topic, in addition to the comment shown under Enforcement.
1. What will the occupancy be?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Parking
Restrictions (In General)

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
MID-DAY ROTARY
JUNE 30, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting with Organization
Mid-Day Rotary
June 30, 2009

Overall: A total of thirty-two participants attended this meeting. Nineteen comments were made by participants at this meeting. While many of the comments were fact-finding questions, the two major issues expressed were the prohibitive fees involved and the current lack of enforcement.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: All comments on the concept of ADUs were questions for additional information.

1. Do you have any goals for what you are trying to accomplish? How many people are you trying to help?
2. Are there any restrictions on what you could build as an ADU?
3. How is Payson doing with its ADU ordinance?
4. Has the City looked at what Telluride is doing?
5. Does an ADU have to include a kitchen? Will studios include kitchens and cooking facilities?

Cost: Participants indicated that the various fees were prohibitive and would discourage owners of illegal units from coming forward.

1. Is there any benefit for someone building a new home to include an ADU? What are the impact fees?
2. What would the approximate total fees be?
3. Regarding impact fees, this is obviously something the City wants, but what is the benefit for anyone to put one in? Why would anyone consider it?
4. Development impact fees – because these fees are so high, they're not an incentive to come forward.
5. Would the City have a sales tax?
6. What is the annual permit fee?
7. Don't most HOAs restrict ADUs? Since 90% of new construction is covered by HOAs, only the older properties would be eligible, and why would anyone do it? The cost is prohibitive.

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern about the current lack of enforcement and one participant indicated ADUs would make things worse.

1. How many illegal ADUs are in existence now?
2. Regarding illegal ADU rentals, does the City have a new strategy for controlling rentals? It hasn't been successful so far. The City has no ability to control it now, and this will make things worse.
3. Concerned about the City's ability to enforce. Code enforcement is an issue.
4. How will the City let people know about the ordinance and how they could make a complaint about an ADU?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Garage Conversions
Grandfather Clause
Inspections and Permitting
Miscellaneous
Neighborhood Impact

Ninety-Day Minimum: One participant asked about a minimum rental time period.

1. Is there any minimum rental time period?

Occupancy: Questions asked related to the number of children and the number of bedrooms required for them.

1. Regarding occupancy, a landlord cannot discriminate regarding children. How would the number of children be limited?
2. How does the ordinance address bedrooms for children?

There were no comments on the following topics:
Parking
Restrictions (In General)

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU MEETING WITH
SEDONA VERDE VALLEY
ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS
JULY 16, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Meeting with Organization
Sedona Verde Valley Association of Realtors
July 16, 2009

Overall: Five participants were present at this ADU meeting with the Sedona Verde Valley Association of Realtors. A total of ninety-eight comments were made by participants at this meeting. Overall, participants were supportive of the concept and felt it would increase property values, which neighbors benefit from also, and it is more of a "real world" answer than previous plans. Costs were a major concern; participants indicated that the upfront costs would "kill it". Participants also questioned how the City would enforce some of the provisions and what staff would be required. Additionally, the fact that there would be no additional impact over what could already happen was seen as a major point.

Appearance: There were no comments on this topic.

Concept: Participants indicated that ADUs would increase property values and expressed concern regarding the size restriction on existing units.

1. I've got CC&Rs of every one of these at home, and we would double check these with title companies; they are rarely changed radically, so it is either in there or not in there. No, they haven't expired. Homeowners' associations can "expire" and go away, but CC&Rs stay, period. The only other thing about CC&Rs and deed restrictions is unenforced issues, if they are blatant, open and not enforced, they are eliminated then. Not all of the CC&Rs, but that section is eliminated. For instance, if you had a CC&R in your subdivision that said no homes less than 1,000 sq. ft., and one went up and nothing was done, that is out. It will not be enforceable on anybody else who wants to put up a 900 sq. ft. house. After Sedona incorporated, a lot of HOAs went away and HOAs are different than CC&Rs. You might want to have the City Attorney research any case law history about guesthouses; there are undoubtedly cases, but see if there is anything that has already set a new standard of law on guesthouses.
2. I've heard the same thing. We, the realtors, like kind of a free market with private property owner solutions to a problem, rather than frankly, the other city plans that were not effective and . . ., anyway, let's not go there. We think this is more of a real world answer. The one thing that, well, I made notes on a bunch of it. The size thing, I hope you don't get tripped up on that, because I don't know what the answer is. It sounds like it is a minimum of 400 sq. ft. or not more than 33% of the . . .
3. Does Cottonwood have an ADU Ordinance?
4. (Regarding the size), I would think that it is just a matter of massaging it to make it work. (Regarding building in more flexibility), I would say so too, because the ones that I know about, 10% ain't going to cut it.
5. We have some concerns about this, some communities require, unless this is out, that the owner occupancy be recorded as a deed restriction; where is that going?
6. Then, the new owner reaffirms?
7. Okay, the new owner will see it on a Title Report; it is going to be recorded, and then what about . . .; their options are to, do they pay fees to continue or what do they do?
8. The Director can waive up to 10%; you may need more.
9. Is this out that some communities notice to residents within a certain distance about an ADU? Otherwise, you are killing the whole thing.
10. What about someone that uses a space for an art studio, and then uses it as a rental; what you are saying is that if they decide to do that for a couple of years, then what happens?
11. (Regarding dropping the property value), it is going to raise the property value.

12. That is just a myth. I don't know if it was said it publicly, and we don't want to contaminate this with the short-term rental issue, but I think the comment was that short-term rentals are kept even more immaculate. Let's talk turkey here and talk honestly; they are kept immaculate and even superior, because of what they are trying to accomplish. Forget the arguments about it; it is the truth, and the nature of Sedona is just not rundown properties.
13. Let's back up a little bit about this is going to hurt our property values, you have a house that is in one of these subdivisions, and let's say it is worth $400,000, if you add a guesthouse that can be a rental, you just increased your property value a whole bunch.
14. I agree; if the house is still worth $400,000, without the guesthouse, the house's value next to it is not going to change . . .
15. And, if you just brought up your value, they benefit also.
16. That is what I was thinking, when they look at the comps in the neighborhood, right?
17. Guesthouses legally can't have a kitchen now, but they all do; we all know that, they all do; they put them in after the City goes through for final.
18. Won't they approve them if it is a smaller scale, like a two-burner stove or cook top, microwave?
19. I can't remember. I'll bet there aren't 10 realtors in the whole association who could say they have had a client ask about concerns about guesthouses, anywhere in the neighborhood, ever.
20. It is typically more desirable, from a buyer's standpoint, to have a guesthouse.
21. (Regarding concern of a rental next door), well, you have a sunset on this. How did the 176 new units become your maximum in 5 years?
22. Eighty-eight units in 5 years is nuts; that is a joke. That is why I still claim that the other plan you have with guidelines (former Housing Policy) is such a drop in the bucket of trying to solve the problem; if you are trying to put some teeth into getting a solution, that is 36 a year.
23. So, it is not limited to 88 units in 5 years. What if it happened in 3 months?
24. Is the 88 new construction? So for people that already have these, does this create a situation where a neighbor who is mad at them calls in and says we have a guy next door that has an in-law apartment, and then they get what?
25. Substandard, I don't know, not so many; I've seen many, many of them, all different kinds and I wouldn't say I've seen too many substandard ones, that doesn't pop out at me.
26. I know of a few that are gorgeous. I would live in them.
27. The rent depends on how big it is.
28. $600 or $700 for sure and going from there.
29. Regarding increasing the value of the home <u>significantly</u>), uh, significant is arguable. They are going to have to put something in. I'm not sure what fair is.
30. This isn't a requirement for anybody to do; someone who wants to do this Accessory Dwelling Unit is going to have the resources to do it. Someone who is getting ready to lose his job or facing foreclosure isn't going to be going, "Well I can get $600 a month, if I put out $15,000". I just don't see that that is going to happen. The other part is if there is new construction, that is where you are talking about some of these units being constructed by those developers, so their plans are going to be approved, and again, they are going to have to have all the financial backing to do that and add these units.
31. (Regarding not getting 88 right away), I see your point, when I begin to look at the inventory. Chapel Vista I and II, up at the higher part forbids it, but the rest of the Chapel is okay, so the main part of the Chapel, yes, and Chapel Hills is apparently in question, but Chapel Vista is a no.
32. What if the HOAs decide, when they get wind this ordinance gets passed, that they don't want it in their subdivision, so we are going to get the homeowners to vote on our rules and regs or CC&Rs, so we can prohibit it.
33. (Regarding absentee owners), they can vote by proxy.

34. What does this mean? "A home occupation may be conducted as an accessory use either in the ADU or the principal dwelling unit, but not both."
35. Nobody is going to check on that. What other small cities have any, are there any comparable to Sedona?
36. On your rationale in Purpose, "Provide a means for residents, particularly seniors, single parents and families to remain in their homes and neighborhoods, are you getting much punch or response out of that? You would think that would be one of your top sales points.
37. People hear "affordable" and think Section 8.
38. This has a sunset on it; yes, it will be a test run so to speak, but it is not forever.

Cost: Participants expressed concern about the cost to create an ADU and indicated that the upfront fees will kill it. One suggestion was if the size of the ADU is based on a percentage of the property, then the fees should be based on that percentage as well.

1. What is the policy now on, I heard it both ways, the sewer hook-up? You are not looking at an independent sewer hook-up for an ADU; a sewer hook-up goes with the parcel, not with the building. You will make it prohibitive; that won't fly.
2. You're absolutely positive that it is tied to dwelling.
3. It is the same argument with the impact fees. We learned this in census.
4. That is disappointing.
5. Audree, give me the fees; the sewer fee was $5,300; impact fees . . .; it is good to see these things come back and bite the City every once in a while . . . and permit fees.
6. If they are limiting the size of Accessory Dwelling Units based on the total size of the property, why wouldn't they assess that same percentage to those impact and sewer fees, so that you are only paying 1/3 of what the sewer fee is, as opposed to the whole amount? It is even less than that one-half, didn't you say the minimum 33%, so I would say it is one-third. If you want them affordable, it should be the same as whatever the requirement is for the size of the property.
7. I'm not sure how this would work, but the fees, instead of waiving them, build it and we will defer your fees.
8. Has there been any discussion for exploration into some of these being designated as subsidized housing, where the person who can qualify gets a subsidy from the government, HUD?
9. I'm just looking at the rationale of how you are going to make an argument of, on all of the fees, of just saying it is not justifiable to hit them with 100% of a sewer fee, it's not justifiable to hit them with the infrastructure. Yes, there is additional sewer service, but the infrastructure is done and built; it is in, even impact fees, on a citywide scale. For non-multi-family zoned, non-commercial property, this is just not a rational argument to say that you have to hit them for $5,300 for a hook-up, because the structure is in, and they are going to be paying a monthly sewer fee anyway.
10. I'm still confused about the existing people that step forward; what do they have to pay? Do they have to . . . (interrupted)
11. Everything in theory, unless they . . . (interrupted). Unless they could prove or said they could prove continuous use prior to incorporation, and that won't give you many people.
12. (Directed to another participant), what sort of tax breaks does somebody get for having a legal rental as opposed to an illegal rental?
13. I wasn't that kind of accountant; you are talking about a CPA.
14. That would be a good question for a CPA, because there is a big benefit. It depends on their circumstance, but by having a rental, there are all kinds of tax deductions that people might really want.

15. I think they are bound to report that as rental income, so if they don't have any expenses to offset it, it might not be a positive thing, because they end up paying that federal tax on the rental income, and the only way you can write off the expenses of the property is if it is vacant typically; whatever you had to pay, like the utilities, sewer, etc.
16. Maintenance and upkeep is also deductible.
17. It is, but there are certain expenses that are not deductible on a rental, unless it is not occupied. We have a rental property and we were told that some of our expenses were not deductible, because they were during the time that the rental was . . . (could not be heard).
18. Also look at it this way, an owner is going to say why is this even worth my while, $600 per month times 12 is $7,200. If the City is going to offset some of my things . . .; if I'm getting no cash out of this thing, like right now for 2-4 years, this isn't worth my while, because I'm going to front it. If I wanted $300 in my pocket a month, cutting this to $3.600, into 16.3, which is our fees, that is like over 5 years to even pay the City off, and this is upfront.
19. I really caution you, of the City going into "too much business" here. Going back to the sewer fee, there is no rationale in the world as to why that should be more than a maximum of $1,000 for a hook-up fee. There is no sense for it; I'm just picking that figure, but . . .
20. Well, what if they are on a septic?
21. They have to get certified to be able to handle the bedrooms.
22. Exactly, and if they don't, they will have to install a new septic for a bigger tank, so they are going to have the full expense of connecting to septic, if it is not already going to accommodate that.
23. (Regarding how many neighborhoods are on septic), it is the big properties out Dry Creek, almost anything with any density, except for . . .
24. I was just playing Devil's advocate, that they don't get a break, if they have to change the septic. I think it should be based on a percentage of how big it is; they are not building a whole new house on a lot, so why should they be charged the same for that. They are not going to pay the same construction costs, it is going to be prorated based on the size of that dwelling unit, so it is common sense.
25. We run into this constantly, "Oh, it has got to be brought up to code", and it is so often just exorbitant; you are going to make me rewire and re-plumb, etc.
26. Yeah, the upfront fees will kill it, but I didn't think the annual fees were . . . Cities have a great way of justifying impact fees. I would think the company that does impact fees has been approached before, to give a rationale of why it can be reduced, in a situation like this.

Enforcement: Participants questioned how some of the parameters would be enforced and indicated the City should have a proposal on the amount of enforcement staff required. Additionally, participants indicated owners of existing units won't have the money to pay the fees, and if they don't come forward, there could be a loss of more homes and a lot of units "off of the table".

1. (Regarding can't back down on existing units coming up to standards), No, No, you will be held liable later.
2. You should have a proposal about the enforcement staff this is likely to take. Instead of just we have 1½ people. It is going to take; I mean it will change, but you have to be ready to engage more people as it arises. You don't want to hire big at the start, because you don't know what you are going to have.
3. (Regarding who in Sedona needs the most help), Linda, I'll just be honest; you are losing us now. You are headed for rent control, and the market will sift it out. You don't even want to go into the bureaucracy and the monitoring of it, and . . . (interrupted). Once this gets put in place, it will be competitive in terms of, especially in this economy; to be affordable, I mean . . . (interrupted).

4. The obvious community benefit is that there is a tax on rentals, correct, income tax, sales tax? There is the first benefit. I have a rental in Clarkdale and I pay city sales tax. Why are you not; that is significant.
5. My observation on your comment about what the community benefit would be, is how would you police that, even if the homeowner said I agree to rent my place out for $600 per month, who is going to be there when they sign a lease, and when that tenant is there and they decide it is going to be $800 a month, because I can't continue to do this. Who is going to enforce what they agree to do?
6. I can do a lease with my tenant and I can do another lease that I give to you. I'm just playing Devil's advocate. We can't be the cops.
7. If you get in the business of having to keep records of going to credit, and when you sell your house, and if you do this, you are just going to have a nightmare on your hands.
8. It presents another problem brewing on the side, which is this, if people have this unit and they come forward, and they have to pay these fees, people really don't have money right now, so what is going to happen to them. They are going to reduce the income that they are probably relying on to try and hang on, loss of more homes. This is what happens in this town, somebody decides that their neighbor makes too much noise or they left their lights on, and then they call up about their neighbor, so if we get into a thing where someone can call about their neighbor and say this guy is renting out his whatever, and then they have to come up with . . .; you know it is just a lot of policing, and it feels like at this time, it is going to be really quite a burden upon people to come up with $3,000 or $5,000 to $16,000 and simultaneously reduce their rent, when they might be right on the edge, so I don't know, there is something about that whole line that feels a little bit . . . I'm talking about existing units.
9. They are not going to be required, because they are grandfathered.
10. There are probably not very many that are still grandfathered that people can document.
11. If they choose not to come into compliance, they just stop renting the place out or they do what they have to do. Maybe the City can make those loans to them.
12. That would mean a lot of them are off of the table; like Sedona West, and these are troubled areas where they are going on now, and Sedona Meadows.
13. There was another piece that you had about a homeowner having to be in residence 6 months a year, and I know a lot of homeowners that are not residents 6 months a year, but do have a guesthouse and a caretaker that may rent it out. I don't know how you can enforce it anyway, so many people come and go, and this is only one of their homes.
14. Doesn't this say though that the property owner has to occupy at least one unit; I didn't see where it was for a particular timeframe.
15. With their voter registration in this house.

Garage Conversions: Participants asked about the ability to convert a garage.

1. Is it still in there that it does not support conversion of garages for ADUs, except if another garage is being constructed? Even if you throw in that they put up a carport.
2. (Regarding storage from garages), why would the City think about that?
3. I'm not going to throw my Christmas tree decorations out in the driveway; they are going to go someplace.
4. My guess is that this is going to stick; you won't allow existing one-story structures to add an additional . . . Really, okay.

Grandfather Clause: Participants indicated a need for incentives for owners of existing units, because it sounds like they would be penalized for coming forward.

1. If you are really going to try to bring people on board, grandfather them, the ones that are in noncompliance, you have to really make some attractive options for them. (Like?) I don't know, the numbers that we just talked about, it is going to cost this and this . . .
2. It sounds like people who are already grandfathered, for them to come in, they are almost going to be penalized for being honest, and I don't think that is where you are trying to go. Amnesty?
3. I don't know if you'll get clean amnesty, because then . . .
4. Because, they have to be brought up to code; they've got to be safe of course.
5. Substandard, I don't know, not so many; I've seen many, many of them, all different kinds and I wouldn't say I've seen too many substandard ones, that doesn't pop out at me.
6. I know of a few that are gorgeous. I would live in them.
7. I noticed one of your resources is Marin County, California, where I lived before I came here in 1992, and Marin County is a place very much like Sedona; everybody wants to live there, so there may be more Accessory Dwelling Units than there are actual homes, and I note you wrote Amnesty Program, do you have any idea what that looked like? It is very much like here, if you want to be here on any terms, so everyone has one.

Inspections and Permitting: There were no comments on this topic.

Miscellaneous: Participants asked about the process and the map displayed.
1. Where is this now, Planning & Zoning has simply had . . .; not actual full-blown hearings.
2. (Regarding the map), when you say "prohibit" what do you mean?

Neighborhood Impact: Participants indicated a major point was the fact that there would be no additional impact over what could already happen.
1. (Regarding neighbor's property value), if it is attractive, I don't see how you could have decreased their property value.
2. (Regarding no additional impacts will be realized over what can already happen), okay, you need to nail that down.

There were no comments on the following topics:
Ninety-Day Minimum
Occupancy

Parking: One participant indicated that the perception that ADUs would reduce property values may be coming from the thought that there would be no enclosed parking or storage.
1. Do these units have then some kind of on-site covered parking, or not, because if you've got this house, I'm going to say behind the house, you've got the guesthouse or whatever, probably no parking for this accessory unit, typically, there is probably not going to be an enclosed garage or storage or something like that, and when you say that thing about bringing down property values, what makes her think about that is then there is more outside stuff, for lack of a better term, outside cars, outside whatever, that people are looking at in the "Not in My Back Yard" thing, and maybe that is one of the things that is coming from.
2. (Regarding screening with walls, fences, landscaping, etc.), if it is parking on the lot, you've got to be screened, not landscaping, but some sort of screening.
3. Why is that item, on-street parking is prohibited, in there? It is legal in many places, most places. Okay, so they have to be in the driveway or on the lot.

Restrictions (In General): One Participant indicated it is a good idea, but too restrictive.
1. I think the idea is a good idea, very good idea, and some of the restrictions may need a little tuning up; too restrictive.

OVERALL
SYNOPSIS OF ALL
ADU PUBLIC MEETINGS
JUNE 29 - AUGUST 6, 2009

Overall Summary of Public Meetings
June 29, 2009 - August 6, 2009

There were three public meetings held between June 29, 2009 and August 6, 2009. Participants in the first public meeting were strongly opposed to the ADU concept; however, the second public meeting was more supportive and most of the participants at the third public meeting strongly supported the concept. Some of the representative favorable comments from the three meetings were as follows:

- I'm a professional building designer and do plans and designs for custom homes and guesthouses. The City's effort is to include a phenomenon that is already taking place. Many already have illegal units that are occupied and some are in your neighborhoods, and probably not bothering you. This gives the City a way to regulate what is going on. I'm in favor of more diverse housing and a lot will be pre-existing guesthouses. . .
- I agree with Linda Martinez, the situations I am aware of are so benign, like an aging father, a daughter or friend, and I haven't observed these horror stories being described. If something is amiss, this document contains provisions to cancel the permit. People do have to complain and officially file a report, and then it is pursued. She has personally seen Jim Windham enforce her complaints.
- I just wanted to share that the school district does continue to support workforce housing and the ADUs. If you go around and ask current teachers, you may hear this is something I wouldn't use, I'm not interested, but as a governing board, we really look to the future for long-term planning, and the reality is, and I think you are seeing the same in the Fire Department and the Police force and the City, some of our finest people are going to be retiring in the near future, and the same with the school district. We are anticipating and planning for a large bubble of retirees. As our new exciting educators come into the community, it is even more of a burden to find housing for them. I was talking to Sodexho on a plane the other day. They were in our community, loved our community and wanted to continue. Sodexho is a food service company that was providing service to our three schools; they ultimately left, because they could not find affordable housing for their management team, and they had a tremendous turnover. They had zero issues with people wanting to live and work here and provide that service, but they sure did struggle in keeping somebody that could afford it. For me personally, on the legal ADUs, I've watched young employees live in detached garages in deplorable conditions, but for $600 per month, they were willing to do that, so if we can provide some housing options with standards that we should expect for all of our residents, it is a good thing.
- One of the things, which Linda mentioned, is for the handicapped and elderly, and he would like to ask if Sedona is considering having some standards for visitability and accessibility in this area?
- We have experienced this situation in Honolulu where we used to live, before our insanity attack and move to the mainland. Anyhow, we lived in an older house in a nice neighborhood. The situation arose, because Honolulu is perpetually short of housing, and so they addressed it with what they called the Ohana Zoning; Ohana is the word for family. They did not restrict the use of that to families however; they would allow strangers. We rented out to some nice people who were strangers to us until that time; it worked out very well. We did not have the structure that this program seems to have; I can't tell you what we had, because we didn't have anything, we just lived and it was great. It worked out very well.
- I'm a Certified Aging in Place Specialist and a couple of things I would like to see here, involved with the ordinance, are visitability and accessibility, because we are talking about multi-generational. As the lady who first spoke mentioned, having someone to look after yourself or when the kids come to stay with you, because also the economic climate as well is

creating more multi-generational living, and this would keep Mom out of the rest home, etc., and visitability and accessibility, concerning not so much universal design per se, but some accessibility in having an access for people who are getting older, etc.

- I know several single people, women actually, who are renting guesthouses, and they really don't have a lot open to them other than that kind of situation, when they want to live by themselves. I also know several people who rent guesthouses out and couldn't keep their homes, if they didn't have that income coming in. It is huge, and it is the difference to me, in this kind of economy, that we all need to support each other and stick together and work with each other, because this is huge, a huge deal to both sides of this, as far as I can see, and it doesn't add to over-population. It is actually a beautiful arrangement to have people living harmoniously, and I know quite a few situations, and they are all working for everybody, so I think it is fabulous. We have it here, so why not use it and support each other.
- The thing that strikes me about this plan, whenever we think about change, people react either negatively or positively, but it brings out a reaction, and when I think about something that has been proposed here, I think of reasonable, because it isn't pie-in-the-sky, but it brings a small incremental benefit to citizens, whether it be somebody who needs a little extra income renting out their house, which may prevent them from foreclosing, maybe not. It brings incremental change to somebody who might want to live where they work, and it brings some incremental business here to our community, because the reality is if people live here, they are much more likely to spend money here to go to Ace Hardware, to go to Basha's, to get gas at the Circle K or wherever. Whether economic times are good or bad, it is the small incremental things we can do to benefit our community that can help, and to me that is what this seems like. We are here probably like everybody else, because it is such a beautiful place, and here we are using existing houses to help house people. It is like that seems to make sense to me; it just seems like a sensible thing to do, and it helps people who may not be able to live here, who may not be making gobs of money and live on a hill in a nice house. With the exception of the lack of affordability, which obviously the City is looking into; $16,000, if that is not changed, you might as well scrap it, because who is going to pay $16,000 to get $500 or $600 a month in rent. I think it is a very good idea and I would support it.
- Looking at your map over here and looking at the population of our City of Sedona, we have probably between 11,000 and 12,000 residents, and how many houses does that represent? I'm not sure, but let's say it is 8,000 houses. Okay, say 7,000, now you look at all of the red areas that say, hey, no go in this area, and you look at the blues where there are still a lot of questions about whether there is; I don't know is Crimson View on that. Actually it isn't prohibited; it is just that they don't have the space for it. It doesn't work that way; there is no way we could do it. There are a lot of places, which again simply couldn't accommodate this, so if we take that 6,000 and whittle it down to 2,000 that could accommodate this thing, and then we say alright how many of those would actually want to do something like that and be willing to spend the money for it, maybe we would end up with 600 or 700 possible. What have you got, what is the number? (Regarding it is way lower than that), that is what I was afraid of. I thought I was topping off, being very generous. The point is that we are not going to be deluged with this situation, but we are going to offer a very comfortable situation for some people who would very much welcome the opportunity to live here on a modest scale, be of assistance, and when you are ready for someone in your backyard. I think this is just a very, very positive step to go in this direction. I think that point that it is going to be 100 to 200 or 250 is extremely important; we are not going to be deluged with these, but it could be a huge help to those who need them. I'm talking about the owners that need the house next door, the little one.

- I just wanted to say that from a humanitarian perspective, you don't have to convince me on ADUs, I'm already convinced about that in terms of the goodwill that it has in terms of community impact, but in terms of the business perspective, I think it makes perfect sense. If you look at the classified ads for example, just glance over them, how many jobs, and follow them. How many jobs do you see that pay $10 an hour, $8 an hour, at some of our more wonderful spas and salons, and what have you, and I'm sure that there are a lot of people that hunger for this work, but imagine getting paid that salary, and that is before taxes. How are you going to live here? How are you going to sustain your family? Number two and this is a good concern, but from the presence and participation that I see here, I think we can do it, and that is the issue of enforcement. How are we going to help in our neighborhoods and our communities, to make sure that people are complying with ordinances? With the participation that I see here, and the feedback that I feel we are getting, I think we have to . . ., if we don't want government to be involved and knocking on our doors and stuff, it is up to us to take that accountability and make sure that people are living in appropriate housing. That is all I have to say. I think this is a great idea; I think that the team has done a wonderful job and I think it is a very exciting time to be in Sedona.
- It seems to me that if you are going to be dealing with enforcement, you also have to have a source of information, and I can't see the City running around knocking on all the doors to see who is living there or what is behind it or inside of it, so obviously, you are going to have to respond to neighbor complaints. Now how many neighbor complaints on this kind of issue have you had over the last two years, and what has become of them? That (number) is scarcely overwhelming.

Representative comments from participants in the three public meetings who were opposed to the ADU concept were as follows:

- You seem to say that you don't want to reinvent the wheel, so why haven't you already looked at Yavapai County. The County doesn't allow detached on property of less than 35,000 sq. ft. lots or .8 of an acre, and I would prefer one acre, but that protects the modest neighborhoods that can't absorb the traffic, noise, drugs, crime, etc. When I lived in a coastal community, Laguna Beach annexed South Laguna and they had so many problems, they had to outlaw ADUs, because of drugs, noise and parking problems. We expected to live in single-family areas and we don't want it to change; we don't like de facto up-zoning.
- I was an inspector and an appraiser, so I know what I'm talking about, and what is going on is changing the zoning, and if we bought in a single-family area we should have the right for it to remain single-family. If we want to lift up the downtrodden all over town, we would expect the City to stop illegal ADUs, but it doesn't. As an appraiser, this is diminishing our property values by sloppy zoning. Houston doesn't have zoning and look at their property values. We are entitled to enforcement, and people who live here have somehow gotten on the wrong side and those who want to live here have gotten on the right side. If this passes, there will be a rash of lawsuits to make the City pay for the difference, perhaps even a class action lawsuit and I believe we will be upheld.
- What is the whole idea behind this? In 1936, I rode a bicycle for 1 hour uphill, carried my lunch and nobody bought my lunch or gave me a bus to ride. Do I feel sorry for someone who can't live here; it is like Estes Park and other resort towns, there are low wages, because the employers don't want to give raises. My father dropped out of high school and worked 3 jobs but never whined, except about the New Deal. There are two groups in favor of this. There is the problem with real estate values, and business owners want local housing for their employees, so they don't have to pay more than minimum wage, and the do-gooders, and you know how I feel about those and Obama. From Cottonwood, there are three ways to get back and forth, car pool, get a moped, or take the bus. We don't owe these people a living.

- I see nothing wrong with Cottonwood being a bedroom community. You don't see a doorman on 5th avenue living on 5th avenue.
- It took me 39 years to get here and resorts have the responsibility to get their workers here. I did see an Enchantment shuttle obviously transporting their employees. I was raised in a third-generation house in a less desirable state, but I saved and moved here when I could.
- I'm one of the five real estate agents in town and I've been an agent for 18 years. I'm in the blue zone in Uptown. As far as the City's enforcement of the 30 days, when people don't stay, the record of enforcement stinks, and I called Jim Windham and asked if he had received any complaints, and he said he had a foot of them on his desk. If the job was open, I would apply, because that would be the only benefit from this. Now you are looking at an ordinance that will require a lot of money and staff time to enforce. It is an unenforceable ordinance, and it takes a lot of money and time to enforce CC&Rs.
- Having seen the previous versions, this is a lot better and a lot more enforceable if you have the staff to enforce it. Your wording on the 176 needs to be clarified; I've seen an email saying 176, and it is really 176 plus the existing units. Also counting an ADU as ½ as far as impacting the density limit, can City Council change the density limit cap by redefining a dwelling on its own? I've listened to the discussions and would come down on the side of the ADU, but when you monkey with the density limit, then - when you communicate, are you honest in your communications and telling the public about that? Are you telling the community? The public doesn't know you are monkeying around with the density limit for ADUs and that is violating the density cap, so it needs to be clarified.
- There is a failure of the City to enforce its own ordinance and regulations. A major point is that it is not good to do it, if you can't enforce it.
- I suggest this is trying to turn residential areas into commercial areas, and you could have even a little house with 2 or 3 families in it. I oppose this vehemently. We have nice residential areas now and want to keep them that way. This is a ridiculous idea.
- Your earlier answer was a little disingenuous in saying that ADUs wouldn't impact neighborhoods. Currently, the average household in Sedona is 2.1 people, but with the definition of family as 4-unrelated adults, which can include their grandparents, parents, children and even domestic servants, when an ADU is on a lot, you increase the people there, so that answer is disingenuous and not really truthful. There is nothing that limits the number of people that can reside on the lot. If you want to limit the number of people, it needs to be added. If there is no limit; it would be helpful to put that in. For an ADU, I believe you can have a limit. Currently, we are in single family areas and this will change it to multi-family, which is defined by the number of dwelling units. In RS-10a, RS-10b and RS-6 zones, they all would increase in density and some single-family areas could have density greater than medium density, multi-family. What you are doing is authorizing multi-family in single-family areas and we bought single-family housing.
- I see on page 5, letter M, "If a separate external entrance for the ADU is necessary"; I think it should be mandatory to have ingress and egress, and the Ohana Zoning that they had over there was not so restrictive, but it seemed to work out fine and there had to be off-street parking. It was inspected once before you were able to rent it, just to make sure it was habitable, that it had a toilet and cooking facilities and that was it. This is so regulated; I don't see how anybody in their right mind would even agree to this. Page 9, letter B, says that if it is rented to low-income people, it has to have a 20-year timeframe; that is ridiculous. What if he sells his house in 5 years?

The following points were raised by some participants for further consideration:

- In terms of the growth cap of 176 units, and then how we define an ADU as 1/2 of a unit, have you looked at the impact fee as far as 1/2 an impact fee? And then also sewer

connection, is it a completely separate sewer connection, or are they all tied into one sewer connection and what is the fee? I mean is there an adjustment there that we can look at? I was just wondering where in the process you are as far as looking at that, because what I've heard a lot too is that nobody is going to, especially for the units that exist, that is not an incentive to pay $16,000 to become legal, and then how we looked at the unit to begin with, it is not a full dwelling unit, and I know there was some discussion in how we got that number, but just if there was any thought process to take it that extra step and look at the impact fee and so forth.

- A point of clarification, when you commented about illegal, you are talking about individual homeowners that are illegally renting them out right now? Okay, that is what I thought; I assumed that was the case, and you made me think; I was in one of the small focus groups and one of the comments from a couple of realtors surprised us, they were throwing out numbers of 100 to 200 possible "illegals", essentially in a cross section of neighborhoods in Sedona right now, and I just wanted to reiterate that comment, as we have been talking about this restrictive nature. Success will build on success, in that if we somehow can give incentive to the existing "illegals" to come forward and to be a part of it, so it becomes a known opportunity in the community. Then again, I think success might build on success, because one of our comments out of the focus group is that "Big Brother" is definitely watching it, it is restrictive and some of these costs that they are talking about, let alone for the individuals currently with ADUs; why, what is the incentive for them to come out?
- One of the things is to try to help people who can't afford housing and the only thing I see is that this part about the Development Impact Fees may be waived, if the property owner agrees to rent the unit to income-qualified tenants earning 80% or less of the median, so is that a big enough benefit? I don't know the cost of Development Impact Fees.

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU PUBLIC MEETING
JUNE 29, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Public Meeting
June 29, 2009

Overall: Of the twenty nine participants in the ADU public meeting, several expressed opposition to the ADU concept. A total of thirty six comments were made by participants at this public meeting.

Appearance: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Concept: There was opposition expressed to the concept of ADUs. Nine of the thirty six comments were regarding this topic.

1. Can I assume this is to address affordable housing, using low-income guidelines for rent or affordable housing guidelines? If it is low-income, I'll sign up; otherwise we have a whole different thing here, because that homeowner could build a quality ADU and charge $1500 per month, and how does that help Sedona?
2. What is the limitation or regulation, by square foot?
3. I'm a professional building designer and do plans and designs for custom homes and guesthouses. The City's effort is to include a phenomenon that is already taking place. Many already have illegal units that are occupied and some are in your neighborhoods, and probably not bothering you. This gives the City a way to regulate what is going on. I'm in favor of more diverse housing and a lot will be pre-existing guesthouses. It seems that the square footage changed and the requirement regulating the units is too small. Basically 400 sq. ft. is 20 x 20 and they measure from the outside of the walls, so it is really 19 x 19, and it is impossible to have a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen and living area in that. They end up being studios with a wet bar. When a kitchen and permanent living is occupied, it needs to be a decent place to live. She has built a 600 sq .ft. unit for 1 or 2 people, but she doesn't understand the 800 sq. ft. cap. If it is on a large lot, she doesn't see why you don't use it as an ADU and remember that they need storage space.
4. You seem to say that you don't want to reinvent the wheel, so why haven't you already looked at Yavapai County. The County doesn't allow detached on property of less than 35,000 sq. ft. lots or .8 of an acre, and I would prefer one acre, but that protects the modest neighborhoods that can't absorb the traffic, noise, drugs, crime, etc. When I lived in a coastal community, Laguna Beach annexed South Laguna and they had so many problems, they had to outlaw ADUs, because of drugs, noise and parking problems. We expected to live in single-family areas and we don't want it to change; we don't like de facto up-zoning.
5. I was an inspector and an appraiser, so I know what I'm talking about, and what is going on is changing the zoning, and if we bought in a single-family area we should have the right for it to remain single-family. If we want to lift up the downtrodden all over town, we would expect the City to stop illegal ADUs, but it doesn't. As an appraiser, this is diminishing our property values by sloppy zoning. Houston doesn't have zoning and look at their property values. We are entitled to enforcement, and people who live here have somehow gotten on the wrong side and those who want to live here have gotten on the right side. If this passes, there will be a rash of lawsuits to make the City pay for the difference, perhaps even a class action lawsuit and I believe we will be upheld.
6. What is the whole idea behind this? In 1936, I rode a bicycle for 1 hour uphill, carried my lunch and nobody bought my lunch or gave me a bus to ride. Do I feel sorry for someone who can't live here; it is like Estes Park and other resort towns, there are low wages, because the employers don't want to give raises. My father dropped out of high school and worked 3 jobs but never whined, except about the New Deal. There are two groups in favor of this. There is the problem with real estate values, and business owners want local housing for their

employees, so they don't have to pay more than minimum wage, and the do-gooders, and you know how I feel about those and Obama. From Cottonwood, there are three ways to get back and forth, car pool, get a moped, or take the bus. We don't owe these people a living.

7. Having seen the previous versions, this is a lot better and a lot more enforceable if you have the staff to enforce it. Your wording on the 176 needs to be clarified; I've seen an email saying 176, and it is really 176 plus the existing units. Also counting an ADU as ½ as far as impacting the density limit, can City Council change the density limit cap by redefining a dwelling on its own? I've listened to the discussions and would come down on the side of the ADU, but when you monkey with the density limit, then - when you communicate, are you honest in your communications and telling the public about that? Are you telling the community? The public doesn't know you are monkeying around with the density limit for ADUs and that is violating the density cap, so it needs to be clarified.
8. I see nothing wrong with Cottonwood being a bedroom community. You don't see a doorman on 5th avenue living on 5th avenue.
9. It took me 39 years to get here and resorts have the responsibility to get their workers here. I did see an Enchantment shuttle obviously transporting their employees. I was raised in a third-generation house in a less desirable state, but I saved and moved here when I could.

Cost: One participant inquired cost of sewer hook-up.

1. Does this proposal require a separate hook-up for sewer for the ADU? Are they going to pay the going rate for the capacity fee?

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern with enforcement of ADU compliance. Twelve of the thirty six comments were regarding this topic.

1. I don't understand the criteria, the number, and how you determined where the 176 would be. This is a microcosm, so will this lead to more, like the annexing in Cottonwood and the 20,000 homes? I don't understand the criteria of 176 and how we protect ourselves in the future. How will you address existing ones? Will they stay illegal? Back to the original question, what are the criteria of choosing where the 176 will be? You have some areas owned by developers and they could come in and buy 40 lots, boom.
2. Who checks to see if the owner really lives there?
3. I'm one of the five real estate agents in town and I've been an agent for 18 years. I'm in the blue zone in Uptown. As far as the City's enforcement of the 30 days, when people don't stay, the record of enforcement stinks, and I called Jim Windham and asked if he had received any complaints, and he said he had a foot of them on his desk. If the job was open, I would apply, because that would be the only benefit from this. Now you are looking at an ordinance that will require a lot of money and staff time to enforce. It is an unenforceable ordinance, and it takes a lot of money and time to enforce CC&Rs.
4. Regarding enforcement, we have rentals and even with HOAs and CC&Rs, they are difficult to control and the City is not doing anything to help. There are cars on the streets, noise, etc. It is a dupe and a joke if you think you will control rents. It could be rented out as a B&B, you can't enforce what is on the books now, and you are throwing this in the face of those who bought in single-family neighborhoods. Did anyone survey the workers, what workers with families can live in 400 sq. ft.; you will destroy our neighborhoods. If they work in Sedona, let the businesses subsidize transportation for their workers, there is no reason they couldn't be subsidized. This is a high-end community and our high-end neighborhoods will be turned into low-end neighborhoods. The owner is supposed to live on site for 6 months, but how are you going to enforce that, and what is the cost to try to enforce this? It's not worth it. You are not even being honest about how many are out there and could be potential

ADUs, and if you get this ordinance passed, people could come out of the woodwork, but to increase density on residential properties is a dupe on property owners.

5. Biggest issue is enforcement. There are existing problems, especially parking, and there is nothing in the ordinance to be able to enforce this. Jim Windham is on my list of favorite people, and he admitted that he didn't enforce anything, and Pud Colquitt said you can't do anything about the number of people. Unless you have a lot of money, CC&Rs are unenforceable and useless. A group of attorneys will buy and rent out. One neighbor has 3 or 4 girlfriends and their 8 kids living there and all playing in the driveway, and they could have their brother-in-law and uncle and everybody else. You are kidding yourself if you think you will enforce this. You would have to hire 10 to 15 people and have them going up and down the streets.
6. It says when 176 new permits are issued and since there are none now, that means 176, so that needs to be clarified, and on page 10, the growth cap is 176, then you are calling an ADU ½ of a unit and that bothers me. It is against the Land Development Code. In the Land Development Code, the definition of single-family is one dwelling unit and multi-family is two or more dwelling units, and an ADU is a dwelling unit. Sedona's Growth Management goal limits future growth on total housing units in the Sedona Land Use Plan, and counting an ADU as a unit means that the 176 is really a 2% growth rather than 1%, and it is not hard to imagine 200 existing units out there, so it is really a 4% increase. I thought you were going to regulate this, so I oppose this on every point. Talking with a neighbor, a place across from her is illegal, but she is afraid to report it, and people don't want to give their name, so just because there were only 6 complaints filed doesn't mean that only 6 complaints existed.
7. Those 6 complaints investigated by Jim Windham, does that mean that the stack of complaints on his desk were a rumor?
8. (Person who referenced a foot of complaints) that was about 1½ years ago (possibly regarding vacation rentals at that time).
9. I agree with Linda Martinez, the situations I am aware of are so benign, like an aging father, a daughter or friend, and I haven't observed these horror stories being described. If something is amiss, this document contains provisions to cancel the permit. People do have to complain and officially file a report, and then it is pursued. She has personally seen Jim Windham enforce her complaints.
10. Examples given in the front as benign situations involved relatives, so make ADUs non-rentable if it's for relatives or a caregiver, but non-paying guests. Currently, the way of handling rentals is not appropriate.
11. If you call about a complaint, they say document it, so they make the property owners document it, and one person kept getting notices from the City and she indicated she just ignored them, instead of the City enforcing it.
12. There is a failure of the City to enforce its own ordinance and regulations. A major point is that it is not good to do it, if you can't enforce it.

Garage Conversions: One participant expressed concern with garage conversions and parking.

1. I want to comment on the garage conversions. That is a rotten idea. We don't have enough parking already, and they will be parking in the streets. We will have transients all over, and I don't want the transients across the street. How many driveways will be allowed?

Grandfather Clause: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Inspections and Permitting: Participants requested clarification on the permit process. Three of the thirty six comments were regarding this topic.

1. Doesn't the number really mean the number of new permits issued, including those for the existing ones? Then you need to clarify "new" permit, meaning new, not existing, because that is a surprise. I have not heard that before.
2. What happens to the ADU if the permit is canceled?
3. Regarding the 176 permits, does that mean the existing units don't require a permit?

Miscellaneous: Several miscellaneous comments were made on various topics ranging from size, timeshares, HOA's, CC&R's, and comments such as "Why would anyone want to do that?" and "Full disclosure . . . that is an interesting phrase."

1. In the Red Rock News, Al Spector agreed to provide 4 affordable units behind Sinagua Plaza, and now the City Council voted 4 to 1 to let him purchase housing that was already affordable housing with 3 units, one 2-bedroom and two 1-bedrooms. There are families living there now; they are occupied. It was already affordable housing, and Councilor Colquitt said people are renting there month-to-month, so only one unit will be added. When the City Council does this, and only Councilor Hamilton voted against it, it speaks volumes to me about protecting timeshares.
2. I have a question on the HOAs and putting in bylaws to not allow ADUs; some need 80% to 90% approval and some of the older ones require 100%, and with 40% rentals, they won't get the vote to change the CC&Rs.
3. Regarding Al Spector's development that got automatic approval for 4 units, I owned that triplex and it was built as a 1-bedroom, so by dividing that into two units, it will be smaller than an ADU, but it slid right passed the City Council, because it was greased.
4. If you allow one person to have an exception, then because you have done it, will every person be able to have an exception? Do you promise not, you promise in blood?
5. Why would anyone want to do that?
6. Full disclosure . . . that is an interesting phrase.

Neighborhood Impact: Participants expressed concern with ADUs effect on the neighborhood. Three of the thirty six comments were regarding this topic.

1. I suggest this is trying to turn residential areas into commercial areas, and you could have even a little house with 2 or 3 families in it. I oppose this vehemently. We have nice residential areas now and want to keep them that way. This is a ridiculous idea.
2. We live in a modest older neighborhood and I don't know if ADUs would be allowed; the CC&Rs probably don't prohibit them, because they didn't think about them then. We have a mixture of homes, but they are vulnerable. There are many rentals in the neighborhood now, some are good and other properties have gone down. You want 176 spread out all over, and we can't go back and change our CC&Rs, because we can't even find some of the owners and it takes 100% agreement. Ours is an older neighborhood and it was residential when we bought there; we don't want this in our neighborhood; it is very vulnerable, and maybe if I were in a community where I could trust enforcement, but I'm not. We have an existing problem with a truck and catamaran that haven't moved in 5 years, and as long as there is air in the tires, I guess it is okay, because the City doesn't do anything about it. If you don't put in strict rules, it will impact older neighborhoods; these people don't care, and I don't want to live next door to these people.
3. Your earlier answer was a little disingenuous in saying that ADUs wouldn't impact neighborhoods. Currently, the average household in Sedona is 2.1 people, but with the definition of family as 4-unrelated adults, which can include their grandparents, parents, children and even domestic servants, when an ADU is on a lot, you increase the people there,

so that answer is disingenuous and not really truthful. There is nothing that limits the number of people that can reside on the lot. If you want to limit the number of people, it needs to be added. If there is no limit; it would be helpful to put that in. For an ADU, I believe you can have a limit. Currently, we are in single family areas and this will change it to multi-family, which is defined by the number of dwelling units. In RS-10a, RS-10b and RS-6 zones, they all would increase in density and some single-family areas could have density greater than medium density, multi-family. What you are doing is authorizing multi-family in single-family areas and we bought single-family housing

Ninety-Day Minimum: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Occupancy: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Parking: No comments were made regarding this topic, other than those reflected in Enforcement and Garage Conversions.

Restrictions (In General): No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU PUBLIC MEETING
JULY 8, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Public Meeting
July 8, 2009

Overall: Of the thirteen participants in the ADU public meeting, several expressed support of the ADU concept. A total of twenty three comments were made by participants at this public meeting.

Appearance: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Concept: Support was expressed for the concept of ADUs. Nine of the twenty three comments were regarding this topic.

1. One of the things, which Linda mentioned, is for the handicapped and elderly, and he would like to ask if Sedona is considering having some standards for visitability and accessibility in this area?
2. What size of ADUs are you looking at, are you looking at a single for one person or for families? So, it has to be smaller.
3. Is the maximum 33% of the main . . .?
4. I am not that familiar with City Code, but can people build an accessory dwelling that doesn't come under this category now? Could you further explain the difference between this and what people can do in the code now?
5. Are there any size limits currently on guesthouses?
6. So at this time, if this goes through, then if somebody wants to build a unit with a kitchen, it has to be an ADU? I'm trying to see the difference.
7. Clarify what you are telling us (about the 176 and 1/2).
8. I think it sounds good too, but I think the number is way too big, and I think it would work better if it went as a pilot project kind of thing. You are going to do 20 permits a year and after 5 years, you look and see how it worked out. I think the response from the community would be much better, because there is so much concern about the increase in density and how many living units, and now I hear about these 150. What do they count as; do they count as two separate dwellings or as one? I know they are not counted toward this cap, but when you are looking at the buildout for Sedona? That was my question, whether they were in there or not. Okay.
9. I just wanted to share that the school district does continue to support workforce housing and the ADUs. If you go around and ask current teachers, you may hear this is something I wouldn't use, I'm not interested, but as a governing board, we really look to the future for long-term planning, and the reality is, and I think you are seeing the same in the Fire Department and the Police force and the City, some of our finest people are going to be retiring in the near future, and the same with the school district. We are anticipating and planning for a large bubble of retirees. As our new exciting educators come into the community, it is even more of a burden to find housing for them. I was talking to Sodexho on a plane the other day. They were in our community, loved our community and wanted to continue. Sodexho is a food service company that was providing service to our three schools; they ultimately left, because they could not find affordable housing for their management team, and they had a tremendous turnover. They had zero issues with people wanting to live and work here and provide that service, but they sure did struggle in keeping somebody that could afford it. For me personally, on the legal ADUs, I've watched young employees live in detached garages in deplorable conditions, but for $600 per month, they were willing to do that, so if we can provide some housing options with standards that we should expect for all of our residents, it is a good thing.

Cost: Questions were raised and clarification requested on the issue of cost. Four of the twenty three comments were regarding this topic.

1. One of the things is to try to help people who can't afford housing and the only thing I see is that this part about the Development Impact Fees may be waived, if the property owner agrees to rent the unit to income-qualified tenants earning 80% or less of the median, so is that a big enough benefit? I don't know the cost of Development Impact Fees.
2. In terms of the growth cap of 176 units, and then how we define an ADU as 1/2 of a unit, have you looked at the impact fee as far as 1/2 an impact fee? And then also sewer connection, is it a completely separate sewer connection, or are they all tied into one sewer connection and what is the fee? I mean is there an adjustment there that we can look at?
   I was just wondering where in the process you are as far as looking at that, because what I've heard a lot too is that nobody is going to, especially for the units that exist, that is not an incentive to pay $16,000 to become legal, and then how we looked at the unit to begin with, it is not a full dwelling unit, and I know there was some discussion in how we got that number, but just if there was any thought process to take it that extra step and look at the impact fee and so forth.
3. I get the rationale of 88 versus 176, so I get how it answers that, but I'm not sure, is that if it was counted as 1/2, then the impact fees would be 1/2, so it doesn't address that.
4. I'm just curious, I mean you are talking about maybe up to 200 illegal units right now and you are hoping those guys will convert to ADUs, but then you are saying you can't possibly make 176 over, are we talking 176 additional new ones in addition to the 200 "illegals" we hope will convert? If I have an illegal and I want to convert it, do I need to get all of those permits? If I decide to convert, and I go ahead and get my thing, you are saying that I don't count as one of the 88, but I need to pay the fee anyway?

Enforcement: Participants expressed concern with enforcement of ADU compliance. Three of the twenty three comments were regarding this topic.

1. I was their only person yesterday, I was it. One of the things, I went through and I've done my homework, I read everything and I have a lot of notes, and enforcement has been one of the things that I've talked to people about in the last 24 hours, and they want to know how you are going to actually enforce it. I'll give you an example, Back O' Beyond - they have CC&Rs; I've seen them and if you don't have those, I can get copies of those for you. And, their situation is that they have certain requirements; they are only 3-pages long; it is not a big to do, but they have never had an association meeting, and they said, "We don't want to have to do this", and I said well you would have to, if your CC&Rs are stronger than what Sedona adopts, and she said, "Well, can't they come out and start the process for us?" This is our normal Sedona feeling; we don't want to pit neighbors against neighbors; we just don't. So the question is, how will it be enforced, and fines and penalties, what kind of fines and what kind of penalties, if someone is found in violation?
2. Yesterday, I was talking with everyone about the fact that we have been looking for property, how long now, 6 months; affordable housing to most realtors and to many people within the community is about $330,000 and below, and this morning I posted on my blog, we have 16 active listings under $329,000 and we have 10 in that price range in escrow. That doesn't include the manufactured homes, which there are about 16 I think, none in escrow, but the point is there is a lot of market activity there, but it is also there are multiple offers going in on some on these properties. The saddest part of all that we have run into are the investors that are, in many cases, getting the properties, so many of the people within our community who want and need the properties at this price level aren't able to get them, and there isn't a way that you can restrict that, so I mean, we have seen the illegal, how many kitchens have we seen; the one house with 3 kitchens. We've seen so many things and I promise I won't rat on anyone, but the point is there is a lot of it out there. In

my neighborhood alone, there are three people that I know are illegally renting their guesthouses out, and quite frankly, most of us want this to come into compliance of some sort, we just do. There is another question I've got from people, people ask, "Will there be separate taxing for this investment of income?" When I lived in Hawaii, we had a separate little unit. Hawaii has 3-tiered taxes, one is for under 30 days, that is like the hotels and that is the highest rate, I think 10 years ago we were paying almost 12% high, is it 16% now, oh, thank you, and it will be higher based on their budget right now, so many times these taxes are absorbed into the rates, nobody minded paying them. They have a Revenue Department there that hunts you down and shoots you if you don't pay. I don't know how ours will be.

3. If we have all of the illegal units right now, why are we not enforcing that and using that towards some of these ADUs that we're trying to produce? Why can't we enforce that and put some of that towards the new units that we are trying to do? I mean obviously these people are out there using their units illegally and why can't we enforce that, that might help this. (Are you talking about having them pay some fees?) Well yeah, they are doing this illegally and probably have been for years, and we are not doing anything or benefitting anything. Neighbors don't want to rat on neighbors; you know, what are you going to do. If you do this, it will bring the illegals out. If people are doing a legal ADU and they are going through all of this, it seems like if they look at the other guy and say that is illegal and I have done all of this, it seems like it is going to pull or spot the illegals better.

Garage Conversions: One participant requested clarification on garage conversion.

1. I was trying to figure out how to make this system work for me, you know try to find the loopholes, and let's say I have an existing garage that I want to convert, and I have a lot that is large enough to put another ADU on, can you have two ADUs on your property?
   Just one per property no matter what, okay. Thank you.

Grandfather Clause: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Inspections and Permitting: No comments were made regarding this topic specifically.

Miscellaneous: Four miscellaneous comments were made on various topics ranging from a request for further information to the sewer situation in Harmony Hills.

1. One of my questions had to do with that (WA's experience with too many restrictions), because I was Googling around the Web to find these places and what happened after they put in all of their ADUs, and I couldn't find any information on it, but I would really be interested in objective information; what was good, what was bad about the way it turned out, what kind of properties did these ADUs get put on, are people making money, do they change function after a while and that sort of thing. It sounds like you know about these communities; maybe you can help me with that.
2. This is sounding good; now, people have to be in a certain income bracket to have an ADU? The renter, doesn't have to be? I was wondering how we were going to connect the renters to the ADUs, but really that would be the homeowner doing it, okay, that answers it.
3. My question is all of the assumptions so far are sewer hook-up, what if there is no sewer? Generally, it sounds pretty good.
4. I am from the Harmony Hills area; we are one of the first ones to get sewer. Our sewer is failing. We had the guy out or the team out like maybe four times earlier this year, and they finally kind of settled after digging and doing all that. What is this going to do, are we capable of taking on more units in the area? The sewer backed up; it backed up into

everybody's houses, so then we knew it wasn't us, it was the City and they kept coming out and then they dug, but what are you going to do in these areas? I mean can we handle it?

Neighborhood Impact: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Ninety-Day Minimum: One comment suggested tying this ordinance and the 30-day requirement together.

1. I'm not sure that I'm clear on the 30-day or 31-day, is this going to substitute, take place of what we already have now, which is you can't rent for less than 31 days? What if you don't like your tenants after the 31st day or something? My comment on that is that I think it would be good to tie it together. The second thing is if these ADUs are going to, you know, you have your parents or your kids or something like that, but are you going to have any ground rules that say that we want you to rent it to people who can't afford other housing, is there going to be anything that is going to regulate that? So, it is up to what the homeowner wants to do? Good, thank you.

Occupancy: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Parking: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Restrictions (In General): One comment was made about "the restrictive nature" of the illegal units that are being used right now and incentives to bring these facilities to code.

1. A point of clarification, when you commented about illegal, you are talking about individual homeowners that are illegally renting them out right now? Okay, that is what I thought; I assumed that was the case, and you made me think; I was in one of the small focus groups and one of the comments from a couple of realtors surprised us, they were throwing out numbers of 100 to 200 possible "illegals", essentially in a cross section of neighborhoods in Sedona right now, and I just wanted to reiterate that comment, as we have been talking about this restrictive nature. Success will build on success, in that if we somehow can give incentive to the existing "illegals" to come forward and to be a part of it, so it becomes a known opportunity in the community. Then again, I think success might build on success, because one of our comments out of the focus group is that "Big Brother" is definitely watching it, it is restrictive and some of these costs that they are talking about, let alone for the individuals currently with ADUs; why, what is the incentive for them to come out?

SYNOPSIS OF
ADU PUBLIC MEETING
AUGUST 6, 2009

Synopsis of ADU Public Meeting
August 6, 2009

Overall: Of the sixteen participants in the ADU public meeting, several expressed support of the ADU concept. A total of twenty nine comments were made by participants at this public meeting.

Appearance: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Concept: There was both support and opposition expressed regarding the concept of ADUs. Thirteen of the twenty nine comments were regarding this topic.

1. I am very interested in this, because I think for my property it would be a great value. It would improve my value; it would increase my taxes, so that John gets a raise. The thing I'm thinking is for people like me; now I'm alone and the day may come that I may need help in my establishment; to have an individual place for such a person would be of great value. The other thing I'm thinking is I wish I had a wonderful idea about how on Earth I could do this on my property; unless I can go two-story for the new, where I've only got one-story in the old. Don't worry about it. I have 1/3 of an acre and lots of driveway; I could park 20 cars at my house. (Regarding 20 not allowed for the ADU), for when I have a party. The other important thing to me is here is a rental unit and it is for a low-income person. I've got some living on my street that I have just gone up and down the street to see what I can do about trash, where they have just left trash at the curb. The owner is on the property in this instance, so the owner is watching every day; if the trash isn't picked up, then of course . . . and what is more, you are not going to bring an old clunker in here and park it; not and live at my house you're not, so I think there is a lot of control. (Regarding not for low-income), so we are going to transition from when we were considering the land on Jordan north of Navahopi; that was going to be mainly aimed at low-income people, I believe, or am I mistaken? I'm mistaken.
2. We have experienced this situation in Honolulu where we used to live, before our insanity attack and move to the mainland. Anyhow, we lived in an older house in a nice neighborhood. The situation arose, because Honolulu is perpetually short of housing, and so they addressed it with what they called the Ohana Zoning; Ohana is the word for family. They did not restrict the use of that to families however; they would allow strangers. We rented out to some nice people who were strangers to us until that time; it worked out very well. We did not have the structure that this program seems to have; I can't tell you what we had, because we didn't have anything, we just lived and it was great. It worked out very well.
3. I'm a Certified Aging in Place Specialist and a couple of things I would like to see here, involved with the ordinance, are visitability and accessibility, because we are talking about multi-generational. As the lady who first spoke mentioned, having someone to look after yourself or when the kids come to stay with you, because also the economic climate as well is creating more multi-generational living, and this would keep Mom out of the rest home, etc., and visitability and accessibility, concerning not so much universal design per se, but some accessibility in having an access for people who are getting older, etc.
4. I know several single people, women actually, who are renting guesthouses, and they really don't have a lot open to them other than that kind of situation, when they want to live by themselves. I also know several people who rent guesthouses out and couldn't keep their homes, if they didn't have that income coming in. It is huge, and it is the difference to me, in this kind of economy, that we all need to support each other and stick together and work with each other, because this is huge, a huge deal to both sides of this, as far as I can see, and it doesn't add to over-population. It is actually a beautiful arrangement to have people living

harmoniously, and I know quite a few situations, and they are all working for everybody, so I think it is fabulous. We have it here, so why not use it and support each other.

5. The thing that strikes me about this plan, whenever we think about change, people react either negatively or positively, but it brings out a reaction, and when I think about something that has been proposed here, I think of reasonable, because it isn't pie-in-the-sky, but it brings a small incremental benefit to citizens, whether it be somebody who needs a little extra income renting out their house, which may prevent them from foreclosing, maybe not. It brings incremental change to somebody who might want to live where they work, and it brings some incremental business here to our community, because the reality is if people live here, they are much more likely to spend money here to go to Ace Hardware, to go to Basha's, to get gas at the Circle K or wherever. Whether economic times are good or bad, it is the small incremental things we can do to benefit our community that can help, and to me that is what this seems like. We are here probably like everybody else, because it is such a beautiful place, and here we are using existing houses to help house people. It is like that seems to make sense to me; it just seems like a sensible thing to do, and it helps people who may not be able to live here, who may not be making gobs of money and live on a hill in a nice house. With the exception of the lack of affordability, which obviously the City is looking into; $16,000, if that is not changed, you might as well scrap it, because who is going to pay $16,000 to get $500 or $600 a month in rent. I think it is a very good idea and I would support it.
6. Looking at your map over here and looking at the population of our City of Sedona, we have probably between 11,000 and 12,000 residents, and how many houses does that represent? I'm not sure, but let's say it is 8,000 houses. Okay, say 7,000, now you look at all of the red areas that say, hey, no go in this area, and you look at the blues where there are still a lot of questions about whether there is; I don't know is Crimson View on that. Actually it isn't prohibited; it is just that they don't have the space for it. It doesn't work that way; there is no way we could do it. There are a lot of places, which again simply couldn't accommodate this, so if we take that 6,000 and whittle it down to 2,000 that could accommodate this thing, and then we say alright how many of those would actually want to do something like that and be willing to spend the money for it, maybe we would end up with 600 or 700 possible. What have you got, what is the number? (Regarding it is way lower than that), that is what I was afraid of. I thought I was topping off, being very generous. The point is that we are not going to be deluged with this situation, but we are going to offer a very comfortable situation for some people who would very much welcome the opportunity to live here on a modest scale, be of assistance, and when you are ready for someone in your backyard. I think this is just a very, very positive step to go in this direction. I think that point that it is going to be 100 to 200 or 250 is extremely important; we are not going to be deluged with these, but it could be a huge help to those who need them. I'm talking about the owners that need the house next door, the little one.
7. I'm trying to see that map and it looks like my neighborhood, which is Sedona West, is red; am I correct? I regret to see that. Can anything be done to talk to the community people about . . .? I'm thinking about the people across the street from us, and they have an ideal ADU, just ideal. It would be perfect for this, and it would help the family; it would work in every direction, but we would have to alter the CC&Rs.
8. It is up to you to change those CC&Rs.
9. Thanks a lot, I needed that.
10. The question is, I've been hearing mostly about . . ., by the way I think it is a great idea, but I am not sure who is actually the target population that you folks think will live in these. I can see it as a tremendous help to people who may need a little extra help or for folks that want to keep their homes or for a single person, who like me may be coming in and looking for a smaller place, but younger people or people with children, I kind of doubt it. What are you

thinking about that, what is your target population? In the past, there were a lot of meetings about developers constructing low-income housing and I went to a few of those, and finally, all it was, was talk, talk, talk and nothing ever seemed to get done, so I quit going. Now, are there any developers that are going to be building or that are building any low-income housing? We, Arizona, are bankrupt.

11. I have a friend who is renting a guesthouse and she is a single woman, and I would say that she adds greatly. She loves the neighborhood she is in and has made friends with everybody, and from what I see, what happens is it increases the happiness in a neighborhood. You have more people, you have more interaction, and I don't think we are meant to be just isolated people in these homes, but it is really a community and that is what it feels like in her neighborhood, and it is fantastic. People interact and it is wonderful, so I've seen it be the absolute opposite in the fact that people are more connected, and maybe it is just her neighborhood, but it works well.
12. I live here in Sedona, and how is it working with the guesthouses that are on the books right now? Are those fees just as high, and are they causing some of the problems that people are concerned about or is everybody just underground? In my neighborhood, I can certainly put a guesthouse on my property, and that wouldn't take any zoning, so we are really just talking about the kitchen facilities and the landlord-tenant thing. As far as a building being there, the whole neighborhood is allowed to put a guest unit on their land.
13. I just wanted to say that from a humanitarian perspective, you don't have to convince me on ADUs, I'm already convinced about that in terms of the goodwill that it has in terms of community impact, but in terms of the business perspective, I think it makes perfect sense. If you look at the classified ads for example, just glance over them, how many jobs, and follow them. How many jobs do you see that pay $10 an hour, $8 an hour, at some of our more wonderful spas and salons, and what have you, and I'm sure that there are a lot of people that hunger for this work, but imagine getting paid that salary, and that is before taxes. How are you going to live here? How are you going to sustain your family? Number two and this is a good concern, but from the presence and participation that I see here, I think we can do it, and that is the issue of enforcement. How are we going to help in our neighborhoods and our communities, to make sure that people are complying with ordinances? With the participation that I see here, and the feedback that I feel we are getting, I think we have to . . ., if we don't want government to be involved and knocking on our doors and stuff, it is up to us to take that accountability and make sure that people are living in appropriate housing. That is all I have to say. I think this is a great idea; I think that the team has done a wonderful job and I think it is a very exciting time to be in Sedona.

Cost: Two specific comments were made regarding cost. One of the comments was specifically about an out-of-state county and the other comment addressed the potential of the City of Sedona waiving the sewer hook-up fee for the ADU. (Note: Cost was also mentioned in #5 under Concept.)

1. (Regarding King County loaning up to $14,500 toward construction costs for renting to somebody at 50% of AMI), eighty percent is high.
2. I don't know if you can say anything more about the fees, but just as a scenario, would we assume that if someone has an existing unit, like a guesthouse, where they just needed to put in a kitchen range or something like that, and the sewer hook-up was already done, that the City would waive the sewer fees, since there is no new sewer hook-up, and then the big stumbling block would be the impact fee and the idea of whether the City can make any adjustments with that?

Enforcement: One comment was made regarding enforcement and neighbor complaints, and then the participant noted "That is scarcely overwhelming."

1. It seems to me that if you are going to be dealing with enforcement, you also have to have a source of information, and I can't see the City running around knocking on all the doors to see who is living there or what is behind it or inside of it, so obviously, you are going to have to respond to neighbor complaints. Now how many neighbor complaints on this kind of issue have you had over the last two years, and what has become of them? That (number) is scarcely overwhelming.

Garage Conversions: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Grandfather Clause: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Inspections and Permitting: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Miscellaneous: Several miscellaneous comments were made on various topics, including a needs assessment, changing CC&Rs, and Linda Martinez's opinion on street lights.

1. I have a basic question. I would like to know if there has been a comprehensive and competent needs assessment survey, with regard to this type of development; a survey in this community. Has the community been asked or has our government just decided that we need this and it is going to give it to us? You said this is not affordable housing. What I'm asking is, does the electorate, not the employers; of course, the employers want cheap housing for their people they don't pay much money to, but does the electorate want this in this community? Has anybody asked? I don't hear it.
2. I don't think we vote on it.
3. For your information, what Linda was talking about; there is an act by the legislature and they keep it up to date every couple of years; it is called the Landlord and Tenants Act, and you can get it off of the Internet, print it all out and read every word, and you probably should if you are ever going to rent any property. The other thing is I didn't realize you had as much on Mercer Island. My cousin lives there and has for 40 years. He is an architect in Seattle, so I thought he would be a good one to ask about how well this is working, so I'll call him up tonight and find out what he thinks.
4. I want to speak, but I just got here. I can be the last one to speak; I can hold off. I thought I would have a little fun tonight. This is the second ADU meeting I've been to and I get very passionate, and I get loud and I get whatever. I jotted a few things down, and this is the last meeting I'm going to attend on this subject, because I consider it a bunch of liberal if not what some people would call socialist gibberish. The topic is ADUs; it is not a non sequitur, okay. At any rate, some of you people probably were at the City Council meeting about the lights last fall; the one that was quite vociferous and well attended, and anyone here that . . ., are the people here that were at that meeting? Well there is one; anyone else that I jog their memory I would appreciate it if they would confirm what I have to say. What I haven't said was, one of the members that is one of the proponents of ADUs was, there is no sidewalks in Sedona; we need lights and we need sidewalks, and evidently that person doesn't own a flashlight, because I just measured sidewalks all the way from Brewer Road roundabout all the way to Dry Creek and back; it is exactly 6 miles of unbroken sidewalks . . .
5. Not in residential neighborhoods.
4. (Continued) . . . I'm not talking about in residential neighborhoods. The end of the comment is the person who made that statement is none other than Linda Martinez, she has no credibility with me and she shouldn't have any credibility with anyone else. It is about credibility; you have no credibility and I'm finished. You have no veracity and no credibility.

6. Be respectful . . .
7. He doesn't want to hear the responses to that.
4. (Continued) . . . No, I don't want to hear any more of this liberal gibberish.
8. The gentleman was talking about credibility; I sometimes have a little trouble with the idea of Council and the way it makes decisions and the way it fights about stuff, and the way it has trouble sticking to whatever it is doing. What chance do you think this actually has or something modified; let's say to try to get a little more income, get down from 80%, get down a little bit or anything getting through Council and sticking?

Neighborhood Impact: Participants expressed concern with the affect of ADUs on the neighborhood. Two of the twenty nine comments were regarding this topic.

1. I'm afraid that 50% would lead to run-down neighborhoods.
2. I am concerned as you may have guessed, with regard to government, I'm skeptical. I'd rather do it myself. I'm concerned that this interpretation of single-family zoning to mean multiple-family zoning looks like a constructive condemnation to me. It changes the value of the property. Now if my neighbors decide to have 4 or more unrelated individuals living in another unit next to me and I decide that I want a single-family use, the value of my property is going to be reduced, in my opinion, and I do have an opinion. I was an appraiser, and as an appraiser, I certainly would look at that and I would think that property values in an area where single-family zoning didn't mean that, the values would be different. Multiple-family zoning might increase values under certain circumstances, but not these, and if you are thinking about not having parking on the street, I think you are dreaming. There will be parking on the street; there will be lots of cars involved with this, and if we are going to have parking on the street, that also diminishes value. I don't know how far the City has gone with considering what would happen, if the City passes an ordinance like this, and it actually reduces property values. The people whose values are reduced are likely to come after the City for the difference in value, and they can do that, this is still America; at least it was this morning. (Regarding the flip side of property rights), yes, land use, property rights and all that kind of stuff is a big deal in Arizona, but zoning is zoning. If you buy in a single-family zone, you have every right to expect that it will be a single-family use for everyone, and redefining single to mean multiple is kind of a stretch, isn't it?
   (Regarding not being an issue in other locations), but I'm concerned about here, not there.

Ninety-Day Minimum: No comments were made or expressed regarding this topic specifically.

Occupancy: One participant expressed concern with the number of people permitted to live in ADUs.

1. From a couple of things you said, and I apologize for ignorance about things other folks might know; I was out-of-town for five weeks and then over my head with other stuff; does the owner/landlord have to live on the property? That is an important point I think, because otherwise you have out-of-state landlords and you have rental properties; basically, two rental properties there, so that is an interesting point. Okay, the landlord has to be a resident 6 months of the year; okay. And then, what does it mean when the definition of family and not exceeding the number of people, I mean that I would need a quick read and I was picking up on something you said, so I don't understand what that means. This kind of rubs both ways for me, because I am really, really concerned about the lack of housing for low-income folks who work in this town and do the service work, and so forth, but I also know, because I have a family living next door to me in a townhouse, that they've got too many kids for the size of the townhouse, and then no land no play space, living in that space and that is an issue. They are hardworking folks, they are doing the best they can, but they have two small children and

an almost adult, 18-year-old teen, and two adults living in two bedrooms and one combined living room-eating area, and if you can have an unlimited number of related adults, is there any way to . . . No, but basically you've got two bedrooms for three adults and two children. It is about 1,000 sq. ft. It is pretty tight when you're sharing bedrooms.

Parking: One participant expressed lack of concern of traffic increase with the implementation of ADUs. (Note: Parking was also mentioned in #2 under Neighborhood Impact.)

1. Let's go back to the possibility of having maybe 75 or 100 maximum such units in the community; that is 100 cars, and if you scatter that over Sedona, you won't even know where they are. I don't see this as a traffic problem at all.

Restrictions (In General): One comment was made regarding the "20-year timeframe" for renting to low income people, citing it as "ridiculous."

1. I see on page 5, letter M, "If a separate external entrance for the ADU is necessary"; I think it should be mandatory to have ingress and egress, and the Ohana Zoning that they had over there was not so restrictive, but it seemed to work out fine and there had to be off-street parking. It was inspected once before you were able to rent it, just to make sure it was habitable, that it had a toilet and cooking facilities and that was it. This is so regulated; I don't see how anybody in their right mind would even agree to this. Page 9, letter B, says that if it is rented to low-income people, it has to have a 20-year timeframe; that is ridiculous. What if he sells his house in 5 years?

OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED REGARDING ADU PROPOSED ORDINANCE

Position Statement – Accessory Dwelling Units

By Mike Ward, Candidate for Sedona City Council

To view the proposed ADU Ordinance, reference:
http://www.sedonaaz.gov/documents/view.aspx?PK=12435

In response to the direction given by a previous City Council, the city Community Development Department (CDD) researched solutions to providing affordable housing in Sedona. In the fall of 2008, the CDD proposed an ordinance permitting higher densities in prescribed areas along SR 89A in West Sedona. Embedded, but not part of the high density ordinance, was a reference to a second draft ordinance allowing Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) in areas that are zoned Residential-single family. At meetings with Sedona residents, most attendees objected to both higher densities and ADUs for a variety of reasons. Aware of citizen concerns, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend that the City Council not adopt the high density ordinance.

CDD extensively drafted a new ADU ordinance taking into consideration the ADU issues identified by the residents last summer. The proposed ADU ordinance is now before the residents of the city and will be initially presented as a information item to the Planning and Zoning Commission July 2nd and is likely to go before the Council in the fall.

The Proposed ADU Ordinance

An Accessory Dwelling Unit is a second smaller housing unit located on the same property as the primary single-family dwelling unit. An ADU can be located within, attached to, or detached from the primary single-family dwelling unit. Mobile homes, travel trailers and recreational vehicles cannot be used as ADUs. An ADU must provide a complete, independent residential living space and shall include provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation. In the ordinance, an ADU is defined as a "one-half dwelling unit."

Among the purposes for passing an ADU ordinance are "to provide additional affordable options for long-term rental housing; a broader range of more affordable housing; and a means for residents, particularly seniors, single parents, and families with grown children, to remain in their homes and

neighborhoods by obtaining extra income, security, companionship and services."

In observance of the Community Plan housing density limits, the number of new ADUs is capped at 176 units. After a period of five years, the ADU ordinance would be reviewed by the city and either extended by raising the cap or allowed to expire.

Among the stipulated conditions for having an ADU are: "the property owner must occupy either the primary dwelling unit or the ADU as his/her principal residence for at least 6 months each year; both the primary dwelling unit and the ADU unit cannot be simultaneously rented; ADUs are intended for long-term rental for a period of not less than 90 consecutive days; and the total number of people residing on the property, including the primary residential structure and the ADU, cannot exceed the definition of 'family' as described in Article 2 (Definitions) of the Land Development Code."

To construct an ADU, the property owner must pay $16,000 in fees ($9,000 impact fee, $5,500 Sewer Connection fee, and $1,500 building permit fees). An ADU cannot be less than 400 sq. ft. or larger than 800 sq. ft where the primary dwelling unit is more than 1,500 sq. ft. Where the primary dwelling unit is less than 1,500 sq. ft., the ADU can be no less than 350 sq. ft or more than 500 sq. ft. An ADU must conform to all applicable zoning and building codes and not encroach upon setback requirements. There must be two off-street parking spaces for the primary dwelling unit and at least one but no more than two parking spaces for the ADU. Parking on a residential property is prohibited on the property set back in only the front. Parking is also prohibited on a street side yard of a corner lot. The ADU ordinance further restricts parking on interior side yards and back yards by requiring screening from view. All parking must share a driveway with one "curb cut."

The ordinance also provides for the legalization of the estimated 200 existing illegal ADUs in Sedona providing the owner makes application to the city within 6 months of the ordinance taking affect. The owner must also pay the city fees amounting to pay $16,000 in fees ($9,000 impact fee, $5,500 Sewer Connection fee, and $1,500 building permit fees). The preexisting ADUs must be brought into compliance with all of the provisions of the ordinance. These units would be counted separately from in addition to the limit of the 176 permits to be issued for new ADUs.

Issues:

ADU Definition

The only difference in definition between a guest house and an ADU is that an ADU has a "cooking" area. With the availability of microwaves, cook tops, dorm sized refrigerators, and various counter top appliances like roasters that can be easily moved, how can anyone reasonably make a distinction between a guest house and an ADU?

Housing Density in the Community Plan

The Community Plan caps Sedona's population by limiting housing growth to a total number of housing units. Because there is no land surrounding Sedona that can be annexed, the number of housing units is controlled by the number of units permitted on existing properties zoned as either single family and multiple family. That total number of housing units is approximately 8,500. There are currently approximately 6,500 housing units built within the city.

It has been generally understood that the ordinance places a cap of 176 new ADU permits over the next 5 years. The CDD maintains that the addition of 176 new dwellings is within the limits established by the Community Plan. There is some question about this and it is unclear how many illegal ADUs were considered when the Community Plan was written.

It was only recently disclosed at an ADU ordinance forum that the intent of the ordinance was for 176 new units in ADDITION to the estimated 200 existing illegal units whose owners may apply for an amnesty. The published wording of the proposed ADU ordinance never made this intent clear.

Residential Single-family and Multi-family Zoning

Sedona's Land Development Code expressly limits an area zoned as residential single-family to one dwelling on the property that houses a family. Areas zoned for multi-family residences are defined as properties having a single building of more than two dwellings or a property on which two or more dwellings are situated.

The proposed ADU ordinance would effectively redefine single-family zoned areas as properties having a single building of no more than two dwelling units or a property on which not more than two dwelling units are situated.

Article 2 (Definitions) of the Sedona Land Development Code broadly defines a family as no more than four unrelated adults with or without minor children domiciled within a single dwelling unit. In addition it permits live-in domestic help and care givers. The proposed ordinance does not change the restriction on the people who may legally reside on one property with an ADU.

Recent census data show that on average, 2.1 people live in a single family unit in Sedona. The primary issue regarding single family zoned neighborhoods is the possible change to the character of the neighborhood when the number of people residing on one single family residential property increases to three or more people.

Garage Conversions

The proposed ordinance allows the conversion of garage space into an ADU. This raises the question of not only where the automobiles that were parked in the remodeled garage will be parked, but where all the "stuff" that is stored in garages ends up being stashed.

Sedona's building codes require that any single building housing a second dwelling, a garage conversion for example, must have a separate heating and air conditioning unit for the second unit. All other utilities, gas, water, electric and sewer, may be either consolidated or split.

Parking

The ADU ordinance prohibits parking on the roadway and, presumably, the city police would be responsible for enforcement of the parking restriction. The ADU ordinance requires that there be at least three and not more than four parking spaces located on the property having an ADU. These parking spaces must share one driveway "curb cut."

Affordable Housing

Although "affordable housing" is not the only reason for ADUs, it is perceived by many as the primary focus of the ADU. Home owners who want to create a legal ADU would need to pay the city $16,000 in fees in addition to the construction costs. To be in building code compliance, an ADU constructed as a garage conversion within a single family home also need separate air cooling and heating system installed. These and other associated costs

involved in building an ADU could take a home owner many years to break even at an unaffordable rent. The current ordinance does not place any rent restriction guidelines on ADUs to keep them "affordable."

Converting Illegal ADUs to Legal Ones

Because of the $16,000 in fees and additional expenses to conform the unit to the ordinance, there is little incentive for home owners who have illegal ADUs to make them legal. The costs may even encourage those contemplating building an ADU to do so illegally. Code enforcement of complaints alleging an illegal ADU are very difficult to substantiate because federal laws prohibit city code enforcement personnel from entering a property uninvited. This is part of the reason why illegal ADUs have proliferated in Sedona.

Search warrants for enforcement investigations are impossible to obtain for lowly misdemeanor investigations and fines are rarely levied. If an illegal ADU is found, the worst penalty is the costs for removing the kitchen.

Property Rights

Legally, a person has the right to use their residential property in whatever way they want, within limits. The individual property owner's right is balanced by city zoning and land use ordinances to protect the rights of adjacent property holders, and the city as a whole. The ordinance as proposed requires properties with ADUs to conform to all zoning and land use ordinances, including setback, building height, parking and lighting; the exception is allowing side yard parking. Many property owners are concerned with increased housing densities in single family neighborhoods as well as their rights to live in an area that has been zoned for single-family residences.

Concentrating ADUs in neighborhoods without Residential Covenants

Neither the city nor either county has any reliable way of determining how many subdivisions have active Home Owner Association Residential

Covenants. Most of the areas developed more than 20 years ago probably no longer have active Residential Covenants while those subdivisions less than 20 years old do. The Community Development staff is attempting to determine and map which neighborhoods would allow or restrict ADUs in their Residential Covenants. Although no one knows exactly, a fair guess would be that about a third of the Sedona neighborhoods are covered by Residential Covenants restricting ADUs. The greater the number of neighborhoods that prohibit ADUs, the greater is the potential concentration of ADUs in those neighborhoods that do not prohibit them.

Home Values

All homeowners are concerned with the value of their properties. Although it has been stated by Housing Commission members that there is no evidence of the average home value decreasing in cities that allow ADUs, the evidence is anecdotal. The unanswered question is the home value impact on individual properties immediately adjacent to those properties where there are ADUs.

Housing Density

The ADU ordinance's stated intent is to not increase the total number of housing units or housing density in Sedona. As stated in the language of the ordinance, the Sedona Community Plan "....limits residential growth to the total number of housing units that can be accommodated once this private land is built out at the densities established upon the City's incorporation...." The Community Development staff has indicated that some number of illegal ADUs were anticipated and included in the community plan's density calculations. As previously state, this is an open question.

One of the stated benefits of the ADU ordinance is to allow fixed income property owners to remain in their homes and neighborhoods by obtaining extra income. Some numbers of these people live in older single family zoned neighborhoods that have small lot sizes. Introducing ADUs into those neighborhoods would have a greater impact on increased housing density, traffic, parking and congestion. Although, on average, city housing densities would remain unchanged, the proposed ADU ordinance may create unacceptably higher local densities in more modest neighborhoods.

Code Enforcement

The proposed ADU ordinance rightly provides for many Land Development Code restrictions. It requires permitting, implements an annual $100 filing fee and annual building inspections for monitoring compliance of these many restrictions. There is, however, no provision for adding code enforcement staff and the city does not have the funds to do this in any case. Sedona's failure to diligently and proactively enforce the Land Development Codes provided the opening for Foothills Property Management, who objected to the sudden enforcement of the 30 day minimum stay codes, to litigate the ordinance. They sought legal relief because the city was not consistent in their enforcement. Defending the suit cost the city legal fees. The case was dismissed on a technicality but there was no judgment on the merits of the case.

My Position:

I have many reservations regarding the proposed ADU ordinance. They have been illustrated in the issues identified above. These same reservations have been voiced by the overwhelming majority of Sedona residents who have attended the various forums on the proposed ordinance. My primary objections to the proposed ADU ordinance are that it does not create affordable housing it is not enforceable, and it may even encourage more illegal ADUs.

To make the ADU housing affordable and discourage illegal ADUs, at a minimum impact fees and perhaps sewer hookup fees would need to be waived. To make the code enforceable, additional city code enforcement employees and an additional person to manage the permitting and inspection compliance paper work would need to be hired. Both the waiving of fee income and additional personnel costs would essentially be public subsidies for ADUs to be paid from an already over extended three cent sales tax revenue source. I do not believe that there is wide spread support for the city to subsidize housing of any kind in Sedona.

I do not believe that enacting this ordinance provides sufficient benefits to the city of Sedona to justify the many issues and problems that allowing ADUs would create for the city and its residents.

Sources of information:

John O'Brien, Audree Juhlin, Jessica Williamson, Community Development Department, Sedona, AZ

The Sedona Land Development Code

The Sedona Community Plan

The Proposed Accessory Dwelling Ordinance:

http://www.sedonaaz.gov/documents/view.aspx?PK=12435

From: Linda Martinez <lmartinez@shradermartinez.com>
To: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>, John O'Brien <JObrien@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 10/27/2009 2:54 PM
Subject: FW: Accessory Dwelling Units

Andrew asked me to send this to you, City Manager, Mayor and Council.
Thanks.

Linda Martinez
Shrader & Martinez Construction, Inc.
W: 928 282-7554, ext 201; C: 928 239-0074

From: Andrew Brearley [mailto:andrew@cbsedona.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2009 1:50 PM
To: Linda Martinez
Subject: Accessory Dwelling Units

Re: The Rental of Accessory Dwelling Units.

I am writing to express my support for allowing these units to be rented separately from the primary residence that they belong to.
In my opinion, this policy change would only affect about 5%-7% of all properties in Sedona, as guest houses are not a common feature of local homes. Furthermore, many guest homes belong to high-end properties and I don't believe those homeowners would be looking for an additional income stream from such a source.Hence,the impact would be minimal.
Regarding the effect that such a change may have on property values,I also believe that would be negligible for the neighbors. I have never seen an appraisal that adjusted a propertie's value downwards because it was adjacent to a rental. You may wish to confirm this opinion with an appraiser .(However, I do believe that this proposed change would increase the value of any property that had a guest home because of the potential,additional cash-flow.)

Andrew P. Brearley.
President.

Coldwell Banker First Affiliate,
6486,State Route 179,Suite 102,
Sedona.Az 86351

Tel:(928) 340 6005 Direct. Fax:(928) 284 6804.
email:andrew@cbsedona.com. Website: www.cbsedona.com<http://www.cbsedona.com>.

I am using the Free version of SPAMfighter<http://www.spamfighter.com/len>.
We are a community of 6 million users fighting spam.
SPAMfighter has removed 63350 of my spam emails to date.
The Professional version does not have this message.

Chip Putman
240 Ross Road
Sedona, AZ 6336

March 31, 2007

Dear Sedona City Council,

I wanted to let you know how pleased I am that the council is considering permitting Accessory Dwelling Units in Sedona. I think that ADUs will be a very simple, inexpensive and effective way to provide quality affordable housing for Sedona residents. I recently spoke to a church group at St. Andrew's Episcopal Church about our ethical responsibility to encourage affordable housing here in Sedona. The response was (almost) all favorable concerning ADUs. What surprised me was that most of the comments were pragmatic and self serving.

"When I get older, I would love to have someone living on my property and keeping an eye on me."

"A monthly rental check would be a huge help."

"I'd love to have my mom living here with her grandchildren."

"Then maybe I could afford to live here"

Where I live in the Northview Subdivision, there are plenty of living units being rented out now without proper permitting. It's just a reflection of the tough times we live in. I've never heard any of the neighbors complain, (especially the older ones who lived during the Great Depression). I am certain that these homeowners would rather be in compliance with the city. This would also increase their property values. I believe that I too, would build a guest house on my own property and rent to a young family.

I hope that you will pass this rule change which will help so many people in so many ways.

Sincerely,

Chip Putman

Cc Interim City Manager
John O'Brien
Audree Juhlin
Housing Commission

VVSAC

Verde Valley
Seniors in Action Coalition
PO Box 305
Sedona AZ 86339-0305

P: 928.282.1122
F: 928.282.5074

www.vvsac.org
Email: vvsac111@gmail.com

BOARD MEMBERS:
Christine Bryson-Lazo CSA,
President & Chair

Harvey Grady

JoAnne Haines

Marlene Latham

April 17, 2009

2009 APR 22 AM 11: 28

Sedona City Council
102 Roadrunner Drive
Sedona AZ 86336

Re: Accessory Dwelling Units

Dear Mayor Adams and City Council,

The Verde Valley Seniors in Action Coalition is requesting the City Council to approve the revised ADU ordinance as proposed by the Sedona Housing Commission.

The lack of senior housing in Sedona has been an issue that keeps coming up at the Coalition and Seniors in Action Business Alliance meetings. A number of seniors we have encountered in focus groups and meetings know they will need to downsize and have voiced concern wondering where they can relocate to within the greater Sedona area. Currently, the only senior housing option is Sedona Winds. This issue will continue to escalate as our populace ages.

We must support our seniors to be able to "*Age in Community*" and one way to provide an answer to this dilemma is through Accessory Dwelling Units.

Thank you for your consideration.

Most sincerely,

Christine Bryson-Lazo

Christine Bryson-Lazo CSA
President
Certified Senior Advisor

CC: Interim City Manager
John O'Brien
Audree Juhlin
Housing Commission members

Verde Valley Seniors in Action Coalition is a non-profit 501(c)(3) tax exempt organization..

From: "Eddie Maddock" <[redacted]>
To: "Jessica Williamson" <JWilliamson@SedonaAZ.gov>
Date: 4/24/2009 8:06 PM
Subject: Re: City seeks focus group participants

CC: <RAdams@ci.sedona.az.us>, <JBradshaw@SedonaAZ.gov>, "Pud Colquitt" <PCol...

Hi Jessica:

This request absolute amazes me. After the recent slap in the face by members of the Sedona City Council to discourage public participation, why in the world would any Sedona registered voter even consider wasting time to participate in a "focus" group or any other such contrived public bogus participation? Shameful (my opinion).

Thanks anyway.

Eddie
-------Original Message-------

From: Jessica Williamson
Date: 4/24/2009 3:59:16 PM
To: Jessica Williamson
Subject: City seeks focus group participants

CITY SEEKS FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS
FOR DRAFT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

The City of Sedona Community Development staff, working with the Housing and Planning & Zoning Commissions, is drafting an ordinance that proposes to allow the long-term rental of accessory dwelling units such as guest houses and mother-in-law flats. As part of the public outreach process, in addition to community meetings and informal discussion forums, the City is planning to hold a series of small focus groups to get feedback and suggestions on the proposed ordinance from people who live and/or work in our community.

The focus groups should represent insofar as possible a broad and inclusive cross section of Sedona's residents and workforce so that a wide variety of perspectives are heard. The focus groups are intended to be small so that participants have a chance to speak and have their questions answered. The format will provide a relaxed forum for questions, comments and suggestions. The objective of the focus groups is to review and provide comments and suggestions regarding the draft ordinance.

The City expects to hold the focus groups from mid-June through mid-July 2009. The exact dates have not yet been set.

Space is limited, and registration is required. Depending on the number of people who want to attend a focus group, registration may not guarantee a place on a focus group. The City will also hold informal discussion forums and open community meetings to provide a variety of options for public review and comment, so everyone who wants to comment on the proposed ADU ordinance will have many other opportunities to do so. Written comments are always welcome and will be considered in the review process.

THE DEADLINE TO REGISTER FOR A FOCUS GROUP IS FRIDAY, MAY 15, 2009. THE

REGISTRATION FORM IS ATTACHED.

The draft accessory dwelling unit ordinance is expected to be posted on the Housing Commission's website at www.SedonaAz.gov/housing by June 1, 2009. Select "Housing Strategies"; the ordinance will be under "Accessory Dwelling Units".

For more information or to register, call Jessica Williamson, Associate Planner, at 928-203-5045 or e-mail her at Jwilliamson@SedonaAz.gov. If you e-mail, please include your name, address, and phone number. Also indicate whether you could attend a focus group on a weekday between 9 am- 12:00 pm, 12:00 pm- 5:00 pm, or after 5:00 pm.
Jessica Williamson
Associate Planner
City of Sedona
928-203-5045

From: Jessica Williamson
To: [redacted]".GWIA.Sedona
Date: 4/27/2009 8:03 AM
Subject: RE: City seeks focus group participants

CC: Juhlin, Audree

HI, Eileen

There are a number of ways you can voice your concerns about the proposed draft accessory dwelling unit ordinance. The focus groups are one way to express your concerns. The City is also planning to hold community meetings and informal discussion forums, all of which you are welcome to attend. If you prefer, you may always send us written comments and they will be considered as part of the review process. You may e-mail your comments to Audree Juhlin at AJuhlin@SedonaAz.gov or mail your written comments to her at City of Sedona, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Jessica Williamson
Associate Planner
City of Sedona
928-203-5045

>>> Eileen Igoe <[redacted]> 4/25/2009 6:03 AM >>>
I'm totally confused. I thought that idea was already shot down. It's a terrible idea and I would like to voice my concerns to the proper people.
Who are they?

Thanks,
Eileen Igoe
(928) 300-9947

Date: Fri, 24 Apr 2009 15:39:14 -0700
From: JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov
To: JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov
Subject: City seeks focus group participants

CITY SEEKS FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS
FOR DRAFT ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

The City of Sedona Community Development staff, working with the Housing and Planning & Zoning Commissions, is drafting an ordinance that proposes to allow the long-term rental of accessory dwelling units such as guest houses and mother-in-law flats. As part of the public outreach process, in addition to community meetings and informal discussion forums, the City is planning to hold a series of small focus groups to get feedback and suggestions on the proposed ordinance from people who live and/or work in our community.

The focus groups should represent insofar as possible a broad and inclusive cross section of Sedona's residents and workforce so that a wide variety of perspectives are heard. The focus groups are intended to be small so that participants have a chance to speak and have their questions answered. The format will provide a relaxed forum for questions, comments and suggestions. The objective of the focus groups is to review and provide comments and suggestions regarding the draft ordinance.

The City expects to hold the focus groups from mid-June through mid-July 2009. The exact dates have not yet been set.

Space is limited, and registration is required. Depending on the number of people who want to attend a focus group, registration may not guarantee a place on a focus group. The City will also hold informal discussion

forums and open community meetings to provide a variety of options for public review and comment, so everyone who wants to comment on the proposed ADU ordinance will have many other opportunities to do so. Written comments are always welcome and will be considered in the review process.

THE DEADLINE TO REGISTER FOR A FOCUS GROUP IS FRIDAY, MAY 15, 2009. THE REGISTRATION FORM IS ATTACHED.

The draft accessory dwelling unit ordinance is expected to be posted on the Housing Commission's website at www.SedonaAz.gov/housingby June 1, 2009. Select "Housing Strategies"; the ordinance will be under "Accessory Dwelling Units".

For more information or to register, call Jessica Williamson, Associate Planner, at 928-203-5045 or e-mail her at Jwilliamson@SedonaAz.gov. If you e-mail, please include your name, address, and phone number. Also indicate whether you could attend a focus group on a weekday between 9 am- 12:00 pm, 12:00 pm- 5:00 pm, or after 5:00 pm.

Jessica Williamson
Associate Planner
City of Sedona
928-203-5045

Windows Live™ SkyDrive™: Get 25 GB of free online storage. Check it out. (http://windowslive.com/online/skydrive?ocid=TXT_TAGLM_WL_skydrive_042009)

From: Eileen Igoe <[redacted]>
To: <ajuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 4/28/2009 6:59 AM
Subject: RE: Concern about ADUs

Audree,Without established building codes and manpower to inspect these dwellings the City should not even be considering this measure. Landlords are notorious in this town for not insulating, e.g., garage units, and exploiting tenants in numerous other ways including ridiculously high rents for rat trap dwellings. It's just like many of the employers and those in the tourist industries - all exploiting people who desire to live in, work in, or visit the beauty of Sedona - they just keep coming - the supply is endless and so integrity is not in the equation.
Particularly disturbing as well is that there is little recourse for exploited tenants because Judge Lundy does not know landlord tenant law, is biased in favor of landlords, to the point where he does not even rule on tenants' claims, he basically dismisses them outright. I've witnessed his extreme dishonorable behavior in the courtroom.
I thought this whole idea was shot down? How on earth did it get put back on the table again?
Thanks,Eileen

> Date: Mon, 27 Apr 2009 08:35:26 -0700
> From: AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov
> To: eileen.igoe@hotmail.com
> Subject: Concern about ADUs
>
> Hi Eileen, Jessica forwarded your email to me. I have included your
> name and comments not supporting the ADU concept. If you want to
> provide additional information, please let me know. I appreciate your
> taking the time to comment on this important issue.
> Audree
>
> _____
> Audree Juhlin
> Assistant Director
> Community Development
> City of Sedona
> 102 Roadrunner Drive
> Sedona, AZ 86336
> phone: (928) 204-7107
>

Windows Live™ SkyDrive™: Get 25 GB of free online storage.
http://windowslive.com/online/skydrive?ocid=TXT_TAGLM_WL_skydrive_042009

Sent: Monday, April 27, 2009 4:18 PM
[redacted]
Subject: [Fwd: [SPAM] FW: ADU is raising it's ugly head]

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: [SPAM] FW: ADU is raising it's ugly head
Date: Mon, 27 Apr 2009 14:16:14 -0700
[redacted]
References: <263256.22555.qm@web55605.mail.re4.yahoo.com>

[redacted]

Carol Wirkus and many others have worked hard to keep affordable housing out of the immediate Sedona area.
If you don't agree with this, then just delete.
If you agree that we don't need or want this, then read this email and maybe join a focus group.
susan

ADU = Accessory Dwelling Unit

The proposed ADU ordinance would allow homeowners to carve an additional living space out of their home OR to convert a garage to a living space OR to construct another building on their single family property, for the purpose of renting to others.

&nbs p;
Two days ago Jessica Williamson, Sedona's housing planner, called me to talk about ADUs. She asked if I would host a gathering of people in my home to discuss ADUs. I said no. She then asked about presenting a talk to FOF members about ADUs. I said no. Lastly, she told me about the ADU focus groups she will be holding. I told her to please sign me up.

The City staff continues to work toward this terrible idea that would destroy our neighborhoods. In today's RRN you will find an article entitled "City seats public on new housing forum." The article explains that the City will be holding focus groups that "represent a broad and inclusive cross section of Sedona's residents and workforce so that a wide variety of perspectives are heard." In other words, they're going to do their best to bring out proponents of this terrible idea.

Please consider signing up for a focus group--and encouraging your friends to sign up. Call Jessica at 203-5045, or e-mail her at Jwilliamson@SedonaAZ.gov <mailto:Jwilliamson@SedonaAZ.gov>.

Encouraging residents to carve rental units out of their single family homes is probably the single most destructive thing the City of Sedona could come up with! The potential negative impacts are too numerous to list in this e-mail.

Best Regards,
Carol

---

*The Average US Credit Score is 692. See Yours in Just 2 Easy Steps!
<http://pr.atwola.com/promoclk/100126575x1221421330x1201417418/aol?redir=http://www.freecreditreport.com/pm/default.aspx?sc=668072&hmpgID=62&bcd=AprilAvgfooter424NO62>*

Rediscover HotmailR: Get e-mail storage that grows with you. Check it out.
<http://windowslive.com/RediscoverHotmail?ocid=TXT_TAGLM_WL_HM_Rediscover_Storage2_042009>
No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.287 / Virus Database: 270.12.4/2081 - Release Date: 04/27/09 06:19:00

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.5.287 / Virus Database: 270.12.4/2081 - Release Date: 04/27/09 06:19:00

- I am opposed to pushing ADU's as a feel-good way to advance development for the 'benefits' of greater density and developer coffers.

- I want real numbers, not imaginary percentages, of so-called commuting Sedona employees who would actually MOVE HERE to a SMALL rental were it made available, not just say they'd like to live in Sedona .

- I want real numbers, not imaginary percentages, of Sedona professionals, such as teachers, p-olice officers, firefighters and other civil servants, who would actually RENT a SMALL ADU were it made available.

Lin Ennis - Comments 4/30/09

Availability for focus groups
We intend to hold focus groups at a variety of times to allow greater opportunities for people to attend.

- Please circle those days of the week when you are most likely able to attend a focus group
  Mon Tues ((Wed)) Thurs ((Fri)) Sat
- Please circle the time or times when you are most likely able to attend a focus group
  9 am – noon ((noon – 5:00 pm)) after 5:00 pm

Mail, email or fax the completed form to Jessica Williamson, City of Sedona, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336; Jwilliamson@SedonaAz.gov; fax: 928-282-5348
Questions? Call Jessica Williamson, Associate Planner, City of Sedona, 928-203-5045

From: "Steve Moody" [redacted]>
To: "'Jessica Williamson'" <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 5/14/2009 9:37 AM
Subject: RE: Focus Groups for Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance
Attachments: Reply--REGISTRATION FORM FOR ADU FOCUS GROUPS 4-09.doc

Ms. Williamson,

Attached is your questionnaire, which I have filled out.

With regards to ADU's, I have the following concerns: that zoning regulations should be preserved-especially with regards to single family zoning, that parking spaces, which are already scarce in certain areas, would be insufficient, and that ADU's be for residents and not for transient or tourist populations.

Simcerely,

Steve Moody

President, Foothills North Owners Association

From: Jessica Williamson [mailto:JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2009 9:05 AM
To: Jessica Williamson
Subject: Focus Groups for Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance

HOA Representative:

It was a pleasure talking to you the other day. As I told you on the phone, the City of Sedona is drafting an ordinance that proposes to allow the long-term rental of accessory dwelling units such as guest houses and mother-in-law flats. As part of the public outreach effort, the City is planning to hold a series of small focus groups to get feedback and suggestions on the proposed ordinance from people who live and/or work in our community.

I have attached information about the focus groups and a registration form. Please feel free to share this information with your HOA board and members. The deadline for registering for a focus group is May 15, 2009.

Please let me know if you have any questions or want more information.

From: "Lisa Hirsch" <hirsch@sedona.k12.az.us>
To: <ajuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 5/26/2009 7:26 PM
Subject: Housing for Teachers

CC: "Mike Aylstock" <aylstock@sedona.k12.az.us>

Dear Audree,

I would like to add my voice to the process on affordable housing for our Sedona educators, and those who also work at our schools as maintenance people, and aides. I have worked with Linda Martinez and her coalition on affordable housing for several years in order to make the case for a partnership between our City and our district as far as affordable housing for teachers.

As a 15 year Sedona resident who came here as a founding teacher of Sedona Red Rock High School, I understand the struggle. My husband and I arrived from New York City, and quickly learned that while our cost of living was a little less, our pay checks were a lot less. Over my first five years I saw many of my teacher friends able to stay here if they had a second job, and a small space to live. About 10 years ago Sedona's housing market started to sky rocket, prices were out of site and teachers new to the area chose to live in Cottonwood or Rim Rock. Again, many of our younger newly hired teachers loved the community, but chose to leave due to financial stress.

As you know over the past five years it is even more of a struggle for our newly arriving teachers. I am now the current principal of West Sedona, and once again I just had to say goodbye to a phenomenal, young Special Education teacher who could not make her house payments. She and her husband were great contributors to our City, and there was nothing I could do or say to stop them from leaving.

I agree with Mike Aylstock's belief that renting an ADU to a young teacher will be win/win. If this is not possible, I propose a City partnership. If a teacher moves here to teach I would love to see our City kick in their first and last month's rent payment within a certain limit. In some Cities in Idaho teachers are getting first and last month's rent for up to three years. I sincerely believe we can really help our workforce remain diverse and high quality. There are many creative minds in Sedona, and we really need to hang on to our young teachers.

Thanks, Lisa Hirsch

Dr. Lisa Hirsch
Principal West Sedona School
928-204-6601

Principal Skinner: Uh oh. Two independent thought alarms in one day. The students are overstimulated. Willie! Remove all the colored chalk from the classrooms.

From: "Mike Aylstock" <aylstock@sedona.k12.az.us>
To: <ajuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 5/26/2009 1:29 PM
Subject: Support of ADU Rentals
Attachments: Accessory Dwelling Units.doc

Good afternoon Ms. Juhlin,

Attached is a memorandum about the school district's position on Accessory Dwelling Units. They would definitely enhance our recruiting of young talented teachers to the school district and community.

Would you please distribute the memo to the following people?

Members of the Sedona City Council

City Manager

John O'Brien

Members of the Housing Commission

Please call me if you have any questions with regards to the contents of the letter.

Thank you so much,

Mike

Mike Aylstock, Superintendent
Sedona-Oak Creek Unified School District #9
221 Brewer Road
Sedona, Az 86336
(928) 204-6800
aylstock@sedona.k12.az.us

"Behind Every Great School is a Great Staff!"

W. Michael Aylstock
Superintendent of Schools

221 Brewer Rd., Suite 100 • Sedona, Arizona 86336
Telephone: (928) 204-6800 • Fax: (928) 282-0232

www.sedona.k12.az.us
aylstock@sedona.k12.az.us

To: Members of the Sedona City Council and City Manager

cc: John O'Brien, Audree Juhlin, and the Housing Commission

From: Mike Aylstock, Superintendent

Date: May 26, 2009

Re: Accessory Dwelling Units

Recruiting and maintaining a highly qualified teaching staff is one of the greatest challenges our administrative team faces at the Sedona-Oak Creek Unified School District. Shrinking educational funding in Arizona will keep our entry level salaries relatively low for years to come. When prospective teachers see their initial salary compared to the high cost of living in the area, many are forced to accept positions in other parts of the state simply due to economic reasons. If the district was able to steer prospective teachers toward more affordable housing, we would be much more competitive in our recruiting.

The thought of having Accessory Dwelling Units available for rent to staff members is very appealing. When owners have these types of dwelling vacant and available, our new teachers are provided the opportunity to live in high quality housing in our school district, at a cost lower than traditional housing, as they begin their teaching career in Sedona. I believe this would be a win-win situation for everyone involved. Our young teachers be able to live in beautiful Sedona and become part of a neighborhood and the community in which they teach which is so important to the success of any educator. And the owner would be able to receive additional income by renting their ADU to a young professional. There could also be an exchange of rent for maintenance or other services.

Having the availability of this type of housing would also have long-term positive impacts on our young teachers. They would be able to build up savings for the down payment for their own house, start a young family, and establish roots in Sedona. I believe it would be gratifying to the ADU owners to know that they were instrumental in getting a young professional started on what could be a long career and life in Sedona.

Thank you for your consideration of the contents of this letter.

From: "Eddie Maddock" [redacted]
To: "Jessica Williamson" <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 5/31/2009 7:55 PM
Subject: Re: Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance

CC: "John O'Brien" <JObrien@sedonaaz.gov>, <RAdams@ci.sedona.az.us>, "Cliff ...

Ms. Williamson:

With due respect to your mission for affordable housing, my opinion of the Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance based on recent litigation relating to breach of code enforcement on existing long term housing rentals it is absolutely unenforceable as written.

Your intent might be sincere, however the negative repercussions to single family residential subdivisions are too numerous to itemize.

Kindly include these brief comments in the packet to present to the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting to be held on, I believe, June 02, 2009. I absolutely oppose this proposed ordinance.

Respectfully submitted,

Eddie S. Maddock
Resident, Sedona Arizona

-------Original Message-------

From: Jessica Williamson
Date: 5/29/2009 1:03:05 PM
To: Jessica Williamson
Subject: Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance

The proposed draft Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance has been posted on the City of Sedona website at www.SedonaAz.gov/housing. Select Housing Strategies, Draft ADU Ordinance - 5-29-09.

Jessica Williamson
Associate Planner
City of Sedona
928-203-5045

From: Anne Leap
To: Alex Gillon; Audree Juhlin; City Council; Geoffrey Messer; Jim Eaton...
Date: 6/1/2009 10:16 AM
Subject: Re: Draft ADU Ordinance

CC: Alison Zelms; CCArc; Cherry Lawson; Ginger Wolstencroft; Jessica Bar...

Thank you for this information. This ADU's endeavor will be wonderful for Sedona. I realize the time-line for these to be available. Many senior are looking for affordable units in Sedona who are living in other Verde Valley cities. Many of the affordable housing in other cities. contains the mentally ill and drug and alcoholic folks whose behavior freighters our seniors.

Anne Leap, MSW
Senior Information Referral Specialist

City of Sedona
102 Roadrunner Drive
Sedona, AZ 86336
(928) 203-5151
ALeap@SedonaAZ.gov

>>> Audree Juhlin 6/1/2009 8:08 AM >>>
Good morning,

Attached is staff's draft accessory dwelling unit ordinance. This draft is based on comments received during last year's outreach efforts.

Staff working with the Housing Commission has initiated an extensive education/outreach effort. This includes holding a number of focus group meetings, informal and formal community meetings, as well as presentations with community/civic organizations.

In addition, both the Housing Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission will hold at least one public hearing on this ordinance. We anticipate City Council hearing this item in the fall. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks - Audree

Audree Juhlin
Assistant Director
Community Development
City of Sedona
102 Roadrunner Drive
Sedona, AZ 86336
phone: (928) 204-7107

From: Marlene Rayner <[redacted]
To: Jessica Williamson <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 6/16/2009 4:00 PM
Subject: Re: ADU focus group confirmation

Questions I know will come up:
Although ADUs are a good idea in general, they need strict regulation, which may take up a lot of time. I have known ADU residences like this above garages or stables, but these were in rural areas.Unless ADUs are built from the beginning as a "guest residence", the idea of converting garages will be a sore point here in town. Converting garages into such, I assume, cannot over-ride HOA CRCs? (e.g. rules where cars must be in the garage?) There will also be questions about "additions" to homes being in character with neighborhood or have lot coverage issues.)

--- On Tue, 6/16/09, Jessica Williamson <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov> wrote:

From: Jessica Williamson <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov>
Subject: ADU focus group confirmation
To: "Jessica Williamson" <JWilliamson@sedonaaz.gov>
Cc: "CCArc" <CCArc@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: Tuesday, June 16, 2009, 6:27 PM

Hello everyone

Just a reminder that you are registered for an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) focus group on Monday, June 22, 2009 from 10:00 - 11:30 am in the Vultee room at City Hall, 106 Roadrunner Drive.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Jessica Williamson
Associate Planner
City of Sedona
928-203-5045

From: John O'Brien
To: "[redacted]".GWIA.Sedona; Tim Ernster
Date: 7/2/2009 10:40 AM
Subject: RE: Driveways

CC: Audree Juhlin

Hi Jean,

I will pass along your e-mail to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. One item in your e-mail I would like to clarify is that I did not say we did not have enough staff to enforce the ADU ordinance. What I did say is that we have 1½ staff people who work in enforcement and depending on the level of enforcement that the City Council would require, we may need additional staff. If Council wants a high level/proactive enforcement of this ordinance rather than simply to respond to complaints, then our current enforcement staffing levels may have to be increased.

One other clarification: Bill Eich did not make the statement you mentioned. What Bill did say is that Councilor Colquitt told him that the limitation of four unrelated adults in a residence was not enforceable. I don't share that opinion, but I wanted to clarify that Bill's reference was to the enforceability of the unrelated adult issue and not the enforceability of the entire ADU ordinance.

Every code any city adopts has to have some level of flexibility built into the code because it is not realistic to think that the code can address every specific situation that might arise. This is common for all zoning codes throughout the country.

Audree: Please make sure Jean's e-mail and my response are both provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council when they are provided their packets on the ADU ordinance.

Thanks.

John

>>> Jean Jenks <jeanjenks@live.com> 7/2/2009 7:59 AM >>>

Hello John,

For your information, I've read and am familiar with the distressing ADU Ordinance language you reference.

Since the vast majority of residential streets DO NOT have curbs this means that, with relatively few exceptions, utilizing existing curb cuts for parking is not possible. And, as you know, the purpose of existing curb cuts is ADA accessibility. How is usage by individuals with disabilities going to be possible if vehicles are parked in curb cuts in

Sedona? I've never heard of such a thing--is it really legal? Under Title III, the DOJ may obtain civil penalties of up to $55,000 for the first violation and $110,000 for any subsequent violation.

Just what does the vague, open-sesame type statement "If possible, the Director and City Engineer may allow exceptions on a case-by-case basis" mean in plain English? Are residential yards going to be cut apart with extra driveways, or not? Why are you refusing to disclose this important information to the public? I believe the "If possible, the Director and City Engineer may allow exceptions on a case-by-case basis" language in the proposed ADU Ordinance needs to be changed to "No exceptions shall be allowed." Junking up single-family residential districts with too many vehicles, as well as old clunkers and ugly trucks, is going to diminish the City of Sedona's livability and get City Hall into trouble.

At last Monday's ADU Ordinance meeting you told participants there were not enough staffers (only one and one-half) to enforce the proposed ADU Ordinance. Also, attendee Bill Eich mentioned one City Councilmember by name and said she'd informed him that the ADU Ordinance was unenforceable. And attendee Cole Greenberg stated the City does not enforce zoning with existing ADUs and that diminishment of property value with sloppy zoning enforcement would lead to a rash of lawsuits due to the difference in value. In my opinion, these kind of statements indicate that City Hall is once again "way over it's head" on an important issue and that the ADU Ordinance problems are insurmountable.

BTW, I thought it interesting that out of the approximately two dozen participants at the ADU Ordinance Meeting on Monday only one spoke in favor of the proposed Ordinance, and she was attempting to drum up business for herself. Also interesting was that the lady sitting next to me was telling you of her concerns about honesty.

Please note Yavapai County's DETACHED GUEST HOME (i.e., ADU) ORDINANCE re its unincorporated areas does not allow the building of detached units on single-family residential parcels of less than 35,000 square feet in lot size, or .8 acre. With respect to Sedona's single-family residential districts, considering the unenforceability, the existing parking problems, the very narrow streets, the God-awful traffic we already have, and the lack of funds, why isn't City Hall proposing a practical minimum parcel size of 1 acre (43,560 feet)?

Thank you,

Jean

> Date: Wed, 1 Jul 2009 15:37:46 -0700
> From: JObrien@sedonaaz.gov

> To: [redacted]
> CC: AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov
> Subject: Re: Driveways
>
> Hi Jean,
>
> I've copied the proposed ordinance language below:
>
> "If additional parking is necessary, new parking spaces(s) shall utilize existing curb cuts. If not possible, the Director and City Engineer may allow exceptions on a case-by-case basis."
>
> John
>
> >>> Jean Jenks [redacted] 7/1/2009 2:15 PM >>>
>
> Hello John,
>
>
>
> As you know, I attended the Housing Commission's Public Meeting, Presentation and Discussion, proposed ADU Ordinance, on Monday. I recollect asking about parking re garage conversions and also about driveways and then hearing about the former. I am wondering, is there a requirement that a common driveway shall be shared by the primary residence and the ADU? If not, how many driveways on a single-family residential parcel does the proposed ADU Ordinance permit?
>
>
>
> Thank you very much,
>
>
>
> Jean
>
> _____
> Hotmail® has ever-growing storage! Don't worry about storage limits.
>
http://windowslive.com/Tutorial/Hotmail/Storage?ocid=TXT_TAGLM_WL_HM_Tutorial_Storage_062009
>

From: Jessica Williamson
To: Juhlin, Audree
Date: 7/6/2009 10:47 AM
Subject: ADUs

Harry Felton, a realtor, came in re: ADUs. He had comments about the ordinance based on what he had read in the paper. I explained that the size of the ADUs was restricted in the ordinance and that setbacks weren't being affected, and gave him a copy of the draft ordinance. He was in support. I told him about the two upcoming public outreach events this week and invited him to attend.

Jessica

July 7, 2009

To: Audree Juhlin
Assistant Community Development Director
City of Sedona

From: Alan and Patty Slyter
495 Schnebly Hill Rd
Sedona Az

Reference: Proposed ADU ordnance

When we talked several months ago, I expressed my thoughts about how the New ADU ordnance would not be a good idea for the city of Sedona and I personally could not see any benefits of it. During that earlier conversation, you expressed several ideas which I have since been able to review and discuss with my wife. I wanted to acknowledge **I erred in my earlier thinking**. I now feel that the ADU ordinance would be a wonderful benefit for people aging in the City of Sedona. I see where if allowed elderly home owners would be able to reside in their own homes longer and maintain their independence longer. This would allow a care taker the ability to live close but not live with that elderly home owner. Or it would allow a younger home owner to invite their elderly parents to reside on their property but still give the elderly parents their own space and independence. It would also provide an added benefit of assisting in the goal of producing more affordable housing.

My wife and I were unable to attend todays meeting but wanted to express our approval for your new proposed ADU ordinance. If we can assist you please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Alan and Patty Slyter

Date 7/8/09

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

I am writing to give my complete support to the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance for Sedona, which provides a sensible solution for workforce housing at a minimal cost to the city.

As a business owner of major resorts and restaurants with employees totaling 400± my employees tell me that finding housing in Sedona is very difficult. The downturn in real estate has not affected their ability to afford nor qualify for homes. They often drive long distances to work, which creates financial hardship for them.

Our town relies heavily on tourism and the community is not well served when employees have to travel great distances. It leaves little time to become involved in the community and leads to low retention. The smaller size of the units should help keep costs reasonable and renters will be able to live in neighborhoods.

We all know that Sedona has many of these 'rentals' already. It is time to bring this idea forth and allow owners to earn extra income and renters to have more choice.

Sincerely,

Al Spector

Al Spector

From: "Kathy Howe"[redacted]
To: <Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov>
Date: 7/8/2009 7:37 AM
Subject: ADU's

CC: <nancyscagnelli@msn.com>, <ruthcolquitt@hotmail.com>

I am very supportive of your work to make Guest Houses legal in Sedona.
Good work.

Kathy Howe
[redacted]
Sedona, AZ 86336
[redacted]

ADU ORDINANCE QUESTIONS

1. Affordable Housing is a problem affecting business proprietors in Sedona. It has absolutely nothing to do with owners of residential property in Sedona

   So how does the Housing Commission justify their proposal to meet this purely business need , by proposing to impact the privacy, security and value of homes in residential sub divisions, by encouraging the commercial renting .

2. If I built a ADU in compliance with the proposed ordinance :
   What would prevent me from renting it to other than Sedona workers ,
   for short term rentals, at a very profitable rental rate?

3. Why would the ADUs not become a part of the hundreds of homes currently being rented illegally in Sedona?

Since the city of Sedona is funded largely by business activity, sales tax, bed tax etc, and the residential property owner contributes very little, the city obviously sees the need to support business activity more important than the needs of residential property owners.

With the approach of "Build Out" the reshaping of Sedona is starting to take place. The vision implied by the ADUs, is of a much larger portion of currently residential areas being converted to vacation rental accommodation. High end subdivisions will remain untouched, and older subdivisions will be rebuilt and remodeled, for mixed residential and commercial use.

This is not the vision shared by a large part of the residential community

Rick Chandler
2 of 2460 7/10/09

From: Linda Martinez <lmartinez@shradermartinez.com>
To: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@ci.sedona.az.us>, Jessica Williamson <JWilliamson...
Date: 7/13/2009 11:27 AM
Subject: Comment on ADU

A comment to add to the pile:

One homeowner who lives in Harmony stopped me in Safeway on July 7, 2009.
She had attended the Radisson (Poco) public meeting and spoke up at the end of the meeting against the ADU ordinance.

At the store, I asked her why she was against it. She said that she just likes the 12 [units] per acre. I asked how long she lived here - 10 years. I told her that she came and I came 24 years ago - people will come. What was her thinking regarding allowing some of her neighbors to have extra income and provide some housing?

Then she said that she really didn't have a problem it, but that she was only supporting someone else who was against it. Then she apologized for approaching me in the store.

Linda Martinez
Vice President, Business Development
Shrader & Martinez Construction, Inc.
W: 928 282-7554, ext 201
C: 928-239-0074

From: Linda Martinez <lmartinez@shradermartinez.com>
To: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@ci.sedona.az.us>, John O'Brien <JObrien@sedonaaz....
Date: 7/30/2009 11:37 AM
Subject: FW: city proposal for additional dwelling

Dr. Paydar asked that this e-mail be sent to Council.

Linda Martinez
Vice President, Business Development
Shrader & Martinez Construction, Inc.
W: 928 282-7554, ext 201
C: 928-239-0074

-----Original Message-----
From: fpaydar [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2009 11:26 AM
To: Linda Martinez
Subject: city proposal for additional dwelling

Mrs. Linda Martinez,

I would like to inform your group and the city of Sedona that I am in favor of the proposed change that your group is recommending to the city for permits and regulations for additional dwellings in the residential lots in the city of Sedona. My vote is for complete support of your recommendations.

Sincerely,

Farshid Paydar, MD
Sedona resident
410 Arroyo Pinon Dr.

The difference is clear. Click now for a great laminating machine!
http://thirdpartyoffers.juno.com/TGL2141/fc/BLSrjpTG3HweBq3A3hfMk65mFniSqHk7OCEHuwDq5aGePz2L2kbnya8kDOw/

From: Marlene Rayner [redacted]
To: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: 8/10/2009 11:47 AM
Subject: Re: How about any truth in this quote?

Yes, I am against them too, because they 'up the density in neighborhoods' not covered by strict HOAs. It relegates ADU housing to older or poorer areas. It is time for the City to abandon this way of doing things for "affordable housing". Regular guest houses are for guests or your mother.
Marlene Rayner

--- On Mon, 8/10/09, Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov> wrote:

From: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Subject: Re: How about any truth in this quote?
To: [redacted]
Cc: "John O'Brien" <JObrien@sedonaaz.gov>, "Nicholas Gioello" <NGioello@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: Monday, August 10, 2009, 2:04 PM

Hi Marlene,
Thanks for your response back. Do you want me to include your email with the public comments received regarding the ADU proposal?
Thanks,
Audree

>>> Marlene Rayner <[redacted]> 8/10/2009 10:48 AM >>>
Hi Audrey-
How about rentals of homes? Financing may not be easy to get for manufactured homes, but that is what is available. Too bad. When I was young and had to look for a home I settled for less or lived further away. I feel more responsible for the people displaced from trailer parks.

I also do not necessarily believe you or the statements about what realtors say. All your facts were disputed last summer.

The teacher can easily rent a home in her price range here in Sedona - even in regular homes. She will find something to buy further out. The commute is easy. I do not feel personally responsible for a teacher not finding a home to buy here in Sedona.
.
Marlene

. --- On Mon, 8/10/09, Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov> wrote:

From: Audree Juhlin <AJuhlin@sedonaaz.gov>
Subject: Re: How about any truth in this quote?
To: marlenerayner@yahoo.com
Cc: "John O'Brien" <JObrien@sedonaaz.gov>, "Nicholas Gioello" <NGioello@sedonaaz.gov>
Date: Monday, August 10, 2009, 1:24 PM

Hi Marlene - I am back from vacation. You bring up some good points

that need some clarification. I am making the following comments based
on what we are being told by real estate agents and lenders.

The market is beginning to show an increase in the number of homes sold
in Sedona and the Verde Valley. We are told that this is due in part to
an increasing number of foreclosures and short sale homes. We are also
told that a large percentage of properties being sold for under $200,000
are mobile homes. Mobile homes are extremely difficult to finance and
most usually are cash sales.

Many of the sales are to investors or to people who are moving to our
community with money. Although prices are coming down due to the
foreclosures and short sales, and interest rates have dropped, it is
extremely difficult to get financing. We have also been told that many
of the homes (short sales and foreclosures) go fast, with numerous
offers on the table. One realtor shared her experience trying to help a
school teacher find a home to buy. They have been looking for over six
months, when something comes on the market in her price range, it
usually has several offers before the house is even listed. They have
expanded their search to include the Verde Valley and are still having a
hard time.

Because the housing market is continually changing and due to the
complicated conditions (qualifying difficulties, short sales,
foreclosures), the Housing Commission has elected not to spend tax payer
dollars on updating an informational brochure. Once things settle down
and we have a better understanding of the housing market, I imagine the
Commission will produce a new brochure.

Hope this helps. Please give me a call if you wish to discuss this at
greater lengths.

Take care,

Audree

Audree Juhlin
Assistant Director
Community Development
City of Sedona
102 Roadrunner Drive
Sedona, AZ 86336

phone: (928) 204-7107

>>> John O'Brien 8/6/2009 8:25 AM >>>
Hi Marlene,

Audree Juhlin is out of town until next week and I'm copying her with your e-mail.

Audree: After you have dug out from your vacation next week, please see the below e-mail from Marlene and get back to her with your input.

Thanks.

John

>>> Marlene Rayner <[redacted]m> 8/6/2009 8:03 AM >>>
I saw this article and wondered myself. Comment needed. Marlene

"For those who don't read the local rag, an article appeared in the July 24, 2009 RED ROCK NEWS entitled "Five straight months of growth," subtitled "Data shows sale of homes is increasing while prices sliding."
This article contains a very interesting table (data extracted from the
July 13, 2009 MLS), entitled: June '09 Verde Valley Residential Sold vs. Active. For the lowest Price Range, 0 - 199K, it shows the following: Sedona, Sold 16, Active 44; Cottonwood, Sold 136, Active 208; Camp Verde, Sold 35, Active 78; Rimrock/Lake Montezuma, Sold 25, Active, 84; Verde Valley [Total], Sold, 212, Active, 414. According to
the Housing Commission, the salary required to quality for a 6.25% fixed
loan for the 0 - 200K price range is: $26,808 - $47,172.

Very conspicuously absent these days are handouts and charts similar to
what the Housing Commission used to pass out containing up-to-date sales
and rental data. If a copy of the July 24th article I am quoting is wanted, please provide your mailing address so I can send you one. BTW,
per the next to last paragraph in this article: "Interest rates have been coming down over the last several weeks, further increasing the affordability of the reduced price inventory."

Audree Juhlin - FW: Increase Housing Units Survey

From: "Heather Hermen"
To: "'Audree Juhlin'"
Date: 7/31/2009 9:30 AM
Subject: FW: Increase Housing Units Survey

An email we received about the survey.

Heather Hermen
Public Relations Manager
Sedona Chamber of Commerce
PO Box 478, Sedona AZ 86339
928-204-1123, Fax: 928-204-1064
hhermen@sedonachamber.com
www.SedonaChamber.com
www.VisitSedona.com
Twitter Facebook
VisitSedonaBlog

From: Linda Yee [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2009 9:27 AM
To: hhermen@sedonachamber.com
Subject: RE: Increase Housing Units Survey

Hello. I tried to take the survey but many of the questions do not pertain to me, but I have an opinion about ADUs. I'm retired (do not work in Sedona) but live in SEdona and am actively setting up a business that hopes to employ people. The reason I support ADUs is because many of our home owners are elderly, and how wonderful if they could rent their guest homes to younger people who need a place to live but would also be a near-by neighbor to keep an eye on the elder, and provide assistance if needed. It also would help the elder's financial situation because many are worrying about their dwindling saving's accounts. I know of several of these situations. Most employees who I know and who work in Sedona, live in Cottonwood, Camp Verde or Rimrock and drive into Sedona. How nice if they could live and work in Sedona and eliminate the driving which causes pollution and increased traffic on our highways and streets. Linda Yee 203-9476

> From: hhermen@sedonachamber.com
> To: lindafyee@hotmail.com
> Date: Fri, 31 Jul 2009 09:04:07 -0700
> Subject: Increase Housing Units Survey
>
> The City of Sedona would like to hear from people who work in Sedona about a proposed ADU ordinance by means of a quick survey. The proposed ordinance would allow a homeowner to create a second, small living space on their property (called an accessory dwelling unit or ADU) and rent it. Allowing ADU rentals is one way that could increase housing choices for Sedona's workforce.
>
> Here is a link to the survey:
> http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=s2p1v5k70_2bJ_2fJ3VfeByaFg_3d_3d
>
> This link is uniquely tied to this survey and your email address. Please do not forward this message. Your participation in this survey is important and will help the City of Sedona as it

evaluates the proposed ordinance. Please note this survey has been designed for employers. You will be sent a separate survey to be forwarded or printed for your employees to take. If you have any questions or require a copy of the survey be sent to you via email please contact 204-1123 ext. 170.
>
> Thanks for your participation!
>
>
> http://www.surveymonkey.com/optout.aspx?sm=s2p1v5k70_2bJ_2fJ3VfeByaFg_3d_3d

Audree Juhlin - RE: ADU Survey

From: "Anna"
To:
Date: 8/12/2009 9:13 AM
Subject: RE: ADU Survey

Dear Audry,

I live and work in Sedona but I do think the ADU concept is a good one. In the years I have worked here, I have observed and experienced the continued turnover that employers deal with because workers find the commute to Sedona too expensive, and they cannot find affordable housing.

In my neighborhood, an increasing number of 'shared rent' situations exist where several people are renting a single family dwelling and sharing the rent. I know of three individuals who work for New Frontier's Market that are sharing rent in a single family dwelling just four houses up the street from me. I am glad they are able to work and live close by but know that is not always a good living situation for people as they may need more privacy and just have different lifestyles.

Due to the downturn in real estate sales, homes that were on the market because the owner died, or needed to move away, the homes are now being rented.... not by single families but by several individuals. In one case I know that two families are living in the same single family home.

This situation may continue for a while....but a turn in the sale of homes or CC&R's change and enforcement could change these situations dramatically.

In any case a solution is needed to make reasonable housing available to individuals and small families who want to live and work in Sedona.

Marjorie A. Johnson, 355 Navahopi Road, Sedona AZ 86336-4158; 928-282-5817

2009 AUG 13 PM 12: 53

MEMORANDUM TO CITY COUNCIL RE MEETING AT KSB ON AUGUST 5, 2009
And to PLANNING & ZONING

The meeting at Keep Sedona Beautiful building was not extremely well-attended, but a fair-sized group citizens of our city were present to learn more about the possibilities of adopting changes to allow the **"Accessory Dwelling Units"** to be constructed.

A large zoning map of the city was displayed and explanations given by John O'Brien, of the city staff, as well as Linda Martinez helped those present understand possible areas in the city where these units might be allowed. The limitations set by CC&Rs would rule out those subdivisions having such in place. Older parts of town, such as "Chimney Flats" where I live would present no problem. Linda also gave a comprehensive report of many cities similar to ours in size that have adopted this idea.

In my opinion, the consensus of those present was that this would be an acceptable change in our zoning laws and probably very helpful to many residents. All present were allowed to speak, using the microphone, and only one person expressed adamant opposition to the plan.

My own perception is that, providing my lot allowed enough space (observing setbacks and other regulations) to build such a unit would definitely enhance my property. I am thinking of possible need in the future for regular nursing care, of possibly housing for a 6-month time family members wishing to settle in Sedona or perhaps offering a rental unit at a reasonable cost in an attractive setting for persons such as teachers, office workers, retail clerks, and others.

I feel, unlike some others who expressed their opinion, that many of the possible problems mentioned may never come to be. That is, one or two more cars on my property can easily be accommodated (realizing that other properties may not be that adaptable.) Having an owner in residence on the same lot would seem to be a *deterrent* to noise, uncontrolled trash and other objections mentioned.

A few expressed a possible *decrease* in value to the property. My view is to the contrary and I would furthermore expect an increase in appraised value, thus raising my taxes. I believe the advantages outweigh this objection.

I urge the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Council in turn to give careful consideration to this idea and to enact whatever change is necessary to put it in force.

Most sincerely yours,

Marjorie A. Johnson

Marjorie A. Johnson

August 13, 2009

Audree Juhlin - Subject: Housing Strategies: Draft of ADU Ordinance

From: Elmer VanDenburgh
To:
Date: 9/8/2009 6:50 PM
Subject: Subject: Housing Strategies: Draft of ADU Ordinance

Dear Audree Jublin

I'd like to see residents be allowed to rent accessory dwellings, but I sympathize with neighbors who suffer repeatedly from irresponsible behavior of the renters. I suggest you build in consequences for abuse of rental privileges with your proposal. Perhaps a warning to the abusing party and notice that a fine of $100 will be imposed on the renters and homeowner and payment due or the renters will be evicted within 24 hours if a second complaint is verified.

The homeowner should be warned in person if possible and by mail at the time of the disturbance and a notice nailed to both owners and renters doors that a $100 fine will be issued on the second abuse call, if he isn't living there for future renters to see that a warning is in effect. Warnings are to be left in place for two years. Both the renter and home owner are responsible and should be fined. Monies could go to the police department. All calls are to be verified by police who answer that they in fact heard noise. Each call will increase the fine by $100 up to $1,000 on the home owner. It has to be unprofitable for him to rent. After the third call in two years, the rental will be encircled with orange tape and warnings to keep out visible on the premises to stop abuse. It doesn't matter if new renters are causing the second, third, etc. calls. It is the homeowners responsibility to notify prospective renters that previous warnings and fines are in effect on his property. After five calls, rental privileges are to be denied for five years. The neighbors deserve a rest. These fines and restricts would apply because the owner is making money and/or is not present to oversee the conduct of renters.

Abuse is not necessary. Our police are understaffed; there is no need to waste their time with repeated violations of this nature when certain, quick action can be taken. It would seem one or two fines would end the problem, freeing the police from useless repetition. A police person's call should be effectual, not useless. The home owner is making money at his neighbor's expense, he isn't there to oversee the situation, without creating monetary consequences, why should he care? Some abusers will not stop unless it costs them something. Be serious about the consequences. People listen when they see you are serious. If no correction for abuse is part of the new proposal, then the council members who vote for expanding accessory rentals would be increasing the problem and acting irresponsibly.

Thank you for all the work you do. I know you will do your best.

Sincerely,

Lorraine VanDenburgh

COMMENT CARD

PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS
PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

Community participation and input is important to the City of Sedona. Your thoughts, concerns and ideas are greatly appreciated.

I attended the July 8 meeting at St Andrews. I found it informative & well done. It is clear that there are still some unanswered questions & unresolved issues with regard to ADU's. It's too bad about HOA's & CCR's because those are the typ of community that cou accommod & contr ADU'

Name: Kathy Heidepriem Phone: [redacted] Email:

Address: Sedona

Return completed Comment Card to Audree Juhlin, Assistant Director, Community Development Department, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336. For more information visit the City's web site at: www.SedonaAZ.gov/Housing or contact Audree Juhlin at (928) 204-7107 or by email at Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov.

COMMENT CARD

PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION
PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE
JUNE 29, 2009

Community participation and input is important to the City of Sedona. Your thoughts, concerns and ideas are greatly appreciated. FOR THE THIRD TIME SINCE 2005 THE HOUSING COMMISSION IS PUSHING UP-ZONING IN SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS. WE RESIDENTS WHO PURCHASED IN SINGLE-FAMILY HOME NEIGHBORHOODS HAVE THE LEGAL RIGHT TO LIVE IN SAME. IT IS THE CITY'S JOB TO ENFORCE OUR EXISTING ZONING, NOT EFFECTIVELY CHANGE IT TO MULTI-FAMILY V/A AUTHORIZING A 2ND HOUSING UNIT (i.e., ADU)

Name: JEAN JENKS Phone: [redacted] Email: [redacted]

Address: [redacted], SEDONA, AZ 86336

Return completed Comment Card to Audree Juhlin, Assistant Director, Community Development Department, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336. For more information visit the City's web site at: www.SedonaAZ.gov/Housing or contact Audree Juhlin at (928) 204-7107 or by email at Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov.

COMMENT CARD

PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS
PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

Community participation and input is important to the City of Sedona. Your thoughts, concerns and ideas are greatly appreciated.

Advantages to ADU.

(1) Owner on same property - less trash, more control (2) Possible use for nursing care to aged owner of primary unit. (3) Improving value of property. (4) Increase tax income.

Name: Marjorie A. Johnson Phone: 282-5817 Email: mjohns@sedona.

Address: 355 Navahopi Road, Sedona 86336

Return completed Comment Card to Audree Juhlin, Assistant Director, Community Development Department, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336. For more information visit the City's web site at: www.SedonaAZ.gov/Housing or contact Audree Juhlin at (928) 204-7107 or by email at Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov.

COMMENT CARD

PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS
PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

Community participation and input is important to the City of Sedona. Your thoughts, concerns and ideas are greatly appreciated.

30 Days not 90 Days

Fees on existing buildings outrageous!
Makes it unaffordable!

Name: RICK LAMONT Phone: 282-0055 Email: JRICKLAMONT@GMAIL.COM

Address: PO BOX 1569 SEDONA AZ 86339

Return completed Comment Card to Audree Juhlin, Assistant Director, Community Development Department, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336. For more information visit the City's web site at: www.SedonaAZ.gov/Housing or contact Audree Juhlin at (928) 204-7107 or by email at Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov.

COMMENT CARD

PUBLIC MEETING PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS
PROPOSED ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT (ADU) ORDINANCE

Community participation and input is important to the City of Sedona. Your thoughts, concerns and ideas are greatly appreciated.

Why 90 days

Name: JOHN SKANESKI Phone: 928-457-4191 Email: [illegible]

Address: 559 Van Deren Road EagleTOM@AOL.com

Return completed Comment Card to Audree Juhlin, Assistant Director, Community Development Department, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ 86336. For more information visit the City's web site at: www.SedonaAZ.gov/Housing or contact Audree Juhlin at (928) 204-7107 or by email at Ajuhlin@SedonaAz.gov.