Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session
City Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, November 30, 2017- 3:30 p.m.

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

Vice Chair Levin called the work session to order at 3:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance and requested roll call.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Vice Chair Levin and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt, Kathy Kinsella, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer. Chair Marty Losoff was excused and Commissioner Mayer was unexcused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, James Crowley, Andy Dickey, Audree Juhlin, Ryan Mortillaro, Rob Pollock, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

Councilor(s) Present: Mayor Sandy Moriarty and Councilor John Currivan

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

Audree Juhlin announced that Rob Pollock, Associate Attorney, is representing the City Attorney's office. Vice Chair Levin then asked when he passed the Bar and Rob indicated in July.

3. PUBLIC FORUM: (This is the time for the public to comment on matters not listed on the agenda. The Commission may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.)

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

4. Discussion regarding the update of the Land Development Code.

Mike Raber indicated that the purpose of today's work session is to introduce the public draft of the second part of our Land Development Code update. From July through September, we discussed Zoning Districts and Use Regulations, and in this second stage, we are now focusing on Development Standards and Subdivision Regulations.

Mike referenced the memo and noted that staff didn't expect that the Commission had read through this draft, but we do ask that you read the draft over the next few weeks and get your individual comments to staff by December 19th. It will be brought back to the Commission on January 16th, and staff will consolidate those comments and provide those for discussion at that time.

Mike explained that members of the consulting team will provide an overview and this is an introduction; we do not want to get into the fine details until you have had a chance to review it and make individual comments. He then introduced members of the consulting team, Matt Goebel and Tareq Wafaie, from Clarion Associates.

Presentation, Consultants Matt Goebel and Tareq Wafaie with Clarion Associates: Mr. Goebel indicated that they have a presentation that is similar in structure to the one they did in the summer. They will walk you through the background of the project and remind you of the overall scope, to give you a sense of where this material fits in context. They will then spend the bulk of their presentation walking you through the new material just distributed, so you will have some idea of

what is there as you go through your detailed review. Then, there should be plenty of time for discussion.

Matt referenced the project goals and scope of work, and indicated that when the Commission conceived of this project to update the Land Development Code, you identified some important goals that are summarized as follows: 1) Clarify and simplify the development and design standards – that was one of the biggest goals and what they will spend the bulk of the time discussing today. 2) Streamline the development review procedures – that will pretty much be the next meeting in the spring; they will talk about that in the final part of the Code. 3) Create a more user-friendly code – make sure the document is well illustrated, clean, easy to use, well organized, etc. 4) Encourage broad public participation - they have been working with staff throughout this project to reach out to the public and they will continue to do that, and 5) Implement the Sedona Community Plan – that is a really important part of their marching orders. As a community, you adopted a thoughtful plan that set out a high level of themes. Mixed-use development should be encouraged; walkable and bike-able development is something you want to see in Sedona; protection of scenic views, historic heritage – all of those things are important, and you don't really have a good robust toolbox in place to get at all of these principles, so one of their challenges is to develop a Code that helps you implement that Plan and the CFA Plan.

Mr. Goebel indicated that in terms of how they implement those goals, looking at the overall scope, they kicked the project off at the beginning of this year with an aggressive series of interviews and discussions with stakeholders about what could be improved and what could be achieved in a new Land Development Code. They summarized the results of that work in an assessment report that was distributed and discussed with the Commission, and now they are in the drafting stage that will continue through the early part of 2018, and then there will be a lengthy period for public involvement starting in the middle of 2018.

Matt stated that the drafting piece can be broken down even further; it has been summarized into three different parts – they presented the first part of the material in the summer and that was the Zoning Districts and Use Regulations, including what you can do on your property, what uses are allowed, etc. Today, Development Standards are about quality issues such as how the building has to look, how much parking has to be provided, how the site is graded, etc. All of those types of standards are addressed in this second part of the Code.

Matt explained that the final part of the Code is Administration and Procedures, such as how you get your project approved, etc. For each of the components, they are going through an iterative process, so they develop a staff draft first and walk through that will staff internally to ensure they got all of the facts right and have a good workable set of proposals. Then, they revise the public draft, which is what they are presenting to you this week. They are going through these presentations and all of the public draft first, and then they will consolidate all of the materials into one consolidated draft. The adoption phase has a lot of specific tasks, but the public will have a lot of bites at the apple; there will be a lot of opportunities to weigh-in.

Regarding the Code itself, Matt indicated that he didn't carry forward the slide of the current Land Development Code organization, but it is a really long slide. You have a lot of individual discreet chapters, but they have proposed a simpler organization where all of the like materials are put together. It is a simpler, cleaner organization that should make it easier to find things. They have highlighted in red the two Articles that they are going to focus on today in this presentation – Development Standards, which is all of the quality standards, and Subdivisions, so they primarily are just going to talk about Articles 5 and 7 today. They did distribute Definitions as part of the material, but they are not going to focus on those in this presentation.

Mr. Goebel stated that Development Standards is an important part of the Code, and as they work around the country, this is the piece of a zoning code that varies the most from community to community, because your physical environment, people, policies and goals are very different from community to community, so what you are trying to achieve is always very different. In Sedona,

they wanted to make some observations of what you have on the books. First, you have a very strong emphasis on compatibility with the natural and built environment and that is woven throughout all of your regulations. When you drive through Sedona, you appreciate all of the great work that has been done by the Planners and Officials to protect that great sense of place. It is important to acknowledge upfront that a lot of good work has been done in regulating development quality to maintain the sense of place that you have. To get there, your Development Standards are more sophisticated than they see in most communities, especially for a community this size. There has been a lot of good work done over time, and that should be appreciated and respected.

Matt then pointed out that with that said, it has been done in piecemeal fashion by different people at different times, and you have ended up with a code structure that has a lot of redundancy, overlapping provisions throughout especially Articles 9 and 10. Article 9 is technically kind of part of the Code, and Article 10 is part of the Code as well, but it is called the Design Review Manual that is distributed as a freestanding document. The public often doesn't understand the relationship between those two pieces. They deal with the same topics in different ways with different language, so you have an organizational challenge in how you get at some of these key regulations and you have a mixture of standards, which are mandatory things that must be complied with, and guidelines, which are encouraged, so that is another layer of potential confusion. Also, your standards don't really adequately address redevelopment and in-fill, which is a big part of what you are going to see moving forward. It is not going to be a lot of green-fill development; it is redevelopment and in-fill. When you put it all together, this whole system can become complex and difficult to administer. You have a very strong staff, but it is a small staff, and it is a lot of work for them to have to administer over time, so you have a set of documents that need to be updated.

Matt explained that their overall approach to cleaning up this material is to simplify where possible and consolidate related material from Articles 9 and 10. You don't need two different places that address building materials or convert guidelines to standards. For the most part, you have squishy language in Article 10 that is ambiguous as to whether or not it actually is a standard. They have tried to carry forward all of that language in one spot and clarify that it is all standards, because you had language at the introduction of the Design Review Manual that made it standards; it is just that language hadn't been threaded throughout the document, so the authority to say no, based on those standards was a little ambiguous, and they are clarifying that those are all standards. Focus on high quality development, sustainability, in-fill and redevelopment should be allowed and encouraged.

Mr. Goebel indicated that their approach with illustrations is important. This is a very text-heavy document right now, and your current Design Review Manual has a lot of illustrations; it is almost too much of a good thing. Illustrations are really good, but when they get so voluminous that they make it hard to understand. the underlying policy is a challenge, so they have stripped them all out. Their focus is getting the text right, and then they will put in new illustrations to illustrate the new text. It is not like this is just going to be a text code; this first draft is text, but they will add illustrations moving forward.

Matt added that importantly, they think there needs to be a few separate documents that support the new Land Development Code. You have some really detailed technical stuff in your Land Development Code that just makes it longer and a lot of it is obsolete. You want to remove it from the Code, so it can be maintained and updated without having to go through a full code update. Technical engineering standards, a list of fees for applications, submittal requirements for applications, etc., have been removed and they are going to work with staff so those can be turned into freestanding documents that support the Code.

Matt stated that regarding design guidelines, there potentially could be some stuff from Article 10 that is very helpful and talks about why you regulate design in Sedona. It is not appropriate for a code necessarily, but you don't want to get rid of it altogether, so they are going to keep that stuff in a bin and work with the staff to try to find a home for that old material.

Mr. Goebel explained that whenever they work on this type of material in any community, there are some key considerations that they think about in regulating development quality. First, what are the resources you have available to administer this on a regular basis. You shouldn't adopt stuff beyond what your staff has the ability to administer. A community shouldn't adopt new detailed architectural design standards if they don't have anybody on staff that understands how to review those plans or is trained in architecture. You have a very sophisticated staff, so that is not so much of an issue here, but it is an important thing to think about. Also, for each topic they discuss today, where do you want to land on the regulatory spectrum? Do you want to take a light touch, be relatively hands-off and let the market decide how to regulate quality or is it important for Sedona to be fairly strong in identifying certain design goals and saying this is how you have to get there? That is an important question and you can think about that discreetly for each of the topics they go through today. You might land on a different place on the spectrum for parking than you do for landscaping.

Matt asked if there are sufficient opportunities for flexibility in the Code. For all of these topics, there is a set of standards, but there also should be opportunities for flexibility and creativity, and they have tried to thread that throughout. Finally, are the standards enforceable? That is a key factor in thinking about adopting a new standard. You shouldn't put anything on the books that you don't have the staff to enforce.

Mr. Goebel indicated that is his introduction, but it is important to set the stage for all of these regulations about development quality. They now are going to get into the substance and their slide summarizes the contents of Article 5, but they will go through the materials one by one. He then referenced Section 5.2 and explained that it is obvious that the Code applies to all new development, so anything new or any new building that comes out of the ground will have to comply with these Development Standards, but there is a question about how many of these new standards you apply to existing structures that may just want to expand or redevelop part of their site, so there is language that gets to that issue. It talks about how there is kind of a sliding-scale approach, so the table goes through Section by Section and says that for each different part of the Code – for landscaping, parking, etc., there is a threshold identified and above a certain threshold – a certain number of dwelling units, floor area, etc., you will have to comply with the new standards, and that is a way of getting at redevelopment. One thing to think about is how strict you want to be with redevelopment in this Code, in applying the new standards?

Mr. Wafaie indicated that they are going to walk through the various subjects within the Development Standards and start with some images to start thinking about what types of things they are talking about that are addressed by each section. There are some Sedona-specific images and some outside of Sedona, but the real purpose is to show you both good and bad examples of lots of different things that are all covered by this second part of the Code update.

Tareq stated that he was going to start with grading and drainage, and the Development Standards article is really organized from the ground up, so they are starting with improvements to the site before buildings come out of the ground, and then they work their way up from there. Starting with grading and drainage, you have done a great job of understanding the importance of limiting cut and fill into the slopes and how much development is appropriate on steep slopes, plus how you protect the scenic vistas. You've thought about how to both retain and allow water to pass through a site, which is an important issue, especially in a dryer climate where you get flash flooding. He then showed a bad example of controlling erosion, not in Sedona, but just showing that there are best practices, and sometimes a lot of these issues can be addressed within the zoning and subdivision regulations, but sometimes these things need to be just engineering standards that are outside of the Land Development Code. There are a couple of supporting documents that will run alongside the Land Development Code update. They have extracted information regarding technical engineering standards and extracted information regarding submittal requirements -- things that will change frequently that they think should live outside of the Land Development Code, and grading permitting is one of those things.

Tareq indicated that for each of these topics, they will summarize the intent of that section and highlight some of the bigger changes. As you spend time reviewing the material over the next three weeks, this will give you a pretty good detailed area to focus on. The goals of grading and drainage are use the natural site features as much as possible, rather than cutting and filling into the land; follow the natural topography; avoid those sensitive areas like riparian areas and steep slopes, and blend in with the natural landscape. They didn't actually propose a lot of substantive changes to the grading and drainage section. They slimmed it down quite a bit, because a lot of this material would be hosted in a separate engineering manual.

Tareq referenced Access, Connectivity and Circulation – how do people, cars, bikes, etc., move around a site, how do they access a site and how do they move between sites? That is a very important thing to consider, and thinking about street networks, this example is not a Sedona example, but shows how important it is to not to only provide access to new subdivisions and individual lots, but how those lots can access each other. What happens at that end of a cul-de-sac? How do fire and other emergency vehicles access subdivisions? That is all part of this chapter. Bikes and pedestrians – when designing new streets and revamping existing streets are you accommodating multiple modes of transportation, including the Verde Lynx, bicycles, etc.? The goal is to enhance all mobility for all ages and abilities, and allow travel by multiple modes of transit, whether you are driving, biking, walking, skateboarding, etc. Regarding the contents of this chapter, they talk about streets and how they should be connected, driveways and access, and pedestrian and bicycle circulation; again, not just from site to site, but within an individual site as well. When you are laying out a parking lot, you should consider how pedestrian traffic will move through that parking lot.

Mr. Wafaie stated that some of the key changes include a requirement for a circulation plan for most development types. They want to know how you plan to move traffic, including pedestrian traffic, and they are requiring cross access between adjacent uses. This is going to require a lot of thought and a lot of individual negotiations with some cases, but they heard repeatedly and have seen repeatedly as they continue to make their way around the City that there are issues, because each site has its own access, but they are not well connected to each other, so they want to improve that by requiring cross access whenever you can. There are new standards for street connectivity and new standards for pedestrian safety, including sidewalks on both sides of the street, but there is a major caveat there -- that is not always appropriate for the character of every neighborhood. Not all local streets need sidewalks on both sides. He thinks about neighborhoods adjacent to Oak Creek, and that would be outside of the character of a lot of the development there, so you don't want to chip away at the existing character, but if a CFA Plan or some other neighborhood planning effort defines that as an important thing, then it should be required.

Tareq referenced off-street parking and loading, and indicated that it is a big deal in most communities, and for a code that is a little older, the parking requirements are somewhat out of date, so they have taken care to standardize where they can, and if you recall, they introduced the new Use Table in Part 1 of the Code, and it defined all of the land uses and where those would be appropriate within the City. The parking regulations are aligned with that Use Table, so every use that you defined in Part 1 now has an accompanying parking standard with it. They understand there are different contexts; maybe Uptown should be treated differently than other parts of town. There are auto-driven corridors that should be designed as such and allow for a good automobile access, and there are pedestrian-oriented corridors. Your Sedona Community Plan calls out great opportunities in Uptown to create a walkable mixed-use center, and parking standards can address that.

Regarding circulation and how you move across a site while still allowing for adequate parking, Tareq showed an example from Tlaquepaque and indicated that you are looking at different surfacing materials. Parking surface is also covered in this chapter. If you look at the Safeway and PetSmart shopping center, how much parking is enough parking, how much parking is too much parking, and how should they be surfaced and landscaped? These chapters can't be looked at in a silo; grading and drainage have a lot to do with what happens in a parking lot. The amount of

impervious coverage has a lot to do with how you move water in and around the City. Residential parking standards are covered as well, including where is it appropriate to park and how much parking is necessary?

Tareq explained that they wanted to modernize the parking requirements, making them clear and making sure they are following some of the parking trends, but also respecting the local needs here where you have told them there are parking issues. Improved flexibility is threaded throughout the Development Standards article. They can get to a pretty good place of understanding what the requirements should be, but there will always be applications that come before you that you can't plan for and might need some level of adjustment, some level of flexibility. They have created those opportunities throughout the Land Development Code to give the Director authority, if there is a study that supports it, to allow adjustments to certain standards within the Code.

Tareq noted that they have standardized parking requirements. Right now, you regulate some uses by number of employees, parking for 1,000 sq. ft. and parking per 500 sq. ft., so they tried to standardize it to the extent that they could to make it an easier document to read, so you can compare apples to apples. They also introduced new parking maximums. They care that you have provided enough parking, so there are minimums, but they also care that you are not providing too much parking, so the standard has been introduced at 125% of the minimum parking required, and that would be the maximum you could provide, unless you show a need for that through a study or unless you are providing pervious pavers or something that will mitigate the additional parking.

Tareq indicated that he mentioned that they have introduced lots of ways for flexibility, and one is to say that there is a special use here and although you are requiring this amount of parking, there is a study that says this is the amount really needed based on the type of use and conditions of that property. There are a lot of alternatives introduced in this chapter, including shared parking. Residential and office uses often have different times of day for peak parking requirements. There is an opportunity to share parking and reduce the amount required as such. Structured parking could be rewarded in a reduction for parking if you are providing it in a structure. On-street parking can count towards your required parking standards.

Tareq stated that regarding Uptown, he mentioned that this is a different beast in Sedona. This is your downtown; it is different and congested, but looking at a system by which the City provides more public parking opportunities rather than a by-use approach, they have suggested a standardized one per 500 sq. ft. requirement in Uptown, so there are lots of opportunities for discussion and the City would like to come up with a system to manage parking in Uptown, which is outside of the Land Development Code update, but very important, and they want to make sure they are coordinating with the Transportation Master Plan to find the best way to approach parking in Uptown.

Mr. Wafaie noted that is a lot of information with a lot of detail in the parking section, and if you are interested, he would recommend reading the Parking Table as a good starting point.

Matt Goebel indicated that the next topic is Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening. How do you soften the new developments with vegetation and greenery? How do you buffer potentially incompatible developments from each other? The types of issues that are covered are the landscaping of the parking lots that Tareq talked about and also the landscaping that buffers parking lots from the streets and landscaping that buffers developments from the street frontages. Some of the surfacing requirements for parking lots come up in this material as well, and also screening. How do you think about loading areas? How are those screened from the street and how do you screen mechanical equipment that is mounted on the ground or on the roof? Those are the types of things that are covered here as well.

Matt indicated that he wanted to summarize all of the different sections that are here. They did a fairly comprehensive reorganization and clean-up of this material. You still have landscaping required in several key areas, so between many developments and the street frontage landscaping,

there is ratios in the Code. For say every 400 sq. ft., you have one tree and several shrubs required, so there is a ratio for each of these areas. You have to screen parking lots from the street and within parking lots you have to provide landscaped islands, and all of those are carried forward. Side and rear lot buffers are required for multi-family or non-residential that abuts single-family residential. If you are interested in this part of the Code, he would pay close attention to these sections, because there is a lot of footnotes and a lot of tweaks that they have made to the standards. He wouldn't say there is anything earth-shattering, but staff has a lot of experience administering the current ratios, so a lot of tweaks have been introduced to try to clean them up and make them match current practice.

Matt stated that general material requirements are introduced that talk about the minimum sizes that are required for any shrub or tree that is required to meet minimum standards identified in the Code. City staff is working on a separate list, outside of the Code, of acceptable plant materials, and that will identify native and non-native species that can be used, so that is a separate topic that is underway that will support this. The tree preservation and protection standards are being carried forward -- not a lot of changes there from what you have now. The screening requirements are all there and that is an important neighborhood compatibility set of standards. Fences and walls also are carried forward.

Matt Goebel indicated that he wanted to talk about some of the proposed changes. The first one is dealing with wildfire. Wildfire mitigation standards are proposed for you to think about. Arizona has seen a lot of fires, and they have seen them in Colorado as well. A lot of communities are grappling with how best to integrate wildfire protection standards into their development codes. They have done a lot of work looking at something called the WUI Code, Wildland Urban Interface Code, which prescribes a lot of different standards for how to help protect and ensure land development is sensitive to wildfire. It covers a lot of things like requiring structures to be sprinklered. It also covers how the site is developed, like requiring defensible space around buildings, so there is not a lot of fuel to support the fire. If you think back to the spectrum that he mentioned earlier, they are not proposing the full WUI Code be folded into the Sedona Land Development Code. They are not proposing sprinklers for buildings, etc., but they have introduced some defensible space standards for you to think about. It says that around every new structure you have to have a defensible space of about 10 ft., and within that space you shouldn't have any combustible materials or put any new vegetation more than like a ground cover. You can do it outside of that 10 ft. area, and it doesn't mean you have to take down things that are there already, but you can't put any new material in. Then, there is also a larger area of 10 ft.-30 ft. where there are some looser restrictions. You have to do some pruning of lower limbs, etc.

Matt stated that the Fire Department would like for this stuff to be considered in the development of new buildings, but it also has real impacts on how individuals can develop their properties, use their properties and the enforceability, so this topic will get some more conversation as they move forward, but staff thought it was important to carry forward this piece in the draft for you to think about. They also have an alternative for landscape plans, so they have laid out a lot of standards that say this is how you shall develop the landscaping, but you have a good amount of creativity that could be authorized by the Director as well.

Matt showed a couple of photos of 'firewise' landscaping and indicated that he wasn't going to say if either one complied or didn't comply; they are just photos they pulled from the library to show the relative proximity of vegetation and stuff to buildings, and if you look at the one, it is a gorgeous building and setting, and it is hard to tell if any of that vegetation is within 10 ft. of that building. If it was, that is a situation you couldn't recreate. You couldn't plant a new tree within that 10 ft. going forward. The Code is not saying you have to take it out if it is there and you are redeveloping a house. In the other picture, you have much less vegetation on the attached homes, so that potentially could be something that would comply more with 'firewise' landscaping. It is important to be thinking about real life examples as you are thinking about defensible space.

Matt Goebel indicated that site and building design is something that you as a community have put a lot of time and attention into over the years to ensure that the quality of the buildings, the colors, the way they fit into the landscape, and the way they are massed and articulated is sensitive to this sense of place. It is important to your quality of life and tourism-based economy; it is important that you maintain that sense of place. You don't want to see a new big box come in and potentially put up a big unadorned faceless façade. The goal of the site and building design standards in a lot of places is to prevent the lowest common denominator. It is not to go in and micromanage the design of every building; it is to prevent the really worse stuff; you have standards in place. He then showed a picture of the new building on SR 89A in front of City Hall and indicated that it illustrates some concepts that have been embraced in your Code. You have different rooflines, so the variation is important for some visual interest. You have the different depths and projections to give the building some relief and some contrast. You have different color combinations, and you may or may not like the design of the building, but it illustrates some of the variety you are trying to get through your standards. Chase Bank was another example that illustrates some of the standards in place that allow certain accent materials like river rock and prominent building entries. You want to prevent things that deal with compatibility issues. A picture of a small bungalow next to a big box building illustrated that you want to think about the thing that comes next door and how you preserve that sense of continuity.

Matt stated that overall, they are not trying to radically change policy, but they did a lot of organizational clean-up, extensive editing to consolidate Articles 9 and 10, and it was the belly of the beast in terms of trying to clean-up a lot of the redundancy between those two different parts of the Code. They did a lot of work to merge and reorganize different competing parts, and a lot of guidelines have become standards. They are technically standards already, but that wasn't clear the way the Design Review Manual was drafted. They removed all of the graphics and will introduce a lot of new ones, and they are trying to simplify stuff as much as possible. You have a lot of standards that have evolved with a lot of writers over time, and they can just be simplified.

Mr. Goebel indicated that to give you a summary of how it is organized, first, the section deals with site design, and the whole organization is much cleaner than what you have now. They are starting with sites, and then getting to the building. For site design, you think about being responsive to the site conditions, the topography, the surrounding natural context and the buildings. Are you ensuring that the building is designed to be protected from potential hazards like a rock fall or floodplain hazard? Are you thinking about the relationship to the streetscape and adjacent developments, etc.? Then for building placement, where does it go on the site? Do you potentially have a contextual front setback and can average the setbacks for a redevelopment project? Where does the building entry face; how are multiple buildings separated from each other on a large site? All of those types of things are addressed. These types of issues now are addressed with building design. They could have a three-hour discussion just on this, so they are just introducing this today, but it is a cleaner organization from what you have. They cleaned it all up and had a lot of opportunities for clarification and clean-up. Again, they are not trying to change the underlying policy you have in place, but it is a big step forward in terms of organization.

Tareq Wafaie indicated that there were a few more topics to cover, including lighting – an important issue in Sedona with your night skies. The Sedona Community Plan mentions the importance of the night sky and the ability to see that for stargazing is an important feature of living here. There are a lot of things to consider, when it comes to lighting. What happens on commercial properties, lodging facilities versus single-family residences or other types of businesses? He then referenced a photo showing warm lighting and indicated that the current Code does address warm lighting, but it is very limiting in the types of lighting. Over the years, there have been a lot of different lighting bulbs and technologies that have been developed. They wanted to make sure that they were flexible to those new technologies and allow staff to review those on a case-by-case basis, as long as you are not glaring on your neighbor. That is basically what lighting boils down to; don't shine in the sky, don't annoy other people and don't be a safety hazard. You do that by preventing things from glaring onto public ways. He then showed an example that was not in Sedona, but showed a gas station and indicated that they are particularly notable for having very bright canopies, so that is

a use that they call out specifically in the Lighting Ordinance to say that you have to shield the lights underneath that canopy. Think about ambience lighting, outdoor string lighting; they made the distinction between permanent outdoor string lighting and temporary outdoor string lighting, and you have that now, but it is important to think about in those permanent locations where that is allowed, and if you just say it is allowed, you could very well be exceeding all of the other lighting standards, depending on the number of string lights you have. As they drove in last night through Phoenix and various other places, the amount of string lighting out there can be very impactful on the night sky, so prohibited in general, but allowed for outdoor dining as long as you are not exceeding the overall values of lighting that the City has deemed acceptable. The goal again is to protect that night sky, but provide a safe place to move around and enjoy the City. Some of the biggest changes were just reorganizing the information, so it is easier to find and understand what is required. Prohibiting those unshielded lights to ensure you are not getting up-lighting into the sky, and adding that flexibility to allow for case-by-case approval, and a lot of guidelines that were currently in Article 10 were shifted to standards within the Land Development Code.

Tareq referenced public art and indicated it is another important feature of Sedona. You have more public art than many communities they have worked for and that is what makes it such a great place to live. It should be required in some cases, and you are requiring a lot of public art. You have some of that outside of this building and it is really fun. They needed to clarify those requirements and ensure that public art is a part of most development in Sedona, rather than just a few, so beyond the reorganization, they expanded the applicability to include multi-family and mixed-use buildings. Today, you don't have a lot of mixed-use development and part of this Land Development Code update was to create those opportunities to make sure living and working are all occurring together. They did not require public art for industrial uses.

Tareq Wafaie stated that the final topic is Subdivisions and this has a separate article as it does today in your Code. The biggest change in Subdivisions is they are talking about how lots and blocks are designed. What types of improvements are you requiring at the time of subdivision in terms of infrastructure, streets, pipes, water and sewer? They separated the standards from the procedures, so in this draft are only the standards for Subdivision. How do you draw the lots, how do you design them and lay them out, how do you lay out the streets, but not how do you get subdivisions approved – that will come in the spring. This contains all of the standards for design and the improvement standards for public facilities that have to be maintained. The biggest changes are much like grading and drainage in pulling a lot of those technical standards dealing with surveying, etc., outside of the Land Development Code that happen at the construction phase.

Tareq referenced flag lot standards and indicated that you have a lot of very unusual lots in Sedona, so there has to be a way to address those and make sure that you don't get too many more of those in the future. Another issue is cluster subdivisions; the Sedona Community Plan mentions this concept in several occasions and does so in the CFA Plans like the Schnebly Hill CFA that talks about clustering development on one part of a property to avoid spreading out lots on sensitive parts of the site, like a riparian area next to Oak Creek. It is achieving the same densities without impacting those sensitive areas, so they have provided a tool by which to achieve that.

Tareq noted that Mike mentioned that he would like to get your comments by December 19th, so you can discuss them in January. As you are reviewing beyond what they provided today, think about whether or not they have left something out. What is missing from the quality standards that should be there; did they not carry something forward that should have been. Are there questions on confusing standards; things that aren't making sense or might be more helpful if a graphic was developed? Those are things they would like to roll into the next drafting phase of the project. They proposed the highlights of the biggest changes, but do you agree with those approaches, and if not, they want to know that as well.

Matt Goebel asked that the Commission read the cover memo to the materials, because that is a good introduction and covers a lot of the stuff that they just covered, and they will get you a copy of

this PowerPoint, if you want to refer to some of the photos as well. They look forward to your comments, but as a preview of where they are going, you will have your next meeting in January, and then they will be working on the drafting of the final part of the Code, which is Administration and Procedures.

The Vice Chair noted that this agenda item is listed as discussion only and she has no cards from the public, but she wanted to double check and was told that none had been submitted. Vice Chair Levin indicated that since the Commission got this packet yesterday morning, she is a little hesitant to ask questions that may be answered by reading it, but we will start and maybe they will have less to do with content and more to do with philosophy of approach, etc.

Commission's Summary Discussion:
Commissioner Barcus referenced the discussion about minimum parking standards and indicated that it seems reasonable, but he doesn't understand the justification for the 25% maximum, because this is a community that has major seasonal swings in activities in commercial establishments. During the holiday weekend, you would have seen all the parking lots filled to capacity or spilling over, so it is commendable to not have too much parking, but he doesn't understand if 25% just came out of the sky or you got an inspiration when you looked out the window, etc. He doesn't know the right number, but it struck him that 25% seemed skinny.

Matt Goebel explained that as with so many things that they deal with in zoning, it is a matter of striking a balance and 25% is a ratio that a lot of communities have seized on as a relatively arbitrary number, but something that makes sense as a reasonable increment above the minimum. A lot of communities are focused on not having seas of parking; they don't want seas of asphalt, and yes, it will be better landscaped under the new Code, but they don't want seas of asphalt. They want to stay just some increment above and try to set an upper bar. First, it is not a maximum upper bar. In the Code, there are ways to exceed that maximum if you can provide a justification or permeable pavers for that material. There are ways to achieve that bar, so it is not an absolute maximum; you can provide a justification, but it is trying to set some cap and say there needs to be some limit beyond which you shouldn't go. It is not based on an economic study; it is based on typical planning practices and a lot of communities have been adopting it for about 10 years.

Commissioner Barcus then suggested that Sedona is atypical, as you mentioned in your introduction, for a city of 10,000 people. It is a little different than common practices. The Commissioner then referenced cluster subdivision standards and indicated there were some lot size suggestions, and actually a little tickler that said, "What is the right number for that?" He stated that he doesn't know what that right number is, but he needs some logic and justification for why 3,000 or 2,500 or 2,000 sq. ft. for cluster subdivision standards might be something that would work well in this community, especially with the housing shortages that seem to have become pervasive. Matt Goebel explained that they have continued to talk with staff about the cluster piece and what the sweet spot is and what those lot sizes should be, and they need to look further and try to understand the intent behind some of those cluster concepts that were introduced in Schnebly and some of the plans where those have been proposed, and think about the types of housing products that will be used there. Is it a tiny home, a more traditionally-sized home, etc., and thinking through that could help form that conversation. If it is a collection of tiny homes, then maybe there is justification for going even smaller. Communities are all across the board in thinking through what the cluster option is and how low you can go below the minimum required in the Code, etc., and he doesn't think there is a right answer to that. They need to figure out what you are looking to achieve. Then, they can help design some standards for you. They are putting in place a mechanism that allows that flexibility, and figuring out where that mechanism allows you to land is going to require more conversation.

Commissioner Barcus asked if it makes sense to specify this and allow for variances or does it make more sense to have it be fuzzy and have everything be determined based on slope, permeability, rock subsurface, etc. Administratively, it is a lot more straightforward to say the minimum lot size shall be 2,000 sq. ft., and for a lot of reasons related to common space versus

trying to get mortgages for cluster housing, etc., you need to own the dirt under the building, and it makes it easier for developers and buyers to deal with this, so he doesn't know the right number, but it seems like it could be smaller than is shown.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that those are quantitative; the qualitative issue is related to redevelopment. Six months ago, he was in a gallery and last month the same building was serving food. It is a much different kind of use even though it is permitted by that zoning. The churn in buildings for lease -- there is this significant rollover in terms of what entrepreneurs want to put in available space, so he is impressed that we will have more focus on redevelopment in terms of interior uses, but he is also thinking of redevelopment in terms of bulldozing large swaths and putting in something that may be considered less 50's and 60's and more contemporary, and fitting in with some of the design standards we would like to see. He thinks of redevelopment in terms of if we were starting with a blank template and there was nothing here and we wanted to do the whole community in one master plan, so this redevelopment component is really important and he is glad to see we are going to be emphasizing that.

Commissioner Brandt asked if we were to start over, would everything be underground, and he then stated that he looks forward to reviewing the updates and has no questions at this time, and Commissioner Klein also stated that he wanted to review the materials before asking any questions.

Commissioner Kinsella indicated there were various places where you were talking about moving chunks of information into a separate document, such as the Design Review Manual. That is great in terms of cleaning up and making it an easier read, but will there be some reference replacing that language to say you need to go to this manual, so somebody won't lose that train of information. Tareq Wafaie stated that they have left placeholders in the draft wherever they removed information, and they are suggesting it be somewhere else. They have put that reference into the Land Development Code draft and usually there is a footnote saying that they think it should be located in the Engineering Standards Manual or an administrative procedures manual, so they will retain those references moving forward.

Commissioner Kinsella stated that the Commission will get more nitty-gritty as we review the document, but just in general, thinking about a circulation plan, it says it is triggered for anything over single-family development and she wondered how that was chosen and what exactly they mean. Are you looking at somebody building a two-family house, etc.? Would they be required to have a circulation plan? Tareq indicated that he would have to go back to that and see if they excluded duplexes, but he thinks that is right. Matt Goebel added that is a good example of a topic that they will delve more into in the final part – Administration and Procedures, because they will then be talking about major site plans versus minor site plans, and they can get more calibrated about which submittal requirements will be required for the big stuff, so they might want to revisit some of these thresholds like for circulation plans once those thresholds are drafted. They have it in here for starting purposes, but he thinks they are going to revisit when those plans are required, and it would be the same for landscaping plans once they draft those thresholds.

Commissioner Kinsella then referenced the Parking Table and indicated it breaks things down by a category use and then a sub-use within those categories, and she is looking for how you are coming across with consistencies within the sub-use categories. For example, some things are done by square footage and other things have seat requirements. She is thinking of when you start to get into the larger use category of food and beverage, and there are so many sub-categories for a lounge versus a restaurant versus a drive-thru versus whatever, so why would seating be used instead of square footage in those cases? Tareq explained that they did not standardize every parking requirement, but they cleaned it up quite a bit and they think it is very hard to regulate parking based on the number of employees, because that changes all the time. How do you enforce a code like that? For things like restaurants and trying to define by building size, there are big and small kitchens and various types of employees, common spaces and outdoor dining, so the number of seats is a common way to regulate parking for those types of uses, because that is really

how many people you are going to have in there. Restaurants, bars and lounges tend to attract a lot more people in smaller spaces than other typical uses, so that was the reasoning behind that; however, Matt Goebel clarified that they tried to move away from all of the standards based on seats, so they should all be in the final column based on GFA. There are seat counts that are used to distinguish big restaurants versus small; it is just a size threshold, but that is not what you use to measure the number of parking spaces, so they agree that they should all be based on GFA.

Commissioner Kinsella stated that also on the Parking Table, for consistency, some business categories take in the patronage and include some employee uses or maintenance uses, and others may not from what she saw. For example, a hospital use has spaces per square footage, and previously it was by patient bed, so does the calculation include how many square feet are allocated per patient that you then translate into the parking requirement; she didn't see anything. If the hospital ever expanded uses, there would be more maintenance vehicles, but she didn't see anything in that type of use, so she wondered if we could look at that to get it more aligned. Tareq Wafaie stated that they can look at that. Again, some communities still regulate hospitals by patient beds, but they think that just based on that type of use, it is more common for hospitals to just do a gross floor area, so they moved to that type of standard. They have written hundreds of codes and always look at how those parking standards differentiate between the different cities, and there has been a lot of studies from the American Planning Association on parking, and finding that magic number is very difficult. They have proposed some new standards that they think would be appropriate for Sedona, realizing that this is a draft and sometimes they will need to tweak it, but the best way to do this is during the testing phase. Before they finish a new code update project, you have to take some sites and recent development applications and see how it performed under the current code and how it would have performed under the new code, and are they going too far in one direction, so they will consider your comments on maintenance vehicles. . . Commissioner Kinsella interjected, and possible expansion. The hospital doesn't have a lot of patient beds now, because it has a lot of day use, but it could expand in the future.

Commissioner Kinsella noted that lodging seems to be broken down into two areas. One is interior access for rooms and the other is exterior access for rooms, but unlike a lot of bigger cities, many of our lodging units are exterior access, although they are treated like and thought of as an interior hotel, but there is no interior access, so she wanted to be sure that is in mind as well. A lot of them are not the old drive-up motels, but they retain that exterior access for rooms versus a lobby.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she would be interested in hearing more about the philosophical basis for determining those elements in Article 10 that have always been recommendations and encouraged without any shall language, and putting them in Article 9, which she asks at the risk of not having read that and it may be very self-evident, but there must have been a philosophical basis for doing that, and she understood that you were going to preserve something in Article 10 that was more on the lines of philosophical, architectural design goals for the community. Matt Goebel indicated that they tried to distinguish between language that talked about intent and philosophical goals versus something that could be reduced to a standard and be enforced, and that is at its core, that is how you break this stuff apart. For example, you have language about building color, and you have some great very thoughtful paragraphs that talk about the importance of selecting colors that blend with the natural dirt, topography and soils, etc., it is great, but then you have some stuff that boil it down into hue values and Chroma values and LRVs, and in a situation like that, they would try to distill a lot of the broad language about the goals into a clear succinct statement, and then present the standards. A lot of that superfluous flowery language is really good and thoughtful, but it is not code language; it is more background. It helps explain why Sedona decided to address this stuff. They had a long conversation with staff this morning about how to draw this line, and they are still working through it. It is going to be case-by-case, but they are going to try to distill as much of that out as they can, and the stuff that doesn't move forward could find a home in a training guide for new staff or developers. People that want to develop in Sedona need to understand why you regulate building color, so they might want to read some of those paragraphs. They don't want to get rid of that, but it is not appropriate for a code, and their guiding principle was if it was an enforceable standard.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the term 'bin' as in throwing things in the bin to see what they may or may not do with them, so if you were to disregard what was left in the bin, because it was flowery, etc., then would you replace that with the reference to the Community Plan, which may well have the foundational language for that color value? Is that where you want to go to make those stronger linkages to the Plan vis-à-vis what is left in Article 10? Matt Goebel explained that he didn't want to sound derogatory when he said flowery; a lot of it is poetic and great language. The Vice Chair pointed out that there were a lot of photographs that enabled the developer to see exactly what we were talking about, and Matt agreed and stated that they don't want to lose that stuff. They do want to draw better linkages to the Community Plan; that is a better, more recent source of community feedback. One thing they discussed this morning is adding in more of the little brown boxes that have linkages to the Plan, but there are pros and cons to that. The pro is that it provides a really direct linkage between those documents and it is right there for someone to understand why the regulation is in place. The downside is that those can become outdated over time, and you are going to have to do another code update if you add in too many references to external things that are going to get updated, so you need to strike a balance. A better solution is to pull forward those ideas from the Community Plan and that background language, get a good tight intent statement, and then highlight that more to make sure it is really good and robust. Vice Chair Levin asked if the intent statement would be like a preface to that article, and Matt indicated yes, but he doesn't know that you want to have specific citations or quotes from the Community Plan, because you are going to update your Plan, and you should; it is a living document.

Matt added that the photographs are really helpful, but maybe some of those buildings are torn down or they have been modified in a way that you didn't support or maybe they are no longer in keeping with what the City currently enforces in the standards, so those are really good candidates to move to a separate manual; they typically don't put a lot of photographs in a code for that reason.

Commissioner Barcus stated that he read this, and he realizes that you are not talking about the definitions tonight, but there is one that he keyed on, because we have had issues associated with this in applications, and it is the definition of 'substantial improvement' on page 125. It is talking about, ". . . repair and reconstruction or improvement, the cost of which exceeds 50% of the market value of the structure either before the improvement or repair is started or, if the structure has been damaged . . .", and that whole paragraph needs to tightened up significantly. If he owns a building and doesn't want to come up to substantial improvement standards, he does three phases in three years with three different permits, so we need to clean up that definition and know why we picked 50%. It is probably a pretty good number, but he would like to be able to drive a stake in the ground and say 50% is common practice or some other kind of standard. The other element of this is whose market value, is it the developer's market value or the county appraiser's market value; whose market value is this and when do we know what that market value change is going to be? If you do a substantial addition, the county appraiser comes out and appraises the property in the next cycle, and that is too late. He likes the idea of getting every existing structure up to current standards and codes based on this substantial improvement doctrine, but it is messy and you are the pros, so maybe you have fixed this in other jurisdictions.

Tareq Wafaie indicated that as part of their work on the next part of the Code, the Administration and Procedures, they will draft the non-conformities regulations, and in doing so, they are going to have to figure this piece out. At what point do you trigger compliance to each of the standards within the Land Development Code? If you are going to base that on market value, whose market value? They started getting into those discussions this morning and expect to get more detailed, so he appreciates your comment. The Commissioner stated that he wants it to be as straightforward as possible to prevent as much gaming as possible. There is always going to be gaming; you are going to look at the numbers and say you are going to do this, or if you have to do all of this other stuff, you might as well do a lot more. There will be different thought processes operated by the developers, but this harkens back to the issue associated with redevelopment that you emphasized.

Vice Chair Levin noted that the Commission has 18 days to read the material and provide comments and questions back to staff, so we will be prepared and the consultants will have enough

time to come back in January with responses to the questions. Mike Raber explained that the Commission will probably be dealing with staff in January rather than the consultant. The Vice Chair then asked if that will be a discussion/possible action public hearing and Mike Raber stated no, it will be a work session, and Matt Goebel added that they will be helping staff prepare for that.

Commissioner Barcus asked when they might get comments from other Commissioners, and Mike Raber explained that staff will be consolidating that as part of the packet for the Commission's meeting on the 16th. Vice Chair Levin then asked if revisions were expected or just discussion of the Commission's comments and questions, and Mike Raber explained that the more staff gets a feel from the Commission as a whole as to what direction you want to move in would be very helpful. The Vice Chair then advised the audience that would like, at a future time, to be able to provide comments, she is not sure if the next time this is agendized that will be permitted or not, but in the meantime, get in touch with staff if you have questions and comments. Mike Raber agreed and noted that comments can also be made online on the website.

Audree Juhlin stated that before getting into the future meeting dates, she wanted to remind the Commissioners that as they are providing their comments to staff, do not send them to all of the Commission – only to staff individually.

5. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

a. Tuesday, December 5, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
b. Thursday, December 14, 2017; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
c. Tuesday, December 19, 2017; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)

Audree Juhlin indicated that the only meeting in December is December 5th for two CUPs as part of a public hearing and an action item on your rules and procedures. Then on January 16th at 3:30 p.m., there will be a continuation of today's meeting, and at 5:30 p.m. there will be a CUP public hearing for the charter school playground. Vice Chair Levin mentioned the January 9th retreat and Audree added that it is in the Schnebly Conference Room from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Commissioner Barcus referenced the December 5th agenda and indicated that a meeting was indicated on January 2nd; Vice Chair Levin clarified that had been canceled, and Audree Juhlin then repeated that the dates to remember are December 5th, January 9th and January 16th. .

6. EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

No Executive Session was held.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Levin called for adjournment at 4:50 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on November 30, 2017

_____ _____

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