Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission
Meeting of January 2nd, 2019
Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room
County Administrative Center
219 East Cherry
Flagstaff, Arizona

Members Present
Don Walters - Chairman
Tammy Ontiveros - Vice - Chair
Tyanna Burton
Jim Clifford
Ray Mayer
John Ruggles
Sat Best
Mary Williams

Members Absent

Staff Present
Jess McNeely, Assistant Director
Zach Schwartz, Sr. Planner
Melissa Shaw, Planner
Chris Roll, Deputy County Attorney
Kendra Crawford, Recording Secretary

Chairman Walters called the meeting to order at 5:28PM. He noted procedures to the audience.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

November 28th, 2018: MOTION: Commissioner Ruggles moved to approve the November 28th, 2018 minutes as written. Commissioner Williams seconded the Motion. The Motion passed 7-1 with Commissioner Best abstaining.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Case No. CUP-18-036 and DRO-18-004: A request for a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review Overlay application for a multiple family development including five (5) units on a .58 acre parcel in the RM-10/A (Residential Multiple Family, 10 units per acre) Zone. The property is located at 3320 Forest Service Road 237 in Kachina Village, Arizona and is also identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 116-49-042D. Property Owner: David and Patricia J Hooker, Flagstaff, AZ
Applicant: David Hooker, Flagstaff, AZ
County Supervisor District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

Mr. Schwartz summarized the staff report along with a PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Best stated there are fifteen bedrooms but only nine parking spaces, is there other parking areas proposed. Mr. Schwartz explained that each house has an attached one car garage and one of those houses also has a one car carport attached to the garage. There is also a four-car carport located on the property. Commissioner Best asked if there were another place for cars to be parked, maybe on the west of the property. Mr. Schwartz replied that the number of parking spots shown on the site plan meet the requirements for that zone; two per unit, one covered and one uncovered. He stated the driveways shown on the site plan may be another parking option, also someone could park in the garage with another car outside the garage. Mr. Schwartz stated that the way the minimum parking standards are designed in the Zoning Ordinance for this zone, have worked out in the other duplexes around this property.

Commissioner Best stated he supports the staff’s recommendations on paving but is there an option between gravel and paving. He stated that there are also pavers as an option, they may not be cheaper but more of a classier look and meet the dust requirement. Mr. Schwartz stated that the Commission can discuss the different types for this waiver with the applicant.

Commissioner Ontiveros clarified with staff that there is no other development in this area, that has received a paving waiver. Mr. Schwartz replied that all the new developments in this area are paved, except KVID’s lot which may have gravel due to it being built in the 1960’s and legal non-conforming.

There were no further questions for staff, the floor was opened to the applicant for comment.

David Hooker, 7507 E Deville Ln. Flagstaff Arizona, stated that he is the owner and contractor for the property and does not have a problem with doing the paving. He explained that pavers would be more expensive than asphalt.

Chairman Walters asked if he read the staff report and agrees with it. Mr. Hooker replied that he did.

There were no further questions for the applicant, the floor was opened to the public for comment.

Todd Flores, 2104 Kachina Blvd. Flagstaff Arizona, asked if there are any provisions preventing these homes turning into vacation rentals. He stated that they own the properties adjacent to the North of this development (gas station and subway property) and the development behind them are rental units. They find that the parking is inadequate, and when there is snow or no parking they will park in their lots. Mr. Flores
also asked about the shared ingress/egress to their property, he would like that taken into consideration. Mr. Schwartz explained that the State Legislature wrote a preemption in law that doesn’t allow the County to regulate vacation rentals differently than long term rentals or normal single-family dwelling types of situation. The Commission is not able to make a condition to address vacation rentals. He stated that the Commission cannot make a condition against making it a vacation rental, but the applicant has mentioned that he is looking to do long term.

Mr. Schwartz asked for more information about their easement questions, he stated that they are being cognize of it with the set back. He stated that he didn’t notice if there was a shared maintenance agreement for that easement. Mr. Flores replied that the easement allows them access between this new development and their property. He wanted to make sure it would be written into the development that they have access to utilize that easement. Mr. Schwartz replied that the easement is an agreement between the applicant and them, but they would need to be a benefactor for that easement.

Ed Flores, 2104 Kachina Blvd. Flagstaff Arizona, stated that his concern is traffic. During one snow fall, they had to chain four vehicles to move them for a fuel delivery. If people cannot get to their places, or cannot find a parking spot, they park in the only place with lights and open spots. Mr. Flores also stated that next to the baseball park the County has a parking lot there, but the gate is locked, so no one can use it. There are a lot of resident’s who during a snow storm cannot make it up the hill and need a place to leave their vehicle. He stated that if the County would leave it open, Todd stated that he would plow it. Chairman Walters explained that the parking lot is owned by the County’s Park and Recreation department, it’s a great idea but he would need to get a hold of them for that partnership.

Mr. Flores stated that their property has a Forest Service address, just like the proposed development, can you access the property through forest service. Mr. Schwartz replied that Forest Service road access is complicated, they have a transportation map that lists the different roads and trails that are open for public access. Anything that is not on that map, you cannot use as a legal access. He explained that in order for you to use one of those public access; you will need to get a Forest Service permit and maintenance agreement. When Staff and Mr. Hooker looked at using the Forest Service road, it wouldn’t suffice for access to the property, it was not wide enough for the requirements of a road. Mr. Schwartz stated that the Forest Service may be able to better answer their questions.

There no more people in the audience to comment on this case, the floor was closed to public and opened to Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Best stated that he can make the findings to approve this case but thinks the parking will be the biggest issue for the applicant.

Commissioner Mayer stated that it’s a good project and will fit the surrounding area and environment. He stated that the parking is an issue for the whole County,
especially in bad weather. The two parties need to get together and come up with a good faith effort.

Commissioner Ontiveros concurs with the two previous Commissioner’s comments. She stated that regarding the parking issues, she understands the concerns with using gas stations lots for overflow parking. She suggests that Mr. Flores speak with the developer asking that overflow parking not be the store. Commissioner Ontiveros stated that she can make the findings to approve both of the motions.

Commissioner Clifford stated that he can make the findings. He referred to the site plan, asking how wide the center area is, can additional parking be added there. Parking will always be an issue, they need to talk with Mr. Hooker about snow removal and that open space. Commissioner Clifford stated that can make the findings to approve this case.

Commissioner’s Burton and Williams stated that they agree with everything that was said by their fellow Commissioners and can make the findings.

Commissioner Ruggles stated he can make the findings and concurs with the comments from the previous Commissioners. He stated that looking at the site plan, he does not think that there is space for more parking, but they are meeting the minimum standard required in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairman Walters stated that it is a good-looking project. He stated as a landlord a big concern for him is removing the snow quickly before it gets packed down to ice. He also stated that he is not sure of where they will be dumping or putting the snow after they plow. To be a good neighbor, access and snow removal will be key.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Ruggles moved to approve Case No. CUP-18-036 with the six conditions as stated in the staff report. Commissioner Clifford seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Ruggles moved to approve Case No. DRO-18-004 with the four conditions as stated in the staff report. Commissioner Clifford seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

2. **Case No. ZC-18-008:** A request for a Zone Change from the AR (Agricultural Residential, one acre minimum parcel size) Zone to the RS-16,000 (Residential Single Family, 16,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size) Zone on three parcels totaling 2.28 acres. The subject properties are located in Oak Creek Canyon on Lower Indian Gardens Drive and are identified as Assessor’s Parcel Numbers 405-28-003A, 405-28-04 and 405-28-005.

**Property Owner:** Ellis Revocable Living Trust DTD 04-02-97, Sedona, AZ

**Property Owner:** Elizabeth W Kauffman Trust, Scottsdale, AZ
Property Owner: Cameron Family Trust, Sedona, AZ
Applicant: David Ellis, Sedona, AZ
County Supervisor District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

Mr. McNeely stated that the applicant is requesting a sixty-day continuance on this case, which will be the meeting of February 27th, 2019. He stated that the request came in after the case and property were noticed, requiring the Commission to make a motion to continue. The Commissioners will be keeping the packet information to review, but if there is a change or anything added, they will receive it in the next packet.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Ontiveros moved to continue Case No. ZC-18-008 for sixty days until the meeting of February 27th, 2019. Commissioner Williams seconded the Motion. The Motion passed unanimously.

**IV. CALL TO PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

There was no public to speak.

**V. CONTINUATION OF STUDY SESSION**

Ms. Shaw reviewed the Draft Zoning Ordinance Chapter 3 – Special Uses and Conditions. The Commission and staff discussed the camp site setbacks, clusters, quiet times, generator usage and recreational facilities (volleyball courts and swimming pools) from the Residential Zones. Commissioner Best discussed the difference between Glamping and camp grounds.

Commissioner Ontiveros asked if there is another County, they can research camp ground standards. Mr. Schwartz replied that they looked at the standards of Yavapai County, but Coconino is the more desired area for camp grounds. The Commission and staff discussed the standards we have for camp grounds. Commissioner Ontiveros stated that some of the biggest concerns that need to be figured out are noise and dust. Mr. Schwartz replied that emergency access and fire are also a big concern.

Commissioner Ontiveros stated that with the CUP process you will find out the concerns neighbors may have and that will be the time to fix them. Mr. Schwartz agreed and stated with Commercial camp grounds the details were always decided through the CUP process and on a case by case bases, maybe with the Residential zones they can do the same. This process is more of a guidance for the CUP processes.

The Commission and staff discussed the paving requirements for camp grounds and what is required for Camp Tuthill, is the County grandfathered. They also discussed County Parks and does the analysis agree with the County’s standards. The Commission requested to have a meeting with the County’s Parks and Recreation Commission.

The Commission and Staff also discussed the twenty percent limitation standard for camp grounds in residential zones, you can go higher but you can never go lower.
This is just a standard and starting point. Mr. McNeely stated that each case will be discussed during their preapplication process and when a site plan is given.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58pm.

Chairperson, Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

Secretary, Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission