

Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission
Meeting of April 29, 2020
Community Development
2500 N. Ft. Valley Road
Flagstaff, Arizona

This hearing was held on MS Teams

Members Present

Tammy Ontiveros – Madam Chair
Don Walters – Vice-Chair
Sat Best
Ray Mayer
John Ruggles
Tyanna Burton
Jim Clifford
Mary Williams

Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Jay Christelman, Director
Jess McNeely, AICP, Assistant Director
Bob Short, Principal. Planner
Zach Schwartz, Sr. Planner
Aaron Lumpkin, County Attorney
Marty Hernandez, Recording Secretary

Madam Chair Ontiveros called the meeting to order at 5:32PM. She noted procedures to the audience.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Clifford made the motion to approve the minutes from March 25, 2020.

SECOND: Commissioner Walters seconded.

DISCUSSION: N/A

VOTE: The vote was unanimous, with Commissioner Ruggles abstaining.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Case No. CUP-20-005: A request for a Conditional Use Permit renewal (of CUP-05-002) for a 63-foot wireless telecommunications facility on a utility easement within a 3.84-acre parcel in the RR-2 ½ (Rural Residential, 2 ½-acre minimum parcel size) Zone. The site is located at 4367 N A1 Mountain Road and is also identified as Assessor’s Parcel Number 116-67-031A.

Property Owner: Nelson Family Trust UDT dated 4-16-10, Manhattan Beach, California

Applicant: Commscapes, LLC, Phoenix, Arizona

Representative: Todd Daoust

County Supervisor District: 1 (Art Babbott)

STAFF: Mr. Schwartz gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. Commissioner Best asked what the decibel level was currently. Mr. Schwartz stated there is not a decibel level written in the Zoning Ordinance. The decibel level is not currently written into the conditions. The current level of the equipment currently is 42.2. Commissioner Ruggles pointed out that the noise from Interstate 40 could reach 50 decibels at the residence.

Commissioner Clifford stated the AC units are rated around 25-55 decibels, not taking into account the of upkeep and age of the equipment.

OWNER: Ms. Nelson, property owner, stated construction on her house was in 2005. The house was designed to mask the noise from the highway, not the cooling units as it was not a problem at the time. Over time, she has had to call to initiate repairs on the system. She is asking for designs that meet design requirements of the FCC. She wants the system tested and that meets requirements.

Commissioner Ruggles asked if Ms. Nelson used a cell phone app to measure the decibels at her house. Ms. Nelson has not tested own her own and feels like it is the company's responsibility to monitor their equipment. She is willing to accept 50 dba as the property line.

Commissioner Ruggles asked if she was willing to use a cell phone app to monitor the levels while the cooling units were running. Ms. Nelson is willing to also test in house to show the levels but reiterated that it is the company's responsibility to monitor their equipment.

Chair Ontiveros apologized that the owner was asked to speak before the applicant, which was out of the order in which the hearing was conducted.

APPLICANT: Todd Daoust, Commscapes, Phoenix, AZ, had provided cut sheets of dba ranges. This site was built in 2005 and occupied by ATT&T and managed by Crown Castle. He had reviewed the changes and the update that was planned. If the CUP had not expired these changes would have been approved administratively.

Chair Ontiveros asked if the house was built before or after the tower. Mr. Daoust could not verify that.

Commissioner Ruggles wanted to know Mr. Daoust's opinion on using a sound wall to help lower the dba. Mr. Daoust thought his client would not have any issues with something in regard to that, as long it was reasonable.

OWNER: Ms. Nelson reviewed the dba that was discussed, 62-70 dBs, will drown out everyday conversation, among other things. She knows when they upgraded the system it had gotten noisier. She applauded the noise reducing wall.

Commissioner Ruggles stated the level readings were taken at the property line and the house is another 250' away. Without the seeing the data taken from the house, it is difficult to tell the applicant what his requirements should be.

Mr. Whitney Cunningham, Aspey, Watkins, and Diesel, Flagstaff, AZ, felt like if a sound reduction wall or similar could be included in the resolution that would be acceptable.

PUBLIC: No one from the public had comments.

COMMISSION: Commissioner Walters thought the applicant should be able to find an air conditioning unit that is much quieter, and not disrupt the property owner. The unit itself should start at less than 50 decibels.

Commissioner Clifford thought the manufacturer could have a quieter unit. The applicant needs to find the information about upgrades.

Commissioner Ruggles stated that using some type of sound level meter reading was needed along with a sound barrier. He thought the case needed to be continued until he had data.

Commissioner Mayer agreed that solid concrete information was needed, and it may take a combination of sound barriers.

Commissioner Best wanted to state the sound level in a condition and have it followed by staff.

Commissioner Williams agreed with Commissioner Best with setting a standard.

Commissioner Burton agreed with setting a standard and write it in a condition.

Chair Ontiveros agreed with the others in making this a condition and followed by staff.

Commissioner Ruggles thought it was possible to mandate a decibel level at the property line. It has been done in the past with other CUPs, setting the decibel limit at the property line. It would be easy for the owner to provide data if the applicant went over the decibels.

Mr. Schwartz said the applicant would need to prove the dba through manufacturer's specifications and would be part of the building permit process.

Commissioner Clifford wanted the clarifications on the recommendations. He stated Condition #2 stated the dba needed to be 50 dba at the residence not the property line.

Commissioner Ruggles thought the condition could be changed to read the property line and the applicant would be responsible for meeting the condition.

Chair Ontiveros asked Mr. Daoust if he understood and was agreeable to the 50 dba at the property line and if he agreed to the rest of the staff report. He understood and agreed.

Mr. Schwartz read a recommended amendment to the proposed condition that would meet the commissioners' intents; "Noise levels caused by the tower shall be kept at 50 decibels or less at the property line. Any mitigation techniques needed to keep the noise impact at this level should be approved by the Community Development Director or referred back to the Planning and Zoning Commission if mitigation constitutes a substantial change or expansion in the applicant's submitted plans. An acoustic analysis provided by an acoustic engineer shall be provided to staff as proof that this requirement is met."

MOTION: Commissioner Ruggles made a motion to approve CUP-20-005 with conditions as stated by staff.

SECOND: Commissioner Williams seconded.

DISCUSSION: NA

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. Case No. CUP-20-007: A request for a Conditional Use Permit renewal (of CUP-14-021) for a 61-foot wireless telecommunication facility on a ½-acre lease area within a 13,875-acre parcel in the G (General, ten-acre minimum

parcel size) Zone. The site is located 24 miles southwest of Winslow and two miles west of Hwy 99 on the top of Chevelon Butte and within Assessor's Parcel Number 407-06-002E.

Property Owner: Chevelon Butte LP, Winslow, Arizona

Applicant: GovNet, Scottsdale, Arizona

Representative: Karen Armstrong, Scottsdale, Arizona

County Supervisor District: 4 (Jim Parks)

STAFF: Mr. Schwartz gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report.

APPLICANT: Karen Armstrong, GovNet, Scottsdale, AZ, said the company was requesting a renewal of the existing towers. She had read the staff report and agreed with the conditions.

PUBLIC: No one from the public had comments.

COMMISSION: All commissioners could make the findings.

MOTION: Commissioner Walters made a motion to approve CUP-20-007.

SECOND: Commissioner Clifford seconded.

DISCUSSION: NA

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Case No. ZC-20-001: A request for a Zone Change from the G (General, 10-acre minimum parcel size) Zone to the AR-5 (Agricultural Residential, five-acre minimum parcel size) Zone on a 10 acre parcel located south of the Winona interchange at 10300 E Wapiti Trail and is also identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 303-32-002A.

Property Owner/Applicant: Russell and Pennie Kortsen, Flagstaff, Arizona

County Supervisor District: 4 (Jim Parks)

STAFF: Mr. Short gave a PowerPoint and summarized the staff report.

APPLICANT: Mr. Russell Korsten, 10300 E. Wapiti Trail, Flagstaff, AZ, had read the staff report and agreed with the conditions.

PUBLIC: No one from the public had turned in comments.

COMMISSION: All commissioners could make the findings.

MOTION: Commissioner Walters made a motion for recommendation of approval for case ZC-20-001 to move to the BOS.

SECOND: Commissioner Ruggles seconded.

DISCUSSION: NA

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. Case No. CUP-20-015: A request for a Conditional Use Permit for a convenience market with fuel islands on six parcels (proposed to be combined) including a total of 1.95 acres in the PC (Planned Community) Zone where CG-10,000 (Commercial General, 10,000 sq. ft minimum parcel size) zoning standards apply. The subject properties are located at 101 West Glen and 61 South Wahweap Drive in Grenehaven and are also identified as

Assessor's Parcel Numbers 601-39-002C, 601-44-001, 601-44-002, 601-44-003, 601-44-004, 601-44-006.

Property Owner: Grenehaven Holdings, LLC, Beaver, Utah

Applicant: Twin Rocks Enterprises, LLC, Littlefield, Arizona

Representative: Rolane Grinnell

County Supervisor District: 5 (Lena Fowler)

STAFF: Mr. Short gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. Commissioner Ruggles had reviewed the lighting plan in detail and indicated it did not conform to Table 4-3 in Zone 3 for Class 2 lighting in the Zoning Ordinance because one type of lighting had a higher lumen count that was allowed. Mr. Short indicated he was aware of that issue. He indicated the applicant had proposed reducing the level of the higher lumen lighting to meet the standard. Mr. Short indicated the lighting permit has not been approved, and he had intended to will work with Mark Stento, the County's lighting advisor on that issue before approving the lighting permit.

Commissioner Best asked about the email with comments regarding water run off and trash issues. Mr. Short stated there was an underground detention area around the store to address water runoff, and drainage on the site would be approved by the Engineering Division. He also indicated an enclosed trash bin would be installed as shown on the site plan.

APPLICANT: Rolane Grinnell, Parowan, Utah, had read the staff report and agreed with the conditions. Chair Ontiveros asked if he will work with Mr. Short and his engineers on the lighting. He agreed with the staff report and he is willing to work with Mr. Short, and his engineers to be compliant with the lighting. He would prefer to use LEDs. Commissioner Ruggles stated as long as the Lighting Ordinance is abided by then using LEDs is understandable. Commission Ruggles would like to see a lock down on the lighting unit so it could not be adjusted upward.

PUBLIC: No comments were presented from the public.

COMMISSION: All commissioners could support the project but thought the signage might be excessive and wanted to make sure the lighting would not be turned up. Chair Ontiveros asked Mr. Short to clarify the waiver for the signage. Mr. Short stated that in the past the commission has been consistent with signage, allowing signage on only two sides of a fuel island canopy. The additional square footage for signage is addressed in Condition #3 that approves the sign waiver. Commissioners thought the signs on three sides of the canopy were acceptable as it addressed the visibility in the area and store's orientation to the roads.

MOTION: Commissioner Clifford made the motion to approve CUP-20-015.

SECOND: Commissioner Ruggles seconded.

DISCUSSION: NA

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

IV. CALL TO PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no comments from the public.

Chairman Ontiveros adjourned the hearing at 7:53PM

V. CONTINUATION OF STUDY SESSION IF NEEDED

Jammy Olivares
 Chairperson, Coconino County
 Planning and Zoning Commission

ATTEST:

Marty Hernandez

Secretary, Coconino County
 Planning and Zoning Commission

Grade	Grade Name	Volume	Sales	% of Total Fuel Sales
Grade 01	REGULAR	197.120	2484.70	62.62%
Grand Total Store Sales Reading				
\$1,842.91				
Fuel Sales				
Paid Out Tender Totals				
Total				
(\$134.00)				
Cash				
Total				
(\$134.00)				
Date Time	Account Desc. / Item	Amount	Tender	
05/11/2020 6:00:27PM	Lotto Paid Out	-212.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 4:27:18PM	Lotto Paid Out	-25.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 2:56:20PM	Lotto Paid Out	-220.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 1:10:47PM	Lotto Paid Out	-27.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 11:04:33AM	Lotto Paid Out	-210.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 10:27:34AM	Lotto Paid Out	-210.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 10:25:22AM	Lotto Paid Out	-210.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 10:00:14AM	Lotto Paid Out	-210.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 9:51:18AM	Fuel Paid Out	-21.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 7:37:03AM	Lotto Paid Out	-210.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 7:24:31AM	Lotto Paid Out	-220.00	Cash	
05/11/2020 6:48:32AM	Lotto Paid Out	-220.00	Cash	
Total				
(\$134.00)				
Paid In / Paid Out Report				