

# DRAFT

## MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING TOWN COUNCIL AD HOC UDO UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY

WEDNESDAY AUGUST 1, 2018  
4:00 P.M.

The Town Council Ad Hoc UDO Update Subcommittee of the Town of Chino Valley convened for a public meeting in the Council Chambers Conference Room, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Mayor Turner called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m.

**2) ROLL CALL**

Present: Lon Turner, Chair; Corey Mendoza, Councilmember

Absent: Cloyce Kelly, Councilmember

Staff Cecilia Grittman, Town Manager; Jason Sanks, Development Services Director (Skype); Alex

Present: Lerma, Planner; Frank Marbury, Public Works Director; Mike Bacon, Planning and Zoning Commissioner

**3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a) Consideration and possible action to approve June 27, 2018 meeting minutes.

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to accept the June 27, 2018 minutes.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

PASSED - Unanimously

**4) OLD BUSINESS**

**5) NEW BUSINESS**

- a) Presentation and discussion regarding the Town's Multi-Residence (MR) districts current development standards, proposed changes, and consideration of creating at least one more district, (MR-L) and (MR-H) to better address proposals for either lower or higher densities.

Mr. Sanks and Committee Members discussed and reviewed the following:

- The current Multifamily District allowed for 14.5-units per acre, which would typically generate two story units. A withdrawn application involved 28 units per acre and because there was no zone to permit that density, the applicants applied for a Planned Area Overlay District (PAD). Most current multifamily units in Town are 12-15 units. There were no large scale units built in Town.
- The Town could expect to continue to receive pressure from developers planning either a small or large scale development project. Since the Town had only one zoning district to address these developments, projects received that exceed the allowed density, would require a PAD. Pressure from developers could include requests for much larger numbers of units in a single structure.
- The zoning code should be written and developed to address various types of development so that individual customization is not necessary.
- Towns and cities commonly had more than one Multi Family Development zone, ranging from low density to very high density (high rise development). The Town was looking to split the MR zoning into two categories; Multi Family Low Density (MR-L) and Multi Family High Density (MR-H). MR-H would receive more scrutiny because of the impacts to the Town which included traffic, public safety, etc.
- Descriptions of Multi Family developments from small to large included: cluster housing - 5-6 units per acre; townhomes – 10 units per acre; apartments – 14 units per acre.
- The current MR zoning standards were 12-years old and the setback standards were inadequate and should be developed to mitigate issues with neighboring properties. Projects could be mitigated or correlated based on height, requiring taller buildings to be further from property lines when in proximity to single family residential areas, but could accommodate smaller setbacks when adjacent to nonresidential neighboring properties.
- Consider more efforts to protect the residents in single family residential areas from dense developments and to facilitate more quality high density development. The Town should not preclude development, but have development happen in a more intelligent way.
- Some cities were pushing towards more organic development that had buildings that turn and twist so it felt more natural instead of feeling like a barracks.
- Implementing a transitional zone between zoning districts.
- Consider minimum requirements for apartment development that should be implemented, such as setbacks, outdoor and green space, and the like. The Town could consider not only limiting the maximum height of a building, but also the number of stories for MFL and Multi Family Medium (MFM) zoning districts. The Town could change the zoning code and limit building heights to 35 feet and two stories. Developers would then have to request a PAD for a three-story building, and would have to provide justification for the project, allowing for discretion from the Town.
- The General Plan identified the Town as a rural community, but the General Plan was too general and provided a mass of land down the center of town that allowed for three stories but didn't consider the surrounding property uses.
- Legal counsel would need to be consulted regarding how quickly new code regulations could be implemented and how long someone has to utilize old code standards.
- Performance measures example: 18 units per acre could require 20% covered parking, small club house with a management office, and may or may not have a pool and BBQ stations. The Town needed to determine what they wanted to require and write code to reflect those requirements.
- Whether or not housing should be built and designed for current residents or for people not currently living in Town. Requiring extra amenities could price out local people, so amenities could be geared for the Town and not be cost prohibitive.
- Requirements of an open space minimum, BBQ area and balconies or semiprivate outdoor space for first floor units. Age restricted housing could have separate requirements that could be different than family apartment units. The Town needs to ensure that it does not become a multi-family slum area where people drive somewhere else to work.

- Development of thresholds and performance measures that could be used when units exceeded a certain number. The developer would have to achieve certain performance measures or other measures as approved by Planning and Zoning and Council if they had other amenities they wanted to provide.
- Passive and active recreation area differences. Typically, 10% is allotted for each. If the amenities were developer driven instead of predetermined by Town, that portion of the project could be dropped and forgotten once property is sold.
- The PAD specifications were written to cover the deficiencies in the current code. The language should be modified to reflect code changes.
- Zoning districts could be written to be very restrictive and clear but need to coincide with the General Plan update. The General Plan should be completely overhauled once the UDO update is complete.
- Consider enhancing the multiple entrance requirements above the Fire Department requirements of 200 units before a second entrance is required.

The Subcommittee recommended:

- Keeping the MF-L zoning with 14.5 units per acre limit in place, adding a 2-story limit to code, and requiring a recreation area with performance measures dependent on the type of community (seniors vs. family). If an applicant wanted more density, it would come back as a PAD with justification for the request. Staff should focus on improving the MR zoning districts and restrict larger per acre units with restrictive language to protect the Town from large scale development.
- Staff initiate a text amendment for the Multi Family zoning code with the restrictive language to go to Council to be implemented quickly. Staff should meet with legal counsel about properly implementing the changes.
- Staff set a study session with Council in August to review story limitations and performance standards for MF zone.
- Staff schedule next UDO meeting for August 29, 2018 at 4:00 p.m. to discuss Commercial Districts – Light and Heavy.

## 6) **ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to adjourn the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

PASSED - Unanimously

Submitted: August 13, 2018.

By: *Vickie Nipper, Deputy Town Clerk*

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.