

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

**WEDNESDAY AUGUST 29, 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 4:22 p.m.

2) ROLL CALL

Present: Lon Turner, Chair; Corey Mendoza, Councilmember

Absent: Cloyce Kelly, Councilmember

Staff Jason Sanks, Development Services Director; Alex Lerma, Planner; Mike Bacon, Planning
Present: and Zoning Commissioner; Cecilia Gritman, Town Manager

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a) Consideration and possible action to approve the August 1, 2018 meeting minutes.

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to accept the meeting minutes from August 1, 2018.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

PASSED - Unanimously

4) OLD BUSINESS

- a) Recap of discussions regarding multi-family residential zoning districts.

Mr. Sanks reviewed and discussed the following:

- Clarified the Sub-Committee's directions for either:
 - Keeping the Multi Family District at 15 units per acre and implementing performance measures, amenities, and site design standards for the zoning district, or;
 - Creating a second high density zoning district with stricter performance measures for high density development.
- The Town had set precedent by approving apartments for 16 & 17 units. The Brooks application was an indication of where the Town was headed and proved the Town was not prepared for this type of development.

The Committee confirmed their recommendation for the following:

- The desire to keep the zoning district at 15 units per acre and retaining the MR designation without changing the name. A list of performance measures would be included and implemented for new development projects. A PAD (Planned Area Development) would be required for any development over the zoning standards.
- Mr. Sanks would work on providing a draft MR zoning code to implement additional proposed standards and providing a draft copy to the Committee before the next UDO meeting.

5) NEW BUSINESS

- a) Discussion regarding Commercial Light and Heavy Commercial zoning districts.

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

- Provided a PowerPoint and an outline of other cities Commercial and Mixed Use districts for comparison to Chino Valley's. The Town had Commercial Light and Commercial Heavy Districts mixed throughout the Town corridor.
- Cities could use the different districts to regulate development ranging from indoor retail (Commercial Light -CL) to outdoor storage, wholesale sales or light manufacturing (Commercial Heavy-CH).
- The Town based their Commercial districts on the intensity of use as opposed to the scale of uses. Example: Safeway was zoned Light Commercial, but in other communities it would be zoned Community Commercial due to the presence of 18-wheel trucks, delivery docks and noise and could require a larger landscaped setback. Smaller mom and pop shops could be zoned neighborhood commercial for their smaller scale.
- The Town did not have any performance or design criteria standards. There were some design criteria outlines that were loosely worded and had not been followed. The Town could consider design standards to become part of code.
- Staff wanted to do a zoning code inventory and provide a report of all the mobile home parks, when the parks were built, zoning they were under and if they were grandfathered. Staff also wanted to create a report of all the outdoor storage and mini storage businesses with the same information. This would help ensure that the businesses had done what was required at the time of development (screening, fencing, landscape, etc.)
- The current code only required a ten-foot setback between commercial zoned property and residential zoned property. The Committee could consider a gradation type setback: for every foot of building height, the building must have a setback adjacent to residential by the same distance. The Committee could instead consider a large setback and large landscaped area when adjacent to residential areas. Landscaped areas could be developed based on building scale.
- Due to the lack of parameters in the Commercial Light Zone, in theory, a developer could come and build an apartment building at any density. The only current standard was an 800 square foot per unit requirement. The code section could be changed to defer to the code section for multifamily development specifications.
- It was recommended separating the setback requirements from the landscape requirements when adjacent to residential areas. The setback requirement could be different for the property bordering the residential property and the side street section of the property.
- It was discussed how zoning changes could affect the property owners and the possible legal issues with any changes to the zoning code.
- The current code had the setback requirements for the Commercial Zones under a different section of code. It was suggested that the setback requirements be included within the

Commercial District zoning standards.

- The Committee requested a copy of the Town zoning map to get a better idea of the areas in question and the location of any vacant land.
- If more zoning districts were not created, a scale could be broken down within the zoning district (example: for a building over 50,000 square feet, the requirement could be 20 feet of landscaping instead of 10 feet).
- Possible Neighborhood Commercial zone locations and difficulties associated with that type of development in a rural community. Adding more zoning areas would be an issue for some time because the Town was not a master planned town and it could be seen as overregulation.
- Since the Town was a highway frontage town, a scaled zoning district might not make sense.
- The Town needed to be much more aware and sensitive to transitioning between zoning areas.

The Committee requested the draft documents one week prior to the next meeting to review the draft changes to the zoning areas before they decided about creating more zoning areas or keeping the Commercial Zones in the current form.

- b) Discussion of possibility of creating Mixed Use or other Community Core related to zoning districts.

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

- The General Plan advocated for the Community core to have a mixed zoning district.
- Consider a zoning district with separate development standards for the community core area, where uses were more intense and buildings were closer to the property line or street.
- Mixed Use would be more pedestrian oriented, providing easy access to buildings with parking on the side or in back. Most communities had a Mixed-Use District that focused on pedestrian oriented development standards, which included pulling buildings and outdoor dining areas towards the street. There had been an idea that Highway 89 towards Perkinsville could become the Town Center. If that was developed, the Town had to consider if they would keep current development standards with buildings further from the street or adopt zoning that provided a more intimate setting, with development closer to the street.
- The district could allow for more flexibility for residential and have either vertical or horizontal mixed use. Vertical use would include residential above the commercial use or clusters of multi-family housing mixed in with commercial uses.
- Food Trucks – land use that needed to be created in the code.
- Adult entertainment code requirements and separation requirements. It could be part of the licensing process instead of the zoning process.
- Lodging and Air B&B zoning requirements were covered by State Statutes.
- Schools – Public & Charter were allowed in residential zones, vocational schools were not allowed in residential zones
- Reed Road future commercial development possibilities and how to deal with zone changes.
 - General Plan
 - Which population would it serve: transient persons or residents
 - Which direction did the Town want the community to move
 - Adjacent land uses
- Consolidating the terms with a definition in the glossary. Forthcoming changes:
 - Churches to Places of Worship
 - Hospitals, clinics to Health Care Facilities

Committee Members requested the following for the next meeting:

- Meeting Date: September 26, 2018

- Commercial Light and Commercial Heavy District development standards and examples of current zoning transition issues
- Multifamily District scaled performance standards
- Mixed Use examples and draft standards

6) ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to adjourn the meeting at 5:37 p.m.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

PASSED - Unanimously

Submitted: September 4, 2018.

By: *Vickie Nipper, Deputy Town Clerk*

Approved: June 26, 2018.