

**MINUTES OF THE STUDY SESSION MEETING
OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2022
5:00 P.M.**

**CHINO VALLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
202 N. STATE ROUTE 89, CHINO VALLEY, AZ**

1) CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Mayor Miller called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m.

Present: Mayor Jack Miller; Vice-Mayor Annie Perkins; Councilmember Tom Armstrong; Councilmember Eric Granillo (arrived at 5:09 p.m.); Councilmember Cloyce Kelly; Councilmember John McCafferty; Councilmember Lon Turner

Staff Present: Town Manager Cindy Blackmore (remotely); Town Attorney Andrew McGuire (arrived remotely at 5:14 p.m.); Town Attorney Michael Goodman; Development Services Director Laurie Lineberry; Public Works Director/Town Engineer Frank Marbury (arrived at 5:20 p.m.); Planner Bethan Heng; Audio Visual Technician Lawrence Digges; Deputy Town Clerk Sara Burchill; Town Clerk Erin N. Deskins

2) Consideration and discussion regarding two new proposed single-family zoning districts within the Town of Chino Valley. (Will Dingee, Senior Planner)

Development Services Director Laurie Lineberry presented the following:

- The quarter and half acre zoning districts would be presented to the Council at the March 22, 2022 meeting.
- Staff was concerned about the number of land splits that had a road easement taken off from the front of the parcel. There were also several minor subdivisions with a line of lots with a 50-foot-wide road easement off the front of the parcels.
- After analyzing lot sizes without considering the road as part of the total number, it was realized that instead of having a 12,000 square foot lot, they were actually getting an 8,500 square foot lot. The front 50-feet was not useable because it was part of the roadway. Visually the lot looked like a 0.16-acre lot, and that was not where they wanted to go.
- Through discussions of both Gross and Effective Lot Sizes, the Commission determined they wanted the Effective Lot Size.
- When someone came in and wanted a 12,000 square foot lot, it was without the road easement added into it.
- There were several discussions with Commissioners and staff about concepts, designs, and roadway designations.
- The Effective Lot Size was the minimum number required in the proposed districts.
- A variety of lot sizes were considered by the Planning Commission. They also discussed if it was the Town's job to plan so that every acre could be split into four parcels, or if the goal was to get good land planning for the community.

- During the last Planning and Zoning meeting, the Commission discussed the appropriate lot width, because a narrow frontage could make a lot look smaller due to the homes being close together. The perfect lot would be square.
- There was discussion regarding length versus width. The code already had a three to one ratio, meaning a lot could not be three times longer than the width because it created pencil lots.
- The Commission, at their last meeting, chose a wider lot width. They also discussed the visual look, feel, and perception of the smaller lots. Based on images, the Commission decided they did not want narrow lots because the lots appeared to look like 0.16 acre lots from the road.

Council and Staff discussed the following:

- Staff could not recall what the setback requirements were for the smaller lots. The front setback was standard in the code and was either 50-feet from the centerline or 20-feet from the right of way line.
- There was a 50-foot dedicated easement width requirement for all subdivisions that was not counted as part of the total lot square footage.
- One of the reasons the UDO had been established was to create districts smaller than one acre. Staff was using that direction to create smaller lot districts. Since the Town recently removed the 0.16 acre lots, the quarter and half acre lots were tools available to use until the General Plan was complete. The General Plan would help determine higher density pockets. This was considered best meeting the public interest. The smallest lot currently available in the code was one acre lots.
- There was public demand for the smaller lots. Since the Commission had chosen the 12,000 square foot lots, an acre lot could be split into three lots. These lots would be required to have water and sewer.
- If the Council chose to adopt the Commission's recommendation, with the effective lot size of a minimum quarter acre at 12,000 square feet and half acre minimum at 24,000 square feet, a one acre lot could not be split into two half acre lots but could be split into one quarter acre and one half acre.
- Lot sizes would be counted from the other side of the easement to the back property line. The front 4,000 square feet was not part of the effective lot size (12,000 or 24,000 square feet) that could be used for private purposes. The actual lot size had to be 12,000 or 24,000 square feet.
- Each case would be examined individually, and existing easements would be researched to ensure all requirements were met.
- These requirements could be used on any property within the Town limits as long as sewer and water were available, and they were rezoned into the half acre or quarter acre zoning district. The property also needed to comply with the General Plan designations once it was completed.
- Members discussed whether it was the Town's job to dictate the appearance of lot frontage. If the lot fit the three to one rule, there should be no specific width required. Staff explained that every district had a minimum lot width and minimum lot size. The ratio ensured lots were functional and accessible.
- The lot sizes were the minimums. If a lot was smaller than half an acre, then it would be zoned as a quarter acre lot.
- A Member discussed that the community seemed to prefer larger lots that were more spacious, and if it were not spelled out, people would make each lot fit their own personal needs.
- Members discussed some current homes with 15-foot setbacks and they wanted to avoid repeating that.
- Staff confirmed that one acre, half acre, and quarter acre had the same front, side, and

- rear setbacks. Members thought the side yards for the smaller lots should be reduced.
- Staff explained that the Commission could not enforce a minimum lot width unless it were in the code.

3) Consideration and discussion regarding changes to Temporary Use Permits. (Will Dingee, Senior Planner)

Development Services Director Laurie Lineberry presented the following:

- In the current UDO, the Temporary Use Permits was a subset under the Commercial Light section.
- This meant there could be no other temporary uses in any other district.
- Staff would be moving that to a stand-alone section of the code.
- Staff wanted to add model home complex so that it would not need to come to the Council as a conditional use permit. It would be handled administratively. Appeals would still go to the Council.
- Staff wanted to add temporary trailers during construction to temporary use permits so that a permit could be issued instead of just a note on the building permit.
- Temporary use permits were for six-months at a time. The trailer during construction could be tied to the life of the building permit, with a year long cap.

Council and Staff discussed the following:

- Developments would not be handled administratively, just the model home complex.
- Other items the Council may want could be added to the temporary use permit list.
- 4H needed temporary use permits to raise an animal. It applied to all properties, but Members did not understand why it was part of the code. Staff thought it was meant for smaller lots and could be used as a teaching lesson for community involvement and being a good dignitary.

4) ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Miller adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jack W. Miller", is written above a horizontal line.

Jack W. Miller, Mayor

ATTEST:

Erin Deskins

Erin N. Deskins, Town Clerk

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Town Council of the Town of Chino Valley, Arizona held on the 22nd day of February, 2022. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 23rd day of March, 2022.

Erin Deskins

Erin N. Deskins, Town Clerk