

**MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING  
OF THE TOWN COUNCIL AND  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2023**

**6:00 PM**

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

Council Present: Mayor Jack Miller, Vice-Mayor Eric Granillo, Councilmember Annie Perkins, Councilmember Tom Armstrong, Councilmember John McCafferty, Councilmember Sherri Phillips, Councilmember Robert Schacherer

Absent:

Commissioners Present: Chair Chuck Merritt, Vice-Chair Gary Pasciak, Commissioner Teena Meadors, Commissioner Ronald Penn, Commissioner Robert Switzer, Commissioner Richard Zamudio

Absent: Commissioner William Welker

Staff Present: Town Manager Cindy Blackmore; Assistant to the Town Manager Terri Denemy; Development Services Director Laurie Lineberry; Assistant Development Services Director Will Dingee, Associate Planner Bethan Heng, Human Resources Director Laura Kyriakakis; Officer Dave McNally, Sgt at Arms; Public Works Director/Town Engineer Frank Marbury; Community Services Director Cyndi Thomas, Audio Visual Technician Lawrence Digges; Deputy Town Clerk Sara Burchill; Town Clerk Erin Deskins

**1. CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL**

Mayor Miller called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a.** Presentation and discussion by Matrix Design Group regarding general information about the General Plan Update; planning process and schedule; and discussion on existing conditions, challenges and opportunities facing the community.

Cindy Blackmore, Town Manager, presented the following:

- This meeting was an opportunity for the Council and Commission members to get more information and update from Matrix regarding the General Plan and provide input.
- A lot of work had already been done to get public input and Matrix would continue to do so.
- The public could go to the website [www.makeitchinogeneralplan.com](http://www.makeitchinogeneralplan.com) to continue providing input.

Celeste Werner, Director of Strategic Planning, Matrix, presented the following:

- Introduced the Matrix Group (the Group).
- The Group would be providing a project update and highlighting some of the public engagement input received from two open house meetings. The meeting was meant to be an informal work session.
- The Group wanted to hear what direction the Council and Commission members believed the plan should be taking after hearing from the public.
- The Council and Commission would be asked questions to help the Group develop the plan.
- The meeting would close with what's next.

Project update:

- The timeline was the same as when the project started and was now in the March/April period when the Group would be developing the General Plan based on the input from, assessments, and evaluations they had done.
- The plan would address existing conditions, locate any deficiencies and surpluses, and how to get from where we are to 2040.
- April/May would be the 60-day public review period where the public would get a draft of the plan to provide further input.
- In June the Council would review the final draft of the General Plan which would include comments heard throughout the 60-day review period in Public Hearings. The Council would also vote to approve the plan.
- This process was set according to State law.
- The Plan would go to vote in November for ratification. The law required a 120-day pause period between Council approval and vote.
- Boards that were used at the Open House were posted around the room.
- The open houses, steering committee meetings, and Council meetings at the beginning of the process had generated the following vision statement:
  - “Chino Valley is a peaceful, affordable, rural community that supports recreation and regional tourism. We are committed to preserving our community’s expansive vistas, endless grasslands, and starry night skies while supporting limited and sustainable growth. Our proud agricultural and equestrian tradition makes Chino Valley a desirable place to build a future.”
- The Group worked to integrate the key items that people were most passionate about.

The Council, Commission, and Matrix discussed the following:

- There was a mix of support for the word affordable and different people used different words to convey “affordable” such as workforce housing and choice of housing.
- The Group felt that the council and commission should define affordable. It would be subjective based on everyone’s income and what they believe is an amount they’d like to put toward a home. It was decided to remove the word.

Public Engagement:

- The Group had developed the project website and over 100 people had signed up to be added to the email list and 27 comments had been received. Those on the email list would receive the draft plan when it's ready.
- The website’s url was shortened from “makeitchinovalleygeneralplan” to “makeitchinogeneralplan” for brevity. Some members were concerned that there was a Chino, California and it could be construed as trying to make Chino Valley like Chino.
- To change the website now would require a lot of work and communication to the public since a lot of people already knew “make it chino.” Another website could be created and it would be the front end, and link to the “make it Chino” website.
- Some members felt it would make it confusing to change it now and that it was a little late in the game.

- Other members mentioned that people who live here call it Chino rather than Chino Valley.
- The website would be going away once the plan was done.
- There had been over 85 responses on the IDPlaces interactive mapping app. Anyone could pull it up on their phone or tablet. It was an interactive mapping exercise where the public could use iconic pins for transportation, infrastructure, new roads, air quality, etc., and pin a specific location and leave a comment in the box that popped up.
- The questionnaire received over 200 responses. The Group had never had such a large public engagement for other rural-type towns. The questionnaire was available online and at the first open house as a hard copy.

#### Open House #1:

- They had a great turnout and over 110 people came.
- The public received notifications from the Town through press releases, social media, and mailers that were sent to 1300 residents in community.
- There were a number of stations that provided interactive exercises where they got a lot of public input from asset mapping where people could represent their support for what should be preserved or enhanced, and identify some of the challenges or opportunities that the General Plan could enhance.
- The Group presented a word cloud representing what people love about Chino Valley and they were: rural, friendly people, open space, large lots, family oriented, recreation, dark skies, etc. This reinforced the vision the members and public would like to see.
- The Group presented a second word cloud representing what people wanted in 2040: Rural, 1 acre lots, more grocery stores, improved roads, no apartments, affordable housing.
- There was a split on some topics from the community. A common area needed to be found for 2040. The plan was not what to do today to improve the community, but about what needed to be done as future development occurred as far as improvements to infrastructure and public services, where money needed to be invested, etc.
- Some strengths the community felt Chino Valley had included: vacant land that has the opportunity for the right type of development, Old Home Manor for a specific type of development, public facilities, the library, senior center, aquatic center, recreation, and the Town's police force.
- Challenges included: poor roads (which was a challenge in large areas as much as rural, and would be more costly the longer it was delayed), limited water to support growth, and water/sewer master plan.
- The citizens were mixed on the need for additional retail and shopping, a town center, and lack of public gathering spaces.
- The Group presented a visual preference survey that was available at the Open House and there was little interest in multi-family housing, and mixed interest in duplexes. As for trails the highest preference was for stabilized dirt or graded gravel multi-use paths/trails.

#### Open House #2:

- This event was also well attended with more than 90 attendees.
- The second event is helpful because the Group could understand where the comments came from.
- 1300 mailers were sent out to the residents to notify them of the event.
- The Group had provided interactive activities which focused on five elements: land use, circulation, public facilities, economic development, and parks and recreation. The input would be loaded on the website for people to view.

#### Land Use:

- At the first meeting the Group talked about what a general plan was comprised of. There were two components: a narrative text of goals and policies to provide direction for

future development, and a future land use map to help guide the type of land uses and development. The zoning map and ordinance had to be in compliance with that map.

- The current general plan said by 2024/2025 this was what the people thought they wanted to see the community be. They were looking for higher density development, more strip commercial along 89, Old Home Manor was identified as an employment corridor. Any decisions made regarding zoning and development were required to align with that plan. The current plan needed to be developed in the 2040 plan and it seems those preferences are not the same.
- There were certain national standards for different populations. A community had to have a percentage of different land uses to be sustainable.

The Group, Council, and Commission discussed the following:

- Some of the Council and Commissioners wondered if they were really getting a legitimate snapshot of what the community wanted, or if they were just hearing from the “squeaky wheels” since only about 200 people went to the two Open House events.
- The Group stated that it is a challenge because no one gets excited about planning until a developer shows up in their back yard. So they also offered the options of people signing up for the email list on the website, and going out to the stakeholder groups of various interests to hear from as wide a cross section knowing not a lot would show up to meetings.
- Compiling information for the plan started with the public, then the steering committee, then the public officials (who represent the public), then the Group would bring planning expertise to the community and give a plan they believe would be a good mix and represent the vision described earlier.
- Some of the Council and Commissioners asked if age had been considered during the planning since in 2040 a good portion of the population would have passed away by then, and the younger demographic didn’t mind driving to town, while the older demographic wanted more options in Chino.
- The Group had done a demographic analysis and found that it was a maturing community.
- Council and Commissioners expressed that 2014 was a very different time where revenue was down and increasing density would mean more revenue, the roads weren’t as bad and there wasn’t as much traffic, water wasn’t as big of a concern, so there were different concerns, and things would change again by 2040.

Land Use Policy Ideas:

- The Group summarized what the public had indicated they wanted in terms of land use.
- The public indicated that commercial uses should not be located at major street intersections. That didn’t mean that the public wants no commercial at major intersections, but it shouldn’t be the predominant pattern.
- The public wanted to see more commercial at Old Home Manor.
- The public indicated that the Town should keep all residential in town to 1 acre lots or more, and there should not be large retail developments, and a new Town Hall was not necessary, which contradicted previous public opinions.
- Discussion ensued regarding the amenities the public wanted, while resisting any opportunities to raise funds for those features and services like imposing property taxes. Additional services and retail were not going to come to the town if there was not enough population to support them. However, there were a lot of other residents who liked not having a lot of services available and having to drive out of Town for those services. Some stated that was understandable, but the Town had to be able to fix the roads and take care of business to a certain degree, so something was going to have to develop and expand.
- Old Home Manor was discussed as the location for mixed use to address affordable housing with multi-family homes, commercial, mixed with single family, and still maintain a rural community.

- Public-private partnerships could be helpful to guide land uses.
- Public data was split and conflicting on what kind of lots were desired and where. Discussion ensued as to what has been discussed during Planning & Zoning Meetings and what that data likely meant.

#### Circulation Policy Ideas:

- This topic was about ways to increase public safety when traveling by methods other than vehicles such as requiring sidewalks, providing soft paths for horses, or requiring bicycle lanes. There may be specific areas that the Town would like to target for each mode of travel.
- Developments were already required to put in sidewalks. The problem with sidewalks and trails was that the Town needed more rights-of-way to build them.
- Prescott and Prescott Valley had regional connectors and that would need to be something that eventually connected to Chino Valley.
- The community supported outdoor recreational activity including bicycling and defining truck routes.
- The community did not support more street lights and limiting the number of driveways and busy streets
- The group highly recommended developing an access management plan to guide where driveways to commercial should be located for safety purposes. This was especially helpful for connecting neighboring lots rather than having to exit one and go out onto the highway to get to the next lot.
- Putting together a street light plan was discussed. Council and Commission members didn't suggest getting rid of them completely, but did agree with the community and keeping them to a minimum. The Group suggested standards that state street lights are only necessary under certain conditions and should be executed in a certain way.
- Equestrian paths, sidewalks and bicycles were discussed including where the Council and Commission thought they were most needed and how important those features would be in 20 years. There weren't as many people riding horses as they did years ago, but it was too busy now to ride around town. Some Council and Commission members felt that if equestrian paths were not preserved the town would move away from being rural. Policies could be written in a geographic manner so that some areas had sidewalks and other areas had equestrian paths and they could be mixed and matched. It was suggested that the paths be multipurpose to allow horses and bicycles.

#### Parks and Rec and Natural Resources:

- Town residents agreed with improving recreation programming to benefit all ages and interests, aquatic center hours and activities, and enhancing existing parks with additional amenities and beautification.
- Town residents wanted the Town to prioritize preserving open space, developing a regional recreation destination that preserved access to the Verde River, and develop neighborhood parks within 10 minutes walking distance of all new residences, equestrian and hiking tourism opportunities.
- Councilmember and Commissioners thought having parks within a 10 minute walk was unrealistic as a 10 minute walk is only a half mile. The new developments all included greenbelts.
- Councilmembers stated that the Town was already doing a lot of the things listed.

#### Public Facilities:

- This portion was about what the Town should do to support the vision for the future. The majority of the public agreed on all except one.
- The facilities included developing water, wastewater, and stormwater master plans, promoting broadband and fiber optic improvements for residents, and inventory and assessment of all facilities.

- The Council and Commission discussed the difficulty in funding such programs when the residents did not want property taxes and also wanted to lower the sales taxes.
- The public was supportive of establishing public-private partnerships, partnering and cost sharing with other agencies like Yavapai County, study and implement impact fees.
- The Council and Commission asked for details on how impact fees were implemented.
  - The State had changed the law in 2014 where there was more flexibility in how the money could be accumulated and spent in the community, but now it was very regimented and the Town would have to develop an infrastructure improvement program. And there were very specific programs identified such as recreation, water/wastewater infrastructure, streets, etc. It had to be services, locations, facilities, equipment that was necessary to serve the new developments coming in to pay for things that support that new development. It had to be done within a certain period of time. If done precisely and carefully there were ways to fund projects that would be beneficial to community.
- Impact fees could not be used to pay for ongoing expenses. It was only for certain capital projects involving new growth, not the existing population.

#### Economic Development:

- Majority of participants agreed with strengthening business opportunities by implementing and updating a business attraction program, developing a business retention program, and pursuing incubators, co-ops, pop-ups, farmer's markets, and partnerships to promote entrepreneurship.
- A business retention program was a program developed in the Economic Development Department and meant to work intimately with small businesses and the Chamber of Commerce to understand what their needs and struggles are, where opportunities might be, how the Town could support them more, and how the business could become more successful. It didn't have to be the Chamber, it could be a non-profit because they had access to a lot of grants and could help rural communities.
- Majority of participants agreed that new businesses should include agricultural and equestrian industries (could include tourism, new farms, etc.), fabrication and light manufacturing, research and development, office and remote work, medical research and services.
- Participants were split on allowing warehouse and distribution, high-tech fabrication and assembly. Council and Commissioners were surprised that the public would not support high-tech fabrication and assembly as it's a mostly clean industry.
- Regarding retail and dining participants agreed with more dining options, family entertainment options, and more outdoor recreation and sportsman retail, but disagreed with more feed/livestock supply stores.
- To attract new businesses participants believed the Town needed up to day and improved available tenant space, work force training programs for targeted industries. Participants disagreed with Great Western Corridor (GWC) improvements. Some members of Council stated that they didn't think the public knew what the GWC was and likely misunderstood that question. Council, Commissioners, and the group participated in discussion about the pros and cons of the GWC.
- The Council, Commission, and Group discussed the airport and what it could mean for development in Chino Valley and whether or not the Town would want to put programs in place to support growth of the airport.
- Discussion ensued regarding why OHM was being referred to as mixed use with residential when it had already been established as a business park with no residential. The public had indicated that they saw OHM as a business park, commercial, and sports and recreation facilities, and disagreed with moderate density housing less than a half-acre. However, when asked where the Town should put moderate density housing, if they had to choose a place, the public overwhelmingly indicated OHM.

Additional comments heard from the public included:

- A town lake at OHM
- Mini-golf or more activities
- Medical facilities
- Assisted living
- Nature center
- More equestrian opportunities
- Take advantage of Jerome Junction
- The Group had provided an interactive map of the Town at the Open House where the public could indicate where they would like to see certain types of development. The public indicated that Highway 89 should be largely commercial along with OHM. Areas that the public indicated for medium density housing had already been approved for apartment complexes and other higher density housing. The Council and Commissioners discussed that further development was going to have to occur on the East side of town and should be done in a way that there won't be isolated islands of residential areas.
- The Group would be looking at what parcels had already been entitled, but not developed, and then look at all developmental lands and the national standards for community land uses to help guide a future land use map for the Town.
- The Council, Commission, and Group discussed the likelihood that the Town was already maxed out in terms of commercial and residential development.

3. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Miller adjourned the meeting at 8:12 p.m.

---

Jack W. Miller, Mayor

ATTEST:



*Erin N. 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 28th day of February 2023. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2023.

*Erin N. Deskins*

---

Erin N. Deskins, Town Clerk