

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

**Thursday, August 2, 2012
6:00 P.M.**

The Town Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Chino Valley, Arizona, met for a Joint Study Session in the Chino Valley Council Chambers, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona, on Thursday, August 2, 2012.

Present: Mayor Chris Marley; Vice-Mayor Carl Tenney; Councilmember Mike Best; Councilmember Darryl Croft; Councilmember Linda Hatch

Absent: Councilmember Dean Echols; Councilmember Lon Turner

Staff Present: Interim Town Manager Robert Smith; General Services Director Cecilia Watts; Town Engineer/Public Works Director Ron Grittman; Utilities Supervisor Chris Bartels; Associate Planner David Nicolella; Town Clerk Jami Lewis (recorder)

Attendees: Garland Miner, Planning and Zoning Vice-Chair; Michael Edmonds, Planning and Zoning Commissioner; Charles Merritt, Planning and Zoning Commissioner; Jack Owen, Planning and Zoning Commissioner; Gwen Rowitsch, Planning and Zoning Commissioner; Dava Hoffman, General Plan Consultant

1) CALL TO ORDER; ROLL CALL

Mayor Marley called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

2) Summary of General Plan Committee activities over the past five months by Dava Hoffman of Dava & Associates. (General Plan Committee)

Acronyms used in this item:

GPC (General Plan Committee)
OHM (Old Home Manor)

Ms. Hoffman reported that this meeting was to brief Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission on GPC activities over the last five months, provide and opportunity to exchange ideas, and for the Council and Commission to provide direction to the GPC.

History

- January 2 – Council appointed the General Plan Committee and approved a contract with Dava & Associates for the new General Plan.
- Current GPC Members – Michael Edmonds, Dan McGuire, Frank Perkins, Nancy Best,

Tom Payne, Ron Romley, Edward Steinback, Marti Klein, Cheri Romley, Norm Freeman, John Morgan, Trisha Lamb, Celia Vander Molen, and Vanessa Herb.

- February 14 – Council adopted the Community Participation Plan Resolution for public involvement, including Public GPC Meetings, Council/Commission briefings, public workshops, Town website, media, and others.

GPC meetings, topics, and activities

- February 13 – Orientation, rules of procedure, history and background Arizona General Plan and Open Meeting statutes. Members were asked to select and photograph their favorite places in Town.
- March 5 – Reviewed selected Town Assets: Aquatic/Community Center, Senior Center, Old Home Manor, Chino Valley Cemetery, solar energy project, Memory Park, library, post office, grocery store, Windmill House, restaurants, Chino Valley Transit, roads, and wildlife viewing.
- April 2 and April 23 – Hosted a public workshop and polled the public on the following subjects, then subsequently reviewed the results:
 - Three greatest current assets – small town lifestyle; scenery and open space; air and water quality.
 - Three greatest current concerns – lack of employment and business opportunities; water resource management; neighborhood upkeep and road improvements.
 - Additional opportunities needed – business expansion, job variety, industrial-park employment, neighborhood shops, cafes, major retail stores, developed “community core,” central business and/or public places; parks and trails; health and medical care facilities.
 - Top important qualities for vision – small town image; rural, farm, ranches and historic; well-maintained and attractive; family-oriented, community spirited, balanced and friendly, inclusive; recreational variety, open space and outdoor living; employment opportunities.
 - Top future recognized attributes – small town character, well-maintained and visually attractive; rural, farming character; large amounts of open space; employment opportunities; historic and heritage preservation.
- April, May, June – GPC members divided into groups to collect data on existing conditions for General Plan elements of transportation; parks, trails, and open space; economic development; and land uses.
- May 14 – informational meeting on economic development from regional authorities—Mike Fann, Fann Contracting; Ab Jackson, Chino Valley Chamber of Commerce; Greg Fister, Prescott Valley Economic Development Manager; and Wendy Bridges, Prescott Assistant Economic Development Director, who presented business information needs, tools, strengths, weaknesses, methods, and directions.
- June 11 – informational meeting on water and transportation from regional authorities John Munderloh, Prescott Valley Water Resources Manager, who presented Arizona Groundwater Management Act, Active Management Area, safe yield, and water conservation and augmentation; and Chris Bridges, Director, Central Yavapai Metropolitan Planning Organization, who presented regional short and long range transportation regarding roads, transit, bike, and walking paths.
- July 9 and 16 – focused on recent population, demographics, and building data; suggested next 10 years land use assumptions in brief, including minimal population growth; residential infill in existing subdivisions; business infill along SR 89; potential business development at OHM; possible agri-business areas along Road 1 East; and potential trails implementation.

3) Review of Land Use Assumptions as drafted by the General Plan Committee, presented by Dava Hoffman of Dava & Associates. (General Plan Committee)

Acronyms used in this item:

- GPC (General Plan Committee)
- UDO (Unified Development Ordinance)
- OHM (Old Home Manor)

Ms. Hoffman continued her presentation:

Land use assumptions and GPC suggestions

- SB 1525 – The Governor approved this in April 2011, amending ARS 9-463.05 relating to development fees, providing that municipal development fees be in compliance with the General Plan and Land Use Assumptions. “Land use assumptions” meant projections of changes in land uses, densities, intensities, and population for a specified service area over a period of at least ten years and pursuant to the General Plan of the municipality.
- Recent population changes, 1970-2010 – In the tri-city area, birth rates had declined, while population had increased, with Prescott and Chino Valley having a steady growth rate, and Prescott Valley experiencing rapid growth.
- Recent population changes, 2000-2010 – The median age was rising due to an increase in retirees, and household sizes were decreasing due to declining birth rate in all tri-cities.
- Recent population age grouping – 55% of the Town’s population was working age 20-64, showing a strong labor force. Chino Valley had a younger population than the tri-cities.
- Recent land use changes – Building permits rose dramatically in 2002-2005, declined dramatically in 2006-2009, and remained level since. 2005 peaked with 350 permits issued, while there were less than 25 in 2009-2011 each year.
- Land use assumptions were based on population growth projections, residential land use density projections, and business and commercial land use intensity projections.
- The GPC suggested that over the next 10 years:
 - Population changes will be flat to minimal, in the range of 0.5-1.0% annual growth, resulting in a 2020 population of approximately 11,500-12,000.
 - Land use residential density changes will be mostly infill of new homes built on vacant lots within existing subdivisions, after existing vacant homes become occupied.
 - Land use commercial intensity changes will be mostly new small business infilling vacant properties along SR 89 where access to water and sewer existed, and will include some commercial and industrial development on OHM properties, along with some agri-business development along the Road 1 East areas between Road 3 South and Road 4 North.
 - Land use changes include some portions of the Town’s Master Trails Plan being implemented.
- GPC suggested the following needs and methods:
 - Avoid the continuance of random “strip commercial” development on SR 89.
 - Encourage, enhance, and market business development of small and large business, realizing that there was a market service area of +/-30,000 population.
 - Adhere to the General Plan in order to provide stability for future investments in the community.

- Create a “community vision” that was accepted and understood by residents, business people, and community leaders.
- Generate and promote a specific “town identity” with consistent guidelines for improvement.
- Identify and enhance and/or expand existing and future “community core and special places,” people-gathering places, downtown, recreation places, civic places, and higher education centers.

Beyond 10 years

- The regional connector was decades out but will stimulate eastern area development; planning is necessary to avoid unmanaged sprawl.
- OHM needs marketing and enhancement for development based on a realistic plan, or sell some or all of the property.
- Future population growth was largely dependent on state and national economies.

A Councilmember commented that since the GPC's public forum was open to the community at large and there were attendees from the county, the comments received at the forum might not reflect the same sentiments as if they had been limited to residents or business owners within the Town limits.

Council, Commission, and GPC then discussed the following topics:

Cluster Developments

GPC recommendations/comments

- Move toward cluster developments to avoid continuance of random “strip commercial” development on SR 89, and develop community “cores” to give a sense of community areas, downtown, and/or hometown feel.
- A reason to make this change was the difficulty in shopping due to having to drive from place to place to shop, and due to the increasing average age, there was a need to consider ease of access for seniors.
- One example of a cluster development was Safeway as the anchor store, with several adjacent businesses. Moving from the strip model to the cluster model gave Prescott Valley and Wickenburg a better look and feel.

Council/Commission concerns/comments

- Property owners should be able to develop as they pleased within proper zoning.
- Regulations should be as loose as possible to allow business in and avoid driving them away.
- Demographics might not support the concept; the Town should welcome any small business in and it may not be able to get anchor stores.
- The Town did not have a “center.” If it had one, it should be someplace within bicycling distance.
- Such “cores” should start in areas that already had water and sewer there or nearby, then expand out.
- The Town’s current land use map needed to be changed, as it was so general and allowed spot zoning.
- The Town had to be careful not to devalue land or force businesses to change their zoning.

Ms. Hoffman, GPC members, and Mr. Smith responded as follows:

- It did not necessarily to take an anchor store to create clusters. The GPC's full recommendation was to “avoid the continuance of random ‘strip commercial’ development on SR 89 by identifying the types of businesses, existing and future, that are clusters enhancing each other and providing convenience to customers, by encouraging the planning before development of mixtures of compatible uses on properties running east or west from the commercial frontage on SR 89, .and by emphasizing that these mixtures of uses are planned to provide convenience for all residents, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, as well as creating livable, walkable centers, for example residential above, behind, or in close proximity to business, and by addressing appearance of the business and the streetscape.” The General Plan could show areas suitable for these types of clustering and the UDO would outline its uses. All this would be encouraged, but not required.
- As business enhanced other business, having them cluster together could create an attraction. A cluster area may not need an anchor tenant; just loosening requirements, having simple design standards, and getting businesses to share space would accomplish it.
- Although the Town could not unwind the current state of SR 89, it could identify ideal locations for such clusters going forward, and the GPC intended to work on that next. They were primarily looking at four hubs on SR 89 due to the location of current infrastructure.
- The land use map was the most important part of the General Plan and would be totally redone. The land use map was not to be confused with the Town’s zoning map, however. The General Plan did not change zoning or existing uses; it suggested appropriate uses and then staff worked with property owners to achieve what was in the General Plan’s vision.

Economic Development

Council/Commission concerns/comments

- At one GPC meeting, one presenter pointed out that the Town did not use a free tool on its website that listed available commercial buildings. This was the first place businesses went and was something the Town could provide right away if it could get local business owners to participate.
- Prescott Valley grew because it had established plats, roads, and utilities. The Town needed to be prepared with zoning, infrastructure, and a road network. The GPC should consider obstacles to development, such as the lack of zoning classes between one acre and one-sixth acre. Adding these might make it easier to develop.
- The Commission had to consider compliance with the General Plan when reviewing zoning applications. Since the commercial designation was largely along SR 89, the current General Plan promoted spot rezoning.
- Core centers need to be identified, and incentives given, or it will not happen; and business will not come without infrastructure.

Ms. Hoffman and GPC members stated that:

- The economic development panel made some excellent suggestions to the GPC, and there were also other websites they recommended.
- A group of business people who were trying to start a Chino Valley economic development Foundation had looked into the commercial buildings website, but found

it hard to do due to the economic condition.

- Part of the GPC conversation was how to market the Town, which had an image of being an old rural community not looking for new business. Thus, the Town should identify all vacant commercial buildings now.

Community Vision

GPC recommendations/comments

- Overall, they wanted to set higher standards for the Town and create a sense of place by creating a standard look. There were small, inexpensive things that could be done immediately, such as cleaning up the highway.
- In the past, it seemed that businesses were allowed in without any forethought or plan. If the Town wanted to grow well, it needed guidelines in place for everyone.
- SR 89 will probably always have business on it, but there were things that could be done to make it look better and more appealing. For instance, Wickenburg developed a theme, which made it more attractive, and in Prescott, adding an awning to a Walgreens made the building's standard architecture look more unique, proving that small architectural differences could go a long way.
- Before Sedona incorporated, a group called "Keep Sedona Beautiful" met and worked with every new developer to discuss the area's vision before the developer ever got to the hearing stage. Perhaps the Town could develop a group like this to keep it proactive, rather than reactive.
- As the Town will develop to the east in years to come, it needed to lay the groundwork now for that development, create a theme that fit the Town's vision, and impart that into future development. Then existing businesses will want to invest in their own changes. Business owners had indicated that they would do so if the Town had that type of vision.
- They could choose to take SR 89 back to a Route 66 feel in the long term future, once development has moved east.
- Past administrations and Councils had plans, but leadership changes kept stalling the process. It might help to retrieve and review former plans.

Council/Commission concerns/comments

- The Town could not be any more rural than currently, since people could not afford to farm now. However, the Town had something its neighbors did not, since neither Prescott nor Prescott Valley advertised themselves as "rural."
- During the last General Plan update, local businesses did not want to look like Sedona and preferred to be individual.
- Although beautification was agreeable, businesses had complained that they could not compete due to the Town's strict regulations cutting into their profits. They had also complained that Town requirements were not all laid out at the beginning of the development process, causing problems during development.
- Based on the above land use assumptions, growth was not going to move east in the near future, so they needed to focus on beautifying, zoning, infrastructure, and having other entitlements in place. They needed to be cautious and not jump too far ahead.
- It will take time to change the highway's appearance. They needed to move slowly and determine how to develop the theme and get the public's input and buy-in.
- The Town did need a brand and/or theme.

Ms. Hoffman, GPC members, and Mr. Smith responded as follows:

- Semantics, such as 'brands,' 'identity,' 'themes,' or 'community' were easy to get

mixed up. The Committee was going to work on these and bring them to the next workshop.

- The Town had some unusual circumstances, but had developed along normal development patterns. Highway development was not a bad thing and they could use infill to help define the Town's identity. With some flexible ideas and incentives, the Town could grow well. There were a lot of positives to work with and the GPC should focus on those.
- Technically, Chino Valley was not a rural community, since its citizens relied on community assets. 'Rural' meant that citizens were totally self-supporting.
- Realistically, there was no money in traditional agriculture. Many ag businesses were going to greenhouses, and the Town was ranked third in the world for greenhouse use. It was hard to convince people that ag was of a different type here.

Zoning Map

GPC recommendations/comments

- The Town might be able to keep more young people here with mixed uses, such as affordable residential near commercial work places.
- By way of example, Scottsdale developed a mixed use area, Kierland Commons, with a "Main Street" feel, composed mostly of outdoor retail shops with residential units above and an adjoining residential tower.

Council/Commission concerns/comments

- The Town's 1990 General Plan had some Area Specific Plans, but they did not occur. Prescott Valley used them to develop along SR 69; they needed public buy-in, but would be a good thing to have in the toolbox.
- The GPC should address mixed uses, half-acre lots, shared parking, and running the bus in support of agri-tourism.

Ms. Hoffman related that there were a variety of mixed uses, which will be defined in the General Plan, such as clustered residential and commercial, or a residential unit upstairs and a business downstairs. Regarding area specific plans, the General Plan will identify where they are needed.

Council thanked the GPC and Commission for their efforts.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the GPC had a sense of direction with more good issues to address, and she invited Commission and Council members to GPC meetings on second Mondays at 3:30 p.m.

4) ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councilmember Linda Hatch, seconded by Councilmember Darryl Croft to adjourn the meeting at 7:45 p.m.

Vote: 5 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

Chris Marley, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jami C. Lewis, 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 2nd day of August, 2012. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 25th day of September , 2012.

Jami C. Lewis, Town Clerk