

NOTES

**Development Guidance System Update Project
ZORC Public Meeting
Camp Verde Marshal's Office
Tuesday, July 22, 2010
6:00 p.m.**

- 1. Meeting commenced at 6:00 p.m. in the Camp Verde Marshall's Office.**
- 2. Attendance: Consultants Dava Hoffman and Rick Counts, Special Projects Administrator Matt Morris, Interim Community Development Director Mike Jenkins, Special Projects Coordinator Valerie House, Planner Assistant Jenna Owens, Permit Technician Becky Oium, Mayor Bob Burnside, Council members Bob Kovacovich and Carol German. ZORC members Greg Blue, Alan Buchanan (also P&Z Commission member) and Shirley Brinkman. Planning and Zoning Commission member Howard Parrish.**

Members of the Public: Ann Schmidt, Ron Brattain, Jan Klann, Stephen Geotting and Suzy Burnside.

3. Introduction:

Dava Hoffman began by explaining the different sections of the Draft Development Guidance System being presented for discussion. She briefly discussed some of the public input from the last meeting and how some of the items were addressed in the content.

DRAFT – PART TWO -Comments:

Bob Kovacovich (Council): Concerned over verbiage in "Ag District" zoning; permitted uses allowing only one family on any one lot. Asked how that would allow 2nd generation families and their existing additional homes on farms.

Suzy Burnside (public): Referred to verbiage in the General Plan that says the intent was for greater than 5 acres when talking about AG Districts; would this require a General Plan amendment?

Steve Geotting (public): AG District needs to be defined to include verbiage regarding farming or garden as a use; should be clear and explain that AG is not for preparation/production of food.

Rick Counts: *Idea is that a garden on a large property under 10 acres is an excepted accessory use. No need to assign criteria, it's accepted on all residential property. We don't want to go so far. We heard both sides in the last meeting and we don't want to limit the resident. If so, how small should a piece of property be?*

Suzy Burnside (public): (referred back to question regarding housing) As far as housing in an AG district, what about Dude Ranches?

Rick Counts: *Do we want Dude Ranches to be allowed on 5 acres or keep it to 10 acre minimum?*

Alan Buchanan (P&Z Commission and ZORC): Yes, allow Dude Ranches on 5 acres. We were rushed to complete each section at the last meeting; every section in 20 minutes.

Dava Hoffman: *The 10 acres is currently in the Code for AG District and was the consensus from last meeting; but lets talk. Should it be 5 or 10 acres? Or other size? (there was discussion of miscellaneous parcels of land 1 acre in size in various locations around Town)*

Greg Blue (ZORC): There are a lot of people allowing their land to be farmed by other people and the lots vary in sizes.

Steve Goetting (public): Should be a difference when we are talking about zoning; a lot of this could be solved by adding verbiage to Home Occupation allowances (e.g. 1 acre parcels not in violation of being a farming activity as defined in H.O. even though they are in R1L-zoning).

Rick Counts: *We need to be careful of criteria that apply to H.O. We don't want to go so far that we create problems, but rather prevent them. If we invite it in as a use for all times, could be through a Special Use Permit.*

Greg Blue (ZORC): There are 1 acre parcels in residential zones that do not have a primary use established (e.g., a dwelling) but the land is tilled and used for farming. We want to protect that use but we are not.

Carol German (Council): We need to protect residential areas and we haven't in the past; agree with Special Use Permit. This would allow neighbors to agree with the use.

There was some discussion as to whether or not every lot with an acre or a little over an acre would have to apply for a Special Use Permit, especially where heavy equipment/machinery are used. A comment was made again that there are places in Town that have vacant lots in subdivisions, 1 acre, that do not have an established primary use (a dwelling) but the owners let people farm them. Rick added that these are tough economic times and we should consider whether or not we should allow possibly a temporary use permit for these situations; staff could approve vs. going through the Planning and Zoning Commission and Council for approval.

Mayor Burnside: Part 2, Page 2, Section 203, last sentence of paragraph: Asked for clarification on the term "analogous." *Rick explained "anything similar."*

Steve Goetting (public): When talking about farming/AG districts, believes the allowance of sheep and goats on 1 acre is more of an impact on neighbors than growing hay.

Suzy Burnside (public): Asked how this sentence would impact grandfathered uses. *Rick said it would have no effect.*

Mayor Burnside: Cannot find a district that allows a "vet" hospital/clinic for large animals; we need to find an area they will be allowed.

Rick Counts: *Should Temporary Use Permits be granted by staff vs. Council having a review at a public hearing to allow neighbor input? When it goes to Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission it often becomes more political than it needs to be. There is always the option of appeal if staff makes the determination.*

Dava Hoffman: *Some places have the Board of Adjustments hear the Use Permits vs. Council. This makes the process quicker.*

Suzy Burnside (public): Commented that the Planning and Zoning Commission used to be, prior to 2005, decision making authority.

Steve Goetting (public): Part 2, Section 3, page 12; Should add agricultural uses to be permitted in PUD.

Greg Blue (ZORC): Asked for clarification of "cluster units" listed as allowance under R1 Zoning District. *Rick explained that it was for individual use, multi-family (usually as rentals), a group of condos or townhouses.*

DRAFT - PART THREE:

Rick explained that they had re-organized and put the sections where they needed to be and tried to give more precise titles to the sections.

Steve Goetting (public): Under Part 3, page 5, "unsafe dwellings" the order of a., b., and c. should be reorganized. Order should be c., b., and then a.

Rick Counts: *We should also create a cross reference to part 6.*

Suzy Burnside (public): (Referring back to Part Two) asked "Where do we allow a Bed & Breakfast? And, would it be a "conditional use" and should it stay in rural areas?" She added that she didn't feel the codes should be too restrictive. *Rick commented that it was not a use allowed under Home Occupation, it was a lodging type of use and would have to fall in the appropriate zoning, e.g. multi-family and commercial. They should be in other than single-family residential districts unless the members felt it should go through a Use Permit process. Dava commented that a Use Permit would provide protection as to the number of bedrooms, parking, screening, etc.*

Carol German (Council): Stated that there are places currently in residential neighborhoods that have B & B's that board horses as well for travelers and she felt they should have to go through the Use Permit process to allow approval by neighbors.

Dava Hoffman: *Suggested that the Board of Adjustments should hear the Use Permits and it would be much faster as 1 single process, with smaller/minor issues reviewed and approved by staff; appeals could go to the BOA.*

Greg Blue (ZORC): Referring to Part Three, Page 5, B - 1. a., the words "on site" should be removed. His concern is that if a person owns a piece of equipment and wants to help a neighbor (not as a business or for profit) they could be in trouble for moving it off of their property; does not agree. He added that he had spoken to a lot of people in the community and they felt the words should be removed; he gave an example of people owning cars that they take off-site for a car show on the weekend. We need to be careful not to sandbag "residential" intent.

Suzy Burnside (public): We should remove "on site" but add verbiage to the affect that the vehicles or equipment need to be kept in operable condition.

Rick Counts: *We can try to make it workable, but have to be careful, without being so difficult that an attorney would have to interpret it. He didn't think the primary purpose of this part was to encourage storage of heavy equipment in residential neighborhoods, acknowledging that outside storage currently in Camp Verde is already more liberal than most communities but let's not make it apply too much.*

Greg Blue (ZORC): Leave that part alone, does not need more defined.

Carol German (Council): Could be abused.

Howard Parrish (P&Z): Referring to Part Two, Section 2, Page 8, C-2 and C-3 Zoning; We have a lot of areas that allow a veterinary clinic for small animals under 100 lbs. but none for large livestock. We allow large animals/livestock in our point system then we should allow the large animal clinic use. *Dava asked where the group felt the use should be allowed? She added that the use would fit in the AG, M-1 and M-2 Districts. Rick added that it cannot be in a more restrictive district than M-1 or M-2 and that the AG District is more restrictive. Rick added that they could look into allowing it in a C-3 District with possibly a Use Permit.*

Part Four:

Dava explained that this section was in regards to Development Standards and that they tried to put everything into one place. She briefly discussed some of the elements such as parking, site orientation, signs, added charts and graphics. In addition she mentioned that they tried to maintain the Development and Appearance Standards but made them more streamlined and easy to use and also pointed out that the process can be approved by staff with the understanding that appeals of staffs decision can be made and brought to Council for review. She added that these standards would be applied to projects fronting the established gateways of Camp Verde and the Historical Town-site areas.

Suzy Burnside (public): Stated that the area being presented as the Historical Town Site map was not correct; it was not the same as the actual area designated to be historic. She added that we do not want

to be misleading and call it historic when in fact it is not. *Dava pointed out that Matt Morris and Ms. Burnside should meet to look further into this item and discuss the map.*

(There was some discussion between the consultants, Matt Morris and Suzy Burnside as to the map. Matt Morris explained how the voter approved General Plan was used to identify the applicable area for the appearance standards portion of the draft ordinance. The General Plan identifies three Special Planning Districts in the town, including the Historic Town Site, which is displayed on the General Plan Land Use Map. Matt asked if the group felt it should be a smaller area or if we should re-name the map. There was also some discussion and differences regarding appearance standards.)

Greg Blue (ZORC): Felt we should not be too restrictive in applying the standards and that we did not want the same look on every new development in Town; especially big box stores that maintain the same type of building and signage and maintain their own theme. We do not want to discourage them or scare them off from coming to Camp Verde because we need the business so badly. The Town should not want a Target to come here that is required to look like a western saloon. *Dava pointed out that it was in the Town Vision and referred to in the General Plan, that the Town should maintain the western rural look and feel.*

(The group discussion referred back to the Historical Town-Site map.)

Ron Brattain (public): We should strike the word "historical" from the "Historical Town-site map" and call it "townsite map."

Greg Blue (ZORC): We need to keep the 3 areas of development separate; we will have 3 different types of development in these areas (referring to Hwy 260, Finnie Flat and Main Street).

Steve Goetting (public): Does not think appearance standards are too restrictive; big box stores will comply with the look we want, doesn't cost too much for front aesthetics. Wal Mart has complied in several communities. It is demographics that bring big box stores to an area.

Mayor Burnside: In the General Plan, it was agreed that appearance standards should apply; our Design Review criteria was crammed down the people's throats. I do not agree with some of the verbiage: Page 1, b-2, this applies to any change of use or zoning change designation. I think the town approval part should "go away." Referred to Section B, item 3, remodeling or renovations would still have to go through process? Need to explain this and make it more clear.

Shirley Brinkman (ZORC): Page 23, Signs, Businesses off of Main Street with no frontage on Main Street cannot put an A-framed sign for advertising. Too restrictive. There needs to be something that allows it.

(Suzy Burnside asked if the resolution regarding right-of-way encroachment had been completed and Jenna Owens (staff) responded that it had and that it only applied to businesses from Arnold Street to Hollamon Street along Main Street.)

Alan Buchanan (ZORC): Candidate packets say political signs cannot be placed anywhere on Main Street. Asked why?

Valerie House (ZTAC-staff): Stated that there were no codes that say you cannot place political signs along Main Street but there was criteria regarding the placement of these signs. The only thing regarding political signs on Main Street are Statute requirements that say signs must be 75' from a polling place. *Dava asked if Valerie could research and let her know what sections of the code or other that address political signs.*

Dava Hoffman: *Discussed minor changes to the Lighting Ordinance section.*

Mayor Burnside: Stated that he would send an email to Dava regarding his questions on "Density." He asked what a principal use was and that he understood that if it were in a residential zoning district, the principal use would be a residential home but still wanted a clearer definition.

K:\647cvdpl\Meetings\ZORC Meetings\Notes-Zorcmtg_7-22-10_vh.docx