

**Sustainable Planning Meeting  
January 4, 2008**

Members Present:	Matt Ackerman	Gene Kerkman
	Bill Feldmeier	Joan McClelland
	Elizabeth Lassuy	Tom Reilly
	Jim Sullivan	Jim Wise
	Elise Link	Shakeeb Shariff
Guests:	Dava Hoffman	Georgene Lockwood

Mr. Ackerman opened the meeting by asking for approval of the December 13, 2007 minutes. The minutes were approved as written. He said the main reason the today's meeting was to establish the format of the developer's panel meeting. Each member volunteered to call the developers they recommended to remind them of the meeting. He asked if there were any other developers that they might invite; and Jeff Davis and Bill Brownlee were suggested. Tom Reilly said he would call them and send them a copy of the invitation.

Mr. Feldmeier asked if there would be a County Attorney at the meeting. It was posted as a public meeting but it was not a public hearing and he had concerns with the public thinking they could interact with the panel when they could not.

Mr. Ackerman said he felt they should begin that meeting by stating the purpose of the Committee.

Mr. Reilly suggested they open with a statement stating the panel was there for the Committee to get information and there would not be public participation. He volunteered to make the statement and then would turn the meeting over to Mr. Ackerman.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that staff provide index cards for people to write their comments or questions so that the Committee could present them to the panel.

Mr. Ackerman said he felt there should be some prepared questions to be addressed and then there could be an open exchange of ideas.

Mr. Reilly said the gist of the discussion was to get the developer's input as to what the County needed to do in order for them to want to do conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Ackerman said the meeting would open with Mr. Reilly's opening statement of the ground rules, and then Mr. Ackerman would present a history of the Committee followed by Elise or Shakeeb presenting where the County was at in regards to conservation subdivisions.

Mr. Sullivan said instead of asking the developers what the County needed to do to get them to do a conservation subdivision, their questions should be more as to how it would affect the developers monetarily to meet the criteria to get the density bonus and what type of density would the developers perceive to have a density bonus.

Ms. Hoffman said she felt the meeting should open with Mr. Ackerman stating that the purpose of the Committee was to make filing subdivisions more attractive over lot splits and to preserve the environment by putting in more sewer systems, to have better access roads, and to provide the best possible living areas for new residents. She asked if the Committee had studied what other counties were doing in this area.

Mr. Reilly replied they had to some extent, especially other Arizona counties. Pima had gone forward with this the most. He said water would be one of the biggest items; ADWR had to give a subdivision an OK that they had adequate water supply and they were not likely to do that in Yavapai County.

Ms. Link said that the Board could approve a subdivision with an adequate or with an inadequate water supply.

Mr. Sullivan asked what it would take for the developers to not do a parcel split and how might they make a subdivision easier to do. He said talking to a developer who wanted to do a conservation subdivision and talking to a developer wanting to do lot splits was not the same thing.

Mr. Reilly said he had clients that did both and Ms. Hoffman agreed.

Ms. Hoffman said clustering was important, that streets were a huge item that needed to be addressed, and water and sewer elements were important. She said by putting houses closer together it saved the developers money, but they needed to have enough units to make it profitable.

Ms. Link said she would address the issue of water and inadequate water supply, the County was in the process of amending the Subdivision Regulations to take out an area that talked about the Board only having to approve with an adequate water supply, and to have the Subdivision Regulations consistent with the State Statutes, the Subdivision Regulations would state the Board could either approve or deny a subdivision with inadequate water supply; this had never been done, but it was now changing because this had resulted in lot splits with wells and septic and this would provide some infrastructure.

Mr. Reilly said there was a Bill being introduced this year addressing road construction with lot splits, changing it to state if you do a lot split you had to construct the access easement to a minimum standard and they had to be maintained.

Ms. Hoffman said she felt the Board needed to have a way to work directly with the Governor and the State agencies, and felt the Governor had to tell her agencies to expedite this.

Ms. Lassuy said there were discussions regarding forming Government task forces to help the local jurisdictions to green their codes, but it was still in only in discussion.

Ms. Hoffman said that they worked with several cities, towns and agencies and one might have a very well coordinated expedited process in place and another might not, but they don't always coordinate, and there was still the problem of one department not communicating with another.

Mr. Ackerman suggested they might create a subcommittee from this Committee to form a Government task force, but for now they needed to ensure the developers knew that was an issue that the Committee might be addressing. He said one question he had was what was the purpose of a residential conservation subdivision, was it to provide an equal alternative to lot splits, or were they trying to create something that would draw as many as different developers on different levels to do this, this Committee should make this as attractive as possible to all potential developers.

Ms. Link replied that was the goal, but they were not trying to make this equal to lot splits, but rather create an alternative.

Mr. Ackerman said they needed to identify a list that would be important to the developers, and give them a list of incentives.

Ms. McClelland said it used to be open space subdivision and now they were talking density bonus. She said a small PAD would not work with sewer and open space.

Ms. Link said she wanted to make sure they were all on the same page, that this would be allowed as a PAD as a matter-of-right, with 25% open space, if they meet all the criteria without meeting any of the conservation or density bonus, but just come in with just clustering with the same amount of density with the underlying zoning and it could be approved, any conservation measures would be optional.

Mr. Feldmeier said they needed to decide the questions they would be asking the panel.

Ms. Lassuy said they needed to present this as not answers to their questions, but this was to gather their input to form the criteria, and that at this point, the Committee would not have all the answers.

Ms. Link said she felt that specific questions were not needed, but just general questions from the agenda to get the discussion started.

Mr. Kerkman said this would help them see if they were on the right track and if they had missed anything.

Mr. Sullivan said that the questions asked were not as important as the comments from the developers and that was what was needed in the minutes.

Mr. Reilly said he was concerned about the possibility of going off on tangents and they had to be able to control the comments and limit the amount of time of each speaker.

Mr. Ackerman reviewed the draft, and asked what they were offering them that might make them want to do this.

Ms. Hoffman said there were actually two separate Ordinances; one for cluster as a matter-of-right and one for conservation subdivisions, and asked if this would be two different parts of the code.

Ms. Link said she looked at clustering as leaving 25% as open space and that was conservation and that this would be one code that would be in both the Zoning Ordinance and in the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Reilly asked if PAD would be removed for the Residential Subdivision, but it would remain in the Zoning Ordinance for commercial, and the next step would be to incorporate mixed uses.

Mr. Sullivan said the Residential Conservation would apply to single family residential subdivisions, not commercial or mixed uses.

Ms. Link said she would like to get a draft together first and then discuss later how they might get it in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sullivan said they needed to compare the Committee's rating system with that of the developers and to ask them if there were other items that might have been overlooked.

Ms. Hoffman suggested inviting Chris Bridges and Mike Willet from Public Works to the panel discussion meeting so that they might be able to address Country road standards.

Mr. Kerkman asked how they would use the information gathered from this discussion.

Mr. Ackerman said the list was too detailed to go through now, but wondered if the points were weighed more heavily because they were harder to do, or more points because it was a greater benefit to them to do. It may be an economic benefit to one developer and not be for a benefit for another developer.

Ms. Hoffman said she felt it was the County who should decide what the important incentives were.

Mr. Ackerman asked what type of density the County wanted them to do.

Ms. McClelland said 50% was too high.

Ms. Link said the County did not have a position on higher or not higher density, if someone did come in with conservation measures that offset or justify the 50% density, that was how the County would determine if it were acceptable or not.

It was discussed and decided to not assign any density number until after they have the input from the developers.

Mr. Ackerman reviewed the format for the January 11 meeting: Tom would read the opening statement setting the ground rules stating that this was not an open public meeting; Matt would give a brief history of this Committee; Shakeeb would then present a summary of where they were at with the Residential Conservation; and then Matt would address the panel to get their opinion and to begin the open discussion.

Ms. Link said that the next Joint Session would be March 26 and she would like to have final draft to present to the Board of Supervisors at that time. It was agreed that there needed to be a limit put on their meetings and that a final draft for the Joint Session was a good idea.

Mr. Ackerman suggested inviting a couple of individuals from the panel to join this Committee.

Mr. Reilly said no, the Committee had enough members and the idea of the panel was to get the developers ideas and opinions.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30.