

**Sustainable Planning Meeting
March 7, 2008**

Members Present: Gene Kerkman, acting Chairman Dava Hoffman
 Elise Link Shakeeb Shariff
 Joan McClelland Tom Reilly
 Bill Feldmeier

Guests: John Rasmussen, Yavapai County Water Advisory Committee
 Georgene Lockwood
 George Seaman

Absent: Matt Ackerman, Chairman Jim Sullivan
 Jon Barnert Jim Wise

The meeting began with the unanimous approval of the minutes from February 22, 2008.

Mr. Kerkman Chaired the meeting in Mr. Ackerman's absence. He asked if everyone had the chance to review the draft Mr. Shariff had emailed to them.

Mr. Shariff stated they had revised the draft per their last meeting discussion and that Ms. Hoffman had also recommended some revisions that were noted on their draft copy. He asked if there were any other revisions that the Committee felt needed to be made.

Mr. Reilly said he would exclude counting private yards as open space. He felt there needed to be some minimal conservation mentioned, two of his concerns were with the central water distribution system and a central sewer collection and treatment system and both of these things needed to be in place in order to qualify for a residential PAD.

Ms. Link said hypothetically, if one had 20 acres in a RCU-2A zoning district and they wanted to cluster, they would be allowed 10 units. She asked if there should be a certain threshold for central sewer and water.

Mr. Reilly said for approximately \$100,000 one could put in a central sewer system that was marginally effective. The Committee asked him to do some research to make sure it was possible to put in a small central sewer package for that amount.

Ms. Link said the only difference was when they did that, they were asking the developer to put that money up front as opposed to him selling the lots and let the buyer put in a \$10,000 septic system.

Mr. Reilly felt it still needed to be in there. He said clustering in itself was conserving, but they needed to be able to collect sewage and recharge the water back into the aquifer. This could be done with ponds or injection wells; there were a variety of ways to do that.

Ms. Hoffman said unless it was a large development she was not sure ponds and injection wells were feasible.

Mr. Feldmeier said he did not see how this would work and reach the conservation type development they were attempting to reach, if they were encumbered with requirements they would not do it and then they were back to lot splits. He did not disagree, but doubted if it would be financially feasible to do. He suggested sending it to the Board with both options, let them know that the Committee had two opinions and let the Board make the decision.

Ms. Link said what they had already included were conservation measures and the Committee had accomplished a lot.

Ms. Hoffman asked if they could go to the Board and say they were only recommending this as the first step. She said what they were doing now was for conservation (clustering of lots and having shorter length of streets) and this was protecting the land.

Mr. Reilly said that he understood that the Committee liked the idea of including a central sewage collection system and a water distribution system, but the issue was the cost of the smaller subdivision where imposing those regulations would only have the effect of promoting lot splits. He said before the Joint Session he was going to try to find out more about what these systems do actually cost and hoped to have sufficient information so that they could establish a threshold so that with X number of units this would be required.

Mr. Kerkman said a lot of this would depend on the physical characteristics of the land because there were areas in the County that would not perk and these systems would not work.

The Committee reviewed the deadlines for the Joint Session and discussed the public notification and public hearing process. Ms. Link stated after the Joint Session if the Board directed them to initiate a public hearing, the formal public participation process would begin and a draft would be mailed out for review to reviewing agencies, committees, and organizations. Then before it was scheduled for public hearing, it would be on the Planning and Zoning Commission agendas, both in Prescott and in Cottonwood, and as a discussion item for the initial meeting, and then it would be noticed for public input at that time which would satisfy the public notification and outreach. Ms. Link said they might also consider putting the draft on the web.

Mr. Feldmeier said if they put this on the web, then they needed to list the reasons why this was a step in the right direction for conservation.

Mr. Feldmeier said this was only Phase I. Phase II was all the conservation measures that they wanted to have included and this needed to be done in a positive way.

Mr. Kerkman said the next item on the agenda was a discussion regarding the performance criteria for attached housing.

Ms. Hoffman said a PAD had a requirement for perimeter setbacks so one could not have houses right on the road.

Mr. Reilly said it would apply to the existing underlying zoning and whatever those requirements were.

Ms. Link said the performance criteria for attached housing was needed because it was a departure from the Zoning Ordinance that allowed single family dwelling, to now allow attached housing as a matter of right. She said it could cause controversy for those living in a single family zoning district to have condos or town homes going in next to them and she felt it would help if it were made so that these would only be allowed on a certain parcel size or to only allow a certain percentage of attached housing within a PAD.

Mr. Kerkman said the next item on the agenda was The Smart Code. Ms. Link said this was something that Mr. Ackerman was more familiar with and since he was not there today to participate in the discussion, they might want to wait until he was there. It was available on the web so that everyone could read it before the next meeting.

Mr. Kerkman said the last item on the agenda was how to discuss questions/concerns from the public and the Committee felt this had already been addressed. He said a lot would depend on the amount of public comment received, there could be a lot or there could be very little.

Ms. Link reviewed the items for the next meeting on March 21, 2008:

- Elise will email a draft for the Committee to review
- Draft a preamble of the draft for review
- Mr. Reilly will have more information regarding ADEQ regulations
- Format for the Joint Session

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.