

**Sustainable Planning Meeting  
May 2, 2008**

Members Present:        Matt Ackerman, Chairman        Jim Wise  
                                 Gene Kerkman                        Jim Sullivan  
                                 Elise Link                            Bill Feldmeier  
                                 Dava Hoffman                      Margie Bryan  
                                 Tom Reilly

Absent:                     Jon Barnert

Guest:                     Candace McNulty  
                                 Georgene Lockwood  
                                 John Rasmussen, Yavapai County Water Advisory Committee

The meeting began with the approval of the minutes from April 18, 2008.

Mr. Ackerman gave a recap of the meeting with the District 3 Supervisor. He felt the concerns that the Supervisor had were no more of a risk than the lot splits the Committee was trying to avoid. He said the Supervisor expressed concerns with density harvesting taking place. Mr. Ackerman said a follow-up meeting had been scheduled for May 14, 2008.

Mr. Kerkman said he felt the Supervisor's underlying concern was with speculative land development.

Ms. Link felt that one concern was that the developers were not engaging the public enough. She suggested that if the developer wanted to engage the public, but did not want to go through a public hearing, they could still have an administrative review; however, the public participation could be part of the process.

Mr. Sullivan said the Supervisor could argue that certain areas, such as a cliff, did not constitute open space, and perhaps the Committee might designate a certain percentage of a development to remain as open space.

Mr. Feldmeier felt they were making it way too complicated and that the Committee needed to go back to the original idea, as the more difficult they made it the less the developers would be willing to do it.

Mr. Ackerman said the main goal of this Committee had been to encourage clustering and to discourage lot splits by way of the Residential Conservation Subdivision. He suggested they should go on to Step 2 and determine where the density could be built in the County along with the idea of a transfer of development rights.

Ms. Hoffman felt that discouraging lot splits was the most important goal of the Committee.

Ms. Hoffman said that anything that went through the County was public, so this was no different than the regular subdivision.

Ms. Link replied there were State Statutes that stated what a subdivision was and it would be difficult to deny a developer if they met the State Statutes.

Mr. Reilly said there was a difference between the public being aware of what was happening and what was controlled by State Statutes which the County had no control over and the public needed to

understand that. There was already a public information system in place and when a PAD went through, there was a list of area organizations that were normally notified.

Ms. Link said it was very valuable to her to have the information from the surrounding neighbors as they were aware of what was happening in their area.

Mr. Sullivan asked wasn't that done now during the sketch plan meetings and if something veered from the normal, the County could say they needed more information before the development could be approved.

Mr. Reilly said there was a difference between the public being informed and them being able to tell you what you could or could not do with your property. He felt the public notification process should remain as it was and that the Committee should move forward with Step 2 concurrently with what they were doing now with the PAD.

Mr. Kerkman asked if a particular size of property was more susceptible to lot splits than another or could this be limited to a certain amount of acreage. The Committee agreed that there was no size limit of the property that prevented lot splits.

Ms. Link suggested they might be able to put in some checks and balances to prevent blatant abuse.

Ms Link said they needed to establish a timeline for the Committee to get this moving forward. She felt they needed to get the list together of those that they wished to review it so that it could be mailed out prior to the study session at the Commission hearing. This list needed to be presented to the entire Commission and then let the Commission initiate a hearing. The Committee discussed the new timeline.

Mr. Ackerman asked the Committee what they envisioned for Step 2. His vision was what sustainable meant in the bigger picture. He asked if the County had the ability to decide where the growth should happen within the County. He said they needed to look at the County to see where the resources were in the County such as food, water, energy and transportation. He said they also needed to address the transfer of development rights.

Mr. Reilly said trying to find out the comprehensive needs of Yavapai County would not ever be accomplished, but everyone had an idea of the tools that did exist to help address the issues of sustainability. He would like to review the list that had been created and use that as a starting point to put together a tool box for Yavapai County to address the sustainability issues. He also felt the open space corridor needed to be addressed.

Ms. Hoffman's concerns were with water and land conservation and felt there needed to be Ordinances towards conservation incentives.

Mr. Kerkman said density was the carrot and growth would happen whether it was planned or not. He felt the County needed to take advantage of the density bonus structure to encourage the type of growth the County wanted. He said the key elements were water conservation, open space, and energy conservation.

Mr. Feldmeier felt catch basins and other water conservation measures were important and that the County needed to encourage density bonuses.

Ms. Link agreed that the Committee should move forward with Step 2. She said the Committee should begin formalizing the language for the General Plan to incorporate conservation and designate the tools needed to accomplish this.

Mr. Sullivan felt the Residential Conservation subdivision was a start towards conservation. He said they should start with a criteria list and if the developers met the sustainability criteria then let them move forward.

Mr. Ackerman said that transfer of development is to give the County the power to negotiate with the property owner to give them the incentives to develop. Yavapai County is a leader in the State and as such, we need to look at the long range picture of the County. He asked if they could work out the language in the General Plan simultaneously with the Residential PAD. He said he was encouraged at the meeting with the Supervisor when he said to look at where within the County it made sense to develop.

Ms. Hoffman said if they offered options such as transfer of development rights that would be great, but they had to be realistic.

Mr. Sullivan said if transfer of development rights could be accomplished by a text change in the Ordinance then the Committee should do that. Growth is going to happen and they don't want to limit the potential growth areas within the county.

Mr. Feldmeier said the transfer of development rights were just another tool to work with, but unless they had a workbench of affordable tools, nothing would be accomplished, and they needed to pick out areas where they hoped to encourage development.

Mr. Ackerman suggested that they define in writing what they hoped to do in Step 2.

Mr. Feldmeier said he would like to see the list of criteria that they had worked on previously.

Ms. Link said that could be emailed to them again.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that the table of the Committee goals be resent as well.

Mr. Ackerman asked if the Steps needed to be done in order or if the Committee could work on them simultaneously. The Committee said it was just a guideline to present to the Supervisors at the Joint Session and the Steps could be worked on at the same time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15.