

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING  
TOWN COUNCIL AD HOC UDO UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE  
TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY**

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 2018  
4:00 P.M.**

The Town Council Ad Hoc UDO Update Subcommittee of the Town of Chino Valley convened for a public meeting in the Council Chambers Conference Room, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Lon Turner called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

**2) ROLL CALL**

Present: Lon Turner, Chair; Corey Mendoza, Councilmember

Absent: Cloyce Kelly, Councilmember

Staff Cecilia Grittmann, Town Manager; Jason Sanks, Development Services Director; Alex

Present: Lerma, Planner

**3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- a) Consideration and possible action to accept the April 25, 2018 meeting minutes.

MOVED by Chair Lon Turner, seconded by Councilmember Corey Mendoza to approve the April 25, 2018 meeting minutes.

**Vote:** 2 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

**4) OLD BUSINESS**

**5) NEW BUSINESS**

- a) Presentation and discussion regarding revised and additional proposed residential zoning districts Single Family-7 (renamed from SR-0.16), SF-10, and SF-15 with associated development standards.

Development Services Director Sanks, explained that according to the changes in Article 4, with the new formatting, they needed to discuss Single Family Districts. This will involve only single family homes, not agriculture or farming. The Town was getting pressure to allow for smaller lots, which staff was allowing but did not have the proper zoning for, like Bright Star. The only way to do it currently is with a planned area development and it should be within the boundaries of the ordinance.

Town Manager Grittmann, asked about the zoning for Bright Star when it came in. Mr. Sanks responded that they utilized MR-1 zoning. There was nothing else available to use, so they platted it from there.

They ended up caving on some of our current requirements with Bright Star, like sidewalks, but it turned out okay.

Mr. Sanks and the Subcommittee discussed proposed changes to Article 4 Residential Zoning Districts:

- Nomenclature: Generally the prefix SF meant Single Family and R meant Residential, followed by a number for the lot size. He recommended not using SR-0.16 or 0.22 as they were clumsy. Mr. Sanks suggested using SF followed by the size of the lot; e.g.: 120, 140, etc. Chair Turner agreed with that designation for anything smaller than 1 acre. Mr. Sanks clarified that SF indicates generally 5 or less people, related or otherwise.
- Lot widths, depths, and set backs: These were the standards. When looking at the smaller lots, setbacks and the house width must be considered. As lots get larger, they are generally wider, which allows for a wider house frontage.
- Subdividing a 1-acre lot into 5 houses: At this point, there was nothing to prevent it. Provisions could be added to help control the type of development on smaller lots. They may also want to put in wording that includes the number of stories rather than height maximums.
- Lot Coverage: This was kept the same rather than rewrite it with different coding.
- Purpose of Zoning Development: To keep the type of neighborhood consistent with what is currently there. Mr. Sanks will be making recommendations.
- Restricting rezones: These provisions were not too aggressive. For example, if someone purchasing a number of homes in a subdivision and then wanting to change it to apartments would change the dynamics of the area, so the Town could control that. Just because someone asks for rezoning, does not mean it will be approved.

Mr. Sanks presented pictures of Bright Star with 55' wide lots and 40' wide homes. These lots were smaller than the 0.16 lots. They were 6,000 square feet lots, which did not match the Town's zoning schematics. A picture of 65' wide lots of 7,000 square feet showed the difference 10 feet can make. This could also go up to 10,000 square foot lots, but the Town doesn't currently have any zoning for this. This would usually only get 3 homes per acre when factoring in streets and easements. Other cities go up to 20,000 square foot lots. This can be for the "mansion" type homes with RV parking, etc.

Mr. Sanks and the Subcommittee discussed:

- Smaller lots: Zoning needs to catch up to what the development needs are going to be in the near future. If the Town doesn't allow smaller lots, young people might not be able to afford to move into them. The Town needs to consider this "workforce housing" and there are a lot of opportunities.
- Development standards: Current standards for 1 acre plus lots were pretty loose, but they seem to be working. The General Plan dictates where the various densities are allowed. That needs to be clear.
- Development size: Developers usually wanted a minimum of 60 lots to develop an area. They have to cover the costs of water, power, streets, etc., so in order to accommodate those development costs, they will push for that yield.
- General Plan: The Town's General Plan differentiates in writing the land uses that are available, but the Town's plan is somewhat loose and very general. While people can request a change in zoning, the Town has to look at the development plan.
- Downtown: The Town does not have a "downtown". Other towns our size generally had a very specific downtown, where their commercial development started, then they built out from there. The Town didn't start that way.
- Zoning requests: It was suggested to set up processes so there was no more than a two-step difference in zoning a new request, maybe just in the 1 acre areas before doing the two steps. The Town had to have the tools set up to stick with what the Town wanted, so that developers

could not try to push a zoning rule. The Code would need to allow for the access as well up to a subdivision.

- Development plan: If the Town developed a Plan that is much clearer on Zoning areas and the like, it would eliminate a lot of the Planned Area Developments, as the new zoning and district code would prevail. There would be a buffer/transition time, so people could come in under the old zones or districts.

Mr. Sanks stated that today he was recommending scrapping the SR 0.16 and adopting the SF-7, 10, and 15. Staff will need to rewrite to match to the General Plan. He was considering maybe allowing for SF-6 as a Senior only area, but he was not sure how it could be enforced and it would almost have to go through planning and development.

The Subcommittee:

- Recommended that Jason move forward;
- Commented that they still need to review: multi-family zoning; what the Town wanted down the road to avoid a “slum-lord” situation; allowance for play space and amenities; and General Plan content.
- Asked Jason to provide more information, comparing other towns and cities and what they have done for zoning and requirements for multi-family areas.
- Hoped to set up the basics and then allow for adjustments through Development Services and Planning and Zoning.

The Subcommittee’s next meeting will be Wednesday, August 1, 2018.

## 6) **ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to adjourn the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

**Vote:** 2 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

Submitted: July 10, 2018.

By: *Vickie Nipper, Deputy Town Clerk*

Approved: August 1, 2018.