

**Coconino County Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Meeting of January 26, 2022**  
**Zoom-Web-Based Technology**

**Members Present**

Tammy Ontiveros – Chair  
Don Walters – Vice-Chair  
Sat Best  
John Ruggles  
Tyanna Burton  
Jim Clifford  
Mary Williams  
Jim Clifford

**Members Absent**

Dennis Baca

**Staff Present**

Jason Christelman, Director  
Bob Short, Principal. Planner  
Zach Schwartz, Sr. Planner  
Melissa Shaw, Long Range Planner  
Kelly Bingham, Planner  
Aaron Lumpkin, County Attorney  
Paul Garns, County Attorney  
Marty Hernandez, Recording Secretary

Chair Ontiveros called the meeting to order at 5:30PM. She noted procedures to the audience.

**I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chair Ontiveros wanted her comment added to December 1, 2021, minutes for CUP-21-070 for the Met Tower case, regarding the “approval of the met tower was not to be misconstrued as an approval for a wind energy project”.

The recording secretary will update the minutes accordingly.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Walters made the motion to approve the minutes from December 1, 2021, with the additional comment added.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Ruggles seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** N/A

**VOTE:** The vote was unanimous, with Commissioner Clifford abstaining.

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Resolution No. 2022-001. Update to the Commission Operating Rules and Regulations to address meetings held using web-based technology.

**STAFF:** Mr. Short summarized the staff report. Mr. Short showed updated changes on the document from when it was sent to the Commissioners for review.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Walters made a motion to approve Resolution No. 2022-001 with the updates.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Ruggles seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** NA

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

2. Case No. SUB-21-030: A request for a Preliminary Subdivision Plat Amendment to remove Condition 6 requiring annexation into the Summit Fire District from the conditions of approval of the 22-lot Tall Tales Ranch subdivision (SUB-20-008) located on a 111.02-acre parcel in the AR-5 (Agricultural Residential, five-acre minimum parcel size) Zone. The subject property is located on Tall Tales Ranch Road one mile west of the N Cosnino Road interchange on Interstate 40 and is also identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 117-01-001C.

Property Owner: 7486 Star House, LLC, Flagstaff, Arizona

Applicant: Civil Engineering and Design, Flagstaff, Arizona

Representative: Ian Braun, Flagstaff, Arizona

County Supervisor District: 4 (Judy Begay)

**STAFF:** Mr. Short gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. Commissioner Best asked in the proposed changed if EMS was included or should it be added.

Mr. Short explained if they created their own fire district then possibly, but they could add the EMS stipulation. If they create their own fire district, then they could contract with Summit Fire for services.

Commissioner Best stated one of the Conditions talked about Public Health. EMS is an expensive service and should be added. He thought this was uncharted territory for the Commission.

Commissioner Best asked who was responsible for ingress, egress, thinning, etc. during the fire season.

Mr. Short said under the CC&Rs they must have a Firewise plan. Trees are very sparse. Commissioner Walters stated the trees were very thin in the area.

Commissioner Walters said fire and EMS were separate services and should not be included. EMS is already provided.

**APPLICANT:** Lindsay Schube of Gammage and Burnham Law, 40 N Central, Phoenix, AZ, stated the applicant had originally agreed to annex into the Summit Fire District but was not able to. The CC&Rs were in place to ensure the neighbors have fire service.

EMS should be left out as this is a separate service. She thought with the way it was written would cover the protection needed.

Commissioner Best stated one Condition says the design of the subdivision will not present serious health problems. If 911 was dialed, who shows up for EMS?

Chair Ontiveros asked legal to weigh in.

Aaron Lumpkin, County Attorney, had not run into this question and would have to do research.

Mr. Short stated you should not need a contract with EMS. Guardian would be the responder for EMS. Commission is trying to add conditions that were not in the original Conditions. Summit Fire does have EMS services.

Ms. Schube stated this property was close to EMS. EMS has relations with fire service. Commissioner Clifford responded that Summit Fire is now Summit Fire and Medical Services.

Chair Ontiveros was satisfied that there would be someone to respond to an emergency.

Mr. Best wanted to make sure Summit Fire would respond if someone called 911.

Mr. Short said there was a station on Townsend-Winona and Cosnino Road.

Mr. Best was satisfied that services would be provided.

Vice-Chair Walters said this was two different services. Fire service for property is a subscription, but EMS is a provided service.

Mr. Christelman stated EMS and fire will respond. If you are not subscription based for fire service, then you will be billed.

**PUBLIC:** NA

**COMMISSION:** NA

**MOTION:** Commissioner Walters made a motion to recommend approval of SUB-21-030 to the Board of Supervisors.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Williams seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** NA

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

3. Case No. DRO-21-014: A request for a Design Review for 31-rental cabins (hotel/motel and resort) and a general store (retail store) on three parcels totaling 4.52 acres in the CG-10,000 (Commercial General, 10,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size) Zone. The subject properties are located on N Fort Valley Road, north of Quintana Drive and the Flagstaff city boundary and are identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 110-14-019A, 110-14-019C and 111-01-010F.

Property Owner: Quintana Investors, LLC, Flagstaff, Arizona

Applicant: Christine Laguna of Civil Design and Engineering, Flagstaff, Arizona

County Supervisor District: 1 (Patrice Horstman)

**STAFF:** Mr. Short gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. Commissioner Ruggles had talked with Mr. Short regarding the lighting. He wanted to add "narrow spectrum" to Condition 5 but would amend during Commission discussion.

Commissioner Best was interested in the berm since this was a gateway to Flagstaff. He wanted to know if the fence was inside or outside of the berm.

Mr. Short stated it would be outside of the berm then landscaping that would flow onto the berm. He also noted the fence would be first, then ten feet of landscaping that would flow on and off the berm.

Commissioner Best thought the berm would help with screening. He would work on wording for Condition 8 regarding this.

**APPLICANT:** Danny Watson, 1955 W Baseline Rd, Mesa, AZ, had read the staff report and agreed with the conditions.

**PUBLIC:** Brian Herzog, 2912 N Creekside Drive, Flagstaff, AZ, was the HOA president for Coyote Springs. He wanted to address the fencing in the area as transits cross the area. He wanted to see the entire property fenced with a high fence to keep people from wandering onto private property.

Starla David, 3500 N Lost Creek Trail, Flagstaff, AZ, thought with this as a gateway to Flagstaff, the design looked like storage units and wanted more earth tone colors. She wanted a reduction of units. She was wondering about animals in the area with the detention basin and the water features. Without proper fencing it may not keep them out of those areas.

Mike Mitchell, 3305 Granite Ridge, Flagstaff, AZ was wondering if the cabin porches would be facing the common area or toward his property.

Chair Ontiveros asked if this was part of the design review.

Mr. Short thought it was not so far off topic that it could not be answered.

Mr. Christelman stated site orientation was not part of the design review, but the question could be answered.

Mr. Lumpkin said the orientation of the cabin was not part of the design review and should be kept off the record.

Mrs. Mitchell wanted to see a good size fence between properties, as Mr. Herzog had mentioned.

Kenton Harman, 3355 Granite Ridge, Flagstaff, AZ, was adjacent to the property, he felt the documents were incomplete. He felt the design did not show a design of any fence barrier. The design did not include fire suppressant storage, fire resistant materials, fire hydrants, or emergency vehicle access.

Chair Ontiveros asked Mr. Short if these comments were relevant to design review.

Mr. Short thought this was not for the Commission to look at that. This was not in the scope of this hearing.

Chair Ontiveros went back to Mr. Harman to let him know those comments were out of the design review purview. He had no further comments.

Les Butters, 3515 N Lost Creek Tr, Flagstaff, AZ, agreed with several items discussed. His belief that guests would have over-sized vehicles; how would they be accommodated. How does that affect the design?

Chair stated traffic could not be considered. The site plan addressed adequate parking.

Mr. Butters asked about space between the units not traffic on the road.

Mr. Short said the parking plan was addressed in the ordinance and was approved.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioners Clifford, Walters, and Burton thought it would be a

good project.

Commissioner Williams asked if there would be a fence on the north side. She felt people would wander into the woods. Wildlife would walk right into the water features and cabins. From a wildlife and trespassing perspective, she thought a fence was needed on the north side.

Chair Ontiveros said wildlife could not be addressed, but fencing could be addressed. Commissioner Best was disappointed in the design as it didn't fit in the area. The cabins looked like storage units. He asked the applicant to take a look around the area. He changed Condition 8 to read "*...with primarily evergreen trees planted on top of the berm.*"

He wanted to propose Condition 10 regarding signage to help mitigate offsite impacts as approved by staff. He hoped staff would sit down with the applicant to review appropriate signage.

Commissioner Best wanted to see a fence all the way around the project.

In regard to fencing, Commissioner Clifford thought modifying Condition 7 would be a better idea than adding another condition regarding fencing.

Mr. Short added "*...and north...*" to Condition 7.

Commissioner Best thought the fencing should be able to keep wildlife out of the property. This was a wildlife corridor.

Everyone reviewed Condition 8... "*primarily evergreen trees planted on top of the berm. The highway side of the berm shall be planted with native grasses and plants and shall not be covered with gravel. The applicant shall develop an invasive weed plan approved by staff.*"

Chair Ontiveros asked if the signage condition was appropriate to the DRO. Mr. Short said it was not related to the DRO guidelines.

Mr. Lumpkin agreed with Mr. Short that this does not pertain to DRO and should be a Condition in a CUP.

Condition 10 was removed.

Commissioner Best asked if the applicant could put up a sign stating private property on the other side of fence.

Mr. Short said with a DRO staff can approve certain items (signs, lighting, etc.) without coming back to Commission.

Chair Ontiveros reviewed Condition 7.

Mr. Short stated with the design guidelines there are certain requirements the applicant must make in the Zoning Ordinance. The north side of the property, the applicant was not proposing fencing as it was not required in the zoning ordinance. Fencing was not required between two commercial properties. It seemed this was additional type of fencing that was being required that was not really part of the design guidelines.

Mr. Lumpkin stated this cannot be required in a DRO. This was outside the scope of the Commission in a DRO case.

The verbiage was removed from Condition 7 and returned to the original wording.

Commissioner Williams asked if there was any place later that this fence could be addressed and or required.

Chair Ontiveros stated this was out of the bounds of the Commission tonight.

Chair Ontiveros asked Mr. Short to review Condition 5 for the correct wording.

Commissioner Ruggles stated it was correct.

Commissioner Ruggles understood and agreed with the discussion regarding fencing but was satisfied after hearing from Chair Ontiveros, Mr. Short, and legal counsel. Commissioner Ruggles said the siding color does increase contrast with the background color. He thought the berm and landscaping would mitigate that, especially since the buildings were not that tall. The roof will help mitigate some of the contrasts, as well. Commissioner Ontiveros wanted the Commissioners to know that the scope of discussion was very narrow and understood their concerns. She asked that everyone understand how she had to lead the discussion.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Ruggles made a motion to DRO-21-014 with the recommended Conditions as modified.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Clifford seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** NA

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

4. Case No. CUP-21-077: A request for a Conditional Use Permit to use a recreational vehicle (RV) as a permanent residence on a 1.05-acre parcel in the AR (Agricultural Residential, 1-acre minimum parcel size) Zone. The subject property is located at 2229 Picacho Way in Grand Canyon Junction (Valle) and is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number 501-34-049.  
Property Owner/Applicant: Sucha and Jaswinder Virdi, Bellevue, Washington  
County Supervisor District: 1 (Patrice Horstman)

**STAFF:** Mr. Short gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report.

**APPLICANT:** Sucha Virdi, 3400 161 Place, Bellevue, Washington, had read the staff report and agreed with the Conditions.

**PUBLIC:** David Bennet, 150 Wilson Street, Pennsylvania, stated it would be in the best interest of the development not have temporary buildings or RVs without permanent features. He asked that the Commission look at the area and give it a site of permanency. It seems to be scattered and unplanned.

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Clifford, Walters, Burton, Williams, Best, and Ruggles, could make the findings. Commissioner Ruggles said there was a 5-year time frame which would give people latitude down the road to look at the project and go from there on decisions.

Chair Ontiveros could also make the findings.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Williams made a motion to approve CUP-21-077 with the recommended Conditions.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Walters seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** NA

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ontiveros apologized as she had skipped over DRO-21-013, as it was on the agenda before the CUP-21-077.

5. Case No. DRO-21-013: A request for a Design Review for an 84-space recreational vehicle (RV) park and 238 RV storage spaces, to later be converted into 68 RV park spaces, with a general store, cart barn and other supporting uses on two parcels totaling 20.37 acres in the PC (Planned Community) Zone where CH-10,000 (Commercial Heavy, 10,000 sq. ft. minimum parcel size) standards have been applied. The subject properties are located at 13130 and 13450 W Brannigan Park Road in Belmont and are identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers 203-40-007C and 7D.

Property Owner: North Winds Commerce Center, LLC, Phoenix, Arizona

Applicant: Shephard-Wesnitzer, Inc. Flagstaff, Arizona

County Supervisor District: 3 (Matt Ryan)

**STAFF:** Mr. Schwartz gave a PowerPoint presentation and summarized the staff report. Commissioner Ruggles looked at the lighting plan questioning the unshielded lighting and would ask questions later.

**APPLICANT:** Scott Roberts, 9814 E Legacy Lane, Scottsdale, AZ, owner, and developer of Village Camp, had read the staff read and agreed with the Conditions. Commissioner Ruggles said low pressure sodium lighting was no longer available, and the replacement would be narrow spectrum amber lighting.

Mr. Roberts said there would not be a problem with changing out the lighting.

**PUBLIC:** NA

**COMMISSION:** Commissioner Clifford did not have any issues as it followed the Belmont Area Plan.

Commissioners Walters, Burton, Williams, and Best, could make the findings as well. Commissioner Ruggles wanted to modify Condition 5 to say "*fully-shielded narrow spectrum amber.*" and strike the second sentence. He could make the findings.

Chair Ontiveros agreed with the modification and agreed with the other Commissioners.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Walters made a motion to approve DRO-21-013 with the modified Conditions.

**SECOND:** Commissioner Ruggles seconded.

**DISCUSSION:** NA

**VOTE:** The motion passed unanimously.

#### **IV. CALL TO PUBLIC FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

No one from the public spoke.

Chair Ontiveros adjourned the hearing at 7:51 pm.

---

*Jimmy Calveras*

---

Chairperson, Coconino County  
Planning and Zoning Commission

**ATTEST:**

*Marty Hernandez*

---

Secretary, Coconino County  
Planning and Zoning Commission