

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE TOWN OF PINETOP-LAKESIDE PLANNING AND ZONING
COMMISSION, HELD ON THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2023
AT TOWN OF PINETOP-LAKESIDE COUNCIL CHAMBERS
325 W. WHITE MOUNTAIN BOULEVARD, LAKESIDE, AZ 85929**

SOME MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION MAY PARTICIPATE TELEPHONICALLY.

A. Call to Order

Chairman Salskov called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call:

The following Members were present:

John Salskov	Chairman
Harry Turner	Vice Chairman
Alison Stewart	Commission Member
Tim Kendzlic	Commission Member
Todd Fernau	Commission Member
Jack Pence	Commission Member

The following Member was absent:

Timothy Williams	Commission Member
------------------	-------------------

Also Present:

Jeremiah Loyd	Community Development Director
Keith Johnson	Town Manager
Stephanie Irwin	Mayor
Taber Heisler	Councilmember
Mackenzie Valichnac	Deputy Town Clerk
Tina Robinson	Creative Service Specialist
Annie DeRosier	Marketing

B. Call to the Public

Chairman Salskov called for public comments.

Robert Ingels stated, “My name is Rob Ingels and I live on Penrod Road. I wanted to address the Commission tonight and say how helpful it is to have good minutes of past meetings so we can see what is going on in our community. When issues pass from you guys to the Council, its very helpful. As I look ahead in our community, I am hoping that we will soon be back on track to do the General Plan revision. I consulted via phone with Patty King, the executive director of the Arizona Planning Association, I was very pleased to find out that Jeremiah was a member. It’s not that expensive for the Commission to be a member of the Arizona Planning Association. They have a lot of resources that I think would benefit staff, Council, the P&Z Commission, and our citizens. Maybe for a future agenda item, if the Commission is willing, I’d love to have a chance to either discuss the opportunity of the membership. Staff could cover the cost of the membership. There may be citizens who could look forward to being interactive early on as the General Plan revision moves ahead. Due to cost considerations, it would seem, in my eyes at least, that getting started on this sooner rather than later and trying to do an election where the General Plan could be discussed and compromises and details could be worked out. This could be a part of the general election in 2024. We could be ahead of schedule instead of playing catch up in 2025. With that said. I’ll watch for an agenda item. I would be glad to participate either with staff or individual Commissioners and share information. With that I will take a seat but thank you for letting me bring that topic up.”

C. Minutes

C.1 Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission held on March 9, 2023.

Commissioner Kendzlic moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission held on March 9, 2023. Commissioner Turner seconded the motion and by show of hands the following vote was recorded:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN
John Salskov	X		
Harry Turner	X		
Alison Stewart	X		
Tim Kendzlic	X		
Todd Fernau	X		
Jack Pence	X		

Chairman Salskov declared the motion passed with a 6-0 vote.

D. New Business

D.1 Review and Discuss Site Plan (SPR 23-263) for the proposed new administration building for Navopache Electric Cooperative at 2470 Porter Mountain Road, Lakeside, AZ 85929. APN 212-65-001.

Community Development Director Loyd stated Navopache currently has a building at this site. When the site plan was approved in 2010 they were required to have an eight foot chain link fence with barbed wire at the top. The second phase of this project, which includes a new administration building, parking bays, and storage, is being discussed tonight. Director Loyd reviewed the information in the Staff Report. Director Loyd concluded that his staff recommendation is to approve the site plan with the following conditions:

- (1) Screening trees are provided per 17.92.060.B.5, one tree for every 15', on the southern edge of the property boundary adjacent to the R-Low zoned property.
- (2) The number of street trees on Commerce Dr shall be 20 if they are Red Oaks or an equivalent number of pine and red oaks with the recommended spacing for all species.
- (3) The landscaping plan is deficient regarding the number of trees. The plan shows 166 trees, including existing and proposed trees. Therefore, the plan is lacking 115 trees.
- (4) The landscaping plan is deficient regarding the number of shrubs. The plan shows 44 shrubs, and 17.92.050.5.B calls for One (1) shrub for each two hundred (200) square feet of hard surface paving or parking area. Therefore, 1,124 shrubs are required.
- (5) The building will be painted an earth tone color as submitted.
- (6) All conditions of the Fire District having authority shall be met.
- (7) Any other condition(s) deemed necessary by the Commission.

John McGhee, with Cole Design Group, stated that he would like to discuss the landscape requirements. They understand that buffering needs to be in place. The 1,200 required shrubs is based on the total area of land, 17 acres, instead of what is actually being developed, which is about 4 acres. John McGhee would like the shrubs to be based on the area that is actually being developed.

Robert Ingels stated, *“This site is so visible from Porter Mountain Road. Our public school is down there around the round-a-bout. It’s hard to drive down there without noticing the commercial and industrial needs that Navopache has there. There is literally no trees, no landscaping, and no buffering along that stretch of Porter Mountain Road. As I just heard asking to focus on the new 4 acres, I can’t help but wonder how we ended up with chain link fencing and no buffering on a commercial lot. When I realized, if I did this right, there are literally 5 acres on the site of non-pervious surface between the parking area and the building. I have a concern about the run off from the buildings and the parking area. I’m sure that Navopache uses the best practices environmentally. With the proximity of Billy Creek, I don’t know if there was an input from the Forest Service regarding the run off going across the 500 feet and entering the creek and as it flows into Show Low Lake and beyond. Sometimes in other communities, they require soils and the detention areas to try and catch some of the sediments and other things that would be in parking areas so they do not get into our natural resources and streams. Again, on the limited papers that I had size wise, trying to read the keynotes I’m not really sure, and I thought that it might be answered through the voice that I’m hearing tonight or from the representatives from the co-op. Other things that I would be looking for as a citizen is LED lighting. It has brought a lot of changes in vehicles and residential and commercial areas in our community. I know a lot of the retrofitting tends to drop the LEDs down in the lighting structure so that they are not shielded as well. Trying to be a night sky community and hoping that our co-op, which we have 3 services through and have been a member of the co-op since 1978, will be an example of good lighting. We could use them as examples of good lighting for future developments to minimize off-site glare. I can look at the information that is provided but lumens and ranges do not mean a whole lot to me on a sheet of paper. It’s when I drive down the road and the highway through town is shining from rain, snow, or ice it creates a glare and sometimes, at my age at least, it becomes a problem. I’m hoping to see the best of what they can do there. I don’t know if the town forester, oh wait we do not have a town forester. Was a forester consulted at all regarding the tree plan as this moves ahead? Again, I feel it is important that there is buffering of the industrial look from the road, Porter Mountain Road more specifically than from Commerce Road. I don’t know if on the plans, if there is any landscaping in the parking area. Is there an attempt to save trees in that area? Being a Tree City USA community and proudly having it on signs in Town, knowing that the heavily forested corner is going to be radically altered, I guess I would look at it as the co-op trying to be responsible as they can about how the site is used to be a good example of stewardship. So, I guess I look to you and I really appreciate the thoroughness of with which our Community Development Director went through and evaluated this. As Commissioners I hope that some of the discussion will come up with a reasonable*

plan for how this might get approved with the concerns of the citizens of the town. Thank you.”

Commissioner Fernau stated that the total shrub count is for the whole 17 acres and not the 4 acres of the proposed development. He asked if it was premature to enforce a landscaping requirement on land that is not included in the proposed development.

Chairman Salskov added that there are parcels in the Town that do not have any trees. The landscaping code would require the developer to add trees that were not already there.

Commissioner Stewart asked if the tree requirement was based on the hard surface area and not the total acreage.

Community Development Director Loyd confirmed that is correct. The proposed area has a lot of existing trees and they are asking if they can just replace the trees that are being taken down during the build and add them to another area on the property.

John McGhee stated that they will meet the street tree requirement. The reduction they are asking for is the site trees which is based on the pavement and hard scape. They are asking for this number to be based only on the new development, not the whole property.

Commissioner Kendzlic asked if they would replace the grass with more trees.

John McGhee answered that they will most likely be adding 2,000 square feet of grass, mainly around building to have the 50% reduction in site trees.

Commissioner Stewart stated, *“I would like to say something. First of all, I would like to say that I am not against your project at all but I am for what is fair for everyone who has commercial property in Pinetop-Lakeside. This morning, I reviewed the code for C-2 zoning and it very clearly states under 17.68.070, Additional Regulations, that any property adjoining a rural or residential zoning district or abutting a street or alley shall be screened by a solid masonry (block, stone or brick) wall six feet in height. Said wall shall be subject to review by the Design Review Board. I did bring this to Jeremiah’s attention and it was obviously four o’clock this afternoon that it got discussed and he explained that there was a stipulation in the landscaping code that a CMU block wall can be substituted for screening trees placed every 15 feet. I don’t see that stipulation in the code number that you quoted me. Our job is to follow the code and unfortunately the code is saying*

that there needs to be a masonry wall, six foot in height to screen between the rural area and any streets or alleys. That would even mean down Porter Mountain Road. As a Commissioner I am confused what is code. It is black and white under the C-2 zoning.”

Community Development Director Loyd answered, *“That is says under C-2 zoning that the screening is for residential and commercial. The properties that are in the County are zoned commercial residential but they are being used commercially, so the code wouldn’t apply on Porter Mountain Road. The only section where the code would apply is on the southern side where there is R-Low. In 17.92.060.B.5., Walls and Screening Devices, it says the commercial property that directly abuts residential property must properly shield the commercial lot from the residential lots. This shall be accomplished through the use of trees and/or screening walls. Trees may be spaced a maximum of 15 feet from one another. The trees must run the entire length of the border shared with residential property. The wall shall be a minimum of six foot height and must run the entire length of the border shared with residential property. So right there, it says that you can do either one.”*

Commissioner Stewart responded that she does not read it as either one because the C-2 zoning stipulates that a wall is required. Commissioner Stewart suggested that if anyone needs more time to review the zoning, then the vote could be tabled for another meeting.

Chairman Salskov stated that this application is unique because this is for an addition to an already existing building, not a brand new development. Requiring a block wall would discourage people from building on what they already have. Their site plan and landscaping was already approved in 2010.

Commissioner Fernau asked to confirm that Director Loyd reads the code as saying and/or for the trees and walls.

Community Development Director Loyd answered yes.

Chairman Salskov asked Director Loyd to state the exact number of trees that would be required.

Community Development Director Loyd stated that it is approximately 4 acres but they should make it contingent on the exact acreage that the applicant will provide later.

Chairman Salskov made a motion to approve SPR 23-263 for the Navopache Co-operative Electric administration building with the condition that the new hard scape requirements be based on approximately four acres that they are developing now. Commissioner Kendzlic seconded the motion and by a show of hands the following vote was recorded:

	AYES	NAYS	ABSTAIN
John Salskov	X		
Harry Turner	X		
Tim Kendzlic	X		
Alison Stewart			X
Todd Fernau	X		
Jack Pence	X		

Chairman Salskov declared the motion passed.

E. Adjournment

There being no further business at this time, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:45 p.m.



[Handwritten Signature]

 Chairman Salskov

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Pinetop-Lakeside, Arizona, held on the 13th day of April 2023. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 13th day of April 2023.



[Handwritten Signature]

 Mackenzie Valichnac, Deputy Town Clerk