

PLANNING AND ZONING MINUTES
MINUTES OF THE BENSON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
June 18, 2016

1. CALL TO ORDER-Commissioner Jim Thelander called the meeting to order at 9:05am.

2. PLEDGE- Commissioner Jim Thelander led the pledge.

3. ROLL CALL-Andrew Abernathy, Barbara Thompson, Jim Thelander and Debbie Braatz were present. Randy Robichaud and Cliff Deane were absent. A quorum was present.

4. CALL TO PUBLIC-

Mr. Bob Gent introduced himself as a Cochise County resident since 1947. He stated he represented the Astronomical League, of which 11 members are in Arizona and one of the larger members is based in Sierra Vista. He also noted that he was a member of the lighting task force for both Sierra Vista and Cochise County as they both recently revised their outdoor lighting codes. Mr. Gent stated his purpose in speaking is to call attention to Section 6, which has significant problems. He specifically noted the exemption for 150 watt fixtures (*now reduced to 75 watts*) would be a disaster for outdoor lighting. He stated Kartchner Caverns is applying for international dark sky recognition as an International Dark Sky Park and the actions of this development could jeopardize their application as well as their existing dark sky programs. The Cochise County Association of Astronomical Observatories currently has 60 members, several of whom have moved to Cochise County for the night sky. Mr. Gent expressed concern about light pollution and offered his, and his organizations', assistance to El Dorado and Benson in revising the lighting codes to get both the City code and Vigneto master plan up to speed to allow light in the community without damage to dark skies. He noted that technology is available to accomplish this and at no additional cost. Mr. Gent noted that this potential problem already has a solution and that he is willing to work with all parties. He concluded by stating the current proposal is grossly inadequate and would add to existing light pollution, threatening the dark skies and the local astronomical research. Mr. Gent provided a letter to Commissioners.

Debbie DiBiasie introduced herself as originally from Boston. She stated she is interested in small business and from her research the outlook for the area is bleak. She commented that if the Vigneto project doesn't take place, then people will leave the community and the town will turn into a ghost town. Ms. DiBiasie stated she wants to see Benson thrive and believes El Dorado can help. She noted the developers seem to be willing to work with the city and others. In regard to environmental concerns, Ms. DiBiasie requested solutions rather than threats to crush the project. She questioned who will pay for Benson's plans and programs if Vigneto doesn't come.

She concluded by asking the Commission to vote and pass the project because it's not fair for the people who want to stay in town or come back but can't due to the lack of jobs.

Mr. Richard Green introduced himself as an astronomer and the Assistant Director of the astronomy program at UA. He noted that as a professional he was attracted to the area for the desert environment and the dark, clear skies. He stated that he was speaking on behalf of the professional observatories and space science programs within the state, requesting preservation of the dark sky environment. Mr. Green informed the Commission that within approximately 30 miles is one the world's largest telescopes, the MMT, jointly operated by UA and the Smithsonian Institute. Mr. Green stated he wanted to reiterate on Mr. Gent's theme and offer of assistance to allow safe development that provides lighting that goes down instead of up into the sky. He noted that the developer seemed to have made an effort in this direction but the plan still needs to be improved, such as controlling color, addressing horizontal light and establishing absolute low light levels. Mr. Green offered assistance to the city staff to find acceptable solutions that allow Benson to grow. Mr. Green brought a list of recommendations for Section 6 of the CMP for distribution to the Commission.

John Dennis introduced himself as a resident of Tucson, Pima County, speaking on behalf of the Arizona optics industry and the Arizona Tech Council. Mr. Dennis stated that astronomy is important to the growing science and technology industry in the local area, noting that the bulk of the state's optics industry is centered around Tucson. He commented that the astronomy community is experienced in coming to solutions that provide improved lighting for development while protecting dark skies. Mr. Dennis asked for the cooperation with the astronomers to create a better solution for the development. Mr. Dennis also brought an article for distribution to the Commission.

Mr. Kevin Oberg introduced himself as a Benson property owner and SEAEDG partner with interests in promoting Benson's economic future. He advised the Commission to think about random developments that have occurred in the area, such as in the Sulphur Springs Valley. He said the Vigneto development is an opportunity to ensure the values that the Benson cares about-social, economic, water resources-are addressed with an organized, planned developed so constraints or limitations are forever. He requested the Commission approve the plan with minor modifications as referenced to ensure the development happens as a high level of quality.

Tricia Gerrodette introduced herself and asked the Commission to consider three topics-the plant palette, water and the planning unit plan process. She noted that at the beginning of the process there had been concern from AZ Game and Fish about the development having too many non-native and potentially invasive species. She stated those plants are still on the list and asked the Commission to consider revising the plant palette to remove the worst potential invaders. She also commented that AZ Game and Fish noticed El Dorado claiming to want a native plant palette, but included pine trees, which are not native.

Regarding water, Ms. Gerrodette noted that the project is 50% larger than what was originally permitted. She stated there are new listed species and new areas of critical habitat. Ms. Gerrodette stated these concerns are the basis of the lawsuit filed by a number of groups with the

hopes that the Army Corps of Engineers (ACoE) will do a new consultation. Ms. Gerrodette expressed that these concerns should be considered by the Commission. Ms. Gerrodette questioned the Planning Unit Plan process, wondering if the Commission would see a detailed subdivision plan. She stated that between the Development Agreement and the CMP she could not tell what the Commission would see in the future. She concluded by asking the Commission to ask what items they will see so as not to allow things to be approved via fiat.

Lupe Diaz introduced himself as a Benson resident and President of the Chamber of Commerce. He said that on behalf of the project he's glad to see there are questions being raised and that the project is still moving forward. He commented that many of the questions seem to be about regulations and he expressed his opinion that the Army Corps of Engineers has done their job in looking at the land and water. He stated the town also needs to consider personal freedoms regarding property acquisition and the ability to propose plans and build with the goal that people will own homes. Mr. Diaz noted that we shouldn't infringe on that right, but also need responsible planning. With 100 members in the Chamber, having over 200 employees, Mr. Diaz expressed his awareness of Cochise County's downward trend in population and economy. He noted the Chamber supports responsible building and would like that to happen for the community, for the children to be able to raise families and earn a living. He wants Benson to be a place to come to, rather than go through. Mr. Diaz concluded that the Chamber supports the project and is glad to hear that people are addressing lighting and water.

Ted Bahn introduced himself as a resident of Tucson, formerly of Florida. He stated he learned a lot about water in Florida, particularly about subsidence and sinkholes. He noted that these are created from over-pumping the aquifer and he suggested mitigation measures should be taken at the home itself such as preserving native plants, using weirs and other catchment systems. Mr. Bahn noted that an expert in the subject, Brad Lancaster, is only 30 miles away and that he helped Tucson create a roadway system that collects water rather than allowing it to run off. Mr. Bahn also suggested that rooftop collection systems be allowed. He concluded by saying resolution at the individual home helps reduce water and sewer bills and that he think it's simpler to start at the beginning of the process to reduce water use and risk.

George Scott introduced himself as a lifelong resident of the San Pedro Valley and Benson. Mr. Scott read a letter from SEAGO. Mr. Scott commented that he personally had read through the CMP and found it extensive and planned out. Mr. Scott stated there has been ample time for issues to be addressed and that he supports the project in order to provide jobs for the children who want to stay in town. Mr. Scott concluded by asking the Commission to support the project.

Kevin Rasch introduced himself by waving a Land and Water magazine which advocates for well managed natural resources. Mr. Rasch stated he was impressed with El Dorado's overall design and that he hasn't seen a better design than what they are offering. He believes Benson needs to thrive and expressed that Benson is a part of him since he's been involved in the community. Mr. Rasch concluded by stating he would like to have something to build for the future, that he doesn't want kids to go to the big city because there is no opportunity here.

5. NEW BUSINESS

Work Session regarding the status of the proposed Final Community Master Plan for the Villages at Vigneto

Planner Michelle Johnson opened the presentation, introducing the City Attorney Paul Loucks and the City Engineer Brad Hamilton. She noted that the process for a Community Master Plan is laid out in the Section 3A of the existing zoning regulations. She noted that the Final CMP process is to ensure the technical feasibility of the Preliminary Community Master Plan, including infrastructure and traffic analysis.

Michelle Johnson briefly outlined the history that led to this Final CMP document, reminding the Commission that the Preliminary Community Master Plan was submitted in early 2015 and approved in April 2015. She outlined the multiple drafts of the Final CMP that have passed between El Dorado and the City: the first draft submitted to the City in September 2015, reviewed and returned to El Dorado; the second draft submitted to the City in December 2015, reviewed and returned to EL Dorado in early February 2016; the third draft submitted to the City in sections during the months of March and April, reviewed in May 2016; and the Final draft currently under discussion submitted to the City in late May 2016. She noted that the City had consultants available who reviewed and commented upon each draft.

Michelle Johnson explained the CMP process allows flexibility in determining development standards such as lot sizing and configuration, alternative parking calculations, and signage. She also noted that the Zoning Regulations require dedicated open space and that homes are required to be located within a certain distance of a recreational facility or trail, which El Dorado acknowledges in the CMP.

Section 1 Preface:

Michelle Johnson explained that Section 1 establishes the purpose of CMP, part of which is creating standards that are different from what currently exists in the existing zoning regulations.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if the Building Inspector had been involved with developing the standards. Michelle Johnson replied that both the contract Building Official Mac McMillian and Fire Chief Keith Spangler had received copies of each draft. She also noted that as she read the document and had questions about the relationship between the CMP and life safety codes, she sent those questions to them for their guidance.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked about any commitments City Council has made. Michelle Johnson responded that Council received the various CMP drafts, just as P&Z did, and that some Councilmembers have asked questions about the document. She also told Commissioners that they had received this Final CMP version before Councilmembers received theirs since Council has been busy with other large documents (development agreement and budget). She noted that the same Final CMP version was currently in Council's boxes; some members have picked it up but she didn't know if anyone had started reading it yet.

Commissioner Jim Thelander expressed concern to City Attorney Paul Loucks that since it was such as large document something could be written into the document that was contrary to existing regulations. He questioned if changes could be made later, since there is little detail within the document and since some aspects seem to conflict with existing regulations. City Attorney Paul Loucks explained that this document will effectively become the zoning standards for the development, that the regulations within this document will govern the development. He explained that if there are concerns, this is the time to address those concerns.

Commissioner Jim Thelander again expressed that some things in the document seem to go against existing regulations, such as the types of plants. Planner Michelle Johnson interjected that topics differing from the existing standards will be discussed. Commissioner Thelander stated that he doesn't want to buy into something that will cause conflict down the line because it was missed at this level. City Attorney Paul Loucks explained that having a work session is part of the goal to review, discuss, and address any concerns that Commission has and determine what needs clarification or revision. Michelle Johnson commented that she does have the comments about each draft so would be able to help track the history of a topic, though she wouldn't be able to do it from memory (she did not have that paperwork with her).

Commissioner Debbie Braatz asked about Section 8 which states that if there is conflict between this CMP and the Zoning Regulations the CMP prevails, but since there is intent to update the zoning regulations how those new update would apply. Planner Michelle Johnson explained that some sections of the zoning regulations do not apply to the property and some will, including those future updates.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that he is looking at the document from multiple perspectives: as a resident who lives here, from a professional's standpoint regarding what is expected of a development and from a Commissioner's perspective tasked with fiduciary responsibility. He stated that this CMP is one of the best plans he's seen and he appreciates the work the developer has done to get as comprehensive a plan. He stated that the plan is used to set a standard that both the developer and the City will feel comfortable with, which is actually of a higher quality than what the City would typically enforce on the rest of the community. He noted that El Dorado's resources allow them to do things that a smaller developer simply could not do and that they are voluntarily binding themselves to a higher standard than what others would be asked to do. Mr. Abernathy did not share concerns about conflicts between the CMP and the Zoning Regulations, stating that because the CMP is generally of such high caliber, that what is received for what is given up is still a positive balance. He concluded by saying that while he has specific questions, he feels the City can rely on the CMP's content.

Commissioner Debbie Braatz acknowledged that she's been impressed with El Dorado from the beginning, but it is still a daunting task. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy agreed it's a large task and that this is the one and only shot at getting it right. Michelle Johnson stated that as she goes through the sections questions will be answered.

Commissioner Jim Thelander interjected that he does not share the same feeling, that the first CMP submission didn't even look at what the General Development Plan required and El

Dorado was way off base on the first try. He stated that the General Development Plan is what the Commission should be going by. He stated he is worried about their approach since El Dorado must not have read the General Development Plan.

Section 2: Introduction

Planner Michelle Johnson stated that section 2 describes different aspects of the development. Regarding the community's general description, she noted that it is both age targeted and traditional, but what percentage of which will depend on the market. She pointed out the document describes the recreation and shopping/social environment El Dorado hopes to create.

Regarding economics, she noted the study had been done but Dr. Robert Carreira for Cochise College, the local economics expert. Michelle Johnson acknowledged it is a forecast, that the actual numbers could be higher or lower.

The section also describes the development in relation to its surroundings...Benson, the County and the greater region. Michelle Johnson addressed the fact that the development has practical considerations, both limitations and opportunities. She noted that these include the physical aspects of the development including the fact that SR 90, a major gas line and an abandoned railroad line run through the property. She also noted that a portion of the property is designated Open Space in the General Development Plan because the prior owner decided that area was too rugged to develop and get any return. She noted that this area is a great opportunity for recreation.

City Attorney Paul Loucks spoke about entitlements that exist on the property. He confirmed that a development agreement was approved for the property in early June 2016, stating that the development agreement does not go into zoning or development standards for the property, but rather the development agreement clarifies the responsibilities of the city and the developer in regard to infrastructure and public services. Mr. Loucks noted the CMP is a more detailed land use and land use intensity plan, similar to zoning, though the property is not actually going through a rezoning. He stated that with Preliminary CMP approval in early 2015, Mayor and Council already determined that the plan conforms with the General Development Plan so now the discussion is how to implement the planning land uses and densities. He stated that some of the issues mentioned earlier at the Call to the Public are not issues that are before the Commission at this time.

Commissioner Jim Thelander pointed out that the Commission has not been involved with the Development Agreement so they are not aware of what the City has already agreed to. Michelle Johnson interjected that the recently received Supplemental Regulations to the CMP show proposed changes to the CMP based on the development agreement having being approved. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy requested that the development agreement be given to Commissioners so they can reference the agreement to the CMP document and the supplemental regulations.

City Attorney Paul Loucks acknowledged that issues regarding water, the 404 Permit and endangered species have been brought up to the Commission but that none of those issues are

before the Commission for consideration. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy recognized that 4000 acres does not have a 404 Permit so he asked how El Dorado intends to address that. Paul Loucks quickly explained that the Army Corps of Engineers (ACoE) has jurisdiction over all fishable and navigable waters in the US and determines how development could impact those navigable waters, such as wash crossings. The ACoE determines that development won't negatively impact the flow of water, which is different from the availability of water.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked how the increased number of houses affects the 404 Permit. Attorney for El Dorado, Dana Belknap clarified that the original permit was for 20 years for 20,000 homes on the 8,000 acres of permitted area. She confirmed that El Dorado will have to comply with federal and state law regarding those additional 4,000 acres before they can begin developing, whenever that may be. Planner Michelle Johnson pointed out that a similar statement regarding the developer obtaining additional permitting had been made in the CMP document itself, on page 16. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy also pointed out that the map on page 17 shows the area which has a 404 permit and which areas will require additional permits at a future date. Commissioner Jim Thelander expressed his opinion that throughout this process it has seemed that the original permit would be expanded to cover the larger acreage and the increased number of homes. Andrew Abernathy and Dana Belknap both replied that could not be done.

Commissioner Debbie Braatz asked about where the frequently cited 50% larger figure comes from. City Attorney Paul Loucks replied that he understood the land area to be 50% larger, from 8,000 acres to 12,000 acres. When asked about the number of units and population, Michelle Johnson replied that the proportions have changed with the increase in land area. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy interjected that about 1/3 of the total land area does not have a 404 Permit, approximately 50% of the original area that does have a permit, but that the dwelling units did not go up to 50%.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if business uses were considered since the permit is based on the residential units. Attorney Dana Belknap clarified that the 404 Permit considers the 20,000 dwellings plus commercial and other attendant uses generally found within a master planned community. She noted the future permit, if necessary, will go through the same process of considering dwellings (an additional 8,000 on those 4,000 acres), commercial and other attendant uses.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy pointed out the table on page 5 shows that the largest classification of sustained jobs as a result of this development is retail trade, which is not very highly paid. He noted the second largest classification is the more professional category of healthcare and social assistance, and below that is the third largest classification of food services, also not highly paid and with high turnover. He made the point that even with these job classifications, it is estimated that the project will have an economic impact of \$1.2 billion (compared to Fort Huachuca's impact of \$2.2 billion) which is larger than some of the other military installations such as Luke AFB. He noted that this project could make Benson the second largest economically impactful community in Cochise County and potentially the most populated area in Cochise County, a large scale compared to anything seen in the county. He

noted that there are other developers looking to Vigneto before they begin their own developments in the area. Michelle Johnson confirmed that she receives inquiries about Vigneto from parties interested in starting their own business when this project gets up and running.

Commissioner Barb Thompson questioned if the northernmost part of the project area, outside the 404 boundary is part of Whetstone Ranch. Michelle Johnson confirmed that the white holes are the platted areas of Whetstone Ranch (Canyons and Highland subdivisions) which are not included in this CMP, while the area included in the Vigneto proposal has not been platted.

Section 3

Michelle Johnson noted that many master plans are much smaller in area so the project has been divided into 14 smaller areas, known as Planning Units. She commented that the development will proceed by regions or planning units, not necessarily in order that the planning units are numbered. She explained that each of the 14 planning units will be required to submit planning unit master plans to the City Engineer and/or city consultants for the various infrastructure-water, wastewater, reclaimed water, drainage and roads. The multiple master plans plus some additional information as listed on page 21 will be a complete package, called the Planning Unit Plan.

Michelle Johnson continued into the platting process. She noted that plats will continue to go through the legally required process for platting, both at the preliminary and final plat level. She explained the preliminary plat will continue to come to P&Z for approval and with expire in 2 years if the final plat has not been submitted. She also explained that the final plat process will remain the same, with staff reviewing the submission, the Commission making a recommendation and Council granting approval. Michelle Johnson pointed out the CMP has timeframes for staff to complete their review and that the development agreement allows El Dorado to pay for a third party to perform an expedited review if staff cannot complete the work in the time allotted.

Moving into the discussion of site plan approval, Commissioner Andrew Abernathy questioned if the Zoning Administrator's (ZA) approval was in lieu of the Commission's approval or in addition to the Commission's approval. Michelle Johnson replied the approval was in lieu of. She briefly explained that an approved site plan must be obtained prior to construction for any land use, but acknowledged that ZA approval of the individual site plans is different from what currently occurs. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy confirmed that the Commission is responsible to review and approve/recommend the plat, but the ZA exclusively approves the site plan. He then questioned why the ZA has the exclusive approval authority. Michelle Johnson explained that over the years there has been disengagement on the Commission, feeling like they are nothing more than a rubber stamp since the individual site plans have already been through staff and meet all standards and requirements so there's usually no legal basis to deny the site plan. She also pointed out that the existing zoning regulations require anything with a value over \$20,000 to go to P&Z- which at current costs means that anything as simple as a trash enclosure would require P&Z approval- so since it's a longer process people don't even bother. She noted that the decision was made to grant the ZA authority since even within P&Z there has been

conflict over whether P&Z needs to be involved and how the timeframe is prolonged by requiring P&Z involvement.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy agreed that on small scale projects he can understand those issues, but this is much larger and he feels the Commission should be involved due to their responsibility to the community. He stated that as a professional and a resident he wants to see the proposed larger projects and he's uncomfortable giving that discretion to any ZA. Michelle Johnson suggested creating a threshold to determine what goes to P&Z and what remains with ZA approval.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if changing the document would require Council approval. Michelle Johnson explained that this CMP has not been adopted by Council. She stated the P&Z recommendation to Council would include language to amend this paragraph based on whatever that threshold will be agreed upon with El Dorado. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that this new threshold will only apply to the Vigneto development and does not change the \$20,000 policy for the rest of the city.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if a recommended value had to be decided immediately. Michelle Johnson replied no, since there would need to be discussion with El Dorado too. Andrew Abernathy said he was not prepared to make a recommendation until he speaks further with the developer on how they intend to submit site plans. Dennis Krahn of El Dorado said he was not opposed to the idea of setting a threshold, whether it's a threshold based on one thing or a combination of things such as size, value, number of suites, etc. Dennis agreed to discuss the threshold internally and with staff, who will pass the information to the Commission.

Section 4

Michelle Johnson stated that many of the items contained within Section 4 would be going through the City Engineer's office. Regarding the gas line crossing the property, she said that El Dorado would be increasing the easement width from the current 20' width to 40' wide. Dennis Krahn noted that in some places the 1930s gas line isn't even within the easement, but up to 450' outside the easement. He stated the easement will be rerecorded to match the gas line's actual location and some above ground portions will be relocated underground. Michelle Johnson concluded the gas line discussion by referencing the 350' wide multi-use corridor around the gas line easement that prohibits overnight residential or institution uses.

Michelle Johnson noted that the Section 4 deals with various water infrastructure systems including storm water and FEMA zones, potable water pressure zones and transport/storage mechanisms, wastewater design and flow criteria, and reclaimed water pressure zones and recharge. She stated that roadway engineering includes consideration of how people will get into Vigneto (SR 90 and Post Road) and how they will travel through Vigneto. She noted that Vigneto will include all road classes (arterial, collectors and local roads) and will be designed with roundabouts and paths alongside the roadway system. Regarding water conservation, Michelle Johnson noted that both personal water conservation methods and project-wide conservation methods would be used to reduce water consumption. Michelle Johnson lastly

stated that the listed organizations' standards and expertise will continue to be used to establish design parameters for infrastructure.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about the 20 psi minimum for fire flow. He questioned why fire sprinkler systems for all structures weren't listed a method of water conservation for such an aggressive development when it's been proven by the NFPA, that as an administrative policy, fire sprinklers save water, and has been shown in practice locally in Scottsdale. Mr. Abernathy asked why one of the most effective, known water saving policies is being ignored in this document. City Engineer Brad Hamilton replied that the State currently has a moratorium on cities enforcing residential fire sprinklers. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy was indignant that the state would not permit a known water conservation means, noting that a pumper truck and fire hydrant use 5-8 times more water than sprinklers. Regardless of the moratorium, he felt that that not addressing fire sprinklers in the CMP is an oversight.

Commissioner Jim Thelander stated he didn't disagree with Commissioner Abernathy, but that El Dorado was not the party actually selling homes. Dennis Krahn interjected that whether or not El Dorado would be constructing homes is still being discussed; he noted that the preference is for El Dorado build structures and residences themselves, but the decision is not yet known.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that who builds is beside the point. He stressed that he's talking about maintaining the water supply over the long term, to keep water available, with a policy that would apply regardless of builder. Commissioner Jim Thelander suggested that since fire sprinklers can't be enforced, there should be a strong recommendation that all residences have sprinkler systems since that may be the best that can be done. He asked if a recommendation for fire sprinklers could be included.

Dennis Krahn acknowledged that the Commission can give any recommendation they want in regard to the CMP. He gave a brief history of fire sprinklers, noting that cisterns on the roof under static pressure were the first system. He stated that as building codes have improved, the need for fire sprinklers goes beyond the issue of water, which is why the State has gotten involved. He stated that El Dorado's position is that if and when the industry and state and federal regulations mandate fire sprinklers they will comply, but since that standard is currently not mandated or enforceable, they don't want to burden the purchaser with the additional cost. He stated the costs could be upwards of \$10,000 in a new home, which would be significant to a purchaser. Mr. Krahn acknowledged that the issue of fire sparklers is being debated at the state and federal level by multiple interest groups and when the issue becomes regulatory, El Dorado will address fire sprinklers to the extent required.

Attorney Dana Belknap stated that when and if the City adopts a future update to the building code that includes fire sprinklers then El Dorado will abide by it.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy stated that he sees the development as progressive and fire sprinklers have a minimal impact on the retail cost of structures for the much larger benefits of personal safety and water conservation. He believes fire sprinklers make sense for the Benson and the development, by creating a higher level of value.

Dennis Krahn replied that he doesn't want to be handcuffed compared to the competition by holding this development to a higher standard than other developments in Arizona. He stated that holding them to a higher standard would be a sales disadvantage.

Commissioner Barb Thompson asked if the state law prohibited fire sprinklers in commercial buildings to which City Engineer Brad Hamilton replied no, only residential buildings. Planner Michelle Johnson clarified that both the Fire Chief and Building Official are aware of the state prohibition as well as El Dorado's position. She stated that they would prefer that if/when the state prohibition on enforcement is lifted and when the city adopts updated building codes that include sprinklers for residences, they would like El Dorado to comply.

Dennis Krahn reiterated that the fire sprinkler discussion has been occurring for the past year, including development agreement discussions about fire protection and how to phase it. He stated that topic is not an absent item by oversight, but was absent intentionally.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that he does not want to create an impediment to development but looking at the broader perspective of water conservation, fire sprinklers are a proven policy.

Dennis Krahn responded that the design engineer, having been involved with the land since 1998, has identified 5 or 6 pressure zones within the project and has increased water conservation as technology improved. He noted that comparing the master water plan from 1999 to today uses only 50% of the total water consumption of what it had been in 1999.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about the values used in the Potable Water Demand Criteria on page 49. He stated that the values used appear to reflect the more current standards but new standards may be able to reduce those values an additional 10-20%. Dennis Krahn replied that master plans will be created for each planning unit area and as new engineering practices are implemented, the most accurate values will be used in subsequent planning unit master plans. He acknowledged that he doesn't want those values set in stone since they will change and the City Engineer will be able to monitor and approve the values used.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked how El Dorado would control the water usage if they are not building the house. Dennis Krahn responded that the master plans deal with infrastructure in the ground, not an individual home. He stated that as fixtures in homes and buildings become more efficient and less water is used, cities are finding themselves with oversized lines, particularly sewer lines, which get crusted and dried, resulting in the city needing to increase the maintenance budget to repair/replace/clean out those improperly sized lines. City Engineer Brad Hamilton interjected that the water efficiency of the house itself comes from the adopted plumbing codes. He also noted that Arizonan Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) requires certain minimum values to estimate water usage; if there is demonstrated water savings after construction, then the City and developer can request permission from ADEQ to use lower values in their usage calculations. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy suggested that the Potable Water Demand Criteria on page 48 be revised to clarify that new standards in regard to pressure and volume may be considered in the future. Brad Hamilton stated that ADEQ set pressure and Commissioner Abernathy agreed that pressure is unlikely to change over time. Dennis Krahn

pointed out the last sentence in the paragraph states that modifications to the criteria can be submitted to the City Engineer for his approval so each time a water master plan is submitted it can be changed for improved technology and efficiencies. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy replied that he'd like to see it stated more clearly that as technology changes the planning unit master plans will reflect those changes in design criteria. Dennis Krahn agreed, stating the intent is for the criteria to be per the City Engineer's requirements.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about existing wells. City Engineer Brad Hamilton replied there are 4 potable wells, 2 irrigation wells and 1 well on Vigneto land to serve the existing Canyons. Dennis Krahn interjected that Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) requires a second well, for redundancy purposes, once there are 250 homes in the Canyons subdivision, even though the existing well only runs at about 5% of its capacity and could probably serve 4-5,000 homes.

Planner Michelle Johnson guided the discussion to the next topic in Section 4, landscaping. She noted the plant palette is located in exhibit C and is similar to recommended plant list adopted by the Commission back in 2009. She acknowledged that UofA Waterwise, creator of the 2009 list, has since revised that list. She also acknowledge that there are a handful of plants on the plant palette that are not on the 2009 list. Michelle Johnson also acknowledged that there have been concerns about the plants since the beginning of El Dorado's proposal and she did offer to take plant suggestions from concerned groups, but she has not received any suggestions or responses. Commissioner Jim Thelander asked about liability for using plants that are not on the 2009 list since there was such concern about invasive species and water usage.

Dennis Krahn responded that with a slope of 3.5% across the property, one of the goals is to preserve the vistas and views. He commented that there is a misconception being portrayed about how the development will look because the development is not going to be lush, green Mediterranean landscaping. He noted that the landscaping will improve with technology as new plants are developed and that the few plants and vegetation added to the 2009 list are not new, but are already available in nurseries. He noted that the interior Tuscan landscaping is very similar to Benson, with agave and cactus. Dennis Krahn reiterated that they are not trying to create something where every plant or yard is lush and green and Mediterranean style.

Commissioner Jim Thelander suggested using different terminology since the current terms give the wrong connotation. Dennis Krahn replied that the interior Tuscan landscaping is similarly arid and that they did not vary much from the recommended list. He suggested that the misconception is being propagated by groups that don't want the development to move forward. Commissioner Jim Thelander argued that using terms and connotations people can't visualize is causing problems and forcing El Dorado to spend time explaining their intent. Dennis Krahn reiterated that El Dorado is mostly using plants that the P&Z Commission has already recommended for use within the City. Planner Michelle Johnson interjected that she does have a list of which plants on the plant palette are on the 2009 list and which are not. She noted that there are only a handful of additions.

Commissioner Barb Thompson asked why the plants aren't just removed since they are causing contention with specific groups. Dennis Krahn replied that the groups expressing disapproval have issues with the city's list, not just the Vigneto plant palette, since most of the plants are from the city's list which El Dorado relied upon to create their palette. He agreed to speak with the landscape architect about individual plants and what should be recommended for addition or removal. He noted that any changes to the plant list would become part of the running list of edits, the Supplemental Corrections.

Commissioner Debbie Braatz noted that just because a plant is on list does not mean it is the best plant, but the city may have provided poor options. Dennis Krahn again reiterated that El Dorado took the city's list and added to it. Planner Michelle Johnson interjected that the original plant 2009 list has also been revised, but she has never compared the 2009 list to the current published list, which has changed in format and categories. Dennis Krahn stated he'd be willing to revise the plant palette as time goes on, but since organizations don't agree what plants are best for development, there will always be conflict about what is appropriate for the area and for the development.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about plans to harvest native species in order to reuse them onsite. Dennis Krahn replied that onsite inventory and harvesting would not be advantageous. He stated that most of the vegetation is shrub brush located at the wash edges and grasses on the higher ridgelines that are intended for development. He noted that he'd seen a few random barrel cactus, but other than the wash areas, which they can't significantly disturb under the 404 permit restrictions, there isn't much vegetation on the property. Commissioner Abernathy noted that obviously any protected cactus species will be protected, to which Dennis Krahn replied that there is supposedly one saguaro cactus on the 12,000 acres but he hasn't found it yet.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about preservation of the natural landscape, since he had seen that topic in other CMP documents. Dennis Krahn replied that he's aware of 3 small groves of ocotillo, each no more than 1-3 acres in size. He stated those may be left or they may be harvested because of their value. Commissioner Abernathy voiced his opinion that there are probably other plants that have conservation value, beyond the known ocotillo. Dennis Krahn reiterated that it seems to be mostly scrub brush, with the exception of those few defined groves. Commissioner Abernathy stated that if there are so few native species it's more important for the ocotillo to be preserved since they take such a long time to grow. He also noted that a past freeze killed many ocotillo groves in the area so those remaining groves are more important. Dennis Krahn noted that the groves are located in planning units 10 and 11, not in areas slated for immediate development. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about adding conservation language and Dennis Krahn agreed to speak with landscape architect about identifying valuable plant resources since he's aware that many of the native species cannot be grown in nurseries.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy also suggested removal of several trees, specifically Russian olive and Eucalyptus. Commissioner Barb Thompson asked about the pine tree that was brought up during the call to the public. Commissioner Abernathy replied that the Aleppo pine is not an indigenous species. Dennis Krahn responded the pines are something El Dorado would have to

consider; he also noted there are pine groves with trees 30-40 feet tall within approximately 10 miles so they are known to grow in the area.

Planner Michelle Johnson continued through Section 4 to road and trail standards, noting that encouraging use of alternative transportation is one of the main goals of the Vigneto development, particularly golf cart type vehicles. She noted that the reduced amount of cars on the road, since people will hopefully be using golf carts, figures into the transportation and circulation plan. She explained that the 16' wide multi-modal path, adjacent to arterial streets, will provide transportation routes for golf carts, bicycles and pedestrians. She explained the next level of alternative routes is the 7' wide multi-use lane, a striped lane within the paved area of the collector streets. She then noted that sidewalk and trails of various surfaces will also be provided within the property to provide connectivity and access.

In the final discussion of Section 4, Michelle Johnson briefly outlined the subdivision standards, most of which are under the jurisdiction of the City Engineer with topics and standards such as water and road construction. She specifically noted that parking will not be allowed on local roads since the cross sections of those streets will be narrower than what is normally seen in Benson. She noted that El Dorado will be responsible for no parking signage on those roads.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that he's seen higher density developments with restricted parking that only gave cursory consideration to small parking islands of 1-2 spaces, which resulted in people needing to park blocks away so they don't violate the rule. Since most people aren't willing to park that far away, he suggested that the local roads will get parked on regardless of signage. He suggested cluster parking be provided at the plat level. He stated he wasn't opposed to narrower roads but that acknowledgement needs to be made as to how the roads and neighborhood will actually get used. Commissioner Jim Thelander expressed his opinion that no parking and no parking signage isn't practical since people will have events at their home.

Dennis Krahn stated the project is modeled after a successful development in Florida that is similar in distance to Orlando as Benson is to Tucson. He noted the development has been going on for 35 years and currently has 50-55,000 homes. He stated the typical garage is only 1.5 stalls, approximately 12' wide to fit one vehicle and one golf cart. Dennis Krahn stated that when he visited, he interviewed a community host who only drives a golf cart, as do many of the residents, so the parking standards for on-site parking include a space for 1 vehicle and 1 golf cart plus the driveway for another car. He noted that there are some 65,000 golf carts in the Florida development and probably fewer cars. Dennis Krahn also noted that the resident demographic is not one to leave cars on the streets. He also noted that El Dorado plans to incorporate parking areas at the various recreation and community centers, which will be within walking distance of the homes. Dennis Krahn stated that El Dorado wants to create a holistic approach to transportation and driving, involving other types of vehicles than cars, and narrower road width, especially since the Arizonan sun deteriorates asphalt rather quickly. He acknowledged that there will be times when someone parks on the street.

Dennis Krahn stated that El Dorado is trying to create a master planned lifestyle to get people to interact and use alternative transportation, but he realizes not all people will adapt to that psychology and lifestyle. He noted that the retired population is already coming to Benson, as evidenced by the growth in RV parks over the past decade, so he hopes to find a means to encourage the people who are already coming to expand their stay. He admitted to trying to cater to the targeted demographic of active 50+, but realizes some percent of the residents, perhaps 20-25%, will be families. He concluded by stating the community is planned around a lifestyle and other elements that have made other communities successful, not just the engineering components.

Commissioner Debbie Braatz stated she has concerns about the road width in regard to safety, noting that if there is a problem, the lookers and gawkers will likely block the narrow roads even more than the incident itself. Dennis Krahn responded that discussions had occurred with the police and fire chiefs about acceptable road width. He noted that road sizes have gone from one extreme to the other over the past few decades, from very narrow without curbs or sidewalks to extremely wide, and are now moving back toward narrower streets. He further pointed out that wide roads are often more dangerous because there is so much space, so traffic calming measures are being implemented in these existing wide streets to make them narrower and slower.

Planner Michelle Johnson concluded Section 4 by noting architectural standards are addressed, though they are not specific in the CMP because the specific standards will be created for the CC&Rs governing the individual neighborhoods. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked why air conditioning units are limited to ground mounted units only. Dennis Krahn responded that they don't want a view of industrial equipment on top of the roof in residential areas. Commissioner Abernathy pointed out the limitation to ground mounted is found in both residential and non-residential development categories. Dennis Krahn agreed to remove the limitation from the non-residential standards. Michelle Johnson concluded by noting El Dorado will create their own architectural committee which will approve project design prior to a city building permit being issued.

Section 5

Planner Michelle Johnson noted that El Dorado will be submitting their own sign plans with the first planning unit plans. Their sign plan will help them control some of the internal design and placement aspects within their development. She stated that El Dorado will follow the existing city sign code, which does need to be amended to meet court rulings and best practices, and if they desire to deviate from the sign code then they will submit a comprehensive sign plan to the Commission for approval.

Dennis Krahn commented that El Dorado will be proposing several new topics related to signage, since the current sign code makes a distinction for developments of less than 20 acres and developments greater than 20 acres that limit the number of signs and the sign square footage based on acreage. He noted they will be proposing language similar to the City of Scottsdale since they have sign regulations for master planned communities.

Michelle Johnson said El Dorado will also submit a conceptual monument plan as well, since monuments are not addressed in the current zoning regulations. Commissioner Barb Thompson asked if gates were included in the monument plan. Dennis Krahn replied that the monument would include anything that is not an occupy-able structure used to create a focal point, such as a clock tower.

Section 6

Planner Michelle Johnson stated El Dorado will submit their own conceptual outdoor lighting plan to the Zoning Administrator. She noted that Mike Reinbold, one of El Dorado's principals, has been very vocal about the dark skies so El Dorado has agreed to minimize light pollution per the Benson Zoning Regulations. She noted that the City's lighting code is also due for an update, which El Dorado is aware of, but in the meantime El Dorado has requested some supplements to the existing regulations.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if the area is far enough away from the various observatories that the growth won't impact them. Michelle Johnson responded that there have been many offers to help both El Dorado and the city update and create lighting programs to minimize the impact on the observatories and optics industry. Dennis Krahn interjected that El Dorado is willing to have discussions with the observatories but his goal is to minimize light pollution while maintaining safety and security within the development. He noted that lighting can be minimized almost everywhere, except for what the city might want or require for safety, especially at intersections. He stated that there is no intention to put lights down every street but only at intersections as the city requires.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked about Tucson's lighting practices. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy responded that Tucson's lighting codes aren't up to standard so Tucson is a bad example, and that he'd hope Benson would do better. Dennis Krahn reiterated that lighting will be looked into because they appreciate and respect the dark sky but are caught in the middle of what is wanted vs. what may be needed. Commissioner Jim Thelander reiterated his idea that if Tucson's regulations are legal, then as long as the development is as good as or better than Tucson than the development should be safe. Dennis Krahn replied that he didn't know anything about Tucson or Sierra Vista. He also felt it was premature to decide anything because they don't know where all the parks, ball fields and other aspects will go yet, but common operations such as lighting hours will be respected. He stated that a general blanket decision might not be suitable because they haven't brought in a lighting expert so the existing lighting ordinance will be respected and move toward a plan that meets the city's need and the lighting groups' needs as well.

Commissioner Jim Thelander asked if there were state regulations that don't apply to small cities like Benson but do apply to larger cities that Benson could become. Planner Michelle Johnson replied that there are no regulations like that. Commissioner Barb Thompson interjected that the dark sky could be used as a selling feature for the development. Dennis Krahn agreed, but noted safety and security lighting also have to be provided and admitted that someone will probably be unhappy with the amount of lighting allowed. Commissioner Debbie Braatz urged Dennis Krahn

to work with those organizations and people who want to help El Dorado and also mentioned that she's glad to hear modified lighting wouldn't be a significant additional expense.

Dennis Krahn clarified that the call to the public comment referencing the 150 watt exemption has now been reduced to 75 watts. He also clarified that this exemption was not intended to exempt bulbs on the house since those should already be shielded, but landscape lighting. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy suggested using the illumination term "lumens" to more accurately express the measure of light. Dennis Krahn replied that there are many terms that could be used, depending on whether the measure is taken at the source or the output side of the fixture.

Section 7

Michelle Johnson introduced section 7 as the bulk of the land use regulations that would be under the jurisdiction of the P&Z Commission. She noted the CMP document contains a land use budget and specific lists of both permitted and non-permitted use. The land use budget is an ongoing table that will be updated with each PUP to help track what is developed and where that development occurs.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about parking islands at the 6 dwelling unit per acre level. He pointed out that the Low/Medium category range is from 2-6 units and is estimated to be a large percentage of the residential units. He questioned how the number 6 was chosen for the parking cut off, wondering how parking concerns could be mitigated for Low/Medium density that is less than 6 units per acre. Dennis Krahn replied that the narrow street cross sections are only minimums; that the local streets could get wider to 28' or 32' if the decision is made to allow on-street parking within a subdivision, which is more likely to occur in a traditional, family-type subdivision. He also stated that, based on discussions with the Fire Chief, the minimum drivable area is 24' wide from back of curb to back plus a low-height vegetation area on either side of the pavement that could be driven over if needed. He noted that the planting area is still within the ROW so the pavement itself could get wider and still remain within the ROW if the decision was made to allow parking on one or both sides.

Commissioner Jim Thelander interjected that he still thinks it's unwise to prohibit street parking. Dennis Krahn acknowledged Commissioner Thelander's opinion and told him that videos of the Florida development were shown to Chiefs Moncada and Spangler to demonstrate that those streets remain clear even with the more dense housing of the FL development. He also stated that emergency services have been discussed with the Chiefs and are addressed within the development agreement. He commented that with the annual survey of the 100,000 residents in the Florida development, the desire for wider streets has never been brought up because people want that money spent on recreation and social aspects of the community. He stated that Arizona is used to traditional family-oriented subdivisions while this is a new planning effort.

Commissioner Thelander asked what time of day the images and video were taken, arguing that time of day determines when people are out of their homes anyway, such as at work. Dennis Krahn disagreed with Commissioner Thelander, noting that from his visits the entire movement of people is different. Attorney Dana Belknap interjected that there will be an opportunity to

review parking during the platting phase. Dennis Krahn added that most of the subdivisions won't exceed 60 lots so the maximum street length will be around 300ft and with higher density projects having supplemental parking at one end of these street lengths, there may be 150-200 feet of travel distance.

Planner Michelle Johnson identified the permitted land use categories, noting that even if the names are different, the uses allowed within each category are very similar to the existing zoning regulations. Regarding open space, she noted that 20% of the total project will be open space, with a large chunk being 1624 acres of natural open space on the eastern side of the property. She stated that the prior owner had designated this acreage as open space on the General Development Plan because the land is unsuitable for building. She pointed out that an additional 280 acres are to be developed for recreation, including the recreation centers, trails, parks, golf courses and agribusiness. She noted that there are three classes of parks, similar to recreation centers, which will be of various sizes and offer different amenities. There will be at least one golf course, though more are possible. She then explained that the inclusion of agribusiness, in the form of grape vineyards, orchards or other urban farming, is in response to the growing trend of local foods.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about prohibitions that prevent a person from using any part of their residential structure for crop production; he felt some of the language in the CMP worked against encouraging social food production. Michelle Johnson stated that urban agriculture, vineyards and wineries are listed as permitted uses in the residential category. Commissioner Abernathy acknowledged that the use is permitted, but that it requires at least a one acre parcel. Dennis Krahn responded that a personal garden is not a problem, but there's a difference if the intent is to garden at home for commercial purposes. He acknowledged that it's not their intent to have someone turn their small lot into a commercial enterprise so they can sell from it. Dennis Krahn stated they'd like to promote clubs, including agriculture clubs, but they don't envision any individual buying a lot to sell tomatoes.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy argued that the 1 acre minimum lot size for agribusiness would prohibit community supported agriculture groups since those organizations would never been able to afford a full 1 acre within the dense residential use. He suggested that making it so difficult to accomplish is effectively legislating against the agriculture use. He suggested that a smaller acreage minimum would allow for the use or sale of land to community groups, perhaps even making land available to those types of groups as part of the land use process.

Attorney Dana Belknap interjected that the 1 acre minimal parcel size refers to livestock maintenance, which comes from the city's own zoning regulations. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy agreed this is where he got the figure, but still felt that the language inadvertently includes community gardens. He stated that similar language has been contested in court, including Tucson. He felt the language included everything, even if the intent was only to deal with livestock. He suggested local resources though UA Extension Service for more appropriate language. Dennis Krahn pointed out that the heading is specific to livestock and pets and has nothing to do with growing or crop production. He stated that El Dorado is not regulating anyone's ability to garden on their own property, but simply repeating the city's own zoning

regulations in regard to livestock and pets. Commissioner Abernathy retorted that the city's codes are not currently sufficient and Dennis Krahn agreed, noting that they have had to work and adjust on several thousand items.

Planner Michelle Johnson asked if there were any questions about the trail system, which had already been discussed in conjunction with roadways.

Michelle Johnson introduced the development standards table, noting there are classes of both residential and non-residential development, with the residential having 5 sub-classes based on density. She stated there have been multiple discussions about the development standards table regarding setbacks, parcel size and other issues.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy about the highest density of 24 units per acre, asking if El Dorado could live with that cap. Dennis Krahn responded that he doesn't envision going beyond that density, since it is probably beyond 3 stories. Commissioner Abernathy agreed it would be more than 4 stories, probably 5 and possibly up to 6. Dennis Krahn replied that they don't want to get too high to impact the line of sight. He acknowledged that if a change is desired in the future the CMP can be amended, but for residential units, they are not asking for density greater than 24 units per acre. He noted the target demographic probably doesn't want stairs and he also pointed out the density cap does not apply to hospitality venues or medical centers such as care homes, which would probably be located in the commercial areas anyway.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked about columns 4 and 5 maximum building height, stating that the height limitation would prevent El Dorado from constructing to the expected density above parking. He noted that the low height would instead require additional horizontal land to reach the desired density with parking, which does not seem in keeping with what they intend. Dennis Krahn responded that countless hours had been spent coming up the figures for this page. He stated El Dorado originally thought about submitting multiple pages showing examples of their intended design examples. He agreed that they would review the heights and footnotes since what is applicable to column 4 should also be applicable to column 5. Dennis Krahn also agreed that higher density does automatically include more horizontal, which is why they added horizontal area for every foot above 38'. He also noted that the Zoning Administrator is authorized to grant a 15% variation to the standards in the table so if more height is needed a few feet can be obtained administratively.

Planner Michelle Johnson confirmed that some of the setbacks and distances shown in the table less than what are required for fire safety and El Dorado is aware this arrangement will require higher construction methods. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy commented that the table contains figures that are very similar to figures he's seen on other projects.

Michelle Johnson continued to Conditional Uses and Supplemental regulations, stating that both were taken almost verbatim from the existing zoning regulations. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked if outdoor theaters on page 140 referred to permanent or temporary outdoor theaters or both. Dennis Krahn replied it referred to permanent viewing theaters, not staging areas or temporary viewings. Commissioner Abernathy stated that he thought the word theater was ambiguous. Attorney Dana Belknap interjected that an outdoor theater is defined in the

CMP exactly the same as city's zoning regulations which is basically a drive in. Dennis Krahn noted there are other guidelines for theatrical performances, like an amphitheater. Commissioner Abernathy asked about movies in the park, to which Dennis Krahn responded that if such a use was to be permanently installed, it would include as part of the site plan, but if it's a periodic event it be handled differently.

Michelle Johnson continued through section 7 to RV Parks, noting this section is also almost verbatim from the existing city zoning regulations. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy asked why park models are not allowed. Attorney Dana Belknap said that would be a question for Mike Reinbold. Commissioner Debbie Braatz asked about the difference between a park model and park trailer. Michelle Johnson explained that a park model is basically a very small manufactured home, no more than 400 sq. feet, which is permanently installed on an RV site. Dana Belknap commented that since park models are permanently affixed, they are taxed as real property whereas drivable RVs are considered personal property. Dennis Krahn clarified that RV parks are allowed, but park models will not allowed within those parks. Commissioner Debbie Braatz agreed with that restriction. Dennis Krahn also clarified that manufactured homes and manufactured homes parks are also not allowed within Vigneto.

Michelle Johnson moved on to parking regulations, noting that these are also very similar to the existing city zoning regulations, with the addition of parking standards for active adult areas. She noted that many of the active adult requirements are similar to the already established requirements for similar uses. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy stated that 1 parking stall per 4 seats for a church was inadequate. He suggested 1 stall per 2.5 seats, but acknowledged the alternative transportation may allow for fewer stalls.

Dennis Krahn suggested that overall parking would likely be quite high to provide stalls for both vehicles and low speed vehicles. He commented that the Florida development has extremely large parking lots of 3500 spaces for their town centers. He noted that when major parking centers get to a point of needing 500 spaces, they will likely do a parking study to determine true need.

Planner Michelle Johnson introduced section 8, which lists the existing documents, or sections of existing documents that El Dorado agrees to abide by as part of the CMP. She stated that several sections of the existing city zoning regulations will not be complied with, such as the existing zoning districts, since Vigneto has created their own zoning-type standards. She noted that this section does acknowledge future updates to the existing documents/document sections.

She continued to section 9, the summary, and then moved into Appendix A, Definitions. She noted that many of the definitions came from the existing zoning regulations but new terms had been added to address words found in the CMP document, such as PUP and PUMP.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy went back to section 7, asking why permeable paving was not permitted. City Engineer Brad Hamilton replied that the soils in the area such that if water is added the soil strength immediately decreases so the goal is to keep water out; he noted the wording comes directly from city regulations. Commissioner Abernathy suggested permeable parking lots since there is engineering technology to do it. Dennis Krahn responded that

engineering of parking lots doesn't deal with soil much beyond 30" depth, but beyond that the Benson soils are 20-30% collapsible. When moisture gets into the dirt it creates sinkholes and the pavement collapses, often from irrigation too close to the street. He stated that by keeping water out, they are maintaining the integrity of not just those 30" that were engineered, but the 10 feet underneath that are collapsible.

Brad Hamilton stated that they are looking for opportunities for regional infiltration. He agreed that permeable paving is acceptable in other areas, but using it here is like asking for the pavement to fall apart.

Commissioner Barb Thompson asked what permeable paving meant and what the material is made of. City Engineer Brad Hamilton replied that permeable paving allows water to soak through pavement and that it can be made of many materials. Commissioner Andrew Abernathy and Dennis Krahn both replied that there are multiple materials, from asphalts to pea gravel to ground up tires. Dennis Krahn stated that with pea gravel, plastic is often put underneath the pea gravel so water runs off horizontally, rather than draining vertically into the substrate. He stated that permeable paving is used as a retention method rather than for water recharge into the aquifer.

Commissioner Andrew Abernathy motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Barb Thompson seconded. Motion passed and the meeting and work session adjourned.