



Community Housing Workshops Summary of Feedback, Concerns and Questions August 2023

Local volunteers and housing community leaders Linda Martinez, Mary Garland and Carol Kurimsky facilitated five community meetings centered on housing options for the City of Sedona into the future. These meetings were advertised through the city's mailing list, Library calendar, the Chamber mailing list, an article on the front page of the RRN, spots on KNAU radio, and many groups (churches, neighborhoods, Sedona Residents Unite, etc) and personal email lists.

Seven meetings were held: two at St. John Vianney Church and five in public venues throughout the month of August 2023; over 120 members of the community attended these informational meetings, with approximately 10 people attending more than one meeting. One meeting was held in Spanish. Each participant had the opportunity to listen to a presentation on local housing challenges, needs and strategies, provide feedback, and discuss in small groups the level of support they would give towards a variety of housing solutions. Summary notes from the meetings have been compiled and are included here. Many topics were addressed during small group discussions including housing options, height and density considerations, redevelopment opportunities, concerns regarding traffic, short-term rentals, development hurdles, building code and code restrictions, and location-specific interests (e.g. the Cultural Park). Where possible, comments have been grouped by areas of agreement and areas with no clear agreement across participants.

**The terms *Missing Middle* and *Housing Diversity* are used interchangeably.

Housing Diversity

Areas of agreement

- Workforce Housing
 - Smaller housing units were generally supported
 - General agreement that there is a need for more of this type of housing, called the Missing Middle
 - Benefit: attract more people to work in Sedona; provide needed services
- Family focused housing
 - Some indicated a need for more family focused rentals and ownership with varied unit size to accommodate mixed ages/multi-generational
 - Benefit: improve school stability; job stability; remain in the community
- Co-housing
 - Having both private and community spaces (including kitchen area) is ideal
 - Benefits: build a small community of neighbors who would look out for each other, multi-generational option
- Transitional zones were seen as important
- Live/work
 - An important consideration for many artists and independent businesses in the community

- Design is key to making this successful
- Has the potential to become an STR issue (similar to those next to Picasso's)
- Suggested locations: Uptown, areas without close access to retail like Chapel area (bring retail to neighborhoods)
- Example/Model: Playa Vista in California (below-ground parking, very walkable)
- *Benefit: great way to be near shops and restaurants within walking distance, option to increase density without increasing traffic*
- Mixed use generally supported
- Generally supportive of high quality modular units to bring construction cost down
- In general, there was strong support for smaller units, co-housing, and retirement villages to accommodate the needs of our older residents to age in place.

Areas with no clear agreement

- Building height
 - Some people were very supportive of increasing height in specific locations, and others were against it and instead advocated for more mixed use (these are two separate issues)
 - Support for location-specific height requirement based on viewshed/topography
 - Viewsheds were a common consideration
 - Views are paramount to determining existing house values, blocking views with new housing will diminish home values in surrounding areas
 - Support 3-4 story buildings up against hills where the viewshed wouldn't be blocked
 - On buildings with increased height, consider rooftop patios for enjoying views
- Varied options in a higher density housing situation felt more safe (not sure what "safe" means)
- Important to focus on both owning and renting diverse housing
- Site-specific solutions are necessary; different options are appropriate at different locations
- Proposing/building duplexes throughout different neighborhoods may contribute to broader acceptance of missing middle type housing options - not full agreement on this with strong opinions on both sides
- Partner with Northern Arizona Healthcare (NAH) for innovative housing solutions on their land in Sedona.
- Some support for adding ADUS, but considerable concern about ADUs turning into STRs

Redevelopment

Areas of agreement

- Cultural Park
 - Most were in favor of diverse housing at the Cultural Park, with the inclusion of amenities such as grocery stores
 - Include dynamic public spaces that can be enjoyed by the whole community
 - Possible consideration: New business incubator ideas: competitive, provide resources for a year, shared commercial kitchen for pop up or incubation restaurants

- 89A
 - Commercial areas
 - Many in favor of redeveloping commercial areas and increasing diverse housing in these areas, including increased density and height (for housing only). Height generally viewed as 2 to 3 stories, depending on location.
 - Generally viewed as a positive opportunity to improve the appearance of Sedona
 - Make 89A as enticing as the mountains, needs to be more beautiful
 - Rethink color requirements to complement the landscape, but not blend in; modern and natural
 - Master landscaping plan
 - Support for the appearance and mixed use of Alkemista redevelopment
 - Consider 89A as a destination with gathering places and interesting design and businesses. It becomes a second focal point on it's own after our natural beauty.
- Uptown (with in-depth community outreach/input); focus on housing and redevelopment as opposed to parking
- General support for creating a Main Street and Town Center as a gathering area to improve sense of community
- Need more diverse price ranges for a more diverse population (e.g. young workers and seniors)

Areas with no clear agreement

- 89A
 - Some people wanted to enhance walkability along 89A via crosswalks, but others disagreed
 - Some interest in putting parking underground and two or three stories above ground
 - Concern: more jaywalking with more housing developments
- Other possible redevelopment areas: Brewer Rd., Airport Rd. the Biddles property and Shelby Rd.
 - The purchase of the Biddle property (16+ acres) may be more impactful than the Cultural Park due to location and walkability

Workforce Impacts

- Some participants indicated it is too expensive (unless with a roommate - not desired) to live and work in Sedona, so they keep jobs and live elsewhere
- Benefit: More housing options leads to more opportunities for local work force and overall improving local business success/economy and services available to residents.

Traffic/Transit/Bike-Ped

Areas of agreement

- Excitement about the implementation of a better transportation system, extend to VOC
- Use a traffic flow model to inform future improvements
- Improve bike infrastructure to encourage citizens and visitors to use it more

- Many are unclear on what transit options are currently available in Sedona, and recognize the need for transit options for higher density housing and addressing traffic
- Concern: more housing will increase the amount of traffic and the need for more parking
- **Short Term Rental (STR) concerns**

Areas of agreement

- Follow-up discussion on STR legislation/reform is essential
- Support for the City to incentivize turning STR into long-term rentals

Areas with no clear agreement

- Some suggested that owners of multiple STRs pay hotel taxes
- Implement a 30-day minimum stay

Annexation options

Areas of agreement

- Many in favor of developing the Dells in the next 10 years but recognize the need for future discussions with Yavapai County
- Consider areas that can be annexed that will not impact viewsheds and that can tolerate increased height and density (e.g., Michael's Ranch Road)
- Consider Including Sedona Shadows and VOC into city limits
- Consider Land exchanges of Forest Service and/or County land

Cost/Funding/Financial Concerns

Areas of agreement

- The housing plan needs to have sound fiscal policy
- City help developers make money and create more housing
- Incentives to build multi-family housing (e.g., waive fees, grants/subsidies) to ensure it stays affordable for developers AND residents
- Concern: redevelopment costs can be prohibitive and often there are too many hurdles for developers

Code/development standards

Areas of agreement

- Many supported a change in code to make ideas (e.g. missing middle, alternative housing types) happen more readily
- Approvals for buildings within code need to be expedited; don't let small changes hold up the process
- General agreement of development guidelines changing to accommodate housing diversity

Areas with no clear agreement

- Some expressed the need for the City to hold projects to a higher level of design standard
- Create a primary design book for all new developments

- No definite opinions on reduced parking requirements, as other cities are doing
- Concern: design of previous projects (e.g., Pinon Lofts) viewed as ugly and prone to flooding
- Example/Model: find a progressive town with a fast tract system and learn from it, not reinvent the 'wheel', assign a planner that is part of the development team to help them succeed
- Question: Can changing the code help offset the development costs enough to make it affordable to build affordable housing?

General Considerations

- Research locations of, and protect historic places considered for development or redevelopment (e.g. Elks Club graveyard)
- The city could consider a phased approach to getting more affordable housing across Sedona.
- Bring together builders and architects and ask what they need from the city to make the process better and more efficient
- Automatic email to developers to evaluate experience working with the City to make improvements
- Have a conceptual design competition for architects to come up with a design aesthetic for Sedona in the next 10 years
- Parking structures as opposed to more land occupied by parking lots