



Support your local merchants

FINAL MINUTES
TOWN OF CAMP VERDE – PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
473 S. MAIN STREET, SUITE 106
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2023 at 6:00 P.M.

1. Call to Order

- 2. Roll Call.** Commissioner Greg Blue, Commissioner Robert Foreman, Commissioner Ingrid Osses, Commissioner William Tippet, Commissioner Mike Hough, Chairman Andrew Faiella, Vice Chairman Todd Scantlebury.

Also Present. Town Clerk Cindy Pemberton, Interim Town Manager Gail Mabery, Community Development Director John Knight, Planner BJ Ratlief, Planner Cory Mulcaire

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman Scantlebury led the pledge of allegiance.

There were some technical difficulties in the beginning of the meeting. Because of these difficulties, the meeting was a little bit delayed and offline to start.

4. Discussion regarding meeting procedures, motions/voting, and responsibilities of the Commission and Staff.

Chairman Andrew Faiella led the meeting by starting off with the responsibilities of the Commission and Staff. He said as the Commission they establish Planning and Zoning for the town of Camp Verde. They do this by following the General Plan and listening to the constituents of Camp Verde Town Council and Staff of what needs to be done and what's requested to be done.

He asked Vice Chairman Todd Scantlebury his thoughts. Vice Chairman Scantlebury said he thought it was well said. He asked if there are any other responsibilities that they may have. There have been some questions on the things that come before the Commission. Do they get passed down from Council, or do they come from applicants and within the Commission? He said there has been some friction about that.

Commissioner Ingrid Osses said that sometimes when things come down from Council, they feel obligated to do something. She doesn't feel this is right. She wants to make sure that they're listening to the people of Camp Verde before they make suggestions to Council.

Chairman Faiella said that's what they're supposed to do. He mentioned two past projects that have come before them- The Arena Del Loma Project and the Height Amendment. He doesn't feel like they had sufficient direction from Council on the Arena Del Loma project. The Commission looked at it from a standpoint of zoning and what's appropriate for the neighborhood and community. In the end, the project never went forward.

Community Development Director John Knight said Arena Del Loma was an unusual project. The Height Amendment project would be a better example. Regarding the roles of the Commission and Council, Council's roles are to set the over arching direction, and then the Commission works out the details of how they get there.

Chairman Faiella asked in what cases does Council not direct them or tell them what they're thinking and what's going on when an issue comes up? When there are applications for zoning and new businesses in town, they don't know about it until it gets to them. Council and staff know about it before them. He would like to hear about it ahead of time so they can get started on thoughts and research.

Commissioner Hough said that the first time the height zoning came to them it was for only commercial, not for residential. They declined it because they couldn't change it. The second time it came to them it included all the properties- residential and commercial within a specific zone. They then approved it. However, when it went to Council, they changed the perimeters of it, which is something the Commission wasn't able to do. He was confused why there is so much difference in what Council can do versus what they can do.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said he agreed. He doesn't feel like anyone is at fault, he thinks there was a miscommunication. He mentioned if Council knew from the beginning that they didn't want to touch residents, they should have said that so they could have started there. The Commission was unaware of that and would have made a better judgement in the first place, had they known.

Commissioner Hough said he was surprised they had the ability to change the perimeters at the Council meeting, while the Commission didn't have the ability to change any of their parameters, other than the proposal. He felt it should have come to them as an open proposal.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said, again, that his sense is that nobody did anything wrong. He just felt there wasn't clear communication between Council, staff, and the Commission.

Commissioner Osses wanted clarification from Mr. Knight on what is appropriate for Council to ask the Commission. She also wondered what authorities Council has on items that also go to the Commission.

Mr. Knight said that a code amendment is sponsored by the town. They have a lot of flexibility in what they can do. Code amendments can start from staff, the Commission, or Council. Council can't expand an amendment, but they can reduce it. Council has the authority to provide overarching direction that's specific, but they can't tell you how to make a decision. Council will wait and see what the Commission does. He mentioned that some feedback from Council on some of these recent projects that bounced back and forth were that the Commission should have done more at their level, but since they didn't, they're going to take care of it and get it done. Council expects the Commission to do all the detailed work and get it to the point where they can just give it a thumbs up or thumbs down.

Commissioner Hough said that Council changed the property values on some of the properties with the height amendment, and the residents didn't get to go through the whole due process. At first their property values were increasing, but Council decreased them without going back through the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Knight said that's a good point and they did discuss the possibility of stopping and re-noticing it to send it back to the Commission. But they spoke with the Attorney, and it was decided that it was fine since they were reducing the boundaries at the Council level.

Commissioner Osses said she felt a little bit uneasy because she felt Council wanted them to move things along, which she agrees with, but things get complicated sometimes and aren't easy to just move along.

Mr. Knight said that item was on the agenda several times and there was a gentleman who was a residential neighbor, who sat through the entire meeting. However, they also had another item on the agenda, and when they finally got to the agenda item, the Commission decided to just move it along.

Commissioner Foreman said he's at a little bit of a disadvantage because of his leave of absence. However, he does feel that it's appropriate for Council to make recommendations for them. He feels a better word for what Council does for them is "advise" not "direct."

Chairman Faiella told Commissioner Hough that they were in error thinking they couldn't make the boundary changes themselves. From what he's read, once a motion is made and seconded, during the discussion, someone can ask the original proposer if they'd consider altering it.

Commissioner Hough said if it were an applicant, they could not alter it. However, if it's something they're working on for the city, they can alter those property lines. He wondered if they can also alter which classification, it is?

Chairman Faiella said no, they can alter what the provisions of the agenda item says.

Commissioner Hough said the first time it came around it was only for C2 or C3 properties, but the next time it came around it included the M1 Residential.

Chairman Faiella responded and said in his opinion they could have gone in and said no, they just want to do C2 and C3, not M1's or others. That would have been the amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Hough said at the first meeting they weren't allowed to add the R1, so he didn't think they'd be allowed to take them out either.

Chairman Faiella clarified that that was incorrect information. They could have done that.

Mr. Knight said it's within some boundaries. It depends on what's posted on the agenda. They can discuss at the meeting what's been posted, but if they choose to discuss other things, they need to put a pause on it and go re-notice it and bring it back. They can always make the proposal smaller.

Commissioner Hough said the proposal needs to be more general.

Mr. Knight said that town projects are different than applicant projects. You don't get that flexibility on a re-zone. Different types of projects have different flexibilities.

Commissioner Hough said he's good with this first subject.

Commissioner Osses wondered if they could have a little bit more information when Council wants them to look at a project. She feels like they're driving blind sometimes.

Mr. Knight said that in the past they've tried to do joint meetings, doing two a year. This gives them the opportunity to sit down and talk about priorities and issues. They talked about doing one in March or April.

Town Clerk Cindy Pemberton said that the Commission has the opportunity and right to schedule a joint, work session with Council so they can sit down and get a consensus and see what they are hoping to accomplish.

Chairman Faiella said, to clarify, he's had conversations with Mayor Jenkins, and she's told him specifically that they cannot talk about anything that may be coming up before the Commission and the Council. His understanding from that discussion with Mayor Jenkins was he can't talk to her about re-zoning parcels that may be coming up before the Commission. He wanted to know how it would be appropriate to get a work session scheduled.

Ms. Pemberton said there's a difference between talking to a Council member one on one about business that may potentially sway their opinion, and talking to them about getting a Work Session scheduled with all involved.

Chairman Faiella asked if in that joint Session, can they speak about future projects with the Council?

Mr. Knight said there's a difference between an applicant sponsored project and town sponsored project. With an applicant sponsored project it's different. They submit their application and go through the process, and Council should not be interfering until it goes through them.

Chairman Faiella asked if it's still appropriate for him to talk to a Council member about that, outside of a formal meeting.

Mr. Knight told him he can talk to whoever he wants; he can't violate open meeting law. However, he should be very cautious. A Council member would not want it to appear like they're giving a Commissioner direction. It would then give an applicant, who may not get the consensus he wants, ammunition to say he didn't get a fair hearing.

Ms. Pemberton said that if he ends up giving particular information to one Council member that the other members are not getting, then that gives another Council member an advantage. It becomes problematic.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said that a sign that they're doing something that isn't going to work or is going to be an issue for Council is they get a phone call from Council wondering what they were thinking. The Commission thinks they're doing a good job and what Council has asked, but when it goes to Council they think otherwise and decide to amend it. He wants to know how to avoid all that work, anxiety, and effort, just for it to get dumped or tabled. He said the biggest inefficiency here is the communication and direction between Council and Commission.

Commissioner Hough said he reminds himself that they are representing 12,000 people. It's the responsibility of the Commission.

Chairman Faiella wants to know how they get that information from Council?

Commissioner Hough said the fact that they don't has some implication.

Commissioner Foreman said Ms. Pemberton had the right solution- an open, public work session where they can talk about anything they want. One on one communication is an invitation for miscommunication.

Chairman Faiella asked how they're supposed to get one of those work sessions scheduled. Do they bring it to Ms. Pemberton?

Ms. Pemberton said if it's a Commissioner, they'd bring it up to the Chairperson, who would then bring it to Mr. Knight.

Chairman Faiella clarified whether it could be a private conversation, or a conversation during a meeting.

Ms. Pemberton said that, yes, privately they can have those conversations. It's not about business, it's about process. First, they would set it up with Mr. Knight.

Mr. Knight said they have the indications that they need to make this joint session happen, as it's clear from both Council and the Commission.

Additionally, he said that the Commission has to make the best decisions they can with the information they have. If they don't feel staff is getting them the best information, they need to let him know.

Chairman Faiella said that was a perfect segway into the next topic. He appreciates the work of planners Cory Mulcaire and Bj Ratlief. As it stands right now, both Chairman Faiella and Vice Chairman Scantlebury go and meet with staff ahead of time to set the agenda and get an executive summary. He would like this to continue.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said he agrees. He said Commissioner Blue has been helping with that, as they've been searching for historical continuity. All they're doing is trying to write a good agenda that's easy to read. The purpose of the executive summary is because things can get really complicated.

He wants the new Commissioners, like himself, to learn how to do this. They'd like to have different Commissioners in each agenda setting meeting.

Commissioner Greg Blue said his question is directed toward Cindy. There was something in the last meeting that happened that he wasn't in agreement with. There was a parcel number posted that was incorrect. The Chairperson asked the Director about it and was told that it was no big deal. He felt that it needed to be reposted because it was a lie on what was presented. When people see that parcel number and see that it's nowhere near them, they wouldn't want to attend the meeting.

Ms. Pemberton said that they should have corrected and amended their agenda. Commissioner Blue said he agreed.

Chairman Faiella said he agrees with Commissioner Blue. He gave an example of a Council meeting in which one of the dates was wrong and one of the Council members objected until the date was fixed.

Ms. Pemberton gave another example of what happened with Council last week. The date had been messed up on the agenda. She said if it was longer than 24 hours, they could have amended it and sent out to the public. However, because they were less than 24rs they had to cancel the meeting. As it pertains to what Commissioner Blue was talking about, if the parcel number was incorrect, they'd have to table the item until the number was correct.

Mr. Knight said he thought the error was in the staff report. The notice that was sent out to the public all had the correct information. They corrected it verbally at the meeting.

There was some confusion on whether it was JUST on the staff report, or also on the agenda.

Planner BJ Ratlief said it was just on the staff report.

Ms. Pemberton said that if it were just a staff report error, that can be overlooked. The legally binding document is the agenda.

Commissioner Blue asked her if the error was on the agenda, would it have to be reposted? Ms. Pemberton said they'd either must amend it if it's longer than 24 hours, or they'd have to pull it off the agenda.

Commissioner Foreman said that when he made the motion, he put in the proper parcel numbers, and he also thought they were posted correctly.

Planner Cory Mulcaire and Ms. Ratlief looked it up and saw that the incorrect parcel numbers were both on the staff report and posted publicly.

Commissioner Foreman said he didn't think much of it at the time, but if it was published with the wrong parcel numbers, it should be reviewed.

Mr. Knight said he can have the discussion with the town attorney. There's a certain level of procedural problems that can be fixed between the Commission and Council.

Commissioner Osses said if she were the owner or neighbor of the parcel, she'd want to be at the meeting. They should have the opportunity to come in. However, the correct owner and neighbors would not know with the wrong parcel numbers posted.

Commissioner Hough said it was an exception because it was well described as being within the PAD.

He said he has a couple of concerns. There have been people who have been there a long time and people that are new to the Commission. He would like to be told when things are a conceptual plan. It would cut the workload down if they're reminded by staff whenever anything comes up if it's conceptual or if it's final.

Mr. Knight said that was a good point. He will make sure that is the case going forward. He said some of the plans they get, like High View, are both conceptual and final. They may continue to see this hybrid thing where some pieces are conceptual and some are final.

Commissioner Osses said she heard that staff approved part of the construction on 260. She was curious why it was approved by staff rather than being sent to the Commission.

Mr. Knight said that was an interesting case because the previous Director approved it at staff level. The final site plan should have come back to the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Osses asked whether that was right.

Mr. Knight said it only had conceptual approval, but they didn't have final site plan approval. He's not sure what happened. They fixed it by going back and getting final site plan approval. The Commission did look at it, but it was already under construction.

Mr. Knight said one of the things they try and do as staff is research criteria and requirements, and in some cases, the laws. They also coordinate with the town attorney. They package all of that information and bring it to the Commission. They don't expect them to go out and do their own legal research and go through the staff sheets. They do expect them to know the code well. He said staff is not above making errors. It's their responsibility to get them the information in a timely manner. They always strive to get it out a week ahead of time. They will always have hard copies for them as well, by Friday at the latest. They then do a pre-agenda meeting, where they sit down with the Chairman and the Vice Chairman. He's not sure if the pre-agenda meeting has been done in the past, but he feels it's a valuable process.

Commissioner Osses said she appreciates staff. They do a wonderful job presenting the agenda. She said it's nice to know now that if there is a mistake made, they can amend the agenda. Everyone makes mistakes and they all have bad days.

Mr. Knight said the Commission always has that authority.

Chairman Faiella moved on to meeting procedures. He said one of the newest procedures that just came out from Mayor Jenkins is that citizens are only supposed to speak to their own blue card. They are not allowed to speak on behalf of someone else and share minutes. He doesn't feel that's appropriate. It's up to him to decide what they're going to do, but he'd rather share the consensus. Does the Commission follow suit with Council on this topic?

Commissioner Hough said there's too much salesmanship when you give someone 15-30 minutes to talk. They need the facts, not a sales pitch. If someone really has something to say, they can get it done in 3 minutes.

Commissioner Foreman said he doesn't have strong feelings one way or the other. He doesn't mind if someone gives up their minutes for another person. It's not been his experience that it comes up often in Planning and Zoning meetings. He always used to say if you can't make a point in 3 minutes, you don't have a point to make.

Commissioner Blue said he feels 3 minutes is too short. He'd favor making it 5 minutes. Other communities in the area have 5 minutes to present. The 3 minutes happens fast when you're up there on the podium trying to make a point.

Commissioner Tippet said he would prefer not limiting any one's speech. He wouldn't mind seeing it go to 5 minutes, but also doesn't mind letting them pool their time.

Commissioner Osses said she understands that sometimes people cannot speak in 3 minutes. However, sometimes when the minutes are pooled, they hear the same thing repeatedly in a long speech. She wouldn't mind moving to 5 minutes.

Chairman Faiella said one of the items he's been educated on is that since he's the Chairperson, he can stop someone during their presentation, if they continue to say the same thing over and over. He said what he's hearing is that it doesn't matter one way or another.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury interrupted and said it does matter one way or the other. He gave an example of a guy who stood up 5 times for different reasons and said the same thing over and over. He said he thinks it shows lack of intelligence and wastes their time. He gave another example of when he was previously presenting in front of Council. He did a lot of work and spent a lot of time on his presentation, and when it came down to it, he got 3 minutes. He wonders how they make it fair, but avoid people who talk repeatedly?

Ms. Pemberton gave a recommendation. She said there are several municipalities who deal with these same situations. Quite recently Council was dealing with this. In the best interest of time, they limited it to 3 minutes per person. This is in the town code. Commissioners, however, do not have a limit in their town code regarding speaking time limits. She said the time limits on speakers are really to respect the time of those running the meetings. Do they want to be here till midnight listening to everybody talk? She knows they want to hear what people have to say, however, they can adjust the time limits as needed, depending on the topic. If they choose to allow people to pool their minutes, they can always declare to the audience that they've already heard enough on one topic, and to please not come up and speak again regarding that topic.

Chairman Faiella said he also just recently learned that a person can only speak once. They cannot have several blue cards for themselves on the same issue.

Commissioner Foreman said Vice Chairman Scantlebury is right, there's not going to be one decision that's going to be fair to 100% of the people 100% of the time. He likes Commissioner Blues idea of lengthening it to 5 minutes.

Mr. Knight said the Commission needs to be fair and consistent. 3 minutes is common. They certainly have the right to give more time if they so choose. What might get confusing is if someone were to speak in front of the P&Z Commission, getting more than 3 minutes, and then they were to go and speak in front of Council, they might get frustrated that they are limited to only 3 minutes. Another thing to keep in mind is they still must get business done. They often have big agenda items that cause the meetings to go late. Allowing for more than 3 minutes per speaker is going to make it hard to get through the agenda.

Commissioner Blue said he thinks the solution should be that depending on what the topic is and what's on the agenda, Chairman Faiella should be able to declare what he thinks is best for speaker times.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury agreed.

Commissioner Osses said that people won't feel like they're given the opportunity to talk, especially on a hot topic, if they limit it only to 3 minutes. She doesn't think that's why they're here. They need to get things done in order to pass them to Council.

Chairman Faiella asked Town Manager Gail Mabery her opinion.

Ms. Mabery said that in the town code, the Council has a standard of 3 minutes. The Commission doesn't have a standard. It's up to Mr. Faiella as the Chairman to manage the meeting as he sees fit. As a result of some tough town Council meetings, Council came to that conclusion to give everyone the right to speak, but not allow one person to speak for 30 minutes in place of 10 people.

She said another option would be that if they're going to loan minutes, they can cap it at a certain amount of time, not an unlimited number of blue cards. She said it's effective for everyone to manage that time appropriately.

Chairman Faiella concluded that they'll limit time based on the topic that comes up.

Mr. Knight said the applicant is treated differently. By policy, the applicant is given 10 minutes to speak, and sometimes that is extended if they have a big project to present. Another reason Council put the time cap on is because they often have things on their agenda that they must get through.

Ms. Pemberton said that for applicants, even after a public hearing has closed, the applicant can come back up to the podium to address any questions they may have.

Chairman Faiella said they're now going to talk about how motions are presented.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said sometimes the motions are perfectly timed and helpful, but sometimes they're not. For the last year, he has sat in a position in which he cannot see other Commissioners to get a gage on what they're doing or thinking. Motions happen so fast, they get seconded so fast, and sometimes they just can't be productive and work them out. He would like more time for them to discuss what they're thinking before they make a motion. This will ensure that they're sending to Council things that are well thought out and have been worked together

on.

Ms. Pemberton gave a recommendation that when they get to an agenda item that is going to need a motion made and be voted on, Chairman Faiella could stop and say, "I'd like to open this up for discussion" before they put a motion for it out on the table. This would be more beneficial to them as opposed to making the motion and then discussing it because that's where amendments occur, and everything gets a little convoluted. She said to lay everything out on the table first, and once they all have a consensus, Chairman can call for a motion.

Chairman Faiella said one of the problems they have had is a rush to motion. As soon as an agenda item is stated, a motion is made immediately. He'd like to ask the Commissioners that they not do that anymore until he calls for a motion. Thorough discussion of an agenda item needs to take place before they vote on it.

Commissioner Hough said he remembers a lot of meetings in the past that after a motion was made and seconded, the Chairperson would go by name to each person to ask for any comments before they vote. This would force each person to make a statement about how they feel about an item. It might lead to an amendment, but that's easy.

Commissioner Osses said she's guilty of that. She said she doesn't like it when she feels like they go running around a topic, to the point where it looks like they don't know what they're doing.

She gave an example of when Vice Chairman Scantlebury goes on and on about a topic but doesn't put it in motion.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury agreed with her, but he would like to know what everyone is thinking before they vote because he feels it will help him vote.

Commissioner Osses said sometimes she comes in with her mind made up, but when she hears other members talking, it helps her change directions. She wants to portray to the people that they're put together and have some order in what they're doing.

Ms. Mabery wanted to echo what Ms. Pemberton said. She said the idea behind having discussion before the vote isn't so that they'll all get to consensus every time with a unanimous vote. However, she's experienced in several settings that it's very helpful when a topic is introduced to have the Chairperson go down the line, allowing everyone to speak. Of course they want to respect one another's time with that as well. This process really does help make the motions cleaner.

Commissioner Osses liked this idea and thought it would be nice moving forward.

Commissioner Tippet likes the idea of getting to explain his opinion prior to voting. He said there were sometimes when his vote was totally the opposite of others, and he'd like to have an opportunity to explain his thinking.

Chairman Faiella said he takes responsibility for that not flowing smoothly in the past. Moving forward, they will be taking the advice of Ms. Mabery and Ms. Pemberton on how to get discussions in before final vote has been taken.

Commissioner Huff said in the past it was helpful when staff had already written out a motion so they didn't have to invent it for themselves. This gave them the opportunity to read the motion and study it beforehand, so they knew how they wanted to vote when it came time. It may require some amendments before its said and done.

Commissioner Foreman said he hates to keep bringing up the ancient past, but the recommendations given by Ms. Mabery and Ms. Pemberton were exactly how they used to do it. It worked very well.

Ms. Pemberton said she'd be more than happy to provide the script for the type of process they're talking about.

Ms. Mabery wanted to clarify so they don't lose context and are communicating well. Once the motion is made and seconded, he'll ask for discuss on the motion. This is before the vote is taken. Once the vote is taken the discussion is over. The discussion needs to take place before the vote. That is when they all can put their thoughts out there. It's perfectly fine for someone to say that they'll be voting against the motion, then give their reason why.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said that in the Supreme Court it's called the dissenting opinion. If one person votes no, and Council looks at that and decides that person was right, taking a break to allow that person to explain why they voted no will give them an opportunity to put their explanation on record.

Chairman Osses said that several times she thought Chairman Tippet was going to vote a certain way, and he didn't. She would like the opportunity to ask him what he's thinking.

Chairman Faiella said his question is when they're done with their business for an agenda item, and it goes to Council, what does Council get as record for the meeting?

Mr. Knight said they provide Council with a copy of the minutes. Also, some Council members will go back and watch the Zoom meeting if there were some big items on the agenda. He also added, regarding the motions, he thinks it's a useful tool to go down the line and force everybody to give comments on the motion. He said sometimes on the Commission he's seen some missteps in procedures. The applicant will get up and give their presentation, and before they open it up to the public to share, the Commission begins discussing it themselves. The Chairperson needs to make sure that doesn't happen.

Commissioner Osses clarified. They can get questions answers from the applicant, but they can't give him their opinion?

Mr. Knight said yes. Ask questions, but don't debate and negotiate. It could turn into a legal matter if they're not giving the applicant proper time.

Planner Ratlief told Chairman Faiella that the meeting has hit an hour and a half. She wondered if he wanted to take a break.

Chairman Faiella asked the Commission if they had anything else they'd like to discuss.

Commissioner Hough said he wants to amend a motion that was made a few meetings ago, but he was told by Mr. Knight that it couldn't be amended. He disagreed with this.

Mr. Knight said he has every right and authority to amend the motion.

Chairman Faiella interjected and said, yes, but the person who made the motion needs to be the one who amended it.

Vice Chairman Scantlebury said he saw someone shake their head no and then nod their head yes. Which is it? Who can amend the motion?

Commissioner Foreman said it's his understanding that anyone can propose an amendment to a

motion on the floor.

Ms. Pemberton said that is correct. However, the person who made the motion and the person who seconded that motion would have to agree to that amendment.

Commissioner Hough said he asked the maker of the motion to amend the motion so it included something else in it, but he was told he couldn't do that.

It was decided that he could do that.

Ms. Pemberton said that Council is operating without making amendments, but they know that they can. They've decided that once a second motion is on the table, they let it run its course unless it doesn't pass. They decided this because amendments on top amendments started to look messy. They are certainly allowed to do it, but it's best to have conversations first so they don't need to.

Commissioner Foreman said it doesn't happen very often, but it does from time to time.

Chairman Faiella clarified what the proper protocol would be for amending a motion so that all were clear on that.

Ms. Pemberton told him he was correct in his clarification.

There was confusion amongst the commission on how and when to amend a motion, so Ms. Mabery stepped in to clear the confusion. She said it's not always black and white. She gave an explanation of the most commonly used method that she's seen that should work in any situation they are up against regarding amending motions.

Once there is a motion made with a second, and they start having discussion, it may become clear that an amendment needs to be made for that motion. In that case, someone would say they're going to make an amendment to the motion, and the Chairperson would ask for the second to be removed so that they can make the amendment to reflect the discussion they've had. They then take a vote on the original motion AS AMENDED.

Commissioner Osses said she likes the idea of amending motions when needed because it gives everyone a chance to change it if their discussion reflects the need for a change.

Chairman Faiella agrees. He said the amendment needs to be appropriate for what the motion was in the first place. It can't completely change it.

Commissioner Hough said it's the difference between friendly amendments and aggressive amendments. He's talking about friendly amendments where you just want to correct the text before it moves forward.

Chairman Faiella asked Mr. Knight if he wanted to talk about another item.

Mr. Knight said that item wasn't on the agenda, so they're not going to talk about it this evening.

Ms. Mabery said regarding motions, amendments, and the content of the motion, there are times that she's seen when Commissions and Councils make a motion and everyone approves, but staff is sitting there confused as to what that motion said. In a case like that, they'll need to clarify to staff right there at the meeting what the motion was saying. She said in a case like that, clarifying will help staff to have a full understanding of what that motion meant. It's a rare occasion, but it can happen.

All agreed to that.

Commissioner Osses commended staff.

5. **Adjournment** Chairman Faiella adjourned the meeting at 7:45.


Chairman Drew Faiella


Community Development Director John Knight

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and accurate accounting of the actions of the Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Camp Verde, Arizona during the Regular Session held on the 19th day of January 2023. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 9th day of February 2023.


Mary Frewin, Recording Secretary