

MINUTES

HEARING OF THE NAVAJO COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

July 18, 2013

**ATTENDANCE
P & Z Commissioners**

Attended:

1. **Chuck Teetsel**
2. **Randy Murph**
3. **Joel Lawson**
4. **Ruth Ann Smith**
5. **Bob Hall**
6. **Wendell DeCross**
7. **Robert K. Black, Jr.**

Absent:

**Carol Davis
Evelyn Meadows
Fred Shupla
Jason Hatch
Rick Slone**

Staff Attendance:

Trent Larson	Brandt Clark
Peggy Saunders	Robin McCormick

Meeting held at the Navajo County Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona – Time: 6:02 p.m. to 6:57 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Chuck Teetsel called the meeting of the Navajo County Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 6:02 p.m., and led the pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Teetsel explained the housekeeping and meeting rules for the benefit of the public in attendance.

ITEM #1 – CASE # 13-14: SPECIAL USE PERMIT: Request by Verizon Wireless for a Special Use Permit to modify the tower height an additional 15 feet on an existing telecommunications tower on Assessor Parcel Number (APN): 208-19-001E, a.k.a. a portion of Section 24, Township 11 North, Range 19 East, G&SRM, Navajo County, Arizona, in the Clay Springs area.

Trent Larson presented the Staff Report and gave an overview of the project.

In Favor: 0

Opposed: 1

Motion to approve with conditions as presented by staff Commissioner DeCross, the motion was seconded by Commissioner Murph. The vote was (6-0) to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors.

ITEM #2 – CASE # 13-05: ZONE CHANGE: Request by Ronald & Deborah Watkins for a Zone Change from A-General to C-R (Commercial-Residential) to open RW Gun Shop on Assessor Parcel Number (APN): 103-30-079, a.k.a. a portion of Section 20, Township 19 N, Range 16 East, G&SRM, Navajo County, Arizona, in the Winslow area.

Trent Larson presented the Staff Report and gave an overview of the project. Mr. Larson read a letter of support from the City of Winslow – Paul Ferris. He also presented petitions in favor of the gun shop, with 286 signatures, 90% live in the Winslow area. He also presented petitions opposed to the gun shop with 15 signatures. Mr. Larson also read statements from the opposed petitioners with the reasons they are opposed. Those who live in the area do not want to encourage businesses to their residential area, local roads will suffer from traffic issues, condition problems with the structure, gun shop may draw undesirables to the area. Criminals target fire arms stores, and fear that lost or stolen firearms are a danger to their community and children in the area.

The applicant, **Ronald Watkins** of 1046 Sunset Road in Winslow, spoke in support of his application. He stated that the concerns about traffic would not be an issue. There would be less traffic for the gun shop than there was for the feed store when it was in business. **Commissioner DeCross** asked the applicant where his previous gun shops were located. **Mr. Watkins** stated that he had run gun shops in New Mexico and in Apache County. He closed the shop in New Mexico due to lack of business, and sold the Apache County shop to his brother. The proposed gun shop would have bars on the windows, safes for the guns, and any other safety measures needed. **Deborah Watkins** addressed the appearance and lack of maintenance of the building. She stated that they have plans to fix up the building, including painting it red with white trim the way it used to be. It takes time to bring it back to a presentable condition. **Commissioner DeCross** asked if the applicant was a gunsmith. The applicant stated that he was not. **Chairman Teetsel** asked if the applicant planned to open a firing range either indoor or outdoor. **Mr. Watkins** stated that he did not plan to open a firing range. The Commission asked if there were any other established businesses in the neighborhood. **Mr. Larson** stated that there were no businesses in the immediate area, but there were some nearby. **Ken Hoke** of Winslow spoke in favor of the applicant, stating that this business would not cause problems with traffic. **Dan Wyrick** of French Road spoke in favor of the applicant, stating that this business would not cause problems with traffic. **Mr. Curtis Hardy** spoke in favor of the applicant. **John Dalton** of French Road spoke in favor of the applicant, his family owns several properties in the immediate area and none of them are opposed to the proposed gun shop. He did not feel that an increase in traffic would be a problem.

Diane Pawley spoke in opposition to the applicant stating that back when there was a feed store in this location there were approximately 30 fewer homes in the area. There are more children and animals in the road now. She felt that there was a lack of law enforcement in the area and that a coat of paint would not make the building more secure against fire or theft. She stated that she felt the proposed gun shop would increase crime in the area. She felt that approval of this zone change would set precedence for more businesses to come into the area, thereby increasing traffic and crime even more. **R. J. Pawley** also spoke in opposition.

Commissioner Hall stated that he knows this area very well, and that development of the area was highly unlikely due to drainage. **Chairman Teetsel** asked the applicant for details about the security of the proposed gun shop. **Mr. Watkins** stated that they planned to install cameras, and that they had a guard dog and gun safes. They will also be living on-site. **Mrs. Watkins**

stated that they are already living on the property and that they already have a gun show at a different location, the Elks Lodge on 3rd street, and they would never host a gun show at the proposed shop. **Commissioner Murph** asked about the Federal requirements for gun shops regarding storage. **Mr. Watkins** stated that no one under 18 was allowed to handle the guns. There is no requirement to have the shop be in a brick enclosure. **Chairman Teetsel** asked why a security system would not be installed. **Mr. Watkins** stated that it would simply be an added expense he'd like to avoid, but would install one if the Commission required it.

In Favor: 4 Present + 287 Signatures & Letters (291 total)

Opposed: 2 Present + 15 Signatures & Letters (17 total)

Motion to approve as presented by staff: **Commissioner Smith**, the motion was seconded by **Commissioner Murph**. The vote was (7-0) to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors.

ITEM #3 – POSSIBLE APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE COMMISSION HEARING OF MAY 16, 2013.

Motion to approve: **Commissioner DeCross**, the motion was seconded by **Commissioner Hall**. The vote was (7-0) to recommend approval to the Board of Supervisors.

ITEM #4 – DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION BYLAWS.

County Attorney, **Brandt Clark**, stated that he had reviewed the bylaws and had no issue with them.

Motion to approve: **Commissioner DeCross**, the motion was seconded by **Commissioner Smith**. The vote was (7-0) to adopt the Bylaws.

ITEM #5 – COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS AND/OR DIRECTIONS TO STAFF.

Commissioners' may use this time to offer additional comments regarding any item on this agenda or any other topic; and the Commission may direct Development Services Department staff to study or provide additional information on topics of the Commissioners' choosing.

Commissioner DeCross stated that it was very difficult to hear if you participated telephonically. **Peggy Saunders** stated that she would either move the phone, or set up a teleconference phone in the future. **Commissioner DeCross** raised the issue again of how to encourage attendance for this meeting. The new by-laws state that an attendance report will be given to the Board of Supervisors, but how can the Supervisor be encouraged to take action if their appointee was not attending regularly.

ITEM #6 –REPORT FROM STAFF TO THE COMMISSION.

Staff will prepare an attendance report card for the Commissioners and submit a copy of the attendance report to the Commission and the Board of Supervisors quarterly. **Chairman Teetsel** asked if the Commission could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, regarding attendance. **Trent Larson** said the Commission could direct staff to add it to the next

agenda for action, but suggested that we let the new bylaws stand, at least for a year, and let the report on Commission attendance go directly to the Board of Supervisors.

With there being no further business to bring before the Commission, a motion to adjourn was made by **Commissioner DeCross**, and seconded by **Commissioner Murph**.

The vote was unanimous (7-0), and the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

NAVAJO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Chairman, Chuck Teetsel

ATTEST:

Robin McCormick