



City of Prescott
Planning & Zoning Commission

February 26, 2026 | 9:00 AM
201 N Montezuma Street
Council Chambers, 1st Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Michelman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

Don Michelman, Chair
Thomas Reilly, Vice Chair
Thomas Davis, Member
Susan Graham, Member
Thomas Hutchison, Member
James Kleczewski, Member
James Whiting, Member (Excused)

3. DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS

A. Approval of the January 8, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REILLY TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 8, 2025 MEETING MINUTES; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KLECZEWSKI; PASSED (5-0-1). COMMISSIONER HUTCHISON ABSTAINED.

B. **REZ26-001 & GPA26-001:** A request for Rezoning from SF-35 (Single-Family Minimum Lot size 35,000SF) to BG (Business General) on a Total of 3.6 Acres & Minor General Plan Amendment from Low-Medium density Residential to Commercial for the Expansion of an Existing School to Include Grades 9-12. Location: 2980 Willow Creek Rd, APN 106-21-237B. Owner: Arizona Conf. Corp Seventh-Day Adventists. Applicant: Prescott Seventh-Day Adventist Church, Lindsey Toyama.

Assistant Planner Jacob Lund presented the rezoning request for the Seventh Day Adventist Church, providing maps of the site plan and surrounding properties to show the zoning in the area along Willow Creek Road. Mr. Lund said a revision of plat in July 2025 combined parcels into the current parcel, and that expansion plans include new classroom buildings west of the existing building. Mr. Lund said their current SF-35 zoning allows for grades K-8 but not for grades 9-12, necessitating a rezoning. Mr. Lund said there have been no public comments in response to the posting on the property or mailings, and that City staff concluded the project appears to meet City Code requirements.

Mr. Lund said a minor General Plan Map amendment is required to convert the area from Medium Density Residential to Medium Density Commercial to allow for the proposed zoning to expand the school to accommodate grades 9-12.

Vice Chair Reilly asked why the Land Development Code has a different category for grades 9-12 from grades K-8.

Mr. Lund said he did not know and that the code dates back to 2004. He said that colleges and universities are allowed in Neighborhood-oriented business and Business General zoning but not grades 9-12.

Commissioner Hutchison said the zoning restrictions could be due to high school students driving cars.

Commissioner Davis asked why the rezone is to Business General instead of Neighbor-Oriented Business.

Mr. Lund said that it was intended to avoid an additional Conditional Use Permit requirement and that the two zoning categories are very similar in allowed uses.

Commissioner Davis said he thought a Neighbor-oriented Business category would be more appropriate due to the surrounding uses and zoning.

Commissioner Davis asked how many students would be projected to be in the high school.

Applicant Lindsay Toyama, representing the Seventh Day Adventist Church, said approximately 10 and no more than 20 to start.

Commissioner Davis voiced concerns about increased traffic.

Ms. Toyama said there is an existing overflow parking lot with an estimated 150 car capacity that is used for events like food drives and church services.

Commissioner Kleczewski clarified that there would be approximately 150 students, including 40 high schoolers.

Ms. Toyama confirmed.

Chair Michelman asked what would trigger the construction of the additional building on the site plan.

Ms. Toyama said the additional buildings shown are planned for use by the K-6 program to keep the high school and elementary school separate.

Chair Michelman asked if there is a plan for pick-up and drop-off for students.

Ms. Toyama said there is a plan in use for vehicles to drive in, circle around, and drive out of Nicholette to keep vehicles off of Willow Creek Road.

Chair Michelman asked if there have been any challenges with this plan.

Ms. Toyama said there have not been.

Chair Michelman asked if the addition of high school students would present unique challenges.

Ms. Toyama said there is a system in place with signs for pick-up and drop-off, and that she foresees no new challenges.

Commissioner Hutchison said the project seems to be a continuation of the existing conditional use permit and that it seems appropriate to approve both the rezoning and General Plan amendment.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REILLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF GPA26-001. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER GRAHAM (PASSED 6-0).

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REILLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF REZ26-001. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS (PASSED 6-0).

- C. **CONTINUED ITEM – LDC25-002:** Amendment to the City of Prescott Land Development Code Article 4 Section 4.9.4.B to Update the Parking Requirements Within the Downtown Business (DTB) Zoning District. Applicant: City of Prescott – Planning & Zoning Division.

Community Planner Tammy DeWitt presented on parking in the Downtown Business District (DTB). Ms. DeWitt distinguished the DTB from the Entertainment District, which concerns liquor licenses near schools and churches, explaining that the two overlap but have different purposes. Regarding LDC25-002, Ms. DeWitt said the commentary note will be removed as the parking garage has been constructed. Ms. DeWitt said that the 1968 exemptions intended to protect historic buildings are to be removed, and that new businesses will be required to provide parking regardless of the year the building was constructed, except for retail and entertainment uses. Ms. DeWitt presented some potential impacts from planning and historic preservation, including the hindrance of mixed-use development that eliminates the need for heavy vehicle usage.

Vice Chair Reilly asked if alternative parking agreements would be allowed per approval of the ordinance.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed alternative parking agreements would be allowed.

Vice Chair Reilly asked if parking has to be within a certain proximity of the proposed use.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed.

Ms. Bramlette Planning Manager said that off-site parking must be within 300 feet of the use.

Vice Chair Reilly asked if right-of-way parking would be disallowed.

Ms. DeWitt said certain uses in buildings constructed prior to 1968 were exempt from the parking requirements under the current code requirements.

Vice Chair Reilly asked if a fee in lieu of parking is still available.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed and stated the in-lieu fee may not be used for more than 20 parking spaces.

Alane Moore, Senior Assistant City Attorney, said that use of in-lieu parking for City right-of-way is a contractual agreement with the city and is made on a case-by-case basis.

Vice Chair Reilly said that the ordinance needs to make clear that in-lieu parking is not just for the parking garage.

Ms. DeWitt said that small up and coming business owners may not be able to accommodate this fee.

Vice Chair Reilly said that new business owners would rather rent parking spaces than build their own.

Chair Michelman expressed concerns related to pre-1968 buildings that will be used for uses that have overnight stay not being required to provide on-site parking.

Ms. DeWitt said the change would require on-site parking or a fee in-lieu of parking for all uses providing overnight stay no matter the age of the building.

Commissioner Davis stated concerns regarding increased building heights through a Special Use Permit to allow buildings to be taller in order to accommodate parking.

Vice Chair Reilly said this will constrict the development or redevelopment that occurs in the downtown area and it will be a potential problem.

Chelsea Walton Community Development Director stated there is a balance between historic preservation and private property rights and the intent of downtown is walkability over a vehicular focus.

Vice Chair Reilly provided an example of a building downtown that is a prime candidate for residential uses but would not be able to provide adequate parking. He asked if it would never be able to become apartments with the proposed code change.

Ms. DeWitt said it would not with the proposed change of the code but would have been under the current code since it is a pre-1968 building. She added that the code change is meant to be a quick fix prior to a future overhaul of the Land Development Code (LDC).

Vice Chair Reilly recommended the change only be applied to uses proposing overnight stay requiring on-site parking.

Ms. DeWitt stated that was the original proposal that was brought before the commission in January 2026.

Chair Michelman asked if the language was changed to only require new buildings to provide on-site parking, if the old post office at the corner of Cortez St. and Goodwin Street were converted to apartments, would they have to require on-site parking

Ms. Bramlette confirmed that this building would be exempt from parking requirements if language referring to pre-1968 buildings is kept in the changes.

Chair Michelman stated that he understood wanting to protect older buildings but without more parking being provided downtown with a parking garage, it would continue to be an issue.

Ms. DeWitt stated the only use that this proposal will effect that the current code does not, are hotels since apartments are already required to provide parking.

Commissioner Hutchison stated that not requiring on-site parking is a mistake and believes the changes were the right thing to do.

Chair Michelman asked for clarification if the new proposal or the previous proposal from January 2026 were the right thing to do.

Commissioner Hutchison said all proposed uses that have overnight stay to be required to provide on-site parking regardless of new construction or pre-1968.

Ms. DeWitt clarified that the previous proposal from January would not exempt new construction or pre-1968 development with overnight stays from requiring on-site parking.

Ms. Moore clarified there are 3 separate ideas:

- 1) Current zoning code where uses requiring overnight parking would not be required to provide parking;
- 2) The January 2026 proposal removing hospitality related uses; or
- 3) The current proposal that would require all uses which require overnight parking, including hotel, resort, and similar uses shall comply with the City's parking requirements.

Ms. Moore added that the provision from January still allowed for parking to not be required in buildings constructed prior to 1968 as long as the use did not involve overnight stay.

Vice Chair Reilly confirmed his interpretation of Ms. Moore's clarification was accurate.

Ms. DeWitt stated that per the January proposal any use requiring overnight parking, no matter the age of the building, will be required to provide on-site parking.

Ms. Moore explained that the January proposal removed the verbiage related to "other hospitality related uses" and still allowed for protections related to parking in pre-1968 buildings.

Commissioner Davis stated he would prefer unstrike "permitted uses in buildings constructed prior to 1968."

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER REILLY TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE LDC 25-002; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER HUTCHISON (FAILS 3-3). COMMISSIONER'S DAVIS, KLECZEWSKI, AND MICHELMAN DISSENTING.

Ms. DeWitt stated that this could be moved forward to City Council with a recommendation of denial or a new motion could be made for the January version.

Ms. Bramlette said the January version could be put on screen to compare and discuss the changes from the current proposal.

Commissioner Graham has concerns that the code changes could affect the promotion of tourism and use of the downtown area. She stated that a fee in-lieu of parking should be put aside for a permanent long-term parking solution.

Ms. DeWitt shared the current proposal language and the January proposal language to provide clarity to the commissioners.

Chair Michelman asked if the January version would require construction of a new building for a hotel to provide parking.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed.

Chair Michelman asked if a pre-1968 building that was previously a store converted to a hotel would also require parking.

Ms. DeWitt confirmed.

Commissioner Graham asked if the January proposal would still allow a property owner to demolish part of their building to provide parking.

Ms. DeWitt stated there are provisions that must be met in the LDC and Historic Preservation Master Plan (HPMP) and if all are met, they would be allowed to demo the building.

Vice Chair Reilly stated that in either proposal there is not a lot that can be done to stop and property owner from demolishing their existing building due to private property rights.

Ms. Walton said the idea is to encourage owners of historic properties to maintain or safeguard their historic buildings. She added that there are upcoming LDC revisions that will be studied with a consultant and compare to other communities with historic downtown areas.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS TO RECOMMEND TO APPROVE LDC25-002 AS WORDED AT THE JANUARY 8TH, 2026 PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING; SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KLECZEWSKI (PASSED 6-0).

4. STAFF UPDATES

- A. Update Regarding Approved Final Plat FNP25-007 – Lafferty Ranch.
- B. Update Regarding Approved Revision of Plat RVP25-013 – Idylwild Tract.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Chairman Michelman adjourned the meeting at 10:23 a.m.



DON MICHELMAN, Chairman

ATTEST:



Jacob Lund, Recording Secretary