

*Design Review Board
October 3, 2012*

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 3, 2012, AT 6:30 P.M. IN THE MEN'S LOUNGE OF THE CLARK MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE, 19 N. NINTH STREET, CLARKDALE, AZ.

A **Regular Meeting** of the Design Review Board of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Wednesday, October 3, 2012, at 6:30 p.m. in the Men's Lounge of the Clark Memorial Clubhouse, 19 N. Ninth Street, Clarkdale, AZ.

BOARD MEMBERS:

Chairperson	Phil Falbo	Present
Board Members	Marsha Foutz	Present
	Robyn Prud'homme-Bauer	Present
	Kerrie Snyder	Absent
	John Stevenson	Present

STAFF: Community Development
Senior Planner
GIS/Planner II

Beth Escobar
Guss Espolt

Others in Attendance: Bill Snyder, Kurt Snyder.

- 1. AGENDA ITEM: CALL TO ORDER:** The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- 2. AGENDA ITEM: ROLL CALL:** The Senior Planner called roll.
- 3. AGENDA ITEM: MINUTES:** Consideration of the **Regular Meeting Minutes of July 11, 2012.** Board Member Foutz motioned to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of July 11, 2012. Board Member Stevenson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. AGENDA ITEM: REPORTS:

Chairperson & Member's Special Events Report: Board Member Foutz provided an update on the Verde River @ Clarkdale project, informing the Board that the river stretch from Tapco to Riverfront Park is now open for kayakers and canoes.

Director Report: None

- 5. AGENDA ITEM: PUBLIC COMMENT:** There was no public comment.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 6. AGENDA ITEM: WELCOME NEW BOARD MEMBER:** John Stevenson

*Design Review Board
October 3, 2012*

7. AGENDA ITEM: ELECTIONS: Chairperson and Vice Chairperson.

Board Member Foutz made a motion to elect Board Member Prud'homme-Bauer as Chairperson. Board Member Falbo seconded the motion. Board Member Prud'homme-Bauer accepted the nomination and was elected unanimously.

Board Member Prud'homme-Bauer motioned to elect Board Member Foutz as Vice Chairperson. Board Member Falbo seconded the motion. Board Member Foutz accepted the nomination and was elected unanimously.

8. AGENDA ITEM: DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION: Design Review-DRB#090370, 910A 1ST South St Building, Assessor's Parcel Number 400-03-171.

Staff Report:

Background:

The applicant is requesting approval to replace the existing barn wood siding with stucco. The barn wood was placed on the corrugated metal shell of the building many years ago and is deteriorating.

Per Section 11-4 of the Zoning Code:

'The Design Review Board shall review applications for design approval of new construction, alterations, additions, or renovations to existing buildings or structures...'

Staff Comments:

Although the barn wood siding is an attractive finish for the building, staff understands the desire to replace a deteriorating siding with a more permanent finish. In staff's opinion, since the stucco will be finished with a color similar to the other existing buildings on the site, this proposal meets criteria #1 and # 7 of the review criteria for Design Review approval:

1. **ARCHITECTURAL MERIT:** The architecture and design shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.

7. **MATERIAL, TEXTURE AND COLOR:** The materials, textures and colors of the façade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials, textures and colors used in the buildings and structures to which they are related.

Per Section 304.1 of the International Property Maintenance Code, Article 9-4 of the Town Code:

'The exterior of a structure shall be maintained in good repair, structurally sound and sanitary so as not to pose a threat to the public health, safety or welfare.'

Staff appreciates the applicant addressing the deterioration of the building's exterior before it becomes a code enforcement issue.

Design Review Board
October 3, 2012

Application of stucco to an existing building does not require a building permit; however, the Building Official does conduct a courtesy inspection of these projects.

Recommendation: Staff is recommending the Design Review Board approve this request.

- b. Questions of Staff – None
- c. Questions of Applicant – Board Member Stevenson asked if the applicant had plans for the barn wood that is to be removed. Mr. Kurt Snyder informed the board that a woodworker will reclaim the wood.
- d. Discussion – Board Member Foutz suggested the applicant use a darker shade of color on the shed building to provide some contrast.

ACTION: Board Member Foutz motioned to approve DRB #090370, 910A 1st South Street Building, Parcel Number 400-03-171, stucco siding request as presented, with the suggestion that the applicant consider a darker shade in the same color palette. Board Member Prud'homme-Bauer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

9. AGENDA ITEM: WORKSESSION: Discussion regarding revisions to Chapter Seven – Sign Code of the Town of Clarkdale Zoning Code.

Background:

At the July 11, 2012 meeting, the Design Review Board gave specific direction to staff regarding proposed changes to the Sign Ordinance. In order to respond to this direction, staff has prepared a matrix comparing sign code information from the City of Cottonwood, Town of Camp Verde, City of Sedona and Yavapai County. Comparisons are listed in five categories: Banners, Portable, 'A' Frame Signs, Projecting Signs, Window Signs, and Maximum Total Sign Area.

Below is the direction given by the Board at the July 11th meeting with staff's comments included:

- Look at codes from other municipalities regarding banner permits. The Board would prefer a blanket, annual banner permit, with one fee and no 30-day limitation.
 - All four government entities researched for the comparison matrix set a maximum display time for banners, with seven days being the shortest time, and 30 days being the maximum. Two entities require permits, two do not. Staff still strongly supports requiring a permit for each banner. This is the only way staff will be able to monitor the time period for a banner. This permit fee would be established by Town Council. Staff would recommend a nominal fee of \$10-15 dollars per permit.
 - Staff also believes a 30-day maximum for a banner is a reasonable limitation. After 30 days, the banner loses impact and may become worn and torn. See Section 7-6-M, page 11.
- Add a maintenance section.
 - See Section 7-2-L, page 3.
- Add a requirement that the back of signs must be finished with a non-reflective surface.

*Design Review Board
October 3, 2012*

- See Section 7-2-M, page 3.
- Add the option to use rock scape around the bottom of freestanding signs
 - See 7-6-B-3, page 6.
- Amend the draft section regarding portable signs to allow in commercial zones.
 - Section 7-7-H-1, page 9 has been amended to allow portable signs in commercial zones. Also, the restriction for portable signs to be only allowed for restaurants, etc. has been deleted.
 - The maximum sign size has been amended to 6 feet. This is consistent with other municipalities and the newly adopted sidewalk café ordinance.
- Allow one portable sign per business.
 - See 7-6-H-3, page 7.
- Develop specifications to guide use of attractive portable signs.
 - Staff believes Section 7-1, page one, provides an outline for all types of signs. This section provides broad direction to business owners without eliminating design possibilities. The Design Review board will also have the opportunity to guide the look of a sign during the review process.
- Add a requirement to the sign walker section restricting use to hours of operation.
 - This section has been moved out of the Subdivision Advertising section and listed as a separate section, 7-6-K, page 9, since sign walkers may be used for other types of businesses.
 - Text was added about the hours of operation.

As staff continued to review Chapter 7 of the Zoning Code, the following recommended changes have been made:

- A table of contents has been added.
- Electronic signs have been added to the prohibited sign list. (Page 4)
- The non-conforming sign information has been moved out of the permitted sign section, and placed in a separate section to avoid confusion. (Page 4)
- Regulations for signs for business related activities, like a Bed & Breakfast and Home Occupation, that may occur in a residential zoning district have been moved to a separate section, 7-6 for clarity. (Page 5)
- Neon sides have been added to the permitted sign section. (Page 7)
- Section 7-7-H has been changed to allow projecting signs in all commercial and industrial districts. The prohibition against a projecting sign being on the same wall as a wall sign has been removed. A requirement for an indemnity agreement has been added if the sign projects over public right-of-way. (Page 9)
- Section 7-7-M has been renamed to include a reference to banners. (Page 11)
- The Permitted Signs section has been alphabetized for ease of use.
- A Permitted Sign Matrix has been created and added to the end of the code.

*Design Review Board
October 3, 2012*

In addition, after discussion at the last meeting and examination of sign codes from other government entities, staff has added a Section, 7-8, page 13, which provides the total sign square footage allowable based on linear street frontage. The cumulative maximum includes all wall, window, projecting, and freestanding signage but not temporary or portable signs. Staff notes monument signs are not an option for businesses along Main Street; however, this is the location most likely to use portable signs.

This maximum will apply to commercial businesses only, not subdivisions or other types of signs.

In developing this new wording, staff tried to balance allowable signage with the size and the street frontage of the building. The larger the property, the more signage is allowed. For example, businesses may develop along the SR 89A corridor similar in size to a Wal-Mart or a Target. The Wal-Mart in Cottonwood has extensive signage; however, it is not overwhelming because of the size of the building and the relative length of the street frontage.

For large developments, such as the Crossroads at Mingus commercial area, a master sign package will be required. Having a cumulative size maximum allows the developer freedom to determine the most effective signage for their development. Through the design review process, the Board will be able to determine whether the signage proposed presents the best balance.

Sections of the code referring to other size maximums for commercial businesses have been deleted.

Board Discussion:

The Board discussed various aspects of the draft ordinance, specifically the requirement for a banner permit and the allowance of neon signs. Staff shared pictures of recent banners placed by a commercial business. Discussion ensued regarding creating quality guidelines for banners, including prohibition of hand painted signs and prompt removal of damaged banners.

The Board agreed that neon signs are appropriate in all commercial areas; however, they should not be illuminated when the business is not open.

The Board emphasized that the new ordinance should be easy to use by the business community, provide clear guidelines, and allow flexibility in support of local businesses.

Recommendation: The Design Review Board recommended that the draft revised Sign Code ordinance be moved forward to be reviewed by the Planning Commission in a public hearing with the following modifications:

- Allow for an annual banner permit that would allow an unlimited number of banners for a one-time fee. Include quality control guidelines in permit application.
- Allow neon signs in all commercial districts. Require that neon signs be extinguished after business hours.

10. AGENDA ITEM: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS:

Staff informed the Board that the site plan review for the Crossroads at Mingus Park may be on the December agenda.

*Design Review Board
October 3, 2012*

11. AGENDA ITEM: ADJOURNMENT: Board Member Foutz motioned to adjourn the meeting. Board Member Prud'homme-Bauer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 7:30p.m.

APPROVED BY:



Chairperson

SUBMITTED BY:



**Beth Escobar
Senior Planner**