

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE HELD ON MONDAY, OCTOBER 18TH, 2004, IN THE MEN'S LOUNGE, CLARK MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE, 19 N. NINTH STREET, CLARKDALE, ARIZONA.

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Monday, October 18th, 2004, at 6:00 p.m. in the Men's Lounge of the Clark Memorial Clubhouse.

Planning Commission:

Chairperson	Susan Sammarco	Present
Vice Chairperson	Robyn Prud'homme-Bauer	Present
Commissioners	Dewey Reiersen	Absent
	Bob Noland	Present
	Curt Bohall	Present

Staff:

Planning Director	Steven Brown
Admin. Assistant	Normalinda U. Zúñiga

Others in attendance: Walter J. Wright, Victor Sammarco, Stan & Lynn Makow, Lee & Eunice Gilreath, Bob & Standy Ruppel, Larry & Louise Annen, Ben & Susan Wordinger, Jim & Arlene Crawford, Jim & Carolyn Gary, George Swift, John Lemke, Mark W. Rice, Tami & Joe Gramont, Peter & Doris Gardner, Pat Williams, Eve Sosnowski, Robert Butros, Larry R. Rogers Jr., Arcie Rogers, Doreen Jons, Charity Lange, Marty Brunnermey, Vern & Esther Damme, Sharon Corothers, David & Cheryl Gray, Rodney & Sandy Felitz, Lee & Gail Daniels, Byron Monteith, Chris Boothe, Paula & Jorge Olguin, Perter McIntyre, Edward J. Knight Jr., Henri Prudhomme, Pam Mastrianni, Dan Mastrianni, JD & Karen Maddy, Mike & Mary Caviness, Kent Backus, Craig Backus, Bob Backus, Monty Boudurant, Jim & Sandy Beard, Robert E. Gresen, Lambert Grilach, Jessie Walters, Peg Sarkisian, Steve Phelps, Rosemary Coleman, Jack Langholz, John Razo, Phyllis Razo, Patric M. Gaughan, Gene & Kristina Bunhecy, Deborah & Otho Behr, David Mann, Lew Dodendorf, Soledad Barjas, David & Maria Puzas, Ronald Cronk, Kerrie Bluff, Nancy Wallison, Russ Wallison, Tom Houtson, Nancy Talbot, Phil Terbell, others whose names were illegible, and others who did not sign in.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. REPORTS:

Chairperson's Report: None

Planning Director's Report: Recommendation was made to the Commission that they consider rearranging the agenda to take into account the number of people who were there for the Public Hearing.

Chairperson Noland made a motion to move items 8 and 9 immediately after item 4. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bohall. The motion passed unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

NEW BUSINESS

4. PUBLIC HEARING on the Planned Area Development Application for the Cliffrose Village Subdivision, involving parcel numbers 406-26-012G, 406-29-070B and 406-29-195A. These parcels are located around the Old Jerome Highway, Scenic Drive intersection in the Town of Clarkdale. The Planned Area Development Application is requesting a zoning change for these parcels from R1 to Multi-use, providing for single-family residential, multi-family residential and commercial development.

Planning Director Steven Brown gave a staff report explaining that the applicant has applied for a Planned Area Development Rezoning for 106 acres located around the Scenic/Old Jerome Highway Intersection.

A Planned Area Development (PAD) is defined in the General Plan as:

A comprehensive approach to development of a project that typically includes a mix of uses, subdivision of land, open space designation and the creation of specific zoning rules in a way that allows specific design objectives to be addressed in a unique and flexible manner that benefits the developer and the public at large.

The PAD application has been routed to interested parties for review. Comments have been received back from Yavapai County Flood, and the Fire Department. Copies of their comments are attached.

The Applicant sponsored a Neighborhood Meeting on Thursday, October 14, 2004. Following is a summary of comments and concerns expressed at that meeting along with staff comments in italics where applicable:

Sewer: Surrounding residents questioned whether this development would be required to connect to the sewer system, and what fees they would be required to pay.

Staff has advised the applicant that they will have to provide for this development to be connected to the Town sewer system.

The normal connection and sewer development fees will be applied to each new residence.

Drainage: neighboring residents expressed concern regarding potential flooding caused by this project.

Staff have advised the applicant that they will need to manage drainage onto and off of their property and that they will be required to submit a Phase II Drainage report prior to Preliminary Plat approval.

Water: many concerns were expressed about water and the current drought.

As the Commission is aware, the Town has no regulatory authority regarding water. The applicant has informed staff that they are in negotiations with Cottonwood Water Works to serve this project. Staff has had extensive discussions with applicant regarding use of Xeriscape plants for landscaping and use of effluent during construction if possible. Since the project is outside a water management area, applicant will have to file with the Arizona Department of Water Resources for a determination of serviceability. If they are denied this determination, they will need to include a disclaimer on their Final Plat.

Density: Several comments were made that the project is too dense and that density should remain the same as surrounding neighborhoods.

Average lot size in the Mingus View Estates subdivision is 11,000 square feet. Lot sizes in the Mescal Spur area vary from .5 acre to 2 acres. Lot sizes along Rogers Place and Red Creek Trail average just under an acre.

Staff believes that applicant has addressed some issues regarding transition between neighborhoods but also believes there is room for further discussion, specifically regarding Lots # 30 & 29, and 166-185.

Impact on Schools: Concern was expressed regarding already crowded schools.

Applicant will need to work with Cottonwood School District, as they will be part of that school district and not the Clarkdale Jerome School District, and will contact Sharyl Allen of MUHS in the near future to begin discussion regarding dedicating a school site or in-lieu of compensation.

Building Height: Several request were made to restrict building height to one-story. Current R1 zoning allows for 35 feet in height.

Multi-Family Units: Vocal opposition was expressed regarding inclusion of multi-family units in this project. Homeowners voiced concern regarding a detrimental effect on their property value, also that these units will turn into rentals and the property will not be maintained.

Goal 2-C of the Land Use Element of the General Plan states:

Support housing programs to meet the needs of all residents.

Policy: Encourage a variety of housing opportunities that provide a variety of styles and densities to meet the needs of a diverse population.

Objective 2—C.b

Policy: Support multi-family housing development in areas with adequate infrastructure and where there is adequate separation from lower density development.

Lighting: Concerns were expressed regarding the impact on the night sky.

This development would be subject to the Town of Clarkdale's lighting ordinance that restricts light pollution.

Traffic: The impact on existing streets was questioned.

Applicant will be required to improve Scenic Drive to a Commercial Standard, and the portions of Old Jerome Highway and Mescal Spur that cross their property to a Collector Standard. Staff believes that the applicant has presented a good, overall circulation plan and has allowed for connection to future subdivisions.

The Planning Director also discussed lot sizes and setbacks and asked applicants to provide more information on those two items.

Staff Comments:

The Planning Commission may choose to recommend the approval of the PAD to Council, recommend approval with stipulations, deny the application or request more information.

The Commission must make the following findings in order to recommend approval:

- A. That the proposed Planned Area Development conforms to the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Town.
- B. That the proposed Planned Area Development, as reviewed and approved, will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and general welfare.
- C. That environmental concerns conform with adopted standards.
- D. That the design of the proposed development is sensitive to the physical characteristics of the site.
- E. That the proposed development is consistent with provisions and intents of Zoning Code requirements applicable to the property.
- F. That the proposed development conforms with the improvement standards and design standards set forth in these Regulations and other applicable Town, County, State and Federal regulations.

Staff Recommendation

Staff believes at this time there are too many issues outstanding to recommend approval of this PAD. These include:

- resolving the issue of wastewater management for this project
- setbacks and building envelopes for the project
- density and lot coverage

Staff would also like to request that the applicant be required to submit a Traffic Impact Analysis of this project prior to any action being taken on the PAD so that the findings of the TIA can be incorporated into the application.

Staff requests that if the Planning Commission chooses to recommend approval of the PAD that it include the following stipulations:

1. That Applicant agrees to prepare the following prior to approval of the Preliminary Plat:
 - a. Phase II Drainage report
 - b. Traffic Impact Analysis
 - c. Details on building elevations and footprints for all phases of the proposed development.
 - d. Specific landscaping details to include plant types, locations, and design of watering system.
2. That the Preliminary Plat reflects applicants agreement to improve Scenic Drive to the Commercial Standard for the Town of Clarkdale and the portions of Old Jerome Highway and Mescal Spur included in their development to a Collector Standard.
3. That the Applicant agrees to participate in negotiations of a development agreement to include the following:
 - a. Participation in a Waste Water Improvement District, or some alternative method to fund the sewer infrastructure needed to serve this development.
 - b. Joint access/maintenance agreement for parks and trails.
4. That the applicant will have entered into an agreement with the Clarkdale Jerome School and Mingus Union High School regarding potential school site prior to approval of their Final Plat.
5. The Commercial area, Town Home area, and Recreation facilities shall be subject to Site Plan Review and Design Review.
6. The applicant shall reimburse the Town of Clarkdale for all expenses incurred by the Town in effecting the change in zoning.
7. The Residential lots developed as a part of the Planned Area Development shall be designed in accordance with the lot sizes, setbacks, and Right-of-Way widths indicated on the Final Development Plan.
8. That applicant will make every effort to use non-potable water during construction if available from Clarkdale or Cottonwood.

In addition, comments from the Clarkdale Fire Department were received, which include:

1. Per Clarkdale Town ordinance all town homes (and in this case condos) must have a fire sprinkler system installed.
2. Have engineer contact the Fire Department for fire hydrant quantity and locations.
3. Concerned with the 20 foot drive between the town homes on Old Jerome Highway.

Planning Director Steven Brown stated that staff also has concerns with the last item. In addition, comments from the Yavapai County Flood Control District has expressed some concerns which include:

1. Two regulated FEMA floodplains impact the site and will require the developer to follow the requirements of the Yavapai County Drainage Criteria Manual pertaining to building adjacent to and within FEMA flood hazard areas.
2. Any lot that is entirely or partially within the FEMA flood fringe will require base flood elevations and minimum finished floor elevations on the Final Plat.
3. Building envelopes will be shown on the Final Plat, shown with a minimum 20 foot setback from the flood fringe

Gary Hansen gave a brief introduction of the proposed PAD. Mr. Hansen discussed the use of the General Plan as a guideline for their development.

Adam Langford, working for the Land Design Group, stated that they are applying for PAD which proposes 323 units-which comes out to roughly two units per acre-which include four types of residential, commercial, and open space areas. 29% to 30% of the space would be retained as open space. Mr. Langford stated that the following components were attempted to be tied into the proposal:

- ❑ Open Space
- ❑ Mix of Product type
 - Custom homes – minimum lot size 90 X 100 & go up to 1 acre
 - Village homes 70 X 100
 - Patio homes 56 X 91
 - Town homes – attached
- ❑ Mix of Use
- ❑ Connectivity – pedestrian & automobiles
- ❑ An identifiable center – sense of place

Commissioner Noland asked if the 29% to 30% retained as open space included Mescal Wash.

Mr. Langford stated that yes, it does.

Mr. Langford stated that there would be a 20 foot landscape buffer along Old Jerome Highway. In addition, when a residence is adjacent to open space they would like to have some type of standard fencing that is semi-private and consistent.

Mr. Langford went on to briefly address the following concerns set forth by the staff report:

- ❑ Sewer: Have met with the Town in reference to a Special Improvement District
- ❑ Drainage: Have met with Town Engineer to address this
- ❑ Water: Have been working with Cottonwood Water Works
- ❑ Density: Feels like proposal meets guidelines in General Plan, has had discussion of having one acre lots but feels it will not work
- ❑ Impact on Schools: Have had contact with schools
- ❑ Multi-family Units: Feels this is a key component to development, by providing a different density, different products create a better neighborhood with different people, and different affordable levels for different incomes

- Lighting: Will comply with Town's recommendations on light pollution
- Traffic: Doesn't feel that there is a traffic problem with traffic, but will comply with a traffic analysis at the Town's request

Mr. Langford stated that per meeting with staff, will provide set-back standards for town homes, and minimum square footage for each type of homes proposed. Will comply with Town's building height ordinance.

Vicechair Prud'homme-Bauer made a motion to open the Public Comment.
Commissioner Noland seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

George, 1921 Peregrine Lane, asked "Will each one of these units be owner occupied? Will there be any rental units?"

Joe, 1985 Old Jerome Highway, concerned with space between custom homes next to small town homes, feels like custom homes next to custom homes would work better. Other concerns are light pollution and decrease of property values.

James Gary, 410 Emerald Drive, concerned with drainage of Mescal Wash. Provided photos of fast moving run off in Mescal Wash as a visual of his concern. Asked what drainage is proposed. Feels a large drainage is needed. Also concerned with 138 possibilities of properties turning into rental units. "If you're going to approve changing from R1, 10,000 square foot lots, at least be reasonable and knock out these condos.... We have a right to protect our investments and our lifestyles and all this talk about walking to the video store, the last thing we want in our neighborhood is a video store..."

Stan Makow, 820 Mescal Spur, his comments were cut off at the end of the tape.

Lee, 1800 Old Jerome Highway, concerned with drainage, preserving gulches, and protecting natural environment and animals. "Who will pay the upkeep of taking care of these trails?" On Old Jerome Highway, if the road will be enlarged who will pay for the costs of replacing sidewalks and curbs? Concerned with traffic speed on Old Jerome Highway.

Mary Caviness, 2136 Austin Way, concerned with employment, "Where will all these people work? I don't see an economy here that support these kinds of people that continually come in, which lends itself to a comment made earlier about degradation of neighborhoods because people can't afford to maintain the properties that they purchase..." Another concern is water.

Larry, 581 Antelope Drive, concerned about water in regards to fire, will there be enough to help if there is a fire. Also concerned with drainage and dust control.

Jessie Walters, 1770 Rhinos Place, opposes condos, commercial, property, traffic; concerned about water, drainage issues. "... We can grow, we can grow at a slower pace without having to get slammed all at one time. Commercial properties can come someplace else, across on the Grosetta side, closer up to the #1 Food stores side, it has no place in our neighborhood."

Ray D'Angelo, 2016 Austin Way, concerned with water and the infrastructure to support this development. Do we have enough Fire and Police personnel to support this?

Carolyn Gary, 410 Antelope Drive, concern is with commercial aspect of this project. "I personally like to go to Cottonwood to shop because it makes me grateful to come back to Clarkdale." Also concerned with traffic, and larger populations that want to keep moving here.

George Swift, 800 Evergreen Drive, wanted to know what's going to be done to protect the people's safety that live near the wash, also concerned with where water will be coming from. "I want answers!"

Chris Booth, 123 Sunset Boulevard, "I want to talk about water again because I think it is really shocking that these people from out of town don't know that we are in a D-3 drought area... a D-3 is an extreme drought, we are in the 9th year NOAA says this drought is to persist or intensify and Adam I think this is ludicrous that you use the term 'We understand about the water issue' and then say 'we're going to have turf grass' this is just a massive disconnect from reality and would be laughable if it wasn't so dangerous." Mr. Booth quoted a passage from the paper of the USGS "Recent studies of the geological survey and other scientists suggest that the region may become dryer the next two to three decades, regions population has increased four-fold since the mid 1950's, creating the possibility of severe consequences... You made a mistake with Mountain Gate, don't make it again with Cliffrose – this is going to severely impact us negatively. I know that everyone here and everyone on the commission in your heart of hearts know that don't have the water for this. I would suggest a moratorium. I would plead for a moratorium until the water issue corrects itself..."

Lynn Makow, 820 Mescal Spur, concerned with the six or seven major washes that will have houses built on them. Also pointed out that we are asked to conserve water but the developers are doing the complete opposite.

Mark Rice, 1680 Cholla, concerned with land density and continuity of neighborhoods. Also concerned with schools because they can't hold anymore students. Suggested that you first build the schools then the neighborhood, same with water and sewer and fire and police. Stated that the infrastructure needs to be in place first.

Kerrie Bluff, 910 Main Street/917 Main Street, as a business owner is excited about the prospect of growth in Clarkdale. As a school board member she would like the Wright Trust to know that there are two school districts that need to be dealt with and to her knowledge the High school has been informed. Wanted to encourage the Wright Trust to communicate with the High school and would like to be included in negotiations.

John Razo, Rhinos Way, concerned with the other developments that will occur if this is passed.

Gere, 1841 Peregrine Lane, concerned with the water shortage. “The best part about living Clarkdale is I have to go to Cottonwood for the video, and when I leave, I leave the noise the traffic and the lights. The best part of Clarkdale is I have to go to Prescott for some stuff, and when I leave Prescott I leave the noise and the traffic, and the last thing I want 200 yards from my house is town houses, patio homes and all do respect to whoever, we already have a Patio Town, we don’t need another one in our neighborhood.”

Name inaudible, citizen concerned with buffers and walls, feels like it’s segregating the neighborhoods.

Deborah Behr, 1881 Peregrine Lane, concerned with keeping the area R1 zoning, wants the dark skies, and doesn’t want stores so close by. Also concerned with water, many wells are already having to be drilled deeper. Asked the commission to consider the needs of the community because the commissioners are there to represent them.

Joe, 1985 Old Jerome Highway, concerned with using the 2002 General Plan since it is almost 2005. Concerned with trash during construction.

Peter Gardner, 2100 Red Creek Drive, concerned with development, doesn’t see a need to speed up the process. Also, stated that the R1 zoning works well with the area and doesn’t like the fact that high density homes will be right across the street from his.

Phil Terbell, 1021 Desert Sky Drive, stated that he believed the project is relatively small compared to the size of the community today. Stated that we have needs for a new sewer plant....comments were inaudible....

Steve Phelps, 1731 Silver Spur Circle, concerned about traffic with so many new homes proposed. Also concerned with the density and the possibility of property devaluation.

Rodney Fielitz, 1580 Cholla Lane, stated he received a paper stating that he was a potential participant and wants to know in what.

Commissioner Bohall made a motion to close public comment. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Prud’homme-Bauer. The motion passed unanimously.

5. CONSIDERATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION on Cliffrose Village - for the Planned Area Development Application for the Cliffrose Village Subdivision, involving parcel numbers 406-26-012G, 406-29-070B and 406-29-195A. These parcels are located around the Old Jerome Highway, Scenic Drive intersection in the Town of Clarkdale. The Planned Area Development Application is requesting a zoning change for these parcels from R1 to Multi-use, providing for single-family residential, multi-family residential and commercial development.

Mr. Langford was asked to address the issues raised by the citizens.

Mr. Langford stated that “We are not the builders, we are the developers, so when you are talking owner occupied I can’t tell you whether it will be owner occupied or not, especially in a product like this, town home. Transition, custom lots right next to commercial would not work. You want to talk about weeds and a housing product that’s falling apart. Market wise you will not be able to sell a custom home that’s right next to commercial, I don’t think that would work, that’s why we transitioned highway with condos and these are not attached, they’re single family detached homes on small lots. I just don’t see custom lots next to commercial. Maybe there is some ways to buffer that...”

Mr. Langford also stated that they didn’t have to leave the wash completely open, but did so to accommodate the General Plan. Also stated that the drainage issues would be worked out before preliminary plat approval. In regards to Multifamily Mr. Langford stated that he “doesn’t think it’s about density. It’s about design, and how it looks. It’s not about the density. There’s many places where higher density but it looks good, and it works. And I think it works next the two highways...Curbing, trails, and open space. We’ve talked with the city about this, we want an HOA, a Home Owners Association, how much of this do they take and maintain, do we donate the washes to the city? We are willing to work that out, I think there is some give and take there...Employment. I can’t address that. The market’s there, we wouldn’t be here if the market wasn’t there. I don’t know what else I can say. Water. Going back to the staff report, the Town has no regulatory regarding water... we are in the process of working with Cottonwood Water Works....These people have some problems and want some buffering done, we’ve already talked about working with that, maybe increasing those lot sizes along there. I see this time and time again, people come here because they like it, they want to close the door behind them. They don’t want anyone to follow. So the question is, here’s the document, this is the city’s planning goals and objectives, this is a document, it’s not for 2002 it’s not for 2003, it’s for 10 years... So the question is, how will you grow? How are you going to grow? You will grow. You can’t stop it, you will grow. How are you going to do it, are you just going to be urban sprawl forever 1,100 square foot lots that go on and on? Or are you going to come in and follow the goals and objectives...That’s the big issue, how are you going to grow?”

Vice Chairperson Prud’homme-Bauer stated that there are some serious issues with drainage in this area. “So some of those pictures that were going around with lots of water going down the washes, we have to take that seriously whether it’s a dry year or a wet year... the recommendation of the Phase II drainage report is extremely important to our area, and how that effects Mescal Wash...in terms of density, in terms of the kinds of products you’re offering, and it’s hard to call them products because hopefully they are homes, I think products is a very sterile word. I have some concerns that doesn’t look like a village concept.... Its’ too segregated, I understand the division you’re trying to do with the commercial area around Scenic Drive, I think that’s an attempt for us not to have strip commercial because it’s already zoned commercial around Highway 89A in that area... it doesn’t feel village-like to me. The trails are sidewalks, I have real concerns with that, I have concern

about a trail going down Mescal Wash. That's a wash, let's get it out of the wash, bring it up to the edge of the wash. There's an old railroad right-of-way in there can you use that for a way to get people through and connect the neighborhoods? I see some connection within the new neighborhoods you're creating but I don't see enough connections into the existing neighborhoods.... I do appreciate the walk way put along Old Jerome Highway...."

Mr. Langford asked the Vice Chairperson what was meant by "too segregated".

Vice Chairperson Prud'homme-Bauer stated "You've got three parks that no one from the existing neighborhoods can get to very easily. It doesn't feel it's parks that we can all go to. It feels like they're parks for those neighborhoods only....we need parks out there so that we can have a sense of community, we have no sense of community out there... I'd like to see some breaking up some of the heavy clustering of the town homes and the patio homes all in one area... I'd like to see a less dense design...in terms of variety of housing, yes there is a need of a variety of housing in our area. The protection of the washes is very important to me."

Commissioner Bohall stated that he agreed with the Vice Chairperson's remarks and in addition was concerned with fact the sizes with the lots. Believes they should be larger. Also concerned with "town homes along Old Jerome Highway and Rogers Place area, it needs something different and I don't know what. If I lived there I know I wouldn't like it but it's legal. There's a lot of things in our Town that we don't like that are legal...I live in lower Clarkdale what happens up here is going to affect me and think we got a long way to go before final decisions are made... my primary concern for becoming a member of this commission is to do what is right for Clarkdale. And what is right for Clarkdale may not be right for you, or you, or you back there, but for all of us, that's where we are at. Thank you."

Commissioner Noland stated that he recognizes need for affordable housing, but has concern with density. "You can't make a transition with town homes and custom homes right next to each other, it's impossible. A fence is not going to make a difference. I have major concerns about that and the property owners that are up against those."

Vice Chairperson Sammarco stated that after looking at the proposal and hearing discussions it feels that "you've designed something that fits into the spot but it doesn't fit into the culture of that neighborhood and that concerns me. Again, back to the lot size, it just doesn't look like it fits with this particular neighborhood and it doesn't mean that we don't want to have growth in this area that we don't want to have a variety of housing, because I too think it's extremely important for the health of the community to have places for young families to come in, we can't continue having a retired community and going to be thriving. We need to have opportunities for young people to come in and buy homes.... I'm in favor and support of having a variety of houses within a neighborhood, but again it just doesn't feel like it belongs, it just feels like it's plopped down in the middle of this community, that it's a fine design but it may not fit with the way this particular community is developed. I'd like to see you go back to the drawing board as well and again a wall between custom homes and town homes is not an acceptable barrier...we have concerns about

lighting. I do want to a couple of comments, one about water. If you want a moratorium on building you don't come to the Planning Commission for that, you have to go to the Town and the Council, I'm not sure of the process but it's not something that we can do here so please know that. We also have real restrictions in terms of water because not within our control because we get those notices in the mail too. We are not trying to fight you, we are one of you and share your concern, but we can't make our decisions based on the fact that we are in a drought. If you really feel strongly about that you need to go to the Town Council or take that into initiative for everyone to vote on for a moratorium, I'm just going to put that out there. So we need to do the best we can with this particular development and I think that we need discuss this and we are probably going to send you back to the drawing board.

Mr. Langford stated that he understood that they are at the beginning of the process.

Vice Chairperson Prud'homme-Bauer stated that one thing that might be considered was not having building height any higher than 35 feet throughout the area. The Vice Chairperson also stated that as a personal note to consider "no Residential Review Board, we don't have it anywhere else in Clarkdale, we don't need it in this development. Custom homes will be whatever custom homes will be..."

Vice Chairperson Prud'homme-Bauer made a motion to table this item until the next regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Noland. The motion passed unanimously.

6. **JOINT WORKSESSION-** the Commissioners discussed what might want to be presented in the worksession with the Town Council on October 26, 2004. **Commissioner Bohall** pointed out that in past worksessions there was no dialog with the Council after the presentations. Commissioners agreed that they would like a more interactive worksession with dialog and input.
7. **AJOURNMENT:** With no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

Susan Sammarco
Chairperson

SUBMITTED BY:

Normalinda U. Zúñiga
Administrative Assistant