

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2005, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE CLARK MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE, 19 NORTH 9TH STREET, CLARKDALE, ARIZONA

A regular meeting of the Design Review Board of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Wednesday, March 9, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the Clark Memorial Clubhouse, 19 North 9th Street, Clarkdale, AZ.

Board Members:

Chairperson	Ed Knight	Present
Board Members	Hank Stevens	Present
	Peggy Chaikin	Present
	Ellie Bauer	Present

Staff:

Planner Manager	Beth Escobar
Administrative Assistant	Charlene Stockseth

Others in Attendance: Michael and Kerrie Bluff, Ralph Roney, W. Alan Kenson.

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Knight called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL:** Administrative Assistant Stockseth called roll.
3. **MINUTES:** Board Member Bauer made a motion to approve the minutes of January 12, 2005, and February 9, 2005. Chair Knight seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **REPORTS:**

Vice Chairperson: Two more candidates have been interviewed for the DRB member opening. There are a total of five applicants. The Council now makes a decision for appointment.

Planning Manager: The Community Development Department received a complaint from a community member regarding the lighting ordinance. The complaint was addressed at staff level and the complainant was sent a letter addressing the concerns. Most of the complaints were non-conforming, preexisting; lights that have been in existence since the newest lighting ordinance has been adopted. The policy states lights can stay in existence until the entire light stops functioning; bulbs can be replaced, however, if lights stop functioning or are removed for some reason, then the new lighting must meet the lighting ordinance. The complaint also brought up some points, which staff has already identified, regarding the definition of opaque. Staff asks that perhaps when the Board is choosing future agenda items, staff could be directed to bring some of those concerns to the Board in a report.

A power point presentation was distributed to Board members to review for the joint worksession with Council that is scheduled for March 22, 2005. Chair Knight stated he would make the presentation to Council.

Training is again available for Board members on Conflict of Interest and Ethic Laws to be held in Phoenix, AZ. Registration forms were distributed to the Board.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

OLD BUSINESS

6. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION** – on landscape ordinance changes. The Board recommended using the term “use of permeable landscape where appropriate is encouraged.” Board member Bauer motioned to approve the landscape ordinance with the recommended change and staff send the landscape ordinance to Council. Board member Chaikin seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.
7. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION** - on recommended changes to the Site Plan and Design Review section of the Zoning Code. Staff recommend the Site Plan Review and the Design Review applications be separated. The Board approved the staff recommended changes to the Site Plan and Design Review section of the Zoning Code. Board member Bauer motioned approval with the recommended changes and staff send the Site Plan and Design Review section to Council. Chair Knight seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous.
8. **REPORT ON SITE PLAN/DESIGN REVIEW BOARD APPLICATION FROM MOLD IN GRAPHICS:**

Staff Report:

Applicant is requesting site plan/design review for two additional buildings at the Mold in Graphics facility at 999 Highway 89A.

Building A is approximately 8,750 square feet and Building B is approximately 3,600 square feet. Both buildings will be used for storage.

The Town Engineer has reviewed the site plan with comments regarding storm water detention. The Fire Marshall has approved the site plan.

A copy of the comments from Yavapai County Development Services Department and the applicant’s response were included with this report.

A copy of a letter from Cottonwood Water Works was also included.

Assessments of Site-Plan Review Standards& Criteria

Staff requests that the Design Review Board review the application in accordance with the Approval Standards and Criteria outlined in Chapter 5, Section W.E. Staff comments regarding these standards follows in italics.

1. **Utilization of the Site:** The plan must reflect the natural capabilities of the site to support development. Environmentally sensitive areas must be maintained and preserved.

The site has been in continued use as light industry since 1992. The proposed additions meet all zoning requirements of the Town of Clarkdale Zoning Code for Industry.

2. **Traffic Access & Parking:** The parking space standard for the Industrial Zone is one space per 1000 square feet or 1.5 spaces per employee. Currently, Mold in Graphics has 85 employees and the total square footage, including the additions, is 79,000 square feet. There are currently 120 parking spaces provided, including five ADA spaces. This meets the zoning code requirement.

Applicant is aware of the planned roundabout at this location and that this will affect the traffic flow at the site.

3. **Pedestrian Access:** Per applicant, employees will move to and from the new building via paved areas, either on foot or on a forklift.
4. **Storm water Management.** The response from Yavapai County Development Services states that the area is not in a Federal Floodplain. The area drains into the east and not into Deception Wash.

YC Development Services included a checklist used for all commercial development. Applicant has responded to that checklist in a letter dated February 18, 2005.

The applicant will need to address the issue of runoff, either through an engineered grading plan, or a grading plan that meets the approval of the Public Works Manager.

5. **Erosion Control:** The grading plan to be required must include plans for dealing with runoff during the construction phase of the project.
6. **Water Supply:** Comments have been submitted by Cottonwood Water Works regarding the location of the fire hydrant and the minimal fire flow capabilities of the existing water line.

The existing water system at the property does not provide adequate fire flow water pressure to the site; however, both of the new buildings will be sprinkled.

7. **Sewage Disposal :** This facility is currently connected to sewer; the two new buildings will also be connected to sewer.
8. **Utilities:** *Letters of serviceability have been provided by all pertinent utilities.*
9. **Natural Features:** Deception Wash traverses the northwest corner of this property.

The property slopes from the rear towards Hwy 89A.

10. **Groundwater Protection:** The Public Works department has reviewed the application and requests that the applicant provide run off protection for the property to the south, Valley View Cemetery, due to the proximity of the proposed asphalt drive way to the property lines.

The applicant will need to address the issue of runoff, either through an engineered grading plan, or a grading plan that meets the approval of the Public Works Manager

11. **Water Quality Protection:** Applicant has an existing plan for appropriate disposal of any hazardous waste.

Impact on water quality during storm events should be addressed by the grading plan being required.

12. **Hazardous, Special and Radioactive Materials:** *Applicant states that:*

“Any hazardous and special wastes used in cleaning are disposed of via UNIVAR, 50 S. 45th Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85043”

13. **Capacity of the Applicant:** *Staff believes that the applicant has sufficient financial capacity to complete this project.*

14. **Solid Waste Management:** *Applicant has an existing working plan for disposal of solid waste. The trash dumpster on site is appropriately screened*

15. **Historic and Archaeological Resources:** *There is no historic or archaeological resource report on file for this property.*

16. **Floodplain Management:** *Yavapai Development Services states that this development will not have a direct impact on the floodplain.*

17. **Exterior Lighting:** *Exterior lighting on the buildings will be soft type, fully shielded and recessed into the building, producing a downward light path.*

18. **Buffering:** There is an existing buffer of approximately thirty feet between the proposed new buildings and the neighbor to the west, the Clarkdale Town Cemetery. This buffer is landscaped with gravel and Cypress trees, additional landscaping is indicated on the plans.

The proposed landscaping includes Buffalo Juniper, Tam Juniper, and Purple Leaf Plum. Although not on the recommend plant lists, according to Arizona Botanicals, both of the Junipers are appropriate for the area. They are both low growing, from 1-1.5 feet in height, and wide spreading, 10-15 feet in distance.

19. **Noise:** Applicant will report on noise and hours of operation at the meeting. The Town of Clarkdale’s Zoning Code for Industrial Areas requires that noise will not exceed a specific level. Generally, noise should not be a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood.

20. **Storage Materials:** Applicant will report on materials to be stored at the meeting.

The exterior of the new buildings will match the exterior of the current buildings.

Board Action:

The Design Review Board may approve the plan as submitted, approve with conditions/stipulations, or deny as filed.

If the Board decides to approve the application, staff requests that the following stipulations be included:

1. That the applicant will submit a revised site plan with grading specifications to be reviewed by the Public Works manager that specifically addresses run off management during construction and once the project is completed.
2. That the applicant provide plans for on-site storm water detention.
3. That applicant submits documentation regarding the historical/archaeological resources at the site.
4. That the applicant submits a letter documenting their plan for internal circulation of traffic and pedestrians.

If the Board approves the application, a copy of the plans as approved must be provided to the Town with a signature line for the Design Review Board Chairman. Upon signing, the approved plan must be filed with the County Recorder's office within thirty days of approval.

W. Alan Kenson, 6135 Corsair Avenue, Prescott, AZ; Ralph Roney, P.O.Box 1650, Prescott, AZ made the presentation for the Mold in Graphics application, 999 Hwy 89A, Clarkdale, AZ. Mr. Kenson addressed each of the issues above. Board members were concerned with noise and the proximity of the cemetery. Mr. Roney stated the owners and employees are very sensitive to the happenings at the cemetery and stop any outside activity during cemetery functions. The Board also had concerns about Historic/Archaeological Resources. Staff stated there was no report on file. The Board directed Staff to research any history of Historic/Archaeological resources for that property and report back to the Board.

Board Decision:

Board member Chaiken made a motion to approve the application with the following stipulations:

1. The applicant will submit a revised site plan with grading specifications to be reviewed by the Public Works manager that specifically addresses run off management during construction and once the project is completed.
2. That the applicant provide plans for on-site storm water detention.

3. The Board directed Staff to research any historical/archaeological resources that may be on the site and submit a report to the Board.

The Board eliminated the Staff recommendation that the applicant submit a letter documenting their plan for internal circulation of traffic and pedestrians. The Board felt this issue had been addressed appropriately.

Board member Bauer seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

9. **DISCUSS SCHEDULING BRAINSTORMING SESSION TO IDENTIFY AND PRIORITIZE FUTURE PROJECTS.** Staff suggested this be deferred/discussed at the May 11, 2005, meeting.

NEW BUSINESS:

10. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION** – on Design Review Application from Copper Bluff Investments, Inc.

Kerrie and Michael Bluff, P.O. Box 26, Clarkdale, AZ, presented their application for the remodel of the 10/12 Lounge located at 910 Main Street, Clarkdale, AZ. Kerrie and Michael Bluff conducted a presentation on the materials and colors that would be used on the outside of the building, the front entrance wooden door, the original outside illuminated sign and the block glass that will be in the front and side of the building for natural inside lighting. The Board also reviewed a sample of the gravel to be used for landscaping in front of the building. Kerrie and Michael Bluff also comments on specific issues that were mentioned in the Staff Report.

Staff Report:

The original, non-historic building at 910 Main Street was demolished with a permit from the Planning Department earlier this year. As stated in Section 17-4-2 of the Town Code:

The purpose of the Design Review Board is to review the exterior design of proposed new buildings, proposed alterations to buildings and major development or redevelopment projects which do not include new buildings within the Town of Clarkdale, in order to insure that new development or redevelopment is compatible with the surrounding environment, and to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the Town of Clarkdale, as applicable.

The Design Review Board shall review applications for design approval of new construction, alterations, additions, or renovations to existing buildings or structures and shall have the power to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such requests. The decisions will be based on the following criteria:

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

2. **Proportion:** The relationship of the width of the building or structure to its height shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures and places to which it is related or shall be maintained as original whenever feasible.
3. **Openings:** The relationship of the width of the windows and doors, to the height of windows and doors in the building shall be visually compatible with buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
4. **Pattern:** The relationships of solids to voids in a facade of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings, structures and places to which they are related.
5. **Spacing:** The relationship of the building to the open space between it and the adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
6. **Entrances, Porches and Projections:** The height, projection, supports and relationship to streets and sidewalks, of entrances, porches, awnings, canopies and balconies of a building shall be visually compatible to the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
7. **Material, Texture and Color:** The materials, textures and colors of the facade 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.
8. **Roofs:** The roof shape and materials of a building shall be visually compatible with the buildings to which it is related.
9. **Architectural Details:** Doors, windows, eaves, cornices and other architectural details of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings and structures to which they are related.
10. **Accessory Features:** Garages, carports, sheds, enclosures, walkways, stairways, and landings shall be visually compatible with buildings and structures to which they are related.
11. **Landscaping:** Landscaping shall be visually compatible with the landscaping around the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
12. **Lighting:** Any on-site illumination shall be architecturally compatible to the overall project and not create a negative or visually detrimental effect on the building or neighboring properties.

Staff Comments:

Included are some pictures of the Downtown area that will give the Board a reference when interpreting the structural, textural, design, color, and material compatibility with the proposed structure.

The applicant has stated that the original 10/12 sign will be restored and placed on the front of the building. The applicant has included a picture of the original sign for reference.

The Town Code defines Historic Clarkdale as: An area in which architectural features and details shall be preserved with original or traditional textures and colors.

Staff has noted that no stucco material is used on the surrounding buildings.

Staff has noted that glass block windows are only used moderately on surrounding structures; they are not the sole window openings. Most surrounding buildings have large windows and use glass block only as accents.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Board review the material and approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove this application based on the above-mentioned criteria.

Board Decision:

After discussion with the applicant regarding the use of alternative materials, other than stucco, and the use of existing rock, Board member Bauer made a motion to approve the application as presented. Chair Knight seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

11. **ADJOURNMENT:** Board member Chaikin motioned the meeting adjourn. Chair Knight seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

APPROVED BY:

SUBMITTED BY:

Ed Knight
Chairperson

Charlene Stockseth
Administrative Assistant