



Official Minutes of the City of Cottonwood
 Development Review Board Meeting
 Held April 10, 2008 at 2:00 p.m.
 In the Community Development Conference Room
 821 N. Main Street - Cottonwood, Arizona

Call to Order

Chairperson Backus called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

Roll Call

Chairperson Backus	Present	Member Knowles	Present
Vice Chairperson Anderson	Present (late arrival)	Member Wasden	Absent
Member Bartmus	Absent	Member Lovett*	Present
Member Cox	Present	*(P&Z Commiss. Rep)	

Staff Present:

George Gehlert, Community Development Director
 Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Public Present:

Jerry Brown	Sheila Brown	Andy Groseta
Mary Beth Groseta	Perry Humbert	David L. Murphy
Dr. Brad Woodford		

Consideration of Minutes of March 3, 2008.

Member Lovett moved to approve the 3/3/08 minutes as written. Member Knowles seconded. All members present (Vice Chairperson Anderson had not arrived) voted in favor.

DRB 07-061 Family Dollar Store APN 406-32-086 & 017B

Second review of plans for a 9,180 square foot retail store on 1.12 acres zoned C-1 located at the southwest corner of Hwy. 89A and Black Hills Drive. Owner/Agent: Perry Humbert, Moore Humbert Development, LLC.

Chairperson Backus recused himself citing a conflict of interest.

While awaiting Vice Chairperson Anderson’s arrival, Director Gehlert reviewed the process to date explaining that this is the second hearing of this item and recapping details of the project and the prior hearing. He emphasized that this is a high visibility location in the city and cited the highway and roundabout development in front of the project.

Director Gehlert referenced the outline in the packet listing Board comments and the applicant’s responses to them. He highlighted signage as an issue because the building has frontage on three public streets, which allows them three times the typical sign privilege up to two hundred square feet. Director Gehlert said that the applicant addressed all the other issues.

Director Gehlert projected a graphic display from the previous meeting and explained the elevations and architectural details.

Vice Chairperson Anderson arrived and conducted the meeting for the remainder of this hearing item. He invited the applicant to speak.

Perry Humbert, representing the proposed project, showed elevations and reviewed comments and changes since the last presentation as follows.

- Add architectural detail at the columns
- Bring up parapet wall at the back
- HVAC screening detail was added to plans
- Selected river rock stone finish for the base of the columns
- Will install a stone sill at wainscot height around the building
- Have made elevations consistent on the sides
- Chose dark color on bottom to match stone
- Added a seven inch reveal
- Added stone at the base of columns
- Added masonry screen wall for mechanicals
- Added a parapet at the back of the building to match the front of the building
- The light at the back is under a canopy that matches the front canopy.

Vice Chairperson Anderson opened Board discussion. Points of the discussion were as follows.

- Applicant has addressed most of the concerns from the previous meeting.
- Applicant worked with the Utilities Director and they will not need a backflow device because they down sized the meter. Therefore, screening is not an issue.
- Fire suppression is inside the building so it would not need a backflow device.

Chairperson Anderson, who arrived late, asked Director Gehlert if there were staff concerns. Director Gehlert reiterated concerns he expressed at the beginning of the meeting. These were:

- High visibility location
- Recent Santa Fe architecture development nearby has set complexion of development
- Three sides of building face streets
- Applicant has addressed most of those concerns
- The Board should decide how well the architectural style conforms to nearby development.

Member Cox reiterated that the applicant has dressed up the plans and addressed most of his concerns.

Vice Chairperson Anderson asked if there were lighting concerns. Director Gehlert said the only concern was the lighting under the front canopy explaining it could be visible from the road because the building sits higher than the road. Mr. Humbert asked if that lighting could be changed to full flush or recessed can fixtures. He was not comfortable with their proposed enclosed fixtures. Member Cox said he reviewed the lighting and was satisfied with it. Mr. Humbert confirmed that the canopy is not transparent. Member Cox noted that the light fixture shown under the back canopy was a major improvement and should not shine towards Dr. Woodford's office.

Member Lovett questioned the location of the signage. An extensive discussion ensued, which highlighted the following.

- The proposed pecan trees could obscure the monument sign on the north side in a few years.
- The monument sign on the north is the only proposed freestanding sign.
- As proposed, signage is over the 200 square foot limit allowed by code.
- The Board was not inclined to approve additional signage above the 200 square foot limit.
- The Board would like to see a small monument style sign placed on Alamos Drive identifying the entrance to the store because of the circuitous route from Black Hills Drive to the entrance.
- Proposed sign is taller than the maximum allowed fifteen feet. However, the Board expressed no objections.

Vice Chairperson Anderson opened the floor to the public.

Sheila Brown asked for explanations of access to the store from the future roundabout and where trucks would unload. Director Gehlert showed the traffic circulation on the site plan. Mr. Humbert showed the loading dock door on the plan and explained the truck circulation plan.

Several members of the public, including Mary Beth Groseta, Sheila Brown, and Dr. Brad Woodford, expressed opposition to this type of business at this high profile location. Some of their objections were:

- Business would not add value to that corridor
- Even with DRB requirements, the building looks like a steel building
- Existing Family Dollar Store has poor maintenance, garbage, undesirable clientele, and employees who create a nuisance
- Truck traffic would create safety issues for Dr. Woodford's clients.

Director Gehlert explained that the zoning is already in place and "we" (the city) cannot tell them what kind of a store to build. Vice Chairperson Anderson explained that when DRB considered the project at the previous meeting, they required several things to improve the appearance of the building and "fortunately, or unfortunately," the applicant complied.

Ms. Brown asked who decided this was a good building to put on this high profile property. Director Gehlert reiterated that the zoning was in place for a long time.

Dr. Woodford stated that DRB could decide that this does not fit. He said a parapet all the way around is "a must" and talked about all he had put into his building and the negative effect he felt this project would have on him.

After further discussion about the Board's role, Member Lovett noted that Alamos Drive is access to an industrial subdivision. Director Gehlert explained that an industrial subdivision called Coppersgate was proposed at the end of Alamos Drive.

Andy Groseta said he respects private property rights; the property was already zoned as commercial; he understands the role of DRB; and said he wants to make sure that whatever happens in the area adds value. He asked if the old Family Dollar Store would close or if they would have two locations. Mr. Humbert said they would have two locations. Mr. Groseta suggested the following.

- Look at truck circulation and times of deliveries
- Provide a rack for shopping carts

- Present business owner (Dr. Woodford) made a major dollar investment and this project should compliment that investment.

David Murphy questioned why this type business would want to locate there given its out-of-the-way location and what surrounds the site. Mr. Humbert explained the site selection process and said the site worked demographically. Furthermore, the Family Dollar people want better and more prominent sites.

The Board and Mr. Humbert discussed Dr. Woodford's request for a parapet all the way around. Mr. Humbert explained why that would require a substantial redesign of the building citing drainage and the need for different roofing materials that would add mass and weight. He pointed out the clean design of the exiting roof.

Director Gehlert advised the Board that they could decide if the proposal meets surrounding building standards.

Mr. Brown said his concern was not so much the building but more the tenant and the clientele, which is not in the Board's purview. Mr. Backus explained to the audience what DRB tries to accomplish.

The Board looked at the landscape plan. Mr. Brown questioned the screening effect of deciduous pecan trees and suggested using evergreens. Director Gehlert noted that pecan trees are on the recommended plant list. The Board discussed stipulations.

Member Lovett motioned to approve DRB 07-061 with the following twelve stipulations.

- 1. Development in conformance with the site/landscape plan dated 12-2-07; and elevations dated 3-11-08; colors and materials dated 3-12-08.***
- 2. That the development conform to Public Works comments dated 3-25-08; and to the Code Review comments from 1-2-08.***
- 3. Placement of a parapet on the rear elevation.***
- 4. Placement of stone on the bottom of each column to window ledge height.***
- 5. Horizontal banding painted a color darker than the main building color and with ledge stone.***
- 6. Paint the roof "light stone" per the color samples shown to the DRB.***
- 7. Design the three sides (not including the entrance side) in a uniform manner.***
- 8. Screen the backflow device (if one is required).***
- 9. Submit a proposed sign package to staff limiting signage to 200 square feet maximum for the property.***
- 10. Replace pecan trees with similar height trees that require less water, have faster growth rate, and provide year-round screening (recommendation).***
- 11. Install a shopping cart corral.***
- 12. Canopy lights shall not be visible from the highway.***

Member Knowles seconded the motion and the motion carried four to zero with Chairperson Backus abstaining.

Mr. Backus resumed his role as Chairperson.

Board Discussion

▪ **General**

Director Gehlert said he received a submittal from the Center for Creative Education for a mural. The Board engaged in extensive discussion about mural in general and this one in particular. After reviewing the rendering that was submitted, the Board appeared to be unanimous in their opinions as follows.

1. This mural is a sign because another business coming into that location would remove it.
2. The mural would not enhance the area.
3. Most of the members would view it differently if the mural were on the back instead of on the Main Street elevation.
4. Most members would not like it if it were on Main Street.
5. It has no historic significance.

▪ **Reports and Updates**

Director Gehlert reported that there would possible be two large items on the next DRB agenda – the Cottonwood Recreation Center and the Slag Pile.

Adjournment

Chairperson Backus adjourned the meeting at 3:53 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Date Approved _____