



Official Minutes of the  
City of Cottonwood Development Review Board Meeting  
Held July 24, 2008 at 2:00 PM at the  
Community Development Conference Room  
821 N. Main Street Cottonwood, Arizona

---

### Call to Order

Chairperson Backus called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

### Roll Call

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

### Staff Present:

George Gehlert, Community Development Director	Wes Ballew, Staff Planner
City Project Manager, Scott Mangarpan	Carol Hulse, Planning Technician
Parks & Rec. Director, Richard Faust	

### Public Present:

Katie Barnes	Doug Hulse	Jimmy Lawler
Joe Link	Elizabeth LeSueur	

### Consideration of June 26, 2008 Minutes

*The Board postponed consideration of the regular Board meeting minutes of 6/26/2008.*

Director Gehlert and the Board reviewed and clarified actions on three hearing items from the June 26, 2008 meeting as follows.

#### DRB 08-021 High Five Hangar Association

Due to the lack of a quorum for this item on June 26 and the fact that a model for all the hangars at the airpark received approval at a previous meeting, Director Gehlert would review this item administratively. Issues identified were that there would be five units on one lot, adjustments to the taxiway were necessary; there was a residential area within view of this particular site, and the plan required backing into a cul-de-sac, which is a code violation. Director Gehlert highlighted that the issue of backing into the cul-de-sac would be processed as a variance application.

#### DRB 08-006 Verde Valley Shopping Plaza Renovation

Director Gehlert requested clarification on signage and access issues. The Board responded with the following.

1. Three L.E.D. signs are acceptable provided they do not flash nor change messages more rapidly than 15 second intervals.
2. The Board recommended that the height of the two street signs be lowered. Director Gehlert noted that the height of the interior plaza signs might be ok because of a pending code revision that would enable signs of a height similar to the building architecture.
3. The Board wanted the access near the theater side widened and some division down the middle of the access provided if possible.

DRB 08-017 Cottonwood Commerce Center

Director Gehlert identified issues and received clarification from the Board as follows.

1. River rock banding along the base of the building – was river rock required around the windows? The Board was not certain and Director Gehlert said he would review the recording.
2. Did the Board intend to specify photinias for the shielding of the headlights in the Starbucks drive-through? Yes, because they grow fast and thick. The Board also required installation of footings and a short stem-wall as a base of a wall if needed in the future.
3. Did the Board specify a speed table for a crosswalk to Home Depot? Yes. The Board specified a raised area to slow down traffic and provide a delineated crosswalk. Applicant to submit plan.
4. Handicap parking next to Chamber building and adequacy of onsite parking – Director Gehlert talked about the applicant's desire to split the lots, which might create a situation where the Chamber would not have room onsite for handicap parking as required by code. The Board expressed no objections to offsite parking.
5. L.E.D. sign to advertise events. The Board said they were ok with an L.E.D. sign with the same stipulations as DRB 08-006 (no flashing or animation and change no more than every 15 seconds).

**DRB 08-001 Cottonwood Recreation Center APN: APN 406-42-181 / 406-42-182 / 406-42/252B. Review plans for 52,000 sq.ft. recreation center to be located on 5.5 acres at the intersection of South 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Paula Street in a CF (Community Facilities) zone. Owner: City of Cottonwood. Agent: Scott Mangarpan.**

Planner Ballew presented the proposal and explained that the site was recently rezoned to CF (Community Facilities). He projected graphics and explained the location, surrounding sites, and zoning. Mr. Ballew said the access would be from Paula Street to interior parking lots with no parking lots on 6<sup>th</sup> Street. The form of the building mimics historic structures in the area. He showed elevations and photos of surrounding buildings. After discussion of some of the cuts made to the plans to stay within the project budget, Mr. Ballew invited the applicant to speak.

City Project Manager, Scott Mangarpan, deferred to Katie Barnes from Barker Rinker Seacat Architects (BRS). While Ms. Barnes set up a Power Point presentation, Director Gehlert provided history of the project and discussed joint parking issues, architecture, and buffering to the south. Mr. Mangarpan discussed the cuts made to the original plans in more depth and provided details of what will be included in the recreation center.

Katie Barnes introduced herself as an associate principal of BRS and the project manager for this project. She introduced Joe Link of Shephard Wesnitzer Engineering (civil engineer) and Elizabeth LaSuer (landscape architect) of Morris Design.

Mr. Link provided the following information.

- Explained the grading and drainage plan and the way it fits in with the existing tennis courts, nearby residential areas, and the apartment complex.

- There is an eleven-foot drop in grade from the tennis courts to the intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> and Paula streets.
- Provided history of the design work and said they were able to eliminate retaining walls and provide slopes instead.
- The finished floor of the building would be three feet lower than the tennis courts.
- The building would be eight feet higher than the intersection (Paula and 6<sup>th</sup> Streets).
- Portions of the plan are still under design trying to accommodate Fire Department requests.
- They will use an existing sewer line on 6<sup>th</sup> Street.
- There are two water lines on 6<sup>th</sup> Street and they will tie into a new 6-inch line for the fire sprinkler system on the south side of the building and a new 3-inch line.
- The electric and telephone is overhead.
- Gas is on 6<sup>th</sup> Street.
- The project is within 500 feet of a fire hydrant within all directions but the Fire Department wants a hydrant right in front of the building.
- New curb, gutter, and sidewalk would be installed along Paula Street.
- There are existing trees and the plan was designed to preserve as much existing vegetation as possible.

Ms. Barnes talked about parking.

- Experience has determined best parking ratios to size of building.
- The range for recreation centers is between 1 parking space per 250 square feet of building and 1 parking space per 333 square feet of building.
- It is dependent on the demographics of the area and how people feel about sustainability.
- This plan used an average of 1 parking space per 290 square feet and that equaled 182 spaces for the Cottonwood Recreation Center.
- The design showed 214 spaces on site, 41 at the library, 100 at the County Building, and 40 across 6<sup>th</sup> Street, which totaled 395 spaces in the area.
- The architects felt there would be no conflicts with shared parking with the County due to differing peak periods for each user.

Elizabeth LeSueur of Morris Design explained the landscape plan.

- Selected low water use and drought tolerant plants based on the average rainfall in Cottonwood.
- Considered the surrounding landscaping and adding to the fall colors.
- Bicycle racks were centrally located in the plan.
- Provided as much shade and landscaping in the parking lot as possible.

Ms. Barnes continued explaining projected slides of the various perspectives of the building and displayed the material boards. She discussed how features, colors, and materials work together and blend with the surrounding area. She also talked about the durability of the materials selected. She highlighted features such as the glass tower, which would showcase activity in the natatorium and slide area, and the gym that mimics the form of the Senior Center.

Mr. Mangarpan emphasized that the ground-face masonry unit ties in well with the library and public safety buildings.

Chairperson Backus asked some questions that were answered as follows.

- No effluent is available for irrigation.
- Decomposed granite will be under the plants.
- The retention area at the library was lined with large river rock.
- The retention area drains via a scupper through the sidewalk.

Chairperson Backus requested plantings and bushes in the retention area. He also suggested that its shape should not be a square box and insisted it must be designed for maintenance ease to keep it looking nice.

Further questions from Board members and discussion provided the following information and suggestions.

- Rain catchment is on the add/alternate list. The required mechanical and electrical items were costly.
- All new activities would be indoors and the pool renovation would not increase the size. Therefore, there should not be increased noise for the surrounding residential areas. Additionally, there would be CMU walls by the residential areas.
- Racquetball courts are expensive to build for two people to use – it is not cost effective.
- The retention area should be reshaped with trees planted around it and shrubs planted in it.
- From the northwest view, the mechanical side looks like it is separate – it has a flat roof and only one window in the bottom corner. Ms. Barnes and Ms. LeSueur said they would look at landscaping treatment and probably plant a tree there to break up the mass.

Director Gehlert raised several issues. He said an early issue was parking but that looks like it is being resolved. His other issues and the responses follow.

#### Entry from 6<sup>th</sup> Street and pedestrian access

- Ms. Barnes - You have to go around back. The sidewalks going to 6<sup>th</sup> Street are based on egress.
- Mr. Mangarpan – Everyone, except staff, has to come in from the lower parking lot for security and control. From security and function points of view, pedestrian access would not work.

Pedestrian walking environment Mr. Gehlert compared the pedestrian walking environment at the library to the proposed attached curb-sidewalk at this project and asked if something similar to the library could be done here.

- Ms. Barnes – That is a really good idea.
- Mr. Mangarpan – It would be a function of how we deal with the Fire Department and their request to put trucks between the building and the power line.

#### Bus stops

Mr. Mangarpan responded with the following.

- Ms. Scott plans to service the recreation center with the regular bus stop at the library.
- They will do special pickups at the front entrance for handicapped or other special clients.
- If the bus dropped them off at the front of the recreation center, they would have a long walk around the building to the entrance and it would be no closer than the drop-off at the library.
- They may drop people off between the two buildings in the future if demand warrants it.

- They could use Paula Street in the future.

#### Handicap parking

- Mr. Mangarpan and Mr. Link – showed on the plan where the handicap parking would be.
- Mr. Mangarpan – they would only cross a fire lane, not a drive aisle or road.
- Mr. Link – demonstrated where six handicap stalls could be added, if needed, by giving up two regular stalls.

#### Buffering where glass is along 6<sup>th</sup> Street

- Mr. Mangarpan – the glass is more towards the east and south side. There is not a lot of glass along the parking lot.

#### Ugly stuff such as back flow devices or open drainage fixtures

- Mr. Mangarpan and Ms. Barnes – all check valves, irrigation controller, gas, and electric meters, will be screened per landscape plan.
- Ms. Barnes – dumpster would be screened by red CMU walls to match the building. The enclosure would have a metal gate and is screened with landscaping.
- Mr. Link – Back-flow device for fire suppression system is outside the building.

Director Gehlert asked about the uses of the community rooms and the possibility of leasing them out for weddings, etc. Mr. Mangarpan deferred to Mr. Faust or Mr. Little (who were not present) about the management of the rooms. He and Ms. Barnes explained the configuration of the rooms and the adjacent patio area. Mr. Link said there were no walls around the patio area but there would be bushes.

Director Gehlert expressed approval of the way the building design borrowed from the history and architecture of the area. He expressed disappointment that the metal roof was removed as part of the budget cuts.

There was miscellaneous discussion about the colors. Of particular concern was the yellow, which Ms. Barnes said is much lighter than depicted. She displayed the color sample.

Planner Ballew asked if the skylights would affect the residential neighborhoods. Mr. Mangarpan and Ms. Barnes responded with the following information.

- There are no light fixtures directed towards the skylights.
- Most of the skylights face 6<sup>th</sup> Street or face in towards the building. However, some could be seen from the nearby apartments.
- The building would close at 10:00 p.m.
- Some of the skylights may be eliminated due to budget considerations.
  
- There is no residential property situated above the building (as was the case with Wal-Mart).
- There would be minimal lighting at night. The building might “glow” at night but no bright light would come from it.

There was extensive discussion about the roof and the benefits of metal vs. asphalt shingles. Mr. Mangarpan said the cost difference was about \$600,000. Member Cox was concerned that asphalt shingles would radiate heat into the building whereas standing metal seam roofs are

cooling. Ms. Barnes said the proposed roof insulation would have an R-30 rating and the code requires only R-19. The insulation would be a rigid type under the asphalt shingles. Member Cox questioned which tests established the R-value. Ms. Barnes said their sustainable design engineer consultant ran energy modeling and established what insulation should be provided. She said she could have the consultant run a costs/benefits model comparing asphalt shingles with insulation and standing seam metal roofs. Mr. Mangarpan noted that even if there was a five-year payback (with standing seam metal) there would still be the upfront cost.

Member Cox asked about solar panels. Ms. Barnes said there would be solar panels on the flat roof portions but not on the shingles.

Member's questions and ensuing discussion established that

- the roof could be designed to allow replacement with a standing seam roof in the future;
- there are metal roofs other than standing seam;
- a galvanized corrugated roof on the ridge and other high areas to mimic the Senior Center would be added to the add/alternate list.

The next item discussed was river rock. Chairperson Backus noted there was no river rock shown. Ms. Barnes said the original design included river rock but that was eliminated due to cost. Board members questioned whether cultured stone river rock would cost much more than the currently proposed material. Board members suggested using cultured stone river rock in limited, but visible, areas because the City requires other development to use it.

Member Cox praised BRS highly for the way they pulled in different roof silhouettes and styles and combinations of materials of the whole city. He said it could be used as an example of expectations for future developers.

Mr. Mangarpan enumerated possible places to use river rock as follows:

- Wainscoting on the office wing
- Tot lot wall
- Wainscoting on the storage room bump out.

Mr. Mangarpan said that when costs come in and they know what the options for changes are, he would bring that back to the Board if he could get on the agenda quickly.

The Board engaged in discussion about formulating stipulations. During the discussion, Chairperson Backus recommended the use of granite at least ½ inch in size along the sidewalks to avoid it being kicked all over the sidewalks.

***Member Wasden motioned to approve DRB 08-001 with four stipulations.***

- 1. That development in conforms to the site/landscape plan and elevations dated 3-12-08, as may be further modified by the Design Review Board.***
- 2. That the development conforms to the Code Review comments from 1-14-08.***
- 3. That the applicant submits a lumen count sheet that complies with code.***
- 4. That the following are included in the add/alternates list and incorporated if the budget allows:***
  - a. River rock accents on banding and columns and wherever appropriate.***

- b. Corrugated metal roof instead of asphalt shingles (if budget does not allow a full corrugated metal roof, incorporate as much of it as possible in the most visible and highest areas).*
- c. The sidewalk shown on the plans along 6<sup>th</sup> Street be a meandering sidewalk.*
- d. Break up the mass of the wall of the mechanical wing on the northwest elevation with landscaping (including a tree that would be visible from the adjoining administrative office).*
- e. Reshape the retention area to soften the look visually.*

*Member Knowles seconded and the Board voted unanimous approval.*

### **Board Discussion**

- **General**

The Board considered and voiced approval of a requested color change to a less intense and more earth-tone shade on the previously approved (DRB 07-014) Shaw-Schlegel building at 698 Cove Parkway. Jimmy Lawler agreed to provide a dry paint sample for the file.

Chairperson Backus announced he would be absent for the August (and possibly the September) meetings. Vice Chairperson Anderson may also be absent. Member Cox agreed to serve as Acting Chairperson until either Chairperson Backus or Vice Chairperson Anderson returns.

- **Reports and Updates**

Director Gehlert reported on the possible agenda for the next meeting, which he expected to include Fry's gas station and a sign code amendment regarding height standards.

### **Adjournment**

*Chairperson Backus adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m.*

Minutes prepared by Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Date Approved October 23, 2008