



Official Minutes of the Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
of the City of Cottonwood
Held, February 25, 2008 at 6:00 PM at the
Council Chambers
826 N. Main Street - Cottonwood, Arizona

Call to Order

Chairperson Gillespie called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.

Roll Call

Chairperson Gillespie	Present	Member Kevin	Present
Vice Chairperson Kiyler	Present	Member Lovett	Present
Member Fisher	Present	Member Smith	Present
Member Gonzales	Present		

Staff Present:

George Gehlert, Community Development Director
Wes Ballew, Planner
Charlie Scully, Planner
Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Public Present:

Altizer, John W.	Dupont, Barb	Pender, Tom
Bremner, Elaine	Hall, Robert	Redding, David M.
Brown, Merlyn	Hurkett, Tom	Richards, Bob
Burden, Ronald C.	McInnis, James W.	Vick, Mike
Clarke, Michael	Oliphant, Bob	

Consideration of minutes from the January 14, 2008 Commission work session.

*Commissioner Kevin motioned to approve the January 14, 2008 minutes as presented.
Commissioner Gonzales seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

Consideration of minutes from the January 28, 2008 Commission meeting.

*Commissioner Kevin motioned to approve the January 28, 2008 minutes as presented.
Commissioner Gonzales seconded and the motion carried unanimously.*

**PCU 239 Review of a Conditional Use Permit to allow an antique shop in an R-3 (Multi-Family Residential) zone, located at 1216 E. Mingus Ave. APN: 406-37-046A, 044A.
Owner/Applicant: Janet Hall**

Planner Ballew presented the staff memo displaying an aerial photo, surrounding zoning, and a site plan from the file.

He said the site is zoned R-3 and all adjacent parcels are also zoned R-3. The original use permit was last reviewed on November 15, 1999 and expired on November 15, 2004.

The most recent review of the Use Permit stipulated that outdoor storage be allowed as long as there are no complaints. It also stipulated that all parking be on-site. However, there have been several complaints from the public about the outdoor storage of the site and the general condition of the property. Customers and or employees of the business regularly park on the sidewalk and in the bike lane and a large amount of merchandise is being stored and sold outdoors. Also, the screening fence required by the original Use Permit is now falling down.

Planner Ballew said a Code Review Board meeting was held to discuss the Use Permit with the applicant on October 30, 2007. The applicant was notified of the outdoor storage and parking issues that were discussed at that meeting. The applicant then called to notify the department that she wanted to close the business as soon as she sells all the remaining merchandise.

Staff brought this Use Permit to the Commission for review to prevent the violations from remaining for an indefinite time. Staff recommends revocation of the Use Permit and that the business close within thirty days of this hearing. If the Commission wishes to allow the business to remain open, or if the applicant decides she does not want to close the business at this time, staff would recommend the following stipulations.

1. That parking be contained on the premises. The applicant owns the adjacent vacant lots. If she wishes to use that lot for parking, then she would need to pave the parking and driveway areas with a hard, dust-free surface, per Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance Section 406.C.2.c. Parking on the street, sidewalk, or bike lane is strictly prohibited.
2. That all outdoor storage violations be remedied immediately. All outdoor display of merchandise should be removed, and any trash and debris be cleaned up.
3. That the screening fence required in the original use permit be repaired
4. That a new sign be made for the site that is professionally rendered.

Chairperson Gillespie asked if the applicant was present. When there was no response, Planner Ballew noted he talked to her two weeks ago and she knew about the meeting.

Commissioner Lovett asked if the applicant requested time to close the business. Planner Ballew said she did not.

Chairperson Gillespie opened the floor to the public. When no one spoke for or against the proposal, he closed the floor to the public and opened it for Commission members' discussion.

The Commission discussed such things as what would happen if she did not close in 30 days and if a purchaser of the property would have to come in for a conditional use permit. Director Gehlert said that if closing was a stipulation and she did not close, that would be a violation and enforcement would begin. A new owner would need to apply for a conditional use permit to conduct a business at that location. Commissioner Kevin believed the owner would not be able to sell the entire inventory in 30 days and suggested a stipulation that the property be cleaned.

Commissioner Fisher motioned to revoke PCU 239 for noncompliance with previous stipulations and stipulated a thirty-day time limit for removal of all inventory, trash, and debris from the property. Vice Chairperson Kiyler seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

PCU 07-047 Consider request for a conditional use permit to allow outdoor display and rental of U-Haul trailers and equipment at the Cottonwood Auto Spa located at 920 Camino Real. APN: 406-04-046H. Owner: Camino Real Auto & RV Wash LLC dba Cottonwood Auto Spa. Applicant: Michael Clarke.

Planner Ballew explained the request and displayed and explained a locator map, zoning map, and site photos. He presented the following information

The property is located along the west side of Camino Real within a C-1 zone. The Applicant wishes to use the Southeast Corner of the property, at the corner of Camino Real and Elm Street, for outdoor display and rental of the U-haul equipment. Areas across the street to the east are zoned C-2 (including the recently developed Sedona Shuttle operation and associated short-term vehicle parking area); and R-3 (currently developed as the rear access to Home Depot). Areas across Elm Street to the South are zoned AR-43 (developed as a church site). Areas to the west within the same parcel are zoned C-1 (including the outdoor auto detailing area). Areas further west, behind the auto detailing area, are zoned R-3 (developed as Verde Vista Apartments).

The predominant issue with the proposal has to do with screening. The apartment complex to the East is on a hill overlooking the site and will look directly on the proposed use. Also, Camino Real will be impacted visually by the use. Any attempts to screen the use, short of building a structure to store the equipment, would not screen the use from the apartments above. There is no way to screen the use from the adjacent residential neighborhood. The trailers will have advertising on them and just the trailers themselves will visually impact the adjacent residential neighborhood as well as Camino Real. There is no screening proposed.

Although outdoor oriented commercial uses are generally not encouraged by CUP in a C-1 zone, the site is located amid a variety of indoor and outdoor oriented uses and development, as well as a variety of access routes and parking facilities. Yet, a multi-family residential development is also located nearby. Given this assortment of development, and screening difficulties, Staff would like to entertain some discussion from the Commission regarding the appropriateness of this use, in this particular location.

Should the Commission consider approving the request, Staff offers the following stipulations:

1. Approval subject to the submitted site plan, as may be further amended by the Commission.
2. Submittal of an upgraded landscaping proposal for the retention area.
3. Applicant obtains sign permits for any additional signage.
4. Review in one year.

Commission members and Planner Ballew discussed that vehicles would not be parked in the retention area and landscaping would be installed to prevent such parking.

Chairperson Gillespie invited the applicant to speak.

Michael Clarke Said he had no problem was anything Mr. Ballew said. He explained that the only visual impact is driving down Fir Street where you also see the Home Depot pallet mess. Ninety five percent of the apartment windows face to the northeast. Only two windows face his

property. His property is eighteen feet below the first level of the apartments. He agrees with the stipulations. He is starting to landscape now.

Questions and answers elicited the following information from Mr. Clarke.

- There would be a maximum of twenty units on the property at any time.
- There would be no signage other than what is on the U-Haul units.
- Incidentals such as boxes would be stored in the existing building.
- Mr. Clarke does not know how to provide additional screening on the apartment side because of the differences in elevation.
- The front of the U-Haul units he would face the apartments to minimize the billboard effect of the units.

Commissioner Fisher stated that the commission has an obligation to preserve as much residential property as possible.

Chairperson Gillespie asked if the intent of stipulation number three (regarding signage) had to do with the U-Haul units themselves. Director Gehlert said the applicant has not proposed additional signage and the stipulation is standard. Commissioner Fisher commented that it is difficult to stipulate with the sign ordinance up in the air.

Chairperson Gillespie opened the floor to the public. No one spoke specifically for or against the proposal. Dr. Richards expressed concern about traffic vision with the units so close to Camino Real and Fir Street. He suggested that the U-Haul storage be moved near the back wall and move the car drying area forward. Chairperson Gillespie confirmed with staff that there is no problem with the vision triangle. Mr. Clarke noted that the backs of the trucks would be no closer than 30 feet from the street.

Commissioner Lovett moved to approve PCU 07-047 with the following five stipulations.

- 1. Approval subject to the submitted site plan, as may be further amended by the Commission.*
- 2. Submittal of an upgraded landscaping proposal for the retention area.*
- 3. Applicant obtains sign permits for any additional signage.*
- 4. That U-Haul vehicles do not block access and parking for the primary business.*
- 5. Review of the permit in one (1) year.*

Commissioner Smith seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

PCU 08-002 Consideration of a request for a 24-hour materials processing plant for processing and removal of mining slag on a 12.25 acre portion of a site located on the Verde Valley Fair Association property north of Hwy. 89A between 6th and 12th streets in a C-F (Community Facilities) zone. The application also includes a request for alternative surfacing improvements for interior parking and access areas as set forth by the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance Section 406.C.2c and for the placement of 80-foot tall storage silos and catwalk structures. APN: 406-42-097M (a portion of). Owner: Verde Valley Fair Assoc. Applicant: Minerals Research & Recovery, Inc. Agent: Thomas C. Oakes.

Director Gehlert presented the request (as described) above.

Displaying aerial and zoning maps, Director Gehlert explained the site location, surrounding zoning and uses.

Director Gehlert said the proposal would establish a rock crusher at the SW corner of the site within a bowl excavated within the material itself, in order to enable some screening of equipment and sound. The center of the pile will also be excavated to enable placement of catwalk structures north to the silos and bagging facility at the north end of the site, adjacent to the VFW lodge. Excavated material will be loaded from the pile onto the conveyor system that will bring the slag to the north side of the site to a bagging facility. The silos and bagging facility will be located roughly 1,000 feet west of the residential area, in plain view.

Access to the site is provided from a private driveway, which extends north to Aspen Street. The applicant intends to transport processed materials north to Aspen Street, west to Sixth Street, and south to 89A.

Processed slag would be used in the manufacture of asphalt shingles, asphalt paving, and media blasting. The project is temporary in nature, as the applicant will only process the slag at the site, which they anticipate to be complete in 15 years.

Although no City Council action will be required as part of this review, Staff provided the Council with an update and advisory regarding this request on January 24. The initial proposal was part of the Commission's agenda on January 28, at which time the Commission held the application over to allow additional time for a community meeting and for the applicant to provide site details and further address the noise issue.

The Council's primary concern was for ensuring the public has adequate opportunity to learn about the request and to offer comments. A community meeting was held on February 13. Notices regarding that meeting, as well as the Commission's meeting on February 25, were mailed to all persons owning property within 500 feet of the fairgrounds property (approx. 170 property owners).

Since then, Staff visited a similar site, the applicant's current operation in Ajo, to become further acquainted with the facility setup, the visibility, dust, and sound issues.

Director Gehlert projected many photos and graphics of the Ajo site, some with sound.

Director Gehlert identified the following issues and explained each.

- **Noise**
- **Dust, Surfacing and Drainage**
- **Alternate Surfacing Proposal**
- **Occasional 24 Hour Operation**
- **Emergency Response Street**
- **Height**
- **Landscape and other Buffering Improvements**
- **Alternate site for Processing**
- **Alternate access**
- **Water Use**

- **Lighting**
- **Security**
- **Reclamation**

Director Gehlert reported that staff views this proposal as potentially beneficial to the City. Staff's field visit to Ajo revealed a surprisingly low level of noise impact associated with this use, from 1,000 feet away. However, staff continues to receive concerns from nearby residents. The concerns are primarily noise, lighting, street maintenance, and dust control. There has also been much opposition to the 24-hour aspect of the request.

Additionally, there are issues that may need further consideration before action by the Commission, notably those associated with emergency response, buffering and street maintenance. Given the significance of the request, the Commission may want to consider allowing additional time for public review and input.

However, should the Commission consider approval of the CUP at this time, staff recommends the following stipulations:

1. Approval of the request subject to development in conformance with the site plan dated 2-14-08, subject to modifications as may be required by the Commission, the Fire department or other Staff.
2. That the applicant be allowed to use the crushed slag for surfacing, in lieu of chip seal, subject to approval by the Public Works Director.
3. That an agreement be reached with the City of Cottonwood for maintenance to Aspen and 6th Street. Agreement to be approved by the City Council, Public Works Director, and the City Attorney.
4. That the applicant provide additional buffering improvements adjacent to the residential areas to the east, for review and approval by the Design Review Board. Consideration should also be given to how the site would be screened as the slag is removed and the operation becomes more visible to the adjacent neighborhood.
5. That the applicant address the issue of back up beepers at the site. A solution that impacts the neighborhood as little as possible while still being safe should be devised.
6. That the use be limited to daytime hours only.
7. That the CUP be reviewed by the Commission in one (1) year.
8. Anything else the Commission deems necessary.

The Commission members engaged in an extensive question and answer period. Answers provided by the applicants are summarized below.

- The Ajo plant is very different from what would be in Cottonwood. It was an evolution and is 25 years old. The plant here would be designed and built specifically for this location. The equipment would be new and incorporate new technology.
- The crushing would be separate from the silos and bagging area to move noise away from residences. The crushing operation is the noise producer.
- The bag house would collect dust from the crusher. Dust is a sellable product so they try to collect it all.
- Typically, the plant would not operate 24 hours a day but they need that capability in case of equipment failure or an increase in demand.

- Mr. Hurkett explained details of how the plant operates. Commissioner Smith expressed concern about nighttime digging and Mr. Hurkett said their intent is to build a surge pile during daytime hours and the material would be moved by conveyor from that stockpile at night.
- The intent is to run the primary side only when necessary to build up stockpiles.
- Typically, no part of the operation would run 24 hours a day.
- However, they serve some time-sensitive markets and in the event of equipment failure that halts production while waiting for parts or increased demand, they need the ability to recharge the silos quickly to meet customer needs.
- They are designing the Cottonwood plant with a much higher capacity than the Ajo plant to avoid having to run 24 hours a day.

There was extensive discussion about alternate access. Some of those points were as follows.

- The applicant does not own the land to the south and cannot lease it. Therefore, the operation could not be moved further south.
- There is no traffic light at 7th Street and 89A to move trucks out onto 89A so using the Bed Rock road would not be safe.
- There is no road through the fairgrounds to 12th Street and the light at 89A. Mr. Hurkett said they would rather do maintenance on Aspen than to build a new road.
- The perpetual easement is on Aspen so that plan seems to be the best.
- Commissioner Smith pursued using the fairgrounds access pointing out that the fairgrounds would benefit from the removal of the slag. Using that access when there is no fair activity would take a lot off Sixth and Aspen streets. The applicants said they were willing to pursue the idea if the fairgrounds would cooperate.
- Applicant showed a road on the site plan that circles around for emergency access. Applicant is willing to adjust to provide emergency access when the site is engineered.
- Applicant has lowered silo height by ten feet and is working to lower it more. Will not have exact height until detailed engineering is completed.
- Applicant is open to color and paint suggestions to camouflage silos.
- Applicant estimates ratio of bagged to bulk material sales to be about 50/50.
- Applicant expects to employ 10-15 people at this plant with most of them being local.
- The proposal would benefit the city by removal of the slag, change property with no value to property with value, provide jobs, and the applicant would purchase as much locally as possible.
- Applicant believes that removal of the slag has great potential for a positive impact as the city grows.
- Employment would consist mostly of equipment operators, skilled and unskilled laborers.
- The size of the trucks would be similar to the cement trucks.
- Sound study was derived from transposition of noise level at the Ajo plant to this site.
- Applicant expects little difference in noise between daytime and nighttime operations.
- The city can continue to use the slag pile for July 4th fireworks display during period of slag removal.
- Applicant agreed to plant shrubs between the plant and the residences for some visual screening and noise abatement.
- Catwalk lighting only has to be on when the plant operates at night or when they are doing maintenance. The lighting would not be on all the time.

- Applicant would provide portable rescue equipment on the silos. Their personnel would be trained in its use. There would be stairwell access to the silos.
- Slag in Clarkdale contains metals so it is hauled away to a smelter.
- Slag material would be used only on the road inside the fairgrounds.

Chairperson Gillespie opened the floor to the public.

Tom Pender said he has been here over forty years and has always viewed the slag pile as ugly. He believed the plan was great – it would employ locals and take care of an eyesore. He said he is one hundred percent behind the proposal.

Bob Hall said he is neither for nor against the proposal but, as co-owner of Aspen Mini-storage, was concerned about mitigation of the dust problem, what the ADEQ permit consists of, what would happen to the city permit if ADEQ were to revoke their permit. He said the Commission should know what the ADEQ permit says before they approve a city permit. The applicant responded that ADEQ inspects annually, or more often. If the operation were in violation, ADEQ would fine them or revoke the permit. If ADEQ revoked their permit, they could not operate so there would be no need for the city to void their conditional use permit.

John Altizer said he is in favor of the project and getting rid of the cars on top. He expressed concern about wind conditions and the potential of blowing dust. The applicant responded that they have strong winds in Ajo. The equipment is hooded and enclosed with vacuums at transfer points.

Mr. Altizer also questioned who would be responsible for cleanup if a toxic bed were discovered under the slag pile. He suggested establishment of a fund to guarantee cleanup. Mr. Altizer complained about the lack of response by the city to dust complaints on an operation near the airport and said Cottonwood air has deteriorated because of Forest Service smoke and these other things. In response to Mr. Altizer's question, the applicant said they are under a lease with the slag owner and the property owner. They would bring the site to natural grade and remove their equipment. The rest would be up to the landowner.

Mike Clarke spoke saying that he was an operator of a CIT terminal for several years. He pointed to the cement plant saying it is much cleaner today than in the 1980s and 1990s. New equipment is substantially advanced over the last 25 years. He said he has no problem with the proposal noting that you do not get an ADEQ permit today if you are going to pollute.

Merlyn Brown, who lives at Aspen Shadows, addressed the Commission at length. Some of her points were as follows.

- Comparing Cottonwood and Ajo is not comparing apples to apples.
- This would be a factory in the middle of our town.
- Approval would not preserve residential.
- She was informed by the mayor and the city manager that this would be tabled.
- Neighbors two streets behind her were not notified.
- If sound is 40 decibels and that is equal to a conversation, would you want conversation outside your door twenty-four hours a day?
- Variances are granted for money that speaks – money talks – appalling.

- They should not be granted at someone else's expense.
- That "little stretch of Aspen" is our stretch.
- They have a right to enjoy their homes without twenty years of noise.
- Would love to see the slag pile gone and would put up with six months of all kinds of things to make that happen – but not twenty years.
- Would not do the town any good.
- Would reduce property values, destroy infrastructure, and create appalling traffic.
- What happens if they do not comply?
- Both newspapers would not publish her letters.
- Water will leach (substances) out into ground water.
- Who cares if we grow – most come here to retire.
- Proposal would not help us to live our lives.

Barb Dupont of Aspen Shadows said the previous speaker covered it. Her remaining questions were:

- What are current height and lighting restrictions and why?
- Why do we require the fairgrounds to shut down at a certain time of night?
- Sound carries at night.

Ms. Dupont is opposed to the proposal.

Chairperson Gillespie closed the floor to the public when no one else came forward to speak. A summary of the Commission members' discussion follows.

- Buffers could help mitigate noise and applicants are willing. Nighttime noise is louder than daytime noise. Applicants need specifics about requirements.
- Much is still up in the air, such as Fire Department approvals. Need more information specifically stated and things such as road problems addressed. Then, review again at a later date.
- Backup signals are irritating. Strobe lights could be used at night but audible signals would be needed during daylight hours.
- Dust, surfacing, and drainage could be controlled with stipulations. ADEQ would control environmental concerns.

Chairperson Gillespie addressed the audience. Regarding the dust problem with the project at the airport that Mr. Altizer referred to, Chairperson Gillespie apologized if no one from the city responded. He urged the public to call the Commission when there were problems or violations. He explained that the Commission is there on the citizens' behalf. He further explained that anyone could apply to do whatever. The Commission can stipulate review every year and could revoke the conditional use permit for non-compliance. However, they do not want that to happen and make every effort to get it right the first time. Additionally, stipulations could be changed at every review.

Chairperson Gillespie noted that all he had heard from the applicant was that they would run one, and possibly two, shifts. They asked for approval to operate 24 hours if needed. He proposed that the Commission allow shift one and shift two in case of emergencies. He reassured the audience that it was not a done deal and that even if it were approved that evening, things could change at each review.

Vice Chairperson Kiyler noted that we are close to Lowell Observatory and Cottonwood tries to match Flagstaff's Dark Sky ordinance. Commissioner Fisher said there are a large number of amateur astronomers in the area. Director Gehlert commented that it would matter only if the plant operates at night.

The applicant said they do maintenance one day per week and not usually at night.

Other discussions regarded the following.

What is under the slag pile? The slag pile has been there for 80 - 100 years. No one knows. Whatever is there could have been leaching and could become an issue when disturbed. We probably will not know for sure until the applicant digs a hole in the middle.

Does Prop 207 relate to this? A question for the city attorney to sort out. Director Gehlert's understanding is that Prop 207 only applies to the property itself and not applicable to neighboring property. The first test case is underway in Flagstaff.

The Commission reviewed the follow issues.

- The alternate surfacing proposal – the Commission agreed with.
- The 24 hour operation – explore using one shift on a regular basis and a second shift for emergencies.
- Emergency Response and Fire Department (F.D.) concerns – need further information from the F.D. regarding height, emergency access, emergency response, and rescue. Vice Chairperson Kiyler requested the attendance of the Fire Chief and/or Fire Marshal at the next meeting.
- Landscaping/buffering (mentioned but not discussed).
- Alternate site for processing (mentioned but not discussed).
- Alternate access – applicant to explore traveling through the fairgrounds property to 12th Street to the light at Hwy. 89A.
- Proposed water use is OK.
- Lighting – big issue. Strobes to replace audible back up signals at night, protection for incoming aircraft, provide further details.
- Reclamation – what is underneath? Chairperson Gillespie said the applicant should remove some slag and test at the bottom of the pile before the next hearing. Commissioner Fisher said there could be a limit as to what they can expect the applicant to do to answer that question. He said, however, that the Verde Valley Fair Association should be notified about potential liability if anything is toxic. Chairperson Gillespie stressed that the applicant should make the Commission aware of what is there.

Neighborhood notification and attendance. Commissioner Lovett expressed disappointment in the low turnout from the neighborhood. Vice Chairperson Kiyler noted that 26 people attended the neighborhood meeting but only three were at this meeting.

Public process. Director Gehlert said mailings went out to property owners within 500 feet of the subject property regarding the February 13 neighborhood meeting and this Commission meeting. Staff mailed about 170 notices. He showed the area notified on a projected aerial graphic. He said there were articles in the newspaper and the required legal ad in the newspaper.

He asked the Commission if they wanted more people contacted. Vice Chairperson Kiyler answered in the affirmative and said to put notices in the newspaper. Chairperson Gillespie said to expand the notification area to 1,000 or 1,500 feet.

Chairperson Gillespie motioned to table PCU 08-002 pending completion of another neighborhood meeting following advertisement and notification of property owners within 1,000 feet of the project site. The Commission also stipulated the following:

- 1. Fire Department approval of emergency/rescue access and equipment. The Commission also advised Staff to request the attendance of the Fire Chief or Fire Marshal at the next hearing. Please communicate closely with the Fire Department regarding emergency vehicle access issues, as well as access to equipment, width of catwalks, etc. These issues should be resolved in writing by March 10.*
- 2. Explore alternate access route(s).*
- 3. Site plan details pertaining to landscape buffering between the project and the residential area*
- 4. A tangible proposal for site reclamation after slag removal (could include financial surety).*
- 5. Holding another community meeting and notifying property owners within 1,000 feet of the fairgrounds property.*

Commissioner Gonzales seconded the motion, which carried unanimously upon vote.

Possible amendment to Section 424 of the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance pertaining to requirements for Planned Area Development zoning.

Planner Scully explained the history of the proposed amendment and some of the changes since the previous draft. He circulated two master development plans (MDPs) that were submitted with previous projects (Grey Fox Ridge and Bella Montana) as examples of what an MDP is.

Chairperson Gillespie complimented Planner Scully on his work and commented that there were more than a few changes and he had not had time to study them.

Vice Chairperson Kiyler moved to table discussion of possible amendments to the PAD ordinance until the March meeting to allow members more time to study the changes. Commissioner Smith seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Update and discussion regarding amendments to Section 404.G.6 (General Provisions "Swimming Pools and Detached Accessory Buildings," Section 201 (Definitions - Guest House), and Section 413 (R-1, Single Family Residential) of the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance pertaining to standards and requirements for guest homes.

Planner Scully reviewed a previous discussion on the proposed amendments and highlighted changes made based on that discussion.

Commissioner Fisher asked if temporary guest homes like a friend or relative's motor home would be allowed on a property for a few weeks or a month. Mr. Scully said Clarkdale changed their ordinance to allow that.

After other brief discussion, Chairperson Gillespie commented that the ordinance revisions look good.

The Commission took no action because the item was advertised only as a discussion item.

Update and discussion regarding a possible amendment to the Cottonwood Zoning Ordinance pertaining to new requirements for development of washes, slopes, and hillside areas.

Director Gehlert announced he had no update prepared.

Discussion of possible future work sessions and Informational Reports and Updates.

Director Gehlert reported the following.

- A zoning change application for the property behind Country Bank and an application for a 62-unit addition to Mountain View Villas are items on the DRB agenda in March and will probably be on the March P&Z Commission agenda.
- A proposal for a Family Dollar store at Black Hills Drive and Hwy. 89A is also on the DRB agenda.
- A proposed remodel of the Verde Valley Shopping Plaza is scheduled for Code Review in two weeks but there would be no hearing action.
- Director Gehlert also reported about the sign code issue and the presentation to City Council. He said the mascot folks were in attendance and Council directed staff to investigate the definition for signs that other communities use. He noted that the Council appeared to be headed in a different direction from the Commission so the issue could reappear on a future Commission agenda.
- There was brief discussion about the role the Commission representative plays on DRB. Planner Scully read what the zoning ordinance says about it. Chairperson Gillespie said that person is a full member and Director Gehlert said he/she is a voting member.

Call to the Public

No response.

Adjournment

Chairperson Gillespie adjourned the meeting at 9:17 PM.

Minutes prepared by: Carol Hulse

Date Approved: March 17, 2008