

Official Minutes of the City of Cottonwood
Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting
Held, March 21, 2016, at 6:00 P.M. at the City Council Chambers
826 N. Main St. – Cottonwood, Arizona

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chairman Kiyler called the meeting to order at 6:00 p. m. Roll call was taken as follows:

Planning & Zoning Commission Members Present

Chairman Ed Kiyler
Ray Cox
Judd Wasden

Vice Chairman Robert Williams
Thomas Narwid
Jean Wilder (arrived at 6:04 pm)

Planning & Zoning Commission Members Absent

Suzanne Poslaiko

Staff Members Present

Berrin Nejad, Community Development Director
Scott Ellis, Community Development Planner
Jim Padgett, Community Development Planner
Tyler Roberts, Community Development Assistant Planner/Code Enforcement Coordinator
Christina Papa, Planning Technician, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 22, 2016-REGULAR MEETING

Motion: *To approve the minutes of 2/22/2016-regular meeting*

Made by: *Vice Chairman Williams*

Second: *Commissioner Narwid*

Vote: *Unanimous*

CALL TO THE PUBLIC (NONE)

OLD BUSINESS

1. **PCU 16-001 TC EXCAVATING-** Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit to allow a construction storage yard for excavating equipment in a C-1 (Light Commercial) zoned property located at 121 S. 6th Street. APN 406-42-101D.

Address: 232 S. 6th Street. Owner: B&B Revocable Trust. Agent: Krishna Genie.
Below is Ellis's report:

The applicant has resubmitted a new site plan and landscaping plan taking into account comments from the Planning & Zoning Commission and neighboring property owners. The site will be used for equipment storage for a local excavating business. Site improvements to the front of the property along S. 6th Street will include new landscaping, parking, and sidewalk. Areas of vehicular traffic will be paved or chip sealed to minimize dust. The rear (west) side of the property will provide a buffer between the neighborhood with the installation of landscaping and a block wall, which will eliminate the need to repair/replace the existing chain-link fence. Materials will not be stockpiled on site. The applicant has also proposed a 40 foot buffer zone from the west property line to the yard, helping to eliminate any issues.

If approved, staff recommends the following stipulations:

1. That the project is developed in conformance with the site/landscape plans submitted on 3/15/16, and as may be further modified by the Planning & Zoning Commission.
2. That the project conforms to Code Review Comments dated 06/23/15.
3. The changes as written in the Letter of Intent, dated, 03/04/16, are adhered to as detailed and/or as may be modified by the Planning & Zoning Commission.
4. The slatted chain-link fence on the west side of the property be removed and replaced by a six (6) foot tall solid block wall.
5. Storage/stockpiling of material (dirt, rocks, etc.) will not be permitted.
6. The conditions of approval shall be completed by _____ months from the date of approval by the Planning & Zoning Commission or the Conditional Use Permit shall be subject to revocation.
7. A Certificate of Zoning Compliance documenting the completion of conditions shall be issued by the timeframe specified.
8. Any other stipulations the Planning & Zoning Commission deems necessary.

The applicants agent Krishan also gave a brief presentation after staff to provide the Commission with more details on the changes that they have made, and information regarding their neighborhood meeting and the feedback that they received. Commissioner Narwid asked Krishan when the wall on the back end of the property was expected to be completed. Krishan responded that their completion time line is twenty-four (24) months of approval and will work with staff, this timeline would include the time to get approval on the structural review, engineering, grading, etc. Commissioner Narwid also asked if the fence that they are proposing would match the height of the existing fence that the neighbor has. Krishan said that they could match that height, but it would be an added expense to the applicant. Staff mentioned to the Commission that they can request the height of the fence as a stipulation. Commissioner Narwid mentioned that he would like to see the height be consistent to what the neighbor has up, also the materials that were being stored onsite, have they been removed or are they still there. Krishan said that they will be removed. Commissioner Narwid asked if there was any way to address the exhaust fumes, would it be better to park the vehicles in another location on the property. Krishan responded that it is hard to control the exhaust fumes because if the wind blows or changes direction the

fumes are going to go where ever, but thought that by limiting the hours for the potential movement of those vehicles would hopefully help to reduce the complaints. Commissioner Wasden mentioned that he liked the consistency with the pigment of the wall color to match what was existing on the neighbor's property, also would like to see the height of the wall be the same as what the neighbor has, also that the wall needs to be a priority and would like to see that completed first and within four (4) to six (6) months. Vice Chairman Williams mentioned that it still looked like one of the neighbors is still complaining. Krishan mentioned that to date they have not heard back from this neighbor, they held the neighborhood meeting and they were not in attendance, they reached out to that person with a card left on their door, and mailed a letter, which was included in the commissioners packets, and they have not had any contact. Vice Chairman Williams asked staff if they had heard from the neighbor other than the letter that was received. Staff responded that they had not heard anything else. Vice Chairman Williams expressed his dissatisfaction with the fact that the material storage had still not been removed from the property, and mentioned that it needed to go, it should have already been gone prior to this meeting, would really like the applicant to address the wall and buffer first. Commissioner Cox mentioned that the landscaping plan really doesn't identify how large the plants are going to be when they put them in. Krishan mentioned that APS would be running a power line down the back part of the property where the buffer, plants, and fence would be but assured the commission that they would not be waiting on them to begin the project.

The floor was open to the public for comment, there was no public comment, the floor was closed.

Commissioner Cox mentioned that he didn't want APS to be another excuse, need to have a solution as soon as possible. Chairman Kiyler mentioned to the commissions that they may need to add more stipulations. Commissioner Narwid thanked the applicant for the changes that were made, would like to see the wall height brought up to meet what is existing on the neighbor's property, and to put in plants as early as possible. Commissioner Wasden would like the wall matched, would like to put a timeframe on when the wall needs to be in by. Commissioner Wilder thought that the applicant and commission had good solutions. Vice Chairman Williams mentioned that in the report that they received it said that the timeline called for eighteen (18) months, the applicant said twenty-four (24) months. Krishan mentioned that the total duration of the project would be twenty-four (24) months, four (4) to six (6) months for permit approval, and eighteen (18) months of construction, front is going to be a large project. Vice Chairman Williams said that there is a lot of engineering in this project on the front portion, and wanted the applicant to move forward with the back wall first, there should be a shorter timeframe for the wall, and then a longer timeframe for the front portion of the project. Staff asked the commission to separate out the various parts of the project in the motion. Commissioner Narwid suggested that the wall be up by July 1, 2016, and that the landscaping in the back be done shortly after that, the front portion of the project along 6th Street would fall under that eighteen (18) month timeframe.

Motion: *To Approve PCU 16-001 TC Excavating with the following stipulations:*

- 1. That the project is developed in conformance with the site/landscape plans submitted on 3/15/16.*
- 2. That the project conforms to Code Review Comments dated 06/23/15.*
- 3. The changes as written in the Letter of Intent, dated, 03/14/16, are adhered to as detailed, including the establishment of the forty (40) foot buffer zone on the west side of the property within thirty (30) days (April 20, 2016), limiting vehicle access between the hours of four o'clock PM (4:00 pm) and nine o'clock AM (9:00 am) the next morning.*
- 4. The slatted chain-link fence on the west side of the property be removed and replaced by a block wall matching material and height to the adjoining wall to the north within four (4) months of this meeting (July 21, 2016).*
- 5. Storage/stockpiling of material (dirt, rocks, etc.) will not be permitted and shall be cleared from the property within thirty (30) days (April 20, 2016) of this meeting.*
- 6. The conditions of approval shall be completed by eighteen (18) months from the date of approval by the Planning & Zoning Commission or the Conditional Use Permit shall be subject to revocation.*
- 7. A Certificate of Zoning Compliance documenting the completion of conditions shall be issued by the timeframe specified.*

Made by: *Vice Chairman Williams*
Second: *Commissioner Wasden*
Vote: *Unanimous*

DISCUSSION ITEMS-NONE

INFORMATIONAL REPORTS AND UPDATES

There was a brief update/discussion in regards to the following, no action was taken, these were only for informational purposes.

- 1. Treasure Junkies-selling used cars in the front of property, and landscaping, commission would like staff to investigate.*
- 2. Wesie's-update on progress.*
- 3. Introduction of Jim Padgett to Commission.*
- 4. Vineyards at Cottonwood.*
- 5. Sizzler Property.*
- 6. Galpin RV- update on progress.*
- 7. Masonic Lodge-update.*

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

APPROVED