



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331

(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE TOWN OF JEROME

### DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DATE: Monday, December 12, 2016 TIME: 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: **JEROME CIVIC CENTER**

600 Clark St., JEROME, ARIZONA 86331

### MINUTES

Pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the Design Review Board and to the general public that the Design Review Board will hold the above meeting in Council Chambers at Jerome Town Hall. Members of the Design Review Board will attend either in person or by telephone, video or internet conferencing. The Design Review Board may recess the public meeting and convene in Executive Session for the purpose of discussion or consultation for legal advice with the Town Attorney, who may participate telephonically, regarding any item listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03 (A)(3).

#### **ITEM 1: CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Steve Pontious at 7:02 p.m.

Jennifer Julian, Minute Taker, called roll. Present were Chair Steve Pontious, Vice Chair Mark Venker, Brice Wood, and John Schroeder. Mike Parry was absent.

Staff present were Kyle Dabney, Zoning Administrator; former Zoning Administrator Al Sengstock (via internet teleconference); and Jennifer Julian, Minute Taker.

#### **ITEM 2: APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Minutes of November 12, 2016

Mr. Wood moved to approve the minutes of November 12, 2016 as presented. Mr. Venker seconded. The motion passed 3-0. Chair Pontious abstained as he was absent from the November meeting.

#### **ITEM 3: PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no petitions from the public.

#### **ITEM 4: REQUEST FOR THREE SIGNS FOR PROHIBITION PIZZA**

APPLICANT: JOE SCRIBNER

ADDRESS: 403 CLARK ST., B-1 & B-2

OWNER OF RECORD: 1299 PROPERTIES

APN: 401-06-152H

ZONE: C-1

The applicant asks for review and approval of a new sign.

The applicant was present. Mr. Sengstock explained that the zoning code allows three signs when the site is bordered by two streets. He recommended approval.

Mr. Venker said that he liked the sign and understood that three signs are allowed under the ordinance. His concern was that from an aesthetic standpoint, the bystander is confronted with three signs. It is visually overwhelming. Mr. Sengstock explained that the ordinance allows for three signs. The Design Review Board is concerned only with the design of the sign, not the number of signs.

Mr. Wood said that the Board operates under guidelines by the Department of the Interior. He gave the example of a building in Tombstone, Ariz. that was built in the 1960s but had a sign on it with a date of 1890. He understood that the Board is not supposed to consider the content of signs, but he was disturbed by the "1933" on the sign. He asked if the applicant would drop that from the sign.

Mr. Scribner said he did not have a problem with removing "established 1933" from the sign.

Mr. Schroeder agreed with Mr. Wood about the possible false impression that "1933" could give. He also understood



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

that the business is allowed three signs, but he thought it was overkill to have two signs facing the main highway.

Mr. Scribner explained that it is going to be a counter-service restaurant, so the signs indicate the entrance and exit doors. He also explained that the main sign on the retaining wall by the steps is the one that will be visible from cars. Only the sign on Clark Street will have a light.

Mr. Sengstock reminded the Board that approval or denial of a sign based on content is not permitted, per a Supreme Court ruling last year. Mr. Wood said he was not making that point, just that he personally saw a parallel in Tombstone. Mr. Sengstock repeated that zoning issues are not before this Board, only the design of the sign.

Chair Pontious asked if it is acceptable to express an opinion about the "established 1933" on the sign and leave it up to the applicant to voluntarily remove it. Mr. Sengstock said it is a question of content and the applicant can name his business whatever he wants.

Chair Pontious moved to approve the signs as submitted. Mr. Schroeder seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Wood said that although the Supreme Court ruled on this last year, the Board has always operated under the assumption that the content of signs is not open to discussion.

## **ITEM 5: REVIEW OF PROPOSED PARKING STRUCTURE**

APPLICANT: IDEAS-A-PLENTY, LLC

APN: 401-06-032, 401-06-033, 401-06-026Q

ADDRESS: 446 CLARK ST.

ZONE: C-1

OWNER OF RECORD: ABOVE

The applicants are requesting review and approval of the construction of a parking structure.

The applicants, Steve Knowlton and Nancy Robinson, were present. Mr. Sengstock explained that the project will provide on-site parking for the renovated Walsh Apartments in keeping with Jerome's goal of reducing the number of cars parked on the street. The applicant has provided stamped engineering plans and has considered all runoff and drainage issues. He believes the project does a good job with visual impact on elevations and impact on surrounding neighbors. The design has gotten clearance from ADOT on the installation of the retaining wall. He recommended approval.

Mr. Wood asked if the project had been approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission. (It was approved at the P&Z meeting on December 7, 2016.) He approves of the intention to provide off-street parking and he commended Mr. Knowlton for the excellent work done on his previous renovations. However, Mr. Wood was concerned with the structure above the platform. He thought it was not compatible with Jerome. He felt that the superstructure above the platform is unnecessary and blocks the view.

Mr. Schroeder agreed that the proposed structure has no equivalent in Town, although additional parking is necessary. He asked Mr. Knowlton how many parking spaces will be provided. Mr. Knowlton explained that under the zoning code he must provide 1.5 spaces per unit, so for five apartments there will be 8 spaces. Ms. Robinson explained that ADOT also requires space for cars to turn around.

Mr. Schroeder asked if there will be anything to prevent people other than tenants parking there. Mr. Knowlton said not yet, but he will eventually come back before the Board to request signage.



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

Mr. Knowlton said that his design includes ivy planted on the pergola for two reasons: first, so that all the greenery on the lot isn't lost and second, so that the parking structure doesn't look "like Walmart." He said the design was well-received by his neighbors, and that they seemed to be encouraged by the greenery disguising the structure.

Mr. Schroeder was concerned about invasive species of ivy. Mr. Knowlton said that he will not plant anything invasive. Ms. Robinson said that she has been talking to the owner of the Surgeon's House about possibly transplanting some of the ivy from that property. Otherwise, she will get appropriate plants from the nursery.

Mr. Wood liked having greenery and hoped that if his position prevailed, that the plan would still include some landscaping. He appreciated the creative plan to provide more parking in the Town center and regretted that he could not support the entire design.

Mr. Venker wanted to be certain that the vegetation would be maintained. He did not want to see vegetation that fails to thrive only to be replaced with a tarp or other shade structure that is visually unappealing. Otherwise, he agreed with the project.

Mr. Knowlton pointed out how he has maintained the vacant lot between his properties. He would keep it looking nice. Mr. Wood said, "I defend the guy -- what he says he's going to do, he can do. He's very competent." Mr. Knowlton said if the greenery didn't take, he would certainly come back before the Board with an alternative.

Chair Pontious said that Mr. Knowlton has always been diligent in coming before the Board and following the rules to the letter. He had no problem with the design in that location. It will relieve parking on Main Street by giving the tenants a designated spot.

Mr. Knowlton said that in the past tenants have parked temporarily on the sidewalk on Clark Street and ADOT is aware of that.

Chair Pontious asked if the neighbors have expressed any issues with the design or views. Mr. Knowlton said no.

Mr. Knowlton said that ADOT requires a 25-foot curb cut, which is wider than the street. The theory is that one vehicle can pull out while another is pulling in. The façade is 8 feet high specifically so that trucks or other large vehicles aren't turning around in there; only cars and pickups can fit.

Mr. Schroeder asked if the curb cut would involve moving the railings along the highway. Mr. Knowlton said that the railings belong to ADOT and he will have to get approval from them. The curb cut will be similar to the one at his adjacent property and will meet ADOT specifications. Mr. Wood said that Mr. Knowlton is familiar with the process since he has already been through it.

Mr. Venker asked what material will be on the west-facing side. Mr. Knowlton said it will be the same brick as on is the rest of the structure. He provided a sample.

Mr. Wood moved to approve the parking platform as presented, except for the superstructure above the platform itself (the pergola and the façade on Clark Street) and with a safety feature (such as a guardrail) to prevent people from driving off. His rationale was that the view from the street would be affected negatively by the superstructure.



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

Mr. Sengstock asked if Mr. Wood was referring to view corridors or visual impact. Mr. Wood said visual impact, visual compatibility.

Mr. Sengstock asked if Mr. Knowlton could come back with a different treatment if he wanted to, and Mr. Wood said yes.

Mr. Venker said that he preferred the design with the superstructure as opposed to a vacant lot. He thought the aesthetic would be more palatable street side.

Mr. Schroeder said he appreciated Mr. Wood's point, that other parking lots in town are uncovered. However, he didn't think the pergola was such a visual impact.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Schroeder moved to approve the parking structure as designed. Mr. Venker seconded. The vote was called and motion passed 3-1. Chair Pontious, Mr. Venker, and Mr. Schroeder were in favor; Mr. Wood was opposed.

## **ITEM 6: BUILD AN ADDITION FOR A SECOND PUBLIC BATHROOM, ENCLOSE A PORTION OF THE DECK AND OTHER EXTERIOR IMPROVEMENTS**

APPLICANT: EKZ, LLC

APN: 401-06-013, 401-06-014

ADDRESS: 119 JEROME AVE.

ZONE: C-1

OWNER OF RECORD: DRK, LLC

The applicant requests review and approval of an addition to the original building to add a second ADA bathroom, enclose a portion of the deck and other exterior improvements.

The applicant was present. Mr. Sengstock said that he was not willing to support the original submittal because of the treatment of wood and the colors. After discussion, a revised submittal was provided that addressed his concerns. He supports the revised submittal as it ties together the disparate elements of the building and the deck. The construction of the second bathroom was approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission. (Mr. Conlin provided copies of the revised submittal to the Board.)

Mr. Conlin explained that the issue was over the corrugated siding on enclosed deck. The new submittal uses an alternate material, ghost wood. He provided samples. It is made from dead standing timber and has a neutral coloration.

Mr. Schroder asked when the deck was built. Mr. Sengstock said that the main building is historic, and the deck and other structures have been tacked on since the 1970's. Mr. Conlin said the restroom was added in 2011 in order to meet the requirement for the occupant load.

Mr. Conlin said he was confused by "similar but different" materials. He thought that materials from the same time frame that were generally used around town were "similar but different" and asked for clarity. Mr. Schroeder explained that the materials should fit in with the general scheme of the town, and not stand out as being modernistic. In addition, they should be recognizable as being not historic. You do not want to try to trick people that something new was built during the historic period.

Mr. Conlin explained that he wants to create continuity among all three sides of the building. What exists doesn't really match. He had originally chosen a pine shiplap siding with a charred look as a contrast to the trim and the awning and



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

the white building.

Mr. Sengstock said that the porch cover was not part of the historic building. If it is rehabilitated, it needs to be a common color. The original presentation evoked more of a cowboy town than a mining town. He is in favor of the cobalt grey shown in the revised submittal.

Mr. Wood asked if the Board is deciding on the finish. He asked Mr. Conlin for his preference. Mr. Conlin said he preferred his original design with the charred wood and corrugated metal. He mentioned that items such as benches, trees, and the smoker break up the actual view of where the corrugated metal would go. The rendering doesn't depict those items. He said his original plan was galvanized corrugated metal that was lightly treated with muriatic acid, then left to age naturally. He preferred that to rusty metal.

Mr. Wood asked for clarification of the design under discussion. Mr. Conlin said the original submittal was corrugated siding with charred wood trim. The new submittal is ghost wood, framed with more ghost wood, on the awning and deck enclosure. The deck will have glass enclosures similar to that at the Haunted Hamburger.

Mr. Schroeder asked about the beams on the front entrance awning. Mr. Conlin said that they will be 4x6 beams clad in ghost wood. Mr. Conlin provided a photo of the entrance from the 1950s. He plans to beef up the beams but reduce the number to 4. Mr. Schroeder said that he preferred the simple look of the 4x4 posts.

Mr. Sengstock asked for clarification and Mr. Schroeder said he would like to see the beams left as simple 4x4s, unclad. Mr. Conlin asked for clarification of the finish. Mr. Schroeder said he would like to see the beams remain white.

Mr. Venker said he would like to see continuity between the back patio and the various awning structures, but with the historic building remaining distinct.

Mr. Schroeder said that he has a problem with adding aged wood to the original black and white. Mr. Sengstock said the colors of the deck, enclosure, and overhang should all be the same even though the materials are different.

Mr. Venker said, based on the old photograph, he would rather see no front awning at all. Mr. Sengstock said that the Board cannot cause someone to remove something. Mr. Venker suggested maintaining the same material and color for all the newer structures, so that the untrained eye can identify what is new vs. the historic building. He thought that it would be deceiving to keep the awning and posts white.

Mr. Sengstock asked for clarification and Mr. Venker said that the deck and awning should all be one material and one color.

Mr. Wood agreed with the idea of one color and one material. He had a problem aesthetically with the burnt wood and the aged wood. His preference would be painted wood, to not draw attention to it.

Mr. Schroeder agreed. He also agreed with Mr. Sengstock that the aged wood gives an impression of a cowboy town rather than a mining town. Wood was generally painted in mining towns due to discoloration from the poor air quality.

Mr. Conlin pointed out that the proposed wood is actually dead standing timber, harvested, milled and applied with gray wash. It isn't a new product made to look old, but actually an old piece of wood.



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

Mr. Sengstock suggested painting the wood off-white to tie together the visual impact. The Board's primary focus is the visual impact of the entire town, not just the single structure. He believes that uniformity is correct and that the overhang and enclosure should be the same color.

Mr. Wood said that he understands the desire to fix the deck and make the entire business look better. His problem is mainly with visual surface.

Mr. Conlin explained that he was trying to come up with a design that represents his business and adds color. He would prefer not painting it white. He appreciated Mr. Venker's suggestion of differentiating the newer structures from the historic building.

Mr. Wood made a motion to approve the design as presented with one condition, that the finish be paint. It should not be the same paint as is on the historic building. The design as presented is too unique to the town.

Mr. Conlin requested the opportunity to resubmit the application at the next meeting with updated renderings. Chair Pontious agreed, as there was no consensus at this meeting.

Connie Dedrick, the manager of Mr. Conlin's business, asked if there could be a pre-application meeting to discuss the issues before submitting a redesign. Mr. Wood said that meeting as a quorum is not allowed. He requested that the next submission have detailed drawings indicating materials and colors. The Board reviews the design, it does not do the design.

Mr. Schroeder said that the Zoning Administrator can act as an intermediary between the Board and the applicant.

Chair Pontious asked if Board members could take a field trip to the site. Mr. Sengstock said that the Board could call a special meeting and convene on-site. The Board could also recess and reconvene on-site tonight. He cautioned that any decision must be made as a quorum during a meeting.

Ms. Dedrick asked if the members could visit the site individually in advance of the next meeting. Mr. Sengstock said that was allowed.

There was general discussion about attempting to schedule a special meeting and on-site visit before the next meeting. It was agreed that Board members would visit the site individually.

Chair Pontious moved to postpone this agenda item to the next meeting. Mr. Venker seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

## **ITEM 7: FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Mr. Schroeder asked about the status of a demolition on a specific property. Mr. Sengstock said that he was briefing Mr. Dabney on enforcement issues and he will provide an update at the January meeting.

## **ITEM 8: ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Venker made a motion to adjourn. It was seconded by Chair Pontious. The motion carried unanimously and the meeting adjourned at 8:12 p.m.

Approval on next page.



# TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331  
(928) 634-7943 FAX (928) 634-0715

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE TOWN OF JEROME

### DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

DATE: Monday, December 12, 2016 TIME: 7:00 pm

PLACE: **JEROME CIVIC CENTER**

600 Clark St., JEROME, ARIZONA 86331

## MINUTES

*Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Julian on January 9, 2017.*

Approved:

  
Design Review Board Chair

Date:

1/9/17

Attest:

  
Design Review Board Vice Chair

Date:

1-9-17