

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
TOWN COUNCIL AD HOC UDO UPDATE SUBCOMMITTEE
TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY**

**WEDNESDAY, JULY 10, 2019
3:30 P.M.**

The Town Council Ad Hoc UDO Update Subcommittee of the Town of Chino Valley convened for a public meeting in the Council Chambers Conference Room, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

1) CALL TO ORDER

Vice Mayor Turner called the meeting to order at 3.43 p.m.

2) ROLL CALL

Present: Lon Turner, Chair; Corey Mendoza, Councilmember

Absent: Cloyce Kelly, Councilmember

Staff Joshua Cook, Development Services Director; Alex Lerma, Planner; Maggie Tidabeck,

Present: Economic Development Director

3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a) Consideration and possible action to approve June 26, 2019, minutes.

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to approve the June 26, 2019 meeting minutes.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

Vote: 2 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

4) OLD BUSINESS

- a) Review the changes discussed at the June 26, 2019, meeting regarding the draft language for temporary signage.

Mr. Cook and Committee Members discussed and reviewed the following:

- Reviewed the changes made to the temporary sign code.
 - Added definition for Construction Sign.
 - Added a statement under A-frame signage that sign should not obstruct pedestrian traffic.
 - Added language under temporary signage that stated anything attached to the A-frame or any other special event signage counted towards the total allowed square footage of signage.

- A-frame signage was removed from exempt signage and placed under permanent signage with conditions.
- Temporary sign permit section was changed to add that a permit and fee was required and had an expiration date.
- Increased the size to 48 square foot aggregate for temporary sign placement while waiting for the permanent sign installation.
- Special Event sign language added to include signage would be issued once per quarter and displayed for a maximum 15-consecutive days with approval of a special event sign permit. Two special event signs were allowed in addition to other allowed temporary signs.
- Added a table for allowed sign square footage based on square footage of store front and building width.
- Construction signs were added.
- Special events like rodeos, circuses, etc. required a temporary use permit with specific requirements and followed the 15-consecutive day signage allotment. Staff said that a temporary event section could be added to the sign code for such events. All code relevant to signs should be within the sign code.
- Discussed if government agencies were exempt from the signage code and that the Town needed to stay content neutral. Staff would confer with the Town Attorney regarding government's compliance with the sign code.
- Offsite signage needed to be addressed and could include an allowance for temporary offsite signs. Staff would discuss it with the Town Attorney.

5) NEW BUSINESS

a) Discussion regarding Business Park Zoning District Purpose Statement.

Mr. Cook and Committee Members discussed and reviewed the following:

- Staff drafted a new Business Park Zoning District purpose statement based on other area towns business park statements.
- Committee Members discussed determining what the Town wanted for the area and then creating the purpose statement based off what was actually taking place in the business park. Staff explained that the uses had been reviewed and that the outstanding question about the meaning of the term excessive water use had been addressed by the Public Works Director Frank Marbury. His proposed language would be discussed at the upcoming Council Study Session meeting.
- Staff commented that the purpose statement was supposed to be generic and not a strategic plan statement. A Master Plan specifically for Old Home Manor would be drafted that would define the layout of the specific types of uses. The Master Plan draft and strategic plan would be based on the goals and objectives of the Town's General Plan and the adopted Town strategic plan. The final product would need to be approved and adopted by the Town Council.
- Committee Members questioned the appropriateness of defining a zoning district before the uses and layout were fully understood. Staff explained that the draft business park zoning district code only provided guidance and a template for setbacks, buildable area requirements, types of uses, etc. The General Plan would be able to override someone's desire to have a business park zoned area in an area not fitting the general plan.
- Committee and staff discussed how amendments to the General Plan could be made. Amendments could be made in-house without a consultant.
- Staff stated that the only deficient portion of the business park code was the lack of the noise ordinance code. It needed to be updated in the Town Code before it could be implemented in the

Business Park Zone code.

- There was a requirement to have a façade on the front of building but four-sided architecture was not a requirement of the zone. Committee Members thought the architectural style should be consistent throughout the district.
- A private developer would need to rezone a property, have individual site plan reviews for every site within the development, and follow the strict zoning requirements in order to have a business park zoned property. The tenants and the business park as a whole had strict landscaping requirements. The perimeter landscaping was the responsibility of the developer and had strict guidelines. Committee Members commented that they thought the landscaping requirement for the internal minimum 50-foot landscaped maintained building setbacks were too intrusive. Staff stated the minimum setback could be reduced to 25-feet but it was also meant as a separation buffer between districts and uses. Committee Members suggested the 50-foot setback be maintained for development next to residential subdivisions but for the rest of the development a 25-30-foot setback could be maintained. Staff explained that a 50-foot buffer around the perimeter of a 20-acre parcel was minimal. Committee Members explained that if two buildings were next to each other and each maintained a 50-foot side buffer, it would amount to 100-feet and that seemed excessive. Committee Members believed that a 25-foot side and rear buffer next to a potential residential area that was not yet developed was sufficient and the remaining 25-foot setback should come from the residential development once they built the subdivision.
- Staff clarified that OHM was one business park and there would be one 50-foot side and rear setback around the entire 200-acre development. Staff reviewed a development map with the Committee. The internal setbacks did not include side, lot frontage or rear setbacks and a building could be put right on the internal development line. The minimum internal front yard setback was 50-feet from the internal road. The 50-foot frontage setback would include parking, lot circulation, landscaping, etc.
- Committee Members thought that Chino Valley was pricing themselves out of the market in some subdivisions through regulations. Staff disagreed and thought it was more likely the requirements that developers were forced to take by the previous administration even though it was not outlined in the code. The regulations were not enforced the way they had been written.
- Committee Members discussed that curb and sidewalk requirements may be an excessive request, but staff stated that all communities required both and an area without those could be dangerous for pedestrians.
- Staff explained that the Town was already charging thousands of dollars less for building permits than anywhere else in the area. Staff thought that if the developers were coming, and they were being treated fairly, they would continue to build in the community. The current perception was that the Town was not easy to work with and that needed to change.
- Committee Members discussed the possibility that high density may be the only way for developers to survive in the Town and questioned whether staff should waste money developing a master plan before it was clear what the Council as a whole wanted for the business park. Staff explained they preferred to draft a master plan based on discussions with the Mayor, Committee and Council Members and the goals and objectives of the adopted strategic plan, present it to Council and then make amendments to the plan to meet Council's goals and objectives. Committee Members asked what the primary goals and objectives currently were, and staff explained it was outlined in the purpose statement and zoning code.
- Staff thought there were enough regulations in the proposed code to sufficiently cover the development in the business park district but Committee Members disagreed because of the varying degree of uses allowed in the business park zone. Committee Members also discussed the oversight each business would get through staff review of permits and site plans. Staff explained that the Town's future growth vision per the General Plan was large residential lots, open space, a low amount of heavy intense uses and to maximize on agriculture and small-town feel. Staff believed that the business park was true to that vision.
- Committee Members discussed concerns about appropriate parking and staff stated that parking

could be updated during the UDO update but thought there were enough regulations to determine parking based on the type of business listed in the building permit and business licenses. Site plan reviews would also ensure that a developer was complying with standards. The Committee Members discussed types of businesses in a business park and the different development methods that might be used based on the type of businesses. Staff reviewed the parking regulation requirements by use.

- Committee Members discussed their vision of a business park and it differed from that of staff. Staff wrote the purpose statement to reflect a lower industrial use than some Committee Members had envisioned. Staff stated that if a person did not want to develop a business area based on the business park zone code requirements, they would build in a different area without the restrictions and regulations. Some Committee Members were unclear why a business park zone was necessary. Staff explained that the business park zone was being developed for the OHM development to push forward the Town Council's strategic goals and objectives that had been adopted in 2018, 2016 and 2014. The ultimate goal was to produce light manufacturing jobs. The creation of the zone also allowed private developers to create their own business park and their development needed to be covered by code regulations.
- Staff stated there was a difference between an industrial park and a business park. An industrial park was for heavy users.
- There was not a minimum size to the buildings. The bigger the building requirements, the bigger the user would have to be to make use of a large-scale building. The business park would encompass several buildings. Staff reviewed the setup of a business park in Kentucky.
- Committee encouraged staff to bring visual aides to the Council Study Session.

6) **ADJOURNMENT**

MOVED by Councilmember Corey Mendoza, seconded by Chair Lon Turner to adjourn the meeting at 5:24 p.m.

AYE: Chair Lon Turner, Councilmember Corey Mendoza

Vote: 2 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously

Submitted: July 16, 2019.

By: *Vickie Nipper, Deputy Town Clerk*

Approved: August 14, 2019.