



TOWN OF JEROME

POST OFFICE BOX 335, JEROME, ARIZONA 86331
(928) 634-7943
www.jerome.az.gov

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF JEROME JEROME CIVIC CENTER 600 CLARK STREET, JEROME, ARIZONA

TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2025, AT 6:00 PM

Due to the length of this meeting, Council may recess and reconvene at the time and date announced.

6:12PM (0:35) 1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Present were Chair Lance Schall and Commissioners Rebecca "Becca" Miller, Jera Peterson, Jeanie Ready and Lori Riley

Staff present included Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett and Accounting Clerk Michele Sharif.

6:12PM (0:00) 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. The Commission will vote on approval of the minutes of the regular meeting from 12/17/2024.

Chair Lance Schall introduced the meeting minutes for approval. He asked if anyone had any corrections. There was some conversation between Ms. Ready and Ms. Peterson regarding a correction but it was determined no changes were necessary.

Ms. Peterson made the motion to approve the minutes for the December 17, 2024, Planning and Zoning meeting.

Ms. Riley seconded the motion.

Mr. Schall call the question. With 4 ayes and 1 abstention the motion carried.

Ms. Ready abstained from the vote due to her absence from the December meeting.

Motion to approve December 17, 2024, Planning and Zoning Minutes.

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER			X			
PETERSON	X		X			
READY						X
RILEY		X	X			
SCHALL			X			

6:14PM (2:27) 3. NEW BUSINESS

A. 103 Dundee Avenue. The applicant is proposing an accessory structure on his property at 103 Dundee. The planning & Zoning Commission will review the proposed project.

Mr. Schall introduced the item for consideration.

Mr. Blodgett further introduced the item reading the background and summary information from his analysis on page 6 of the meeting packet. He continued that the intention is to construct this accessory building on top of a previously constructed semi-subterranean building to store wine barrels on site when not in use. He said after scratching his head and seeking outside opinion from other planning departments, he based his decision on the engineering of the original structure, being significant enough that it currently has a garden on the roof and can hold a significant amount of weight. He determined that the overengineering of the structure lends it to be more a foundation rather than the first floor of another structure. He said they are two very different structures and needed to figure out how to approach it. He referred to and read the code compliance response on page 3 of his analysis (page 8 of the packet). He said as he goes through the checklist, he finds no areas in which the building is deficient. It is a unique construction, and the applicant is present to answer any questions regarding the project.

Project Manager Matt LaVoire approached the microphone and introduced himself and informed commissioners that he's been the project manager since 2006. He said what it's being used for is described in his letter on page 2 of the analysis, (page 7 of the packet) He described the purpose of the building being used to house wine barrels during their normal production process. He added it would also reduce traffic coming up and down 89A and less road time for them overall.

Ms. Peterson said she had a question on page 3 of the site plans.

Mr. LaVoire approached the dais using the site plans to point out and answer the questions commissioners had regarding building placement, chilled areas, and access points were.

Mr. Blodgett said if it was helpful we could pull up photos and video of the site of the proposed building.

Video was put on the television for commissioners to view while Mr. LaVoire pointed out specific areas of reference.

Mr. Blodgett pointed out page 2 of the site plans as the proposal of what the building would look like if you were standing on Dundee Ave. looking at the fence for the property.

There was conversation regarding what might be seen from the street.

Mr. Blodgett said they've done a good job making this as low impact as they can to the surrounding properties. He added that they made the design with Town ordinance in mind.

Mr. LaVoire shared who the architect is, and that they work out of Sedona.

Ms. Peterson asked if the building was going to be enclosed.

It was confirmed that yes it will be enclosed and will likely be overbuilt.

Audience member Mark Krmopotich asked if Mr. Lee was contacted regarding the impact it would have on him.

Mr. LaVoire shared that he will be the one resident most impacted, but that he is aware.

Ms. Ready asked if he had an idea how long the project would be from start to finish.

Mr. LaVoire said there is preliminary stuff like site work and utilities that need to be relocated, but once building started he anticipated it might take 6 months.

Ms. Ready asked if there were any concerns regarding slopes, grading or engineering.

Mr. Blodgett confirmed no there were no concerns.

Mr. LaVoire added that it's the same engineer that completed the first building.

Ms. Ready said it's a pretty large structure for a shed and asked if there was language to classify this.

Mr. Blodgett thanked her for asking and said as an accessory building calling it a shed seems like a misuse of the word. He said there is no direct ordinance language defining a building like this, and typically accessory buildings are garden sheds and garages. He continued, the caveat here is that this property is in the agricultural zone and is the only property in Town that is actively undergoing agricultural use. So an accessory building of this nature is perfectly acceptable under an agricultural use.

Ms. Peterson pointed out section Zoning code 503, B.2 regarding agricultural use and read the section.

There was brief discussion regarding size of the building.

Mr. Blodgett said the checks and balances within the Code are the lot coverage limits. He said in this case they anticipated what could become a problem and solved around it.

There was discussion regarding what classifies as an accessory structure along with some examples of those structures throughout other neighboring communities.

Ms. Ready asked if the new structure would be accessible to the existing structure internally.

Mr. LaVoire answered that there is a staircase accessible externally.

There was conversation how the new structure would be attached to the existing structure, such as anchor plating and extra concrete.

Ms. Miller asked if there were any noise considerations for climate control.

Mr. LaVoire answered it would be the same system as what is present now. He described the cooling system and the placement of fans, sharing that there is no motor, it's just wind.

Mr. Blodgett shared that the noise, if there was any, would be no more than a household air conditioning unit makes.

There was some discussion regarding the current placement of the generator on the property.

Mr. Riley asked if any more electrical panels needed to be installed.

Mr. LaVoire said nothing else on the outside, if they needed something it would be a sub within the building.

Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Blodgett regarding 503 E.4 regarding maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Blodgett answered that lot coverage is 8%, and that the majority of the property is a vineyard. This was followed by further discussion regarding lot coverage.

Mr. LaVoire informed the commission that they will see this again when it gets to the permitting stage.

Mr. Ready asked if there would be fire suppression in the building.

Mr. LaVoire answered it is not required, and the structure will have concrete flooring with a metal frame.

Ms. Peterson said she wanted to make a statement before they voted. She said it's under her oath that she goes on site, but in this case, she's seen enough that she can vote on this with a good conscience.

Mr. Blodgett said he appreciated her standpoint, and in this situation due to privacy concerns of the property owner he felt that maybe the representative could provide enough information for the board to decide if it was adequate enough for decision making.

Ms. Riley said having the video helped.

Ms. Peterson said she was going to abstain because every time she's voted, she's visited the site, but this was adequate. Other commissioners expressed their agreement as well, sharing that they like the site visits but having this information was nice.

Mr. Blodgett asked if there was anything else that he could address.

Mr. Schall followed up asking if there were any additional questions or discussions for this item.

Ms. Ready moved to approve the application for the barrel storage accessory structure at 103 Dundee.

Ms. Miller seconded the motion.

Chair Schall called the question, and the motion passed unanimously.

Motion to approve as presented.

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER		X	X			
PETERSON			X			
READY	X		X			
RILEY			X			
SCHALL			X			

6:42PM (30:26) 4. NEXT MEETING ITEMS

Mr. Schall introduced item 4.

Mr. Blodgett was conversing with Mr. LaVoire and Ms. Ready called a point of order.

Mr. Blodgett said for next meeting he doesn't know what the agenda will be just yet, but there will be an election to establish a new Vice Chair, and there may be other housekeeping items to take care of.

Ms. Peterson said she wanted to make a statement regarding zoning. She said we have single family and two families not multiple families. She noticed it in the minutes and everyone says it.

Mr. Blodgett said she is correct. He said we do have R2 zoning not multiple family zoning, but talking to other planners our R2 zoning is multiple family. He said there are multiple ways to talk about it, so he sometimes he feels like he might sound like a crazy person.

Ms. Peterson said with us (Jerome) it states single or two family to make it clear that we don't want 5 families in there.

Mr. Blodgett said we have to be careful with that statement because we do define two types of residential zones and have a lot of nonconforming properties which could lead to questions about if our zoning could be problematic.

Ms. Peterson said R2 says it's single or two families.

Mr. Blodgett said that our R1-5 zoning is also a permitted use in R2. HE said it's the same as there being certain uses permitted in the C1 and Industrial zones. He said when you define R2 as a property it's a duplex but as a zone you could have a lot of things that don't quite fit the zone because it's an overlay.

Ms. Peterson asked what the difference between R10 and R1-5 is.

Mr. Blodgett answered lot size and required setbacks, however that zoning does not neatly apply to any of the lots that it's applied to.

6:46PM (34:36) 5. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schall introduced the item and asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Ready made the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Riley seconded the motion.

Mr. Schall called the question, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:46p.m.

Motion to Adjourn at 6:46 p.m.

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
MILLER			X			
PETERSON			X			
READY	X		X			
RILEY		X	X			
SCHALL			X			

Approved: _____ Date: _____

Chair Lance Schall, Planning & Zoning Commission Vice Chair

Attest: _____ Date: _____

Kristen Muenz, Deputy Town Clerk