



TOWN OF JEROME

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

DRAFT MINUTES RESCHEDULED-REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF JEROME 600 CLARK STREET 600 CLARK STREET, JEROME, ARIZONA MONDAY, AUGUST 03, 2026, AT 6:30 PM

(0:03) 6:48 1. CALL TO ORDER

Present were Chair Mark Krmpotich, Vice Chair Devon Kunde, Board Member Tyler Christensen, and Board Member Scott Staab.

Staff present included Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett.

Chair Krmpotich announced that Board Member Christensen had just been elected to join the Town Council; there was a round of applause. Mr. Blodgett then reminded those present that the DRB board would have another opening and Chair Krmpotich added that would leave two vacancies.

(1:40) 6:50 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 5.26.2026

Vice Chair commented that the minutes looked good, and Board Member Christensen moved to approve them.

Vice Chair Kunde seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of 05/26/2026

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	X		X			
KUNDE		X	X			
KRMPOTICH			X			
STAAB			X			

3. NEW BUSINESS

(2:18) 6:51 A. Alterations and Rehabilitation for 38 Paradise Lane

Mr. Blodgett introduced Item 3A, a rehabilitation and reuse project at 38 Paradise Lane. Proposed alterations included two windows, gable ends, a door and walkway.

Chair Krmpotich asked for clarification of the orientation of the house.

Mr. Blodgett confirmed that it was a 2-level facing Paradise Lane and the back of the house faces Magnolia, upslope. The top floor will have a bedroom, and code would require egress from that room, which it does not have. Part of the restoration is to add that secondary egress to Magnolia. A similar situation exists on an adjacent property, and the contractor is willing to mimic the style closely. It will be subject to building codes and inspections by the Building Inspector, Barry Wolstencroft. In terms of code compliance, Mr. Blodgett said this is an improvement. Due to the historic status of the house, they do not have to do it, but this is the best practice. Mr. Blodgett said that the windows and door will not cut into any part of the structure of the building, and the Building Inspector is not concerned about structural modifications. The door is a historic door, and it is best case scenario for historic preservation and he supports the project. The alterations will make the second floor more accessible and safer. There is a gate that will be added to the boardwalk, and they wish to add a steel fence that will last a long time. Part of the rehabilitation project and best practices is a certificate of appropriateness that will go into the house's file to make sure the property can maintain its historic status. He asked if there were any questions.

Board Member Christensen, regarding the iron fence, asked if there would be spikes on the curved pieces.

The applicant, contractor Jay Kinsella, said they do not have spikes.

Vice Chair Kunde asked if the fence would be stationary.

Mr. Blodgett replied that the current gate does open and close but is in disrepair.

Vice Chair Kunde clarified that it will be a swinging gate.

Mr. Kinsella confirmed that it would swing, and one side would swing towards the existing fence, while the other side would not because that would block the stairwell. On top of the historic door, they intend to add historic double-hung windows with permission. Also, he wanted to clarify that the staircase would lead to the backyard.

Board Member Christensen agreed the staircase will allow for egress into the yard in the event of a fire.

Mr. Blodgett added that in terms of historic preservation, we could not ask for better.

Board Member Christense moved to approve Item 3A as presented, which was seconded by Vice Chair Kunde. It passed unanimously.

Motion to approve the Alterations and Rehabilitation of 38 Paradise Lane

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	X		X			
KUNDE		X	X			
KRMPOTICH			X			
STAAB			X			

(13:01) 6:54 B. Change of Signage / New Sign Ghost City Christian Apparel

Mr. Blodgett introduced Item 3B, new signage for a business that is moving to a space next door to their current location. He explained that the signage was similar to the current sign, but with some changes. The sign was built with our Sign Ordinance in mind. The window signage is technically two separate decals, while the hanging sign is a single sign. As the hanging sign dissects the window decals, it can be considered a single sign. Mr. Blodgett said that he did recommend discussion on this interpretation. He said that the last time the applicant signage came before the board, they voted to consider it as one sign.

Chair Krmpotich asked for clarification.

Mr. Blodgett said it was for the window decals, that were technically two decals but were intended to be part of one sign. Their interpretation of that would be required again.

Board Member Christensen clarified that the window painting was the sign and Mr. Blodgett confirmed this.

Chair Krmpotich commented that the board had given a similar waiver to Haunted Pizano. He felt they could go forward with it as one sign.

Board Member Christensen added that something similar was done at the ice cream shop.

Mr. Blodgett said in that case, as that was the only question he had on the application, everything else fell under the sign requirements of the ordinance.

Chair Krmpotich asked if there were any questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Kunde said that they have a flag; will the flag stay?

The applicant, Levi Parker, said perhaps a smaller flag, because there isn't room for the current flag.

Chair Krmpotich said that he had no questions, comments, or concerns, and asked for recommendations from the board.

Vice Chair Kunde moved to approve, which was seconded by Board Member Staab. Item 3B was approved unanimously.

Motion to approve the Change of Signage/New Signage for Ghost City Christian Apparel

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN			X			
KUNDE	X		X			
KRMPOTICH			X			
STAAB		X	X			

(18:06) 6:59 4. FUTURE DRB AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Blodgett updated the board on Section 106. He said that on July 24th, 2026, the advisor council on Historic Preservation voted 15 to 5 to advance a sweeping proposal to regulations with Section 106. He then explained the ramifications of this change, and the adverse effects, including eliminating some protections.

Chair Krmpotich asked if it would block federal mandates.

Mr. Blodgett said they don't have to care what we have to say, they don't care what federal agents have to say.

Chair Krmpotich asked if it would block all historic preservation.

Mr. Blodgett replied, yes, they will essentially get to write their own findings based on new definitions, with zero review or commentary from groups that might be adversely affected.

Board Member Christensen asked what he meant by that.

Mr. Blodgett replied that it was legal terminology and everyone was trying to figure out what it meant. He further explained that it was vague and almost left us with no recourse for damage. It eliminates protections for eligible properties and narrows the definitions of historic properties, parks, and rural settings, and a loss of higher standards from Section 110. Usually, Section 106 is what we deal with; Section 110 is at the federal level and requires a higher standard of care to minimize harm to national historic landmarks, which has to be better than the minimums. It essentially overhauls SHPO ability to do anything. Currently SHPO must be consulted by federal agencies, but the new draft allows agencies to unilaterally draft and certify, with only peer comment. Mr. Blodgett said this is terrifying for historic preservation and archaeology across the nation right now. There will be a commentary period, and it will go through a process, so he will keep them updated.

Vice Chair Kunde commented that it will probably be litigated and people will file objections.

Mr. Blodgett agreed, and said to anyone who listens, he wants to say that certain agencies, such as tribes, have the experience of fighting this, and he roots for them.

Board Member Christensen said it essentially opens up for people to do whatever they want, and Mr. Blodgett agreed that it undoes the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. It will also limit state historic preservation offices to protect our own history. Mr. Blodgett stated that it does feel like federal overreach on state's rights, and he had no problem saying that on record. We are heading into an interesting fight, and he will keep them all posted.

Mr. Blodgett brought up the Zoning Code updates and said there will be future meetings between the boards. He said we are at the local level of this fight and we have a lot of support from other agencies across the country.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 7:07 P.M.

BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	X		X			
KUNDE			X			
KRMPOTICH			X			
STAAB		X	X			