

TOWN OF JEROME

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

DRAFT MINUTES REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF JEROME 600 CLARK STREET 600 CLARK STREET, JEROME, ARIZONA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2024, AT 6:00 PM

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

6:00 P.M. (0:00) 1. CALL TO ORDER

Present were Chair Tyler Christensen, Vice Chair Carol Wittner, and Board members Mark Krmpotich, Devon Kunde, & Scott Staab.

Staff present included Zoning Administrator Will Blodgett and Deputy Clerk Kristen Muenz.

6:00 (0:34) 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Approval of minutes from the regular meeting of 08/27/2024

Vice Chair Carol Wittner wished to comment regarding the replacement fencing at 537 School Street. The minutes say they were going to replace existing fencing, but there was never any fencing along the wall between her own house and the other house. The only fence was installed by a couple of tenants, some garden edging to contain their dog. Ms. Wittner said the fencing was only so high and motioned with her hands about a foot, and it was only stuck into the ground. She stated that she wanted to clarify there was never a fence between the yards and the review was incorrect. Ms. Muenz replied that she could add a footnote with those comments to the minutes.

Board Member Mark Krmpotich added that he thought that was also true. He remembered the front facade but not the side fence, which was why he questioned it as seen in the minutes.

Mr. Blodgett suggested that they continue the discussion later in the meeting as the project was not on the current agenda to stay on topic.

Ms. Wittner said she would also like to apologize for missing some of the past meetings due to visiting her grandson in Amsterdam.

Mr. Christensen asked how to proceed, and *Mr.* Blodgett suggested approving the minutes with an added note as the error was not in the minutes, but rather in the information of the item.

Mr. Christensen moved to approve the minutes with the suggested amendment.

Ms. Wittner said that she would not vote as she was not present at the last meeting.

Motion to Approve Minutes from the Regular Meeting of 8-27-24 with suggested amendment

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

6:04 (4:27) 3. CONTINUED ITEMS/OLD BUSINESS

4. NEW BUSINESS

6:04 (4:33) A. Review of proposed new Signage for 111 Main Street, Haunted Pizano.

Mr. Blodgett gave a brief analysis of the suggested signage, saying the updated graphics would be placed on the existing sign boards. The graphics would be black and white, while the signboards would be bordered in red. There will be additional graphics on the glass on the front of the building, including on the front door which will have the address above. The total square footage will be within the maximum allowed. He said that he did not see an issue on the surface, but if the board had questions, the applicant was present to respond.

Mr. Christensen asked, will the windows be translucent?

The applicant, Mr. Eric Jurisin, replied that it was undecided. At the moment there were blackout blinds, because he did want it to be dark inside.

Mr. Krmpotich commented that it looked like there would be designs on the windows.

Mr. Jurisin replied that he may do decals or neon behind the glass, he was not sure yet. They were just starting to seriously consider reopening after putting it off for 4 years.

Mr. Blodgett commented that initial discussions did include graphics on the windows, but that would have put him over the maximum square footage for signage, so he removed it from the design. However, if the graphics are behind the windows, that puts them outside the purview of design review.

Ms. Kunde asked if the trim on the signs and doors that were currently yellow will be changed to red.

Mr. Jurisin yes, it will be changed to red. He then provided a brief history of the previous uses of the building, most recently as the restaurant, Grapes, which closed during the pandemic.

Mr. Christensen said that he had a question about the number of signs allowed. He said it was the same logo, but is there a limit?

Mr. Blodgett replied that there was a limit, which is why there were no decals with the logo on the window designs anymore. There was a logo that said "Haunted Pizano" with the street number on the door, but that was much smaller and did not significantly increase the size, and there were allowances in the ordinance for directional signage. *Mr.* Christensen said it seemed more like a watermark on the windows.

Mr. Blodgett explained that what he saw was a leftover shadow of an image from the previous design, and was not included in the resubmitted signage. If the window decals were to exist, they would be on the inside of the windows, which was not part of the design review.

Mr. Jurisin commented that, in his opinion, in the past, windows were not included in square footage calculations. He said it was either never enforced or we changed the ordinance along the way. He added that the property has double frontage too, so that gives it a larger allowance for signage. He stated that is why there are more signs on the building and how it got approved 20+ years ago.

Mr. Krmpotich asked if they had access from Clark Street and Mr. Jurisin replied that we do, there is a path we walk all the time, but the public are not allowed to use it.

Mr. Blodgett said that, in this instance, we are looking at 28.8 total square feet, which is under the maximum of 32 SF. There is some ambiguity in the ordinance about some types of signage, like decals or paintings. Mr. Blodgett said he was not counting the address on the door because it was directional signage, but even if we did, the total would still be under.

Mr. Christensen said that even if it was included, it seemed more like a watermark than signage. He asked if Mr. Jurisin intended to still use the decal.

Mr. Jurisin replied that he did not know, but if he did, he would do it from inside the window.

Mr. Christensen asked if there were any other questions.

Ms. Wittner moved to approve the signage, and Ms. Kunde seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Jurisin thanked the board, and members of the board expressed that they were looking forward to the restaurant reopening.

Motion to Approve Signage for 111 Main Street as presented

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

6:13 (12:54) B. DRB will review new signage for Vino Zona at 369 Main Street.

Mr. Blodgett explained that this was a sign that had up prior to approval, and we are now playing catch-up. It took some time, but he did finally receive written approval from the property's owner. It is a simple sign, with each letter being 6.5" by 6.5", for a total of 7' 1" vertically. Mr. Blodgett said he could not name the font, but it matched the font on the other signage. The color was color-matched to the existing tiles, a sort of dark gray. The total is 3.5' square feet of signage, including the other existing sign on the building, and was still under the maximum square footage of signage allowed on the building.

Ms. Wittner commented that she liked it.

Mr. Christensen moved to approve the signage, and Ms. Wittner seconded the motion.

The new signage was approved unanimously.

Motion to Approve Signage for 369 Main Street as presented

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

6:15 (15:00) C. Final draft review for the Design Review Guidelines. Design review board members will be given a copy of the final draft of the Design Review Guidelines to review and discuss.

Mr. Blodgett explained that he was still waiting for final approval to utilize Anne Basset's artwork. While he was waiting, he was made aware of a design guide written by Brice Wood. Mr. Blodgett said that he would like to get hold of this work to see if he could use it in part, as he hoped to add in what could be useful. At the same time, if he was told we can't use Anne's artwork, he would change the format and design and that would also adjust the timeline for completion. While he waits, he will work on the structure and format. He said he sent a draft to State Historic Preservation, and while he has not received comments back from SHPO yet, the meat of document is here. His hope is that, with this information accessible to the public, we can avoid issues in the future. We are in the final stretches of this and he would love comments and suggestions back at the next meeting and see if we think we are ready to send it to the council or take a step back. He repeated that he would attempt to get a copy of the work from Mr. Wood, and if he did, he would send a copy to the members of the board.

Mr. Krmpotich offered to assist in speaking to Ms. Yacht about the guide by Mr. Wood.

Mr. Blodgett replied that he would appreciate his assistance. If we can get a copy, we can review, compare, and contrast to what we have. *Mr.* Blodgett said we would like this document to "hold the hands" of people to allow them to bring more complete and thought-out projects before the board. He asked for any thoughts.

Mr. Krmpotich asked if it was still 99% of what was presented to the board previously.

Mr. Blodgett replied that it was, but with added history of Jerome from the Haven tour guideline, with their permission. Also, he added the Lighting Ordinance section after it was approved, which he attempted to boil down. Mr. Blodgett explained that he was trying to keep the guideline as concise and direct as possible, and bring in other sources of information.

Mr. Krmpotich asked if they were to read the guideline before the next meeting and Mr. Blodgett confirmed this.

6:21 (20:52) 5. FUTURE DRB AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Blodgett stated there were currently 2 projects where people exceeded or failed to get approvals. The most recent was here on Clark Street, to do with the removal of both chimneys. He said he was not against that work; however, they did need demolition permits to prevent the danger of losing the historic home status. Also, the 537 School Street fence that was installed was not the fencing that was approved and was not installed the way it was discussed or approved. *Mr.* Blodgett said the historic wall had modifications. He said that he was in the process of dealing with both properties, and he did not wish to talk in detail about them because they were in active discussions, but he has requested input from SHPO on them because he and wanted their opinions, especially on the fence. He described some of the items he wished to discuss with SHPO, and said he is taking it very seriously and he will have updates once he has more information.

Ms. Kunde suggested looking at the listing photographs for details on what was there previously.

Mr. Blodgett replied that we have looked back, but he does not want to go into details until he has more information from the owners and the state.

Ms. Wittner commented that she could provide photos, and that they added a much larger fence, along with other details. She also wished to comment that the neighbors who took down the chimneys were not aware that they needed permits and were very apologetic.

Mr. Blodgett replied that he understood that, and in order to protect the town's CLG status, he will have a conversation with SHPO. He said that in both cases, we can take corrective action, and do as best we can to make it right. *Ms.* Wittner offered to contact the property owner and Mr. Blodgett said that it was on the public record, so they could reach out, but he would prefer to be the official point of contact.

Ms. Wittner explained that they took it down because it was falling down, and they were fearful that someone would be hurt.

Mr. Blodgett said that our own building has the same problem, so he is incredibly sympathetic. It is all about protecting CLG status, and our meetings to review these things are our protections. He said he will always work with honest mistakes, they happen, and sometimes they do not know.

Ms. Wittner suggested it would be a good idea to speak with the homeowner and advise him about the building, as they are trying to do a lot of work there.

Regular Meeting of the Design Review Board of Tuesday, September 24, 2024

Mr. Blodgett replied that it was news to him, and he would try to reach out.

Mr. Christensen asked about scenarios when parties may or not be cooperative, and the enforcement.

Mr. Blodgett explained there could be fines or removals. The building could also lose historic status and any ability to obtain grants. He said that he hesitates to throw that threat out because it is in our best interest to maintain the historic status and work with the homeowners. Mr. Blodgett said he also hesitates to pass judgements as to intentions. He said that so far, he has not had to be the bad guy, but he has no problem doing that if he must be punitive. He said that is also in part why SHPO is there. Mr. Blodgett added that the punitive measures are the last resort, and he is hoping SHPO can provide some options.

Mr. Christensen said that the "teeth" if you will, could be well informed residents infringing on their own historic value, which will make it harder for them to get things done, so hopefully they will want to cooperate.

Mr. Blodgett agreed that most people want to maintain the historic value of their home.

Ms. Kunde asked if there could be contact when someone buys a home, or thoughts to being proactive.

Mr. Blodgett agreed that there is a process of education for new homeowners, but we would not know that someone is actively purchasing a home until they reach out.

Ms. Muenz explained that staff do actively monitor the market, and attempt to apprise anyone who contacts the town of the historic status of the town, the Zoning Ordinance, and other issues that may arise.

There was some more discussion regarding reaching out to new homeowners and real estate agents and educating the public on Jerome's unique issues.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to Adjourn at 6:44 P.M.

<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>						
BOARD MEMBER	MOTION	SECOND	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
CHRISTENSEN	Х		Х			
KUNDE			X			
KRMPOTICH		X	Х			
STAAB			Х			
WITTNER			Х			