

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING  
OF THE TOWN OF CHINO VALLEY**

**JULY 5, 2016  
6:00 P.M.**

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Chino Valley, Arizona, met for a Regular Meeting in the Chino Valley Council Chambers, located at 202 N. State Route 89, Chino Valley, Arizona.

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Merritt called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

**2) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Commissioner Lane led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**3) ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair Chuck Merritt; Vice-Chair Gary Pasciak; Commissioner Michael Bacon; Commissioner Claude Baker; Commissioner Annie Lane; Commissioner Julie Van Wuffen

Absent: Commissioner Florence Sloan

Staff Associate Planner James Gardner; Town Clerk Assistant Amy Pyeatt-Lansa (recorder)  
Present:

**4) MINUTES**

**5) STAFF REPORTS**

There was no staff report.

**6) PUBLIC HEARING**

- a) Consideration and public hearing regarding amending the Unified Development Ordinance ("UDO"), Chapter 2, Definitions, Section 2.1, Meanings of Words and Terms; repealing Chapter 4.21 Sign Regulations, and adopting new Chapter 4.21 Sign Regulations, consisting of Sections 4.21.1 Purpose, 4.21.2 Permits Required, 4.21.3 General Sign Regulations, 4.21.4 Measurement of Signs, 4.21.5 Sign Standards, 4.21.6 Temporary Signs, 4.21.7 Prohibited Signs, 4.21.8 Non-Conforming Signs, and 4.21.9 Violations; Removal, all as set forth in the "Amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance of the Town of Chino Valley Related to Signs, dated July 26, 2016".

The intent of the revisions of the Sign Code are threefold: Compliance with Reed v. Gilbert Allowance for more signage for businesses, and creating a proportional allowance for signs based upon speed limits and frontages. To make a more easily understandable code that is easy to read for the public as well as easy to interpret for staff. The revisions proposed address those specific intents by: Creating content-neutral sign regulations Increasing maximum sign sizes, increasing total aggregate signage allowances, creating matrices or tables for different types of signage which allow for more signage on buildings fronting roadways with speed limits greater than 35 MPH, at 35 MPH, and less than 35 MPH (see Table 4.21.5.B-1 and Table 4.21.5.B-2 for examples). Creating a table-based format the spells out quantity, type, and placement of signage for each zoning district and reducing the number of pages of regulations from 22 to 11. This was achieved by creating a more compact format as well as removing provisions in the code which were written for a special purpose, provisions which conflicted with other parts of the code, and provisions which conflicted with state statute and case law.

Attached herein are the amendments to Section 4.21 that have arisen from this process, as well as amendments to Chapter 2 of the UDO, amending, deleting, and adding new definitions for signage.

This is the final review and vote before the amendment is sent to Town Council.

Associate Planner Gardner reviewed each if the proposed sign Regulations in his power point presentation.

- Chapter 2 Definitions, Section 2.1 Meanings of Words & Terms
- Repealing Chapter 4.21 Sign Regulations and adopting new Chapter 4.21 Sign Regulations consisting of Sections:
  - 4.21.1 Purpose
  - 4.21.2 Permits Required
  - 4.21.3 General Sign Regulations
  - 4.21.4 Measurement of Signs
  - 4.21.5 Sign Standards
  - 4.21.6 Temporary Signs
  - 4.21.7 Prohibited Signs
  - 4.21.8 Non-Conforming Signs
  - 4.21.9 Violations, Removal

Planner Gardner responded to questions from Commissioners:

- The amendments and definitions will become part of the Uniform Development Code.
- The International Sign Association suggested 6-seconds as the length of a message on an animated sign.
- Planner Gardner will do more research on message length before this item is presented to Town Council.
- The standard of brightness for animation signs is limited due to the Dark Sky Ordinance.
- There was discussion regarding 2-sided animation signs.
- There is a proposed restriction on the size of residential signs that needs to be added.
- After discussion the Commissioners opted not to restrict window signs. If it becomes an issue they can make changes in the future.
- If a business is located along the frontage, due to the speed limits, they can have more signage.
- If a new owners take over a business with non-conforming signs, they can continue with the existing signage and refresh the sign copy or update the sign.
- Temporary signs, such as garage sales signs, in the right of way can be removed.

Chair Merritt confirmed that Planner Gardner felt there had been sufficient public participation and public input in creating the proposed amendments and that the Town tried to include the business community, sign makers and the community in the process.

MOVED by Commissioner Michael Bacon, seconded by Vice-Chair Gary Pasciak to approve the proposed sign code with the changes that were recommended for the animated signs and that will be forwarding to Council.

**Vote: 6 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously**

**7) NON-PUBLIC HEARING ACTION ITEMS**

There were no non-public hearing action items.

**8) DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Commissioner Pasciak asked if the staff had met with Mr. Freeman as was recommended at the last meeting. Planner Gardner stated that he was not present but that Mr. Freeman had been invited to a meeting at Development Services. Chair Chuck Merritt was present at the meeting along with Mr. Freeman, Director Ruth Mayday, and Vice-Mayor Darryl Croft.

Chair Merritt described what took place at the meeting. Mr. Freeman was asked to write down specific problems he had with the proposed ordinance. The group could then sit down and address those concerns.

After the meeting Chair Merritt received a copy of a letter from Mr. Freeman dated from a few years prior. To date there had been no further response from Mr. Freeman regarding the proposed ordinance.

Chair Merritt stated that there did not seem to be too many restrictions placed on anyone by the proposed ordinance.

Commissioner Pasciak stated his question from the previous meeting about the requirements for septic systems to be approved by the County and the Town as well as what was the impetus behind the development of the ordinance.

**9) PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**10) ADJOURN**

MOVED by Vice-Chair Gary Pasciak, seconded by Commissioner Julie Van Wuffen to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 pm.

**Vote: 6 - 0 PASSED - Unanimously**

*Chuck Merritt*

Chair Chuck Merritt

*8-4-16*

Date