

**Hearing Officer Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2022**

A meeting of the City of Yuma's Hearing Officer was held on June 23, 2022, at City Hall Council Chambers, One City Plaza, Yuma, AZ.

HEARING OFFICER in attendance was Sonia Ramirez.

CITY OF YUMA STAFF MEMBERS present Emily Hart, Assistant City Attorney; Alyssa Linville, Assistant Director of Planning; Chad Brown, Associate Planner and Alejandro Marquez, Administrative Specialist.

Ramirez called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Ramirez approved the minutes of May 5, 2022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

VAR-39341-2022: *This is a request by Arthur Patrick, subject property owner, for a variance to reduce the street side yard setback from 10' to 0' to accommodate the expansion of a garage space, in the Low Density Residential (R-1-6) District, for the property located at 2400 West 5th Street, Yuma, AZ.*

Chad Brown, Associate Planner, summarized the staff report and recommended **DENIAL**.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

Ramirez asked for clarification of the placement of the structure. **Brown** answered the structure was going to be on the right side of the home. **Ramirez** asked if the structure was going to be a garage. **Brown** replied yes. **Ramirez** asked for the distance between the garage and the street. **Brown** answered 20 feet. **Ramirez** then asked if staff had any concerns about the distance. **Brown** answered no. **Ramirez** went on to ask if the garage was going to be attached to the home. **Brown** answered yes. **Ramirez** then asked if the structure was a room addition instead of a garage would staff change their decision. **Brown** replied no. **Ramirez** asked would the structure cause any safety issues with the traffic. **Brown** said no.

APPLICANT/APPLICANTS REPRESENTATIVE

Arthur Patrick, 2400 W. 5th Street, Yuma, AZ, stated the garage could only be built on that side of the home because of the landscaping, and that the structure would not block the visibility of oncoming traffic. **Ramirez** asked if the structure was going to be a two car garage. **Patrick** replied yes. **Ramirez** then asked for the size of the garage, and could a smaller garage be built. **Patrick** stated yes he could build a smaller one, but there were similar sized garages in the area, and that there was no opposition from any neighbors about the size of this garage.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DECISION

Ramirez granted the variance, subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment A, finding that the four criteria of Yuma City Code §154-03.04(D) (1) had been met.

VAR-39750-2022: *This is a request by Sign Masters, on behalf of Sunset Community Health Center INC, for a variance to allow the placement of a monument sign with a zero foot setback, in the General Commercial (B-2) District. The property is located at 703 South Avenue B, Yuma, AZ.*

Chad Brown, Associate Planner, summarized the staff report and recommended **Denial**.

QUESTIONS FOR STAFF

None

APPLICANT/APPLICANTS REPRESENTATIVE

Greg Villapando, 2205 W.12th Street, Yuma AZ, presented a handout that was not included in the staff report, then stated the reason for the new sign was to alert the public of the location of the clinic. **Villapando** also stated that the sign would not be a safety hazard to oncoming traffic. **Ramirez** asked for clarification of the location of the property. **Villapando** replied the clinic is located north of 8th St. on Avenue B after the new Administration Building. **Villapando** then stated that one of the reasons for the sign was to inform the public the difference of the two buildings. **Ramirez** then referred to a comment in the staff report that states there were other signs in the area with similar setbacks. **Ramirez** then asked **Villapando** if he was referring to the sign at Immaculate Conception Church. **Villapando** answered yes. **Ramirez** asked for the height of the proposed sign. **Villapando** replied 9 feet. **Ramirez** then asked if there was a different setback other than 0 feet that could be used. **Villapando** answered that the reason for a 0 foot setback was out of the concern for hitting an underground water pipe, but a 4 foot setback might work. **Ramirez** then asked if there already was a sign on the building. **Villapando** answered yes, but the sign faced south and it was not visible from Avenue B.

Ramirez asked **Brown** if Staff was made aware that the reason for the sign was to potentially prevent traffic accidents caused by the public turning into the property. **Brown** replied that public safety is one of the main reasons for setbacks for Monument Signs. **Brown** went on to say that according to the handout if the public made a left turn exiting the parking lot the sign would potentially block the view of oncoming traffic.

Alyssa Linville, Assistant Director of Planning, stated that there are concerns about visibility according to the handout that was provided, when turning south onto Avenue B it would be hard to see past the sign especially from inside of a vehicle, **Linville** then addressed the mention of similar signs in the area, stating the sign at Immaculate Conception Church was a Pole sign not a Monument sign, and Pole signs have different setbacks. **Ramirez** asked what would be the height of the sign if there was a 4 foot setback. **Linville** replied that if the sign was 4 feet it would call for a 2 foot setback if the sign was 6 feet it would be a 6 foot setback. **Ramirez** then asked what was the setback for a 7 foot sign. **Linville** replied 12 feet. **Ramirez** then asked did the parking lot allow a left turn onto south Avenue B. **Linville** answered yes.

Brown then added Immaculate Conception Church in the Transitional Zoning District different from the clinic, then clarified the location of the property and the entrance to the property.

Ramirez asked **Villapando** based on the information that was just discussed if there was anything more he would like to add. **Villapando** stated that because of the placement of a fire riser a shorter sign would be blocked. **Ramirez** then asked would he consider placing the sign at another location on the property. **Villapando** replied that is the only place the sign would fit.

OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT


None

DECISION

Ramirez denied the Variance to allow the placement of a monument sign with a zero foot setback, in the General Commercial (B-2) District, finding that the four criteria of Yuma City Code §154-03.04(D) (1) had not been met.

Ramirez adjourned the meeting at 9:50 a.m.

Minutes approved and signed this 14th day of July, 2022.


Hearing Officer