



**TOWN OF PRESCOTT VALLEY**  
**Building Board of Appeals**

Minutes

*Wednesday, August 12, 5:30 p.m.*  
*Prescott Valley Library Auditorium*

**I. Call to Order**

Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called the August 12, 2020 meeting of the Building Board of Appeals to order at 5:30 p.m.

**II. Attendance**

Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked for roll call attendance to be taken. Members present: Member Tatro, Member Pape, Member Smith, Member Leithead, Member Nigh and Vice-Chairperson Jarpe. Members absent: Member McIntyre. Staff present: Mike Loiselle, Senior Building Inspector, Russ Harsh, Senior Plans Examiner, Kristi Jones, Administrative Support II and Kelly Campbell, Administrative Support II.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked if there were any changes to the minutes from the April 24, 2019 meeting. There were none; thus, Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called for a motion to approve the minutes. Member Leithead made the MOTION, seconded by Member Nigh, to approve the minutes as submitted from the April 24, 2019 Building Board of Appeals meeting.

Board members voted as follows: Vice-Chairperson Jarpe YES, Member Leithead YES, Member Tatro YES, Member Nigh YES, Member Smith YES and Member Pape YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays.**

**IV. Announcements**

✚ Mrs. Jones introduced new Member Tatro and welcomed him to the Board. Member Tatro gave a brief synopsis of his background. Mrs. Jones also introduced Mike Loiselle, Senior Building Inspector, Russ Harsh, Senior Plans Examiner and Kelly Campbell, Administrative Support II.

**V. Action Items**

**1. Election of Officers**

Mrs. Jones stated that Vice-Chairperson Jarpe would call for nominations for Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, followed by a vote from the Board, adding that the Board could take nominations by voice call or written confidential ballot.

The Board voiced their agreement to make formal vote for nominees by voice vote.

✚ Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called for nominations for Chairperson.

Member Nigh nominated Steve Jarpe for Chairperson.

As there were no further nominations for Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked for a motion to close the nominations.

**Member Smith moved to close the nomination for Chairperson.** Member Nigh seconded the motion.

**Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked for a voice call vote for the nomination of Vice-Chairperson Jarpe for appointment to the seat of Chairperson effective at the conclusion of this meeting.** Motion carried by voice call vote of those members present as follows:

MOTION carried 5:0 by voice call vote as follows: Vice-Chairperson Jarpe ABSTAIN, Member Leithead YES, Member Nigh YES, Member Pape YES, Member Smith YES and Member Tatro YES.

**MOTION carried with 5 ayes and 1 abstaining.**

Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called for nominations for Vice-Chairperson.

Member Nigh nominated Member Pape for Vice-Chairperson.

Member Pape nominated Member Smith for Vice-Chairperson

As there were no further nominations for Vice-Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked for a motion to close the nominations.

**Member Leithead moved to close the nomination for Vice-Chairperson.** Member Smith seconded the motion.

**Vice-Chairperson Jarpe asked for a roll call vote for the nomination of Member Pape for appointment to the seat of Vice-Chairperson effective at the conclusion of this meeting.** Motion carried by roll call vote of those members present as follows:

MOTION carried by roll call vote as follows: Vice-Chairperson Jarpe YES, Member Leithead YES, Member Pape ABSTAIN, Member Nigh YES, Member Smith YES and Member Tatro YES.

**MOTION carried with 5 ayes and 1 abstaining.**

## **VI. Call to the Public**

Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called for further public comment on any of the issues addressed.

## **VII. Adjournment of the Building Board of Appeals**

There was no further public comment related to any item presented during this meeting; therefore, Vice-Chairperson Jarpe called for a motion for adjournment.

Member Leithead made the MOTION, seconded by Member Nigh, to adjourn by voice call vote. Board members voted as follows: Vice-Chairperson Jarpe YES, Member Leithead YES, Member Smith YES, Member Nigh YES, Member Pape YES and Member Tatro YES.  
**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays**

The August 12, 2020, Building Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

---

Chairperson Jarpe



# Building Board of Appeals Work-Study Session

Wednesday, August 12, 2020

5:42 PM

Library Auditorium

7401 E. Skoog Blvd.

----- Minutes -----

## I. Call to Order

## II. Roll Call

Chairperson Jarpe asked for roll call attendance to be taken. Members present: Member Nigh, Member Smith, Member Leithead, Member Tatro, Vice-Chairperson Pape, and Chairperson Jarpe. Members Absent: Member McIntyre. Staff Present: Mike Loiselle, Senior Building Inspector; Russ Harsh, Senior Plans Examiner; Kristi Jones, Administrative Support II and Kelly Campbell, Administrative Support II.

## III. Discussion Items

### 1. Hillside Development

Russ Harsh, Senior Plans Examiner, stated that the Town is in the initial stages of composing a policy or potentially an ordinance to address hillside development as the majority of flat lots within the Town have been developed and what's left are the hillside lots and/or lots with other challenges.

Member Smith asked if we had reviewed the City of Prescott's hillside development as the majority of land in Prescott has hills.

Mr. Harsh indicated that he wasn't sure if the City of Prescott's ordinance had been reviewed; the material included in their packets was based on another jurisdiction. He noted that we could review their ordinance as part of the process.

Member Leithead asked for clarification regarding the applicability as one portion of the draft states that it doesn't apply to individual, single family residential development on existing lots except where part of a planned development or new subdivision; however, other portions of the draft gives the Town the ability to apply this to existing lots.

Mr. Harsh reported that they noticed the conflicting language and modifications need to be made. He explained that the intent of the policy or future ordinance is to address specific lots as subdivision requirements already exist in Town Code.

Member Leithead suggested that cost needs to be considered when working on the modifications. He indicated that there aren't enough engineers in the area to implement the proposed requirements if several lots are affected. Member Leithead stated that the Town already has an existing code related to grading that requires an unusual lot with unusual circumstances to be engineered. He asked if that is being discarded and/or replaced.

Mr. Harsh reported that the intention is to further define and clarify requirements for properties with a fifteen percent (15%) slope or higher.

Member Leithead described a hypothetical example of a slope lot that is surrounded by developed properties. He indicated that finding an engineer who would guarantee that the water wouldn't create a problem by changing the lot would be slim.

Mr. Harsh stated that the intent isn't to get lots changed so engineering isn't required. He emphasized that engineering is still required for steeper slope lots regardless if implementing a new policy and/or ordinance. He stated that the only addition to the existing requirements is regarding driveways being over ten percent (10%) slope, which would require engineering under the proposed change. He reiterated that the easy lots have been developed and what's left are the challenging lots. Mr. Harsh explained that the goal is to stay consistent with the aesthetics that have already been established in the Town and to have more specific regulations going forward in order to attain that consistency.

Member Leithead expressed that most of the language in the proposal is more applicable to subdivisions than individual lots, and his opinion is that it needs to be split into two separate regulations.

Mr. Harsh responded that this is a work in progress and still needed to be fine-tuned.

Member Smith asked for the pros and cons of dividing the policy or ordinance to separate subdivisions and individual lots. He stated there are likely some differences between the two, but water issues are a concern in any case.

Mr. Harsh agreed and expressed that the Town has attempted to mitigate drainage issues as much as possible, and the proposed policy or ordinance is an effort to put specific requirements in place so that future drainage issues can be avoided.

Member Leithead stated that the hillside lots being discussed are those with a fifteen percent (15%) slope, which only represents approximately one to two percent (1-2%) of the total lots in Prescott Valley.

Mr. Harsh agreed that there aren't many. He mentioned that Stoneridge is one area that has several slope challenges, many of which were addressed to a certain

extent when the subdivision was built out; however, in a situation where lots are purchased from the subdivision, the Town is trying to maintain consistency among regulations of development.

In response to Member Smith's question regarding separating the subdivision requirements from the individual lot requirements, Member Leithead explained that when developing on an individual lot with slope challenges, the water from surrounding properties must be considered. He indicated that this is a much different process than creating flat building lots within a subdivision such as Granville.

Mr. Harsh indicated there is a disconnect between understanding the dynamics of developing an entire subdivision versus developing an individual lot and understanding how that one lot interacts with the adjacent lots. The intent is to provide additional tools to remedy this.

Member Leithead voiced his opinion that there are some "unbuildable" lots in Prescott Valley, and there is a need for a detailed breakdown on what is required specifically for single-family lot development, as opposed to the requirements for subdivision development.

Mr. Harsh reiterated that this was the initial goal, and it appears some modifications need to be made to include more specific verbiage related to individual lots. He noted that the purpose of the Work-Study was to gain feedback from the Board.

Member Leithead mentioned that it is important to view it from different perspectives, such as inspector, builder, etc. He said it would be helpful as a builder to have a Code in place to back him up, but it needs to be more refined to match the intent.

Member Nigh agreed that the subdivision requirements need to be separate from the individual lot requirements. He questioned whether a slope calculation analysis would be required if a portion of the lot exceeded fifteen percent (15%) and if this applies to both individual lots and subdivisions.

Mr. Harsh confirmed that the analysis would be required on lots over fifteen percent (15%) and there is an existing subdivision ordinance that details the requirements specific to subdivisions. The Town is now looking to define specific requirements for individual lots.

Member Nigh asked about a theoretical lot that may have an overall slope of six percent (6%) but a small piece is fifteen percent (15%) and whether that piece would trigger the added requirement.

Member Leithead questioned if it would depend on what portion of the lot was

being developed.

Mike Loiselle, Senior Building Inspector, replied, "Absolutely."

Member Leithead further clarified that if the portion of the lot with the fifteen percent (15%) slope was not affected by the building and water flow was not changed, then the fifteen percent (15%) would not need to be addressed.

Mr. Harsh agreed.

Member Nigh asked for clarification on Member Leithead's main concerns.

Member Leithead explained that there is a shortage of engineers within the Quad Cities and current projects are taking longer in engineering after a plan is developed. His concern is figuring out how to work with the engineering constraints. Member Leithead shared that in earlier years, the basic rule of thumb was as long as the water ran off where it ran before the project was started and in the same form, you were okay and he believes that concept is still applicable.

Mr. Harsh concurred if it doesn't increase the flow.

Member Leithead stated that it's going to increase just by putting a roof on the lot; however, it doesn't matter as long as the flow has the same effect as before.

Mr. Harsh agreed commenting that the increased water flow would be dissipated before it reached adjoining properties.

Member Smith disagreed as dynamics are always changing and putting a roof on a lot changes everything in regards to water runoff. He doesn't feel that the runoff will be exactly as it was before.

Member Nigh asked Staff their understanding of Member Leithead's concerns.

Mr. Harsh stated that the current draft is too broad and is more applicable to larger developments; therefore, it should be specifically honed to individual single-family lots.

Member Leithead recommended that the rules need to be specifically defined so they can be implemented and enforced. He noted that the rules should be written in terms that anyone can understand.

Member Nigh asked how Member Leithead would like the wording to be changed.

Member Leithead reported that the current verbiage seems to be designed for an

entire subdivision as opposed to individual lot design.

Mr. Loiselle emphasized that this would apply to all single-family lots; not just within a subdivision. He noted that this is being implemented because most of the flat lots have been developed. Mr. Loiselle identified vacant lots on Magma Drive as examples of sloped lots that are now being developed.

Mr. Harsh remarked that the ten (10) page draft should be condensed to a two (2) page draft with bullet points of the requirements.

Member Nigh asked for the definition of a one hundred (100) year storm.

Mr. Harsh indicated that the snowstorm in February 2019 was close to a one hundred (100) year storm.

Member Leithead reported that it has to do with the amount of moisture within a given timeframe.

Mr. Harsh indicated that current design standards include the ability to handle four (4) inches of rain in one (1) hour.

Member Smith reiterated that before the next meeting, he would like someone to look at current regulations in a comparable area, and potentially utilize those regulations.

Mr. Harsh asked Mrs. Jones how far in advance materials go out before a meeting and how long they would have to review and compile materials for the next meeting.

Mrs. Jones stated that materials go out two (2) weeks before a meeting, and that meetings are typically held on the second Wednesday of the month, but that does not necessarily mean the meeting must be held one (1) month from now.

The Board collectively agreed that they would prefer to allow enough time to review and prepare materials for the meeting.

Member Nigh asked for clarification on the process of the Work-Study meetings.

Mr. Harsh confirmed that this Work-Study meeting was to obtain initial feedback from the Board. A second draft will be put together and presented to the Board at the next Work-Study meeting. Mr. Harsh indicated that the second draft may or may not end up being the final version, depending on further feedback from the Board.

Member Leithead commented that his point of view is that this document needs to be very detailed and specific, and that it should be an ordinance.

Mr. Loiselle clarified Member Leithead's comment, stating that he is looking for a shorter version, including specifically what should be required on a hillside lot.

The Board concurred.

## **2. Meeting Times**

Woody Lewis, Building Official, was not present to discuss; therefore, Mrs. Jones spoke on his behalf, indicating that his preference would be for the Board to meet earlier in the afternoon around three-thirty or four o'clock. He understands that some Members have jobs that may make it difficult to attend at that time but wanted to get feedback.

The Board collectively agreed that four o'clock would be a good time for future meetings.

Mrs. Jones mentioned that the only exception would be meetings involving code changes. In this case, the public meeting would be held later to allow the opportunity for the Public to attend.

## **IV. Adjournment**

Chairperson Jarpe called for a motion for adjournment.

Member Leithead made the MOTION to adjourn by voice call vote, seconded by Member Smith. Board members voted as follows: Chairperson Jarpe YES, Vice-Chairperson Pape YES, Member Nigh YES, Member Tatro YES, Member Smith YES, and Member Leithead YES.

**MOTION carried with 6 ayes and 0 nays**

The August 12, 2020, Building Board of Appeals Work-Study Session adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

---

Chairperson Jarpe