

DRAFT

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE COCHISE COUNTY
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
REGULAR MEETING HELD ON
Wednesday, FEBRUARY 18, 2026**

A regular meeting of the Board of Adjustment was held on Wednesday, FEBRUARY 18, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. in the Development Services Conference Room at 102 Colonia de Salud, Building B, Suite 105, Sierra Vista, Arizona.

Present: Paul Brick, Chair; Clint Briseno, Vice Chair; John Pintek, Member

Staff Present: Matthew Taylor, Planning Manager
Sharon Larsala, Planner I
Bert Whitehead, Deputy Civil County Attorney

Attendees: Melissa Botke, Applicant (VAR26-01)
Darcy Weidenbach, Speaker (VAR26-01)

Chair Brick called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

All Board members present.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

Motion by Vice Chair Clint Briseno, Second by Member John Pintek.

Vote: 3 - 0 Approved

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No one spoke during call to the public.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Docket VAR26-01: The applicant, Melissa Botke, requests a Variance from Sections 2.18.040 and 2.18.050 of the Zoning Regulations to allow construction of a 5,000-sf vehicle garage located 10 feet from the north and east property lines. The Zoning Regulations restrict accessory uses within the R-18 zoning district to a 20-foot setback and limit such structures from exceeding the size of the principal dwelling, as the parcel is less than 4 acres in size (principal dwelling is 550 sf). The property is located at 420 North Schrader Road, in Sierra Vista (APN 107-22-098C) and zoned R-18 (Residential District, one dwelling per 18,000 sf).

Motion by Vice Chair Clint Briseno, Second by Member John Pintek.

Case planner Larsala provided a presentation, which is preserved in the files. Applicant Melissa Botke provided a statement.

Chair Brick opened the public hearing. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. Chair Brick closed the public hearing. The applicant waived rebuttal.

Board discussion: Vice Chair Briseno inquired whether a structure similar to the one proposed in this case had ever been approved in the past in a comparable area. Planning Manager Taylor explained that this request is an outlier compared to other Variances previously reviewed by the Board and noted that further discussion with the applicant would provide additional clarity. Member Pintek asked about some of the existing buildings on the property to help differentiate the applicant's home from the neighboring home. The applicant explained they currently have numerous structures on the property they intend to remove. The applicant stated that the purpose of the requested storage structure is to have a place to store their belongings while upgrading the home and removing the older structures rather than renting off-site storage. The applicant further stated the requested 10-foot setback from the north and west property lines is due to the placement of an electrical pole located near the center of the property which provides power to both their home and a neighboring residence, and they wish to avoid disturbing it. Member Pintek questioned the reason for the proposed size of the accessory structure. The applicant responded that the building is intended to accommodate their ten vehicles. Vice Chair Briseno asked about the intended use of the building and the applicant replied that he plans to use it as a workspace for his vehicles.

Member Pintek asked where the three individuals opposing the Variance were located. Case Planner Larsala explained the reasons for the opposition as indicated on the public comment forms and showed the Board members the locations of the opposing property owners relative to the subject parcel. The applicant stated there are several large accessory structures in the area, some of which appear to be used for commercial purposes. Chair Brick noted that many of those existing structures may have been developed prior to the implementation of zoning regulations. Planning Manager Taylor confirmed that the subject property is located in a subdivision platted in 1970 and predates adoption of the zoning regulations which were adopted in 1975. The applicant added that they intend to locate the proposed building toward the rear of the property, farther from Schrader Road and closer to the state trust land, and that they do not operate loud machinery. Vice Chair Briseno expressed concern that if this variance is approved, other property owners in the neighborhood may seek to construct similarly large accessory structures. Chair Brick pointed out that if the Board were to follow staff's recommendation of a 20-foot setback from the north property line, the structure would then be only eight feet from the existing dwelling. Chair Brick asked whether the case could be tabled and Planning Manager Taylor replied that doing so would be at the Board's discretion. Vice Chair Briseno stated that his primary concern is the appropriateness of a 5,000-square-foot accessory building in a residential neighborhood, noting that the issue is not the setback itself. Vice Chair Briseno then asked whether a 5,000-square-foot building could be constructed on the parcel if it were vacant. Case Planner Larsala clarified that an accessory structure cannot be built without a primary dwelling, as it must be incidental to the principal use of the property.

Vote: 0 - 3 Disapproved

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT, INCLUDING PENDING, RECENT AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' ACTIONS.

CALL TO BOARD ON RECENT MATTERS.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Brick adjourned the meeting at 6:19 p.m.

APPROVED:

Paul Brick, Chair

ATTEST:

Christine McLachlan, Development Services Director