

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE
GILBERT, AZ
APRIL 5, 2017**

COMMISSION PRESENT: Chairman Kristofer Sippel
Vice Chairman Brian Andersen
Commissioner Carl Bloomfield
Commissioner David Cavenee
Commissioner Brian Johns
Commissioner Joshua Oehler
Alternate Commissioner Mary Harris
Alternate Commissioner Seth Banda

COMMISSION ABSENT: Commissioner Greg Froehlich

STAFF PRESENT: Bob Caravona, Senior Planner
Ashlee MacDonald, Planner II
Gilbert Olgin, Planner II
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Nathan Williams, Senior Planner
Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer
Planning Manager Linda Edwards

ALSO PRESENT: Attorney Phyllis Smiley
Attorney Nancy Davidson
Council Liaison Brigette Peterson
Recorder Debbie Frazey

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kristofer Sippel called the April 5 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:01 p.m.

- 1. UP17-1001, ARIZONA AUTO PARTS: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW AN AUTO SALVAGE YARD, FOR APPROXIMATELY 13.33 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 623 N. COOPER ROAD AND ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI).**

DR17-1001, ARIZONA AUTO PARTS: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPING, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, COLORS AND MATERIALS, AND LIGHTING FOR APPROXIMATELY 13.33 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 623 N. COOPER ROAD, AND ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI).

Ashlee MacDonald, Planner II, began her presentation on UP17-1001, Arizona Auto Parts – Request to approve a Conditional Use Permit and DR17-1001, Arizona Auto Parts. She said UP17-1001 is a proposal for a Use Permit for an auto salvage yard, in conjunction with DR17-1001, a request for design review. She said the site is located on the east side of Cooper Road at the location of the former Schuff Steel site and just north of the Weinberger Transfer Station which had been before the Commission last year. She shared a vicinity map, indicating that the surrounding area is industrially zoned. She said on the opposite side of Cooper Road there is some residential development. She said that the site currently has an existing structure on it, which is a canopy left by Schuff Steel. She indicated that the applicant would be utilizing a portion of the existing canopy, but any other structures that exist on the site will be demolished as part of this request. She shared that the site was a 13.3 acre portion of the former Schuff Steel site, zoned General Industrial (GI). She said that Arizona Auto Parts is considered a salvage yard, which requires a Conditional Use Permit within the General Industrial (GI) zoning district. The Conditional Use Permit is being processed concurrently with the Design Review application. Planner MacDonald shared the site plan, noting that the site has two points of access off of Cooper Road. She indicated the portion of the canopy that would remain and again noted that any other existing structures would be removed. She said the applicant would be constructing a new parking field in the front of the site. She explained how the site will operate, noting the location of the gated access drive. She said vehicles would be dismantled under the canopy and then brought out to the yard for storage, where customers would come out and choose parts from the vehicles themselves. She pointed out the location of a new office building that would be constructed under a portion of the existing canopy. She said the applicant has a very elaborate system for placement of vehicles, so a customer would go directly to the vehicle they are looking at and take the parts that they need from it. She shared the floor plan, indicated the area under the canopy where the cars would be dismantled and any fluids would be removed. She shared that parts storage, transmissions, and engines would also be housed underneath the canopy. She said the applicant is required to provide landscaping on all sides of the property boundaries. As part of Staff's 1st Review comments, they will be asking the applicant to add in those landscape setbacks that haven't been provided. She said that they have landscaping throughout the parking area and noted that they are doing some nice improvements along the frontage of Cooper Road within the front landscape setback. She shared the building elevations, again noting that they were using the existing canopy, and integrating a new office building into the northeast portion of the site. She said that Staff has some concerns and would like feedback on the integration of the building underneath the canopy. She also pointed out the use of stucco in a couple of locations, and asked if the Commission thought an additional offset would enhance the use of the stucco. Planner MacDonald said they are using both split face and scored CMU along the bottom of the canopy to provide some shielding of the vehicles. She shared some different views of the building elevations. She also asked for feedback on the 8' CMU wall that shields the stored vehicles and runs along the front of the building. The 8' CMU wall would include an

additional 2' of wrought iron at the top bringing its height to a total of 10'. The applicant and Staff would like feedback on this design element, as to whether the Commission would be comfortable with the design or if they would prefer a 10' solid wall. The applicant does desire to keep the height at 10' for security purposes and to keep people out of their salvage yard. She shared some renderings of what the facility would look like. She shared the colors and materials, noting that the colors and materials are consistent with another facility that the applicant has in the Glendale area. She said that Staff has returned the application to the applicant with 1st Review Comments. She said that Staff had a couple of outstanding questions on the Use Permit. First, they wanted additional information from the applicant on how they will be protecting the ground from potential fluid leakage. Second, they want to be made aware of any on-site crushing that might take place. Third, they desire to know how the vehicles will be removed and also how they will be brought to the facility. She said that the applicant had indicated during their pre-application that vehicles don't remain on the lot for more than 60 to 90 days. In terms of Design Review, Staff is looking for feedback on the solid wall at the front, as well as the incorporation of the office into the canopy. She also asked for feedback as to whether they should provide an offset at the location of the stucco on the front of the building.

Chair Sippel thanked Ashlee MacDonald for her presentation and then called for questions or comments.

Question: David Cavenee asked Planner MacDonald to clarify what her concerns were regarding the stucco on the front. He asked her to go back to the building elevation and explain her request for feedback.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald noted the way in which they had included a stucco accent. She pointed out that it runs flat with the face of the building. She said that in the past, the Commission has preferred some wall plane offset where the material changes. She said it seems like there is really no purpose to the stucco as it is just flat against the metal in the design.

Comment: David Cavenee thanked Ashlee MacDonald for clarifying her concern. He agreed that it would improve the elevation to have some relief at the material changes. He said it wouldn't need to be much, but enough to show that there is a material change. He said he didn't think they would need to require a canopy, however, he did point out it was a west facing front that might get quite hot in the afternoons, and some type of shade awning might be appropriate. He said this would be up to the applicant and wouldn't be crucial. He said he preferred the 10' wall to be a solid wall. He said that it wasn't because he thought most people from the street level would be able to see over the wall, but he thought they might have stacking vehicles that might need shielding. He also mentioned the location where their frontage 4' screen wall comes along the street frontage, and said that they might want to make sure that screen wall aligns in some way with the property to the south, so that they are not so offset. He said they probably wouldn't be the same materials, but it might be nice if the screen wall on this project had some relationship to the screen wall to the south. He said he thought it was nice to have the parking out front, to push the project back from the street. He also said he liked the fact that they were skinning the front with a new skin and not just leaving it as it was. He said he also likes the organization of the back yard area and the way in which they are trying to stack everything in an orderly manner.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if they had any high bay storage within the facility.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that they did not, noting that everything would be stacked on a single level.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if that would be consistent throughout the use.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that was correct. Additionally, she indicated that within this zoning district, any property storage does have to be fully screened.

Question: Joshua Oehler said that he didn't mind the screening wall having a wrought iron break at the 8' level, as long as the overall height was still 10'. He asked Commissioner Cavenee what he was envisioning regarding the 10' wall, pointing out that a 10' wall was pretty tall and might need some decorative break.

Answer: Commissioner Cavenee asked Ashlee MacDonald to show the screening wall. He agreed that a 10' solid wall with the same material and no relief or banding might be rather plain.

Question: David Cavenee asked Ashlee MacDonald what the applicant was proposing for materials in the 10' wall.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said they were proposing stucco columns with both scored and split face CMU block.

Comment: David Cavenee clarified that this would break up the face with the finish. He said he thought that might be enough. He said his reasons for concern were related to the possibility of something protruding above the 8' level.

Response: Joshua Oehler said that was his ultimate worry also, and that was why he was asking Planner MacDonald if they would be utilizing high bay storage. He said it would be important to know where the line of storage would be. He pointed out if the business would be breaking down a semi or large van, these uses could get pretty tall.

Response: Ashlee MacDonald said that she would make sure that they asked the applicant for more details regarding this.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he would be careful bringing it down from a solid 10' to 8', unless appropriate screening was taking place. He said his memories of this type of place involves high bay storage.

Comment: David Cavenee suggested that in addition to a material difference on the 10' wall, they might recommend the addition of color banding to give it more of a break.

Response: Ashlee MacDonald showed a rendering of the Weinberger Transfer Station and said they had done something similar.

Comment: Chair Sippel said that he preferred the 10' screening wall over the 8' screening wall. He said he had some concerns about critters or birds getting into the area. He didn't know if they might be able to tilt the roofline to avoid that problem.

Comment: Brian Johns said he agreed with Staff that a little more should be going on with the planes of the building. He pointed out that it is a big building and that would make it difficult. He also wondered if the requirement for landscaping on all four sides was necessary, given the fact that they have a 10' screening wall. He said that when you consider the purpose of this use, the landscaping is not going to last. He would prefer the applicant spend the money they would spend on landscaping, and put it into the building elevations and do more pop-outs and such.

2. DR16-54, LA FITNESS – AGRITOPIA: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 4.39 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE NWC OF HIGLEY ROAD AND AGRITOPIA LOOP AND ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Senior Planner Bob Caravona began his presentation on DR16-54, LA Fitness – Agritopia. Planner Caravona shared that the applicant was seeking CD's at Risk and he requested input from the Planning Commission regarding elevations of the LA Fitness building and the restaurant, as well as feedback on the ingress/egress drive in the southwest corner. He shared an aerial photo of the subject property, noting its location within Agritopia. He said the zoning was General Commercial (GC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. He shared the site history. He shared a Project Development Table, noting the overall height of the building was 42'. The predominant height of the building is 24'. He said the project meets all setback requirements. He pointed out that Ordinance 2364 and Agritopia have some very specific requirements regarding plant material, landscape and design elements. He shared the conceptual site plan for the north section of Agritopia. Planner Caravona noted that some variety was allowed, as long as the development met the intent and density of the development plan. He said the proposed LA Fitness structure and restaurant is 36,000 square feet. He shared the landscape plan, noting that it is meeting requirements. Planner Caravona then shared the building elevations for LA Fitness. He noted that the applicant had replied to 1st Review comments and had reduced the architectural element that contains the LA Fitness sign from 55' to 42'. He said this change has made the signage more proportionate to the structure. He shared the materials, noting the use of smooth face and split face CMU. He said that the east elevation would include some graphic lifestyle signage. Bob Caravona noted that this approval did not include signage, as signage was handled administratively. He shared that the restaurant was 2000 square feet. He said the restaurant embraces the architectural design of the LA Fitness building. He discussed an ingress and egress point, noting the location where a car would stop before exiting and could potentially block two spaces. He pointed out the location of Backyard Taco across the street. He said he would be asking the applicant, for the sake of symmetry, to replicate the design used at Backyard Taco. Planner Caravona said that in their staff report, they had asked for the removal of two spaces. After speaking with Town Traffic, he said they do not have a standard for collector roads that would have this type of parking stacking, so he believes this is a good suggestion. He noted the location of an egress drive and shared that it would be signed for resident use only. He said this was similar to the approval for Backyard Taco. Planner Caravona finished his presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said that he definitely thought it was a good idea to have lowered the sign element from 55' to 42' because the 55' height would be dramatically out of scale. However, he said he still thinks it is out of scale, but now it is not dramatically out of scale. He asked if there was any way to do a simple step down because he thought a 20' differential between that element and the building was problematic. He thought they should consider breaking that element or bringing the two smaller elements up to get a little more height and get some movement in the building. He said you don't normally see a 20' differential between elements. He said he understands why they are doing it, but suggested if they could bring up the rest of the building to give a little better movement, it would be a great idea. He said he didn't see enough detail in the building elevations and would like to see more detail. He wondered if they didn't use that allocation of space for the signage, what would go in its place. He thought they might be able to use some kind of vine vegetation or something else, but said he would like to see what they would use. He said he felt the elements overall on the LA Fitness were acceptable, but they needed a bit more movement in the building. He then asked to see the Restaurant building. He said it was a smaller building and better in scale. He recommended that they do a better job on the drive-thru canopy. He said currently it looks like it was just tacked on and he thinks it should look more like an element. He said he liked the horizontal planes matching up with the canopies. He sees good movement vertically and horizontally. He said he agreed with Staff regarding the parking. He thought there would be some issues with the stacking and thought that the stacking would cause blocking of a couple of spaces.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if the restaurant project was a PAD.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that it was an open space.

Question: Mary Harris asked about the access from Heartland Lane. She said it was to be signed "residential access only," noting that the business across the street from this project also had the same signage. She asked if the objective for this was to minimize traffic for the neighbors on that street. She wondered if there had been any feedback thus far as to whether the signage at the Backyard Taco site was effective or if the neighbors had concerns about another facility going in and whether the sign would be effective in meeting the objective of minimizing the amount of traffic in the neighborhood.

Answer: Bob Caravona said he has not received any public input regarding that. He said that he probably would receive more public input as the public notice goes out. He will follow up with the applicant to see if they have had any comments in their discussion with the developer.

Question: Mary Harris asked if that public input (if received) would be shared when the case comes back before the Planning Commission.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered affirmatively.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the applicant was requiring the additional ingress/egress point to the site or if that was a Staff request.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that it was the applicant's request and part of the original platting of this site. He said it was part of the development agreement with the developer that the access be allowed.

Comment: Linda Edwards said she might be able to help clarify. She told the Commission that when Backyard Taco came in with their application, Staff worked extensively with the Design Review Board and examined several potential scenarios for circulation. She said the same owner that owns the property for the Backyard Taco site, also owns the property for the LA Fitness site. She said that it was part of the agreement that they have mirrored and controlled access points because they have a local street, a collector street and access points from Backyard Taco and LA Fitness all lining up. They wanted to restrict traffic in this area, so at the time that the Commission approved Backyard Taco, they also approved this mirrored access on the property to the north. In answer to her previous question, Linda Edwards let Commissioner Harris know that she had been to the property a few times and the residential street sign seemed to be working. She said it isn't obvious to those who visit Backyard Taco that there is an alternate way to exit the property, because it looks like it is going to a home. She said it isn't obvious unless you are a resident.

Question: David Cavenee asked if they were concerned that the residents would start using that as a quick way to get back out to Higley.

Answer: Linda Edwards said she didn't think that would make it quicker for the residents. She said it would be quicker to continue on Heartland until they reach the Collector (Agritopia Loop) and then go eastbound to the signal.

Question: David Cavenee asked if there was a common trail system along the north end. He asked if they were tying into that system.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that they would be connecting the east/west trail along the highway and that will be a benefit of this development to the community.

Comment: David Cavenee said he agreed with Commissioner Oehler about the vertical relief of the long, linear rooflines. He thought they had done a lot of nice accents along the face of the building, but he said this didn't penetrate enough through the vertical lines. He would recommend they rethink that design element. He also said on the north elevation, he thought it appears as if they have a loading dock or bays in the design. He said he thought it would be beneficial to take a look at that since it would be the freeway view. He thought it would be better to make it look more like a retail elevation. He said he likes the finishes they have chosen and he thinks it is an attractive building and he has no other concerns. He said he particularly likes the west elevation that has green screen and thinks it will look very attractive.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked about the use of vinyl. He said he realizes that vinyl is used a lot in Agritopia as a screen wall, but he said it is usually used to block headlights. He pointed out that this design has a lot of slits in the vinyl screening. He asked if that would be acceptable for what is needed as a screen wall.

Answer: Bob Caravona acknowledged that there would be some slits in the screen wall, but indicated that they would probably be including some vegetation to lessen the lights. He further stated that they did need to follow the ordinance for a solid screen wall.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if they do meet the requirements for the ordinance.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered affirmatively.

Comment: Vice Chair Brian Andersen said he had some concerns on the floor plan for the south elevation. He said that the design used a lot of glass and he suggested that the applicant make sure that the reception desk is set back far enough that the daytime sun won't become an issue.

Comment: Chair Sippel said he would like to see the way in which this site is developing along with Backyard Taco. He suggested that Bob Caravona bring an aerial view showing the overall site and the way in which the overall site comes together. He also mentioned that only in America can you have a fast food PAD and an LA Fitness sharing the same parking lot.

3. DR17-1002, UNIFIED SCREENING AND CRUSHING: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR AN APPROXIMATELY 9,805 SF TWO STORY MANUFACTURING AND OFFICE BUILDING ON APPROXIMATELY 0.54 ACRES, LOCATED AT 225 NORTH PASADENA STREET AND ZONED LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (LI).

Gilbert Olgin, Planner II began his presentation on DR17-1002, Unified Screening and Crushing. He shared that this project was an Office/Warehouse Building. He shared a rendering of what the proposed project would look like. He shared the site history. He also shared an aerial map which indicated the location of the property at 225 North Pasadena Street. He shared some images of what the vacant site looks like today. He also shared some images of what the area surrounding the project looks like to show the type of architecture already in place. He shared a vicinity map. He said the site was zoned Light Industrial (LI). He shared a site plan, noting that the area indicated in yellow was the building envelope. He indicated that the site had one point of ingress and egress and pointed it out on the site plan. He said the access would be shared with the neighboring property to the north. He shared the location of a 24' aisle drive that goes to the back of the site. He said the site has 22 parking spaces, indicating that the majority of the parking would be to the north of the site. He showed three additional spaces for parking to the south. He also pointed out the location of the trash enclosure. Planner Olgin said that the proposed building was two stories in height and would not exceed 34'. He said they are planning an office use on the top floor and a warehouse on the bottom floor. He said that the site plan he is showing has a slight change from the site plan in the packet given to the Commission. Planner Olgin said that the applicant represents the owner of this site and that the owner also owns the site behind this property. Since the owner owns both properties, he wishes to drop the wall and make it a flat surface so that he can access the back side. He showed the area where they plan to do a 6' wall with a rolling gate for security purposes. The security gate will limit the access to one area only. He shared the landscape plan and provided some images of some of the trees that they were proposing for the site. Planner Olgin then shared the building elevations. He said that they used glass to break up the look of the building. He indicated that the design had a stucco finish and brick was used on the rest of the property. He said they have broken up the design

with colors and the use of tinted glass. He showed a metal feature in the design. He said that Staff did not require a lot of changes in their 1st Review comments. He said that the design fits quite well in the area. He pointed out the plan for a gabion wall as part of the landscaping. He finished his presentation and asked for feedback from the Commission.

Comment/Question: Carl Bloomfield said the first thing he noticed was the turning radius into the trash enclosure. He asked Planner Olgin to walk him through what they were proposing for that area. He asked if the plan was to tear down the wall between the two properties because they are both gated.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that Public Works had reviewed the design to make sure it worked and they gave their approval to the design. He pointed out the drive aisle that exists and he said that if they bring the wall down it will also go to the east. They will only have enough of an opening to accommodate a vehicle. He said they will have four spots in the front for customers and the parking spots in the back will be for the people that work on site.

Question: Carl Bloomfield asked to clarify that the site plan was showing both options and that they would choose later on in the process which option they went with.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that they had provided the two different site plans to show both options, but they would prefer to go with the option of taking down the wall.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield said he was in agreement with Staff regarding the building, the elements and colors and materials. He said he didn't have a problem with any of the design.

Question: David Cavenee asked for clarification if they were asking to take the back fence down from property line to property line or if they were just asking to take down just enough for a vehicle to get through.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said they were proposing an area just big enough to accommodate a vehicle.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said it might be nice as a Study Session comment to show the limits of that removal. He said that he didn't think there would be a problem with it if the owner owns both of the properties. He did wonder about the neighbor just north of the property and asked if they had any idea if the neighboring property would have any problem with that portion being opened up or if they would have a problem with a 6' gate being added.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that he had not spoken to the property owner to the north, but he indicated that they share a front drive access opening and have a shared access agreement. He said he would make sure to ask if the neighbor to the north had any issues with the proposed plan.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said he thought that would be important because they do share the aisle of parking and aisle of access so he would want to make sure they were agreeable to impeding that with a 6' rolling gate and also with opening up the back. He asked Planner Olgin to clarify that it looked like the 6' rolling gate only left about three or four stalls in front, with one being a handicapped spot.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that there was one handicapped spot on the site and a total of 20 spots.

Question: David Cavenee clarified that he was referring to the area outside the gate. He asked how many guest spots were outside the gate.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said there would be four parking spots, one of which was ADA accessible.

Question: David Cavenee asked if these four parking spots would be shared between both buildings.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said those four parking spots were just for this building.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that the building to the north did not use that strip of parking.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered affirmatively. He said the building to the north had their own parking lot.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that even though they have shared access, they don't use that area.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered affirmatively.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the site would use existing underground retention.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said it would not. He said the retention for this site would all be underground except for a small portion up front.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify if the retention was to be installed and would be new.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenee said he thought the architecture was attractive for an industrial location. He said he appreciated the attempts to make the landscaping additionally attractive with a gabion wall. Considering the type of industrial area the project was located in, he thought it would be a very nice look.

Question: Mary Harris mentioned the note in the Staff report about the possibility of the wire mesh used in the gabion wall changing color over time. She asked if Staff had a particular concern with that possibility.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said that you don't usually see a gabion wall being used in a Light Industrial usage, so he thought it was a very nice architectural feature. He thought the use of the gabion wall adds a lot to the design and he didn't think the possibility of the color changing was a concern.

Comment/Question: Brian Johns said he appreciated the images of the types of trees the project was proposing. He said that the rendering shows a big change in the heights of the walls. He said for this scale of building, he felt it was kind of minimal. He said as long as they hadn't hit their maximum height, it would be nice to see a little more massing on the two elements. He said they were proposing some nice materials. He agreed with Planner Olgin that the use of the gabion wall was a positive. He said he didn't have any issues with the trash enclosure or the pass through. He said it would have been nice to see the gate. He asked about the breakup of the tall windows, noting that the breakup occurred by a panel with the same material as was on the gabion walls. He said it looked to be a Welded Wire Fabric (WWF). He asked if there was something behind that. He said the WWF was a very thin material, so he didn't know if it would actually depict as strong as it was showing on the elevations, unless it had a plate behind it.

Response: Gilbert Olgin said he would make sure to find out if there was something behind the WWF material before the next meeting.

Comment: Brian Johns said if it was just the WWF with nothing behind it, he didn't think it would get the effect that was being shown on the elevations.

Comment: David Cavenee said that he would like to see where the rolling gate connects to the building. He said if he counts four stalls (roughly 36' deep) into the site, it looks like it would hit mid-bay, not back at the location of the CMU break. He would like to see how that area interfaces with the architecture. He suggested asking the applicant to show how that would interface.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler thanked Gilbert Olgin for the presentation. He said he agreed with Commissioner Johns about the WWF. He said it would be good to do something to give it a little more thickness to it or it would be lost in the elevation. He said they might want to look at a thicker wire. He also said that on the rendering it showed some landscaping at the location of the cross access easement. He asked if it was actually asphalt in front of that.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said there was some landscaping in the area, but he said the design would not have as much landscaping as was represented on the rendering.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said it looked like a sidewalk so he was trying to understand what was being suggested at the location of the opening. He asked if it was 60' of opening. He said he would like to know more about how this would work. He said it looked like a very large entrance. He said he thinks the building looks great, but he said he wanted to know what the existing access would be used for. He suggested that if they were locking off with a gate on one side, there might not still be a need for that access anymore.

Response: Gilbert Olgin said that would be a good question to ask.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said he thought it seemed like they were looking at a 55' or 60' opening out of the back, but he wanted to know where the line was regarding how much of the wall they would be removing. He said he would like more definition. He asked if they would still be asking for a cross access agreement since the landowner owns both pieces.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin answered that he believes since the landowner owns both pieces, they won't need to ask for anything on the back side. He said he will verify that information.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said that normally when you cross parking lines, unless you do a lot combination, you do have a cross access agreement between the two. He said if the landowner ends up selling one, it makes sense to have an agreement. He asked to clarify that the turning radius would work and that you would turn in and then back up the entire way to exit the site. He asked if Public Works was okay with that.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said they had originally placed the trash enclosure in a different location and it didn't work, so they moved it to the current spot. He said the current plan does work and they are able to get in and get out. He indicated that even if the wall were not allowed to be taken down, the current plan will work even with the wall up and even if the parking lot is full.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked if they were requiring any kind of T-turn or if they would just be backing out of the property. He said he does prefer the location of the trash enclosure, but wanted to make sure it actually works to back up 200+ feet.

Question: Vice Chair Andersen asked if Town Fire Code requires fire risers to be in a 5' x 5' dedicated room with direct access.

Answer: Gilbert Olgin said he did not know the answer to that question and would have to get back to the Commission with an answer.

Comment: Vice Chair Andersen said he is 99% certain that is what is required, but he asked for Planner Olgin to check into it. He said currently the fire riser is tucked into the corner with no direct access out. He said it would be important to verify and coordinate all the details to make sure it all works.

Question: Chair Sippel asked Town Council Phyllis Smiley if it was acceptable to proceed with Agenda items 4, 5 and 6 before recessing the Study Session for the Regular Meeting. He said they would then reopen the Study Session and proceed with Agenda Item 7 after the Regular Meeting adjourned.

Answer: Phyllis Smiley said it was acceptable to start the Regular Meeting late, it just couldn't be started early.

4. DR17-1005, SANTAN PAVILIONS II: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 10.5 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF SANTAN VILLAGE PARKWAY AND WILLIAMS FIELD ROAD AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC).

Senior Planner Amy Temes began her presentation on DR17-1005, SanTan Pavilions. She shared the site history for the project. She shared the project location at the southwest corner of Santan Village Parkway and Williams Field Road. She shared the Phase 1 portion of the site, as well as The Flats at San Tan, the mixed-use apartment complex. Planner Temes said this request was for Phase II. She said that Phase II was highlighted in blue and included 126,535 square feet of retail space, including a large big box anchor store and parking stalls. Planner Temes said that part of the conversation she would like to have this evening involved the pedestrian nodes and seating location elements. She said during the Use Permit process, she had referred to those areas as landing pads. The idea was that these landing pads would bring the residents out of The Flats at San Tan and bring them into the commercial center. Planner Temes noted that the design also allowed for fitness trails and 8' wide shaded walkways with a double row of trees in an effort to tie everything together to make it a part of their everyday living environment. She reminded the Commission that there had been a lot of conversation about the integration between the two uses. She said Staff is still making an effort to get the two uses as integrated as possible. She shared some additional exhibits from the Use Permit which showed that signage, walkways, and pavement patterns were all supposed to be integrated. She also shared the landscape concept board that was provided for the Use Permit. She said she wanted the Commission to see these exhibits to remind them what they had envisioned the commercial portion of this mixed-use project to be. She said she wanted feedback on the 8' wide fitness tracks and how they were integrated into the landing pads and if the landing pads were substantial enough and articulated enough.

Senior Planner Temes shared the revised site plan. She told the Planning Commission that the applicant had just responded to 2nd Review comments and had revised some of the circulation issues that had been addressed, as well as making sure that the 8' pathways were unencumbered. She showed where the 8' path was heading north along Shops H, which face east. She said that

the applicant had done a really good job of responding to Staff comments asking that this area be unencumbered, so that the 8' pathway are free and clear of doorways, seating and shrubs. She shared the covered walkway (depicted in tan) and the location of trees. She said they weren't really getting the double row of tree effect in this design that they had originally envisioned. She acknowledged that it was difficult to get signage on buildings when you have a double row of trees in front, but she asked for input on what they might do to soften the environment a bit more with some of the plant materials that had been chosen. She also pointed out a triangular area that was one of the key landing pads, noting that the applicant had added some concrete seat walls, but she pointed out that there were only three trees. She said that during the Use Permit process, Staff was envisioning articulation of pavement, specialty pavement, public art or other artistic feature or some kind of specialty overhead shading with some nice benches underneath for gathering. She wanted input from the Commission as to whether this design was meeting the intent of the discussion they had during the Use Permit process, if the design was adequate and if they could keep moving forward with the project. She indicated that the applicant had requested Construction Documents At-Risk, noting that after the 2nd Review, the applicant would like to move forward and come back in May for approval. Planner Temes said this was a fast track project and the big box tenant would like to be open by Christmas. She also pointed out that the design is consistent with what was approved in Phase I in terms of colors, materials and design.

Planner Temes then discussed the area around Shops D, which is on the far side of the big box anchor store. She indicated the plant material the applicant was proposing. She pointed out the overhead structure and noted that again, the design only had two trees and the landing pad consisted of two benches with some plant material around it. She pointed out that Staff preferred a different plant material than the one proposed, as it would be quite spiny and wasn't an ideal plant to have next to a seating area. She revealed that the big box anchor store proposed was At Home, a home goods store. She said the design is consistently showing the same trees, the same ground cover and concrete benches throughout the area. She pointed out the location of the landing pads that were required, noting that they did not have any specialty pavement or specialty features, other than some seating. She asked for input from the Commission as to whether the lack of these features meets the intent. She also indicated that the Use Permit showed that there were to be three connective points from the parking lot and the shops along the street, back to the inline shops and the main anchors. She pointed out the location of the connective points, indicating that the applicant had provided four connective points. Planner Temes said that connection point 1 would require a sidewalk in order to be a fitness path. She believes that with some shifting of shrubs and ground cover, they could easily add in a sidewalk and meet the intent. She indicated that on connections points 2 and 4, there were long stretches of non-landscaped areas that the applicant had marked DG. She pointed out that DG would not be acceptable to Staff, as it would not meet the high-end intent of what was agreed upon with this project, so Staff will be asking for additional landscaping in those areas. Planner Temes

shared the colors and materials. She reminded the Commission that during the Use Permit process, they had asked if the colors and materials were compatible with Phase 1 of the project. She pointed out that the colors do blend well. She shared some perspectives of the proposed project, noting that the horizontal plane changes were approximately 2' which was a nice distance for a building of this massing. She also said there was vertical movement between 2' and 10'. She told the Commission that Phase III was on her desk for an administrative approval for a small PAD site. Planner Temes finished her presentation and asked the Commission for input on whether what is shown meets the intent, or whether they need to do a little more work to meet the intent. She specifically requested input on whether the architectural shade structures are equal to or meet the intent of the proposed double row of trees and she also requested input as to whether the fitness paths were being properly represented throughout the project.

Chair Sippel thanked Planner Temes for her presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment: David Cavenee said he agreed with Planner Temes about the limited amount of landscape. He suggested that there are other ways to landscape the front of a retail center without blocking signage. He said you can use canopies with vines or other vertical shrubs, or you can use large, decorative pots. He also pointed out that there are plenty of shrubs that can grow up and green the sides of a building without blocking signage. He suggested that more landscape needed to come in, especially if these pathways are to be considered pedestrian pathways for the mixed-use contingent. Regarding seating, Commissioner Cavenee said that because it was a pathway, he thought it should have some seating, but he didn't think a large big box store would necessarily be conducive to seating, so he said he wouldn't push too hard for too much seating, but suggested they have some stopping points. He said he thought the building itself looked fine and he liked the architecture. He thought it was creative, new and fresh, but he did suggest softening it somewhat with the suggested landscape. He said he didn't have any issues with any of the renderings or elevations.

Question: David Cavenee asked Amy Temes to share the list of requested feedback she wanted from the Commission so he could make sure he had answered all of her questions.

Answer: Planner Temes shared her list of requested feedback.

Question: Planner Temes asked if the Commission believed that specialty pavement would help differentiate some of the landing pad areas as special or different.

Answer: David Cavenee said that in areas where pathways crossed paved areas, he thought those areas should be articulated, especially if they are driving this project toward a higher-end look. He suggested it should be more than just paint, but should be a different surface such as pavers or integrative interval stamped concrete at the location where you cross paths, as well as where

paths cross asphalt. He also suggested that at the four entry points into the different parts of the space, a bit of a landing pad or special surface should be used at those locations.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said that he still sees these as two completely separate units without the integration they had hoped for, but he said that was for another discussion. He does believe this project needs to be held to a higher standard because the Use Permit was for a mixed-use project, so he thinks the walkability is very important because that was the pitch used to gain approval for the Use Permit. The landscaping was supposed to be integrated and the project was supposed to provide walkability and connectivity between the two uses. He stated that the landing pads were promoted as tremendous areas that people were going to want to stay in, so he thinks the landing pads and the crossing paths have to be well designed, even overdesigned. He suggested that some seating would be nice. He said he agrees with Commissioner Cavenee that he didn't think you needed a great deal of seating, but the seating should be a part of a nicely designed seating element within the landing area. He also discussed the walkability between the double rows of trees. He said they should look at this as a retail center that needs to have proper signage, but there are plenty of different ways that vertical landscaping can be achieved and still provide a lush feel to the site. He said he has somewhat of an issue with the use of stamped concrete. He feels it is a good product, but that over time it gets worn out. He suggested the use of pavers or something else that wouldn't break down over time as easily. He further said that for this project to meet the standards that were presented to the Commission in the Use Permit, they need to be held to a higher standard.

Comment: Carl Bloomfield thanked Amy Temes for her presentation. He noted that her presentation focused on a lot of the criteria that were talked about in the previous Use Permit approval. He said he appreciates her willingness to stay focused on those criteria. He concurs with what has been expressed by his fellow Commissioners, but he wanted to thank Amy Temes specifically, for her attention to those details, because it matters to members of the commission.

Question/Comment: Chair Sippel asked Planner Temes to go back to the exhibit which showed the main landing space that had the six concrete benches. He said he was in agreement that he thought the design would have a lot more creative design features and would convey the thought that it was a nice place to be. He doesn't think they have done that with this design and they need to do a lot more. He said he concurs with the other Commissioners that much is yet to be done.

Question: Chair Sippel asked if the applicant was wanting to go CD's At-Risk.

Answer: Amy Temes said that the applicant was requesting CD's At-Risk. She said they would have a meeting with them next week to specifically talk about landscape and see if they can come to some agreement on the level of landscaping that Staff is expecting and then have the

applicant make those modifications as quickly as possible, in an effort to get some interim approval, so that they can keep moving forward in order to make their deadline for opening before the Christmas season.

Comment: Chair Sippel said that he assumed they were in attendance in the audience and he let them know that there was much to be done in terms of landscaping. He said the Planning Commission's expectations were a lot different than what had been presented before them tonight.

Question: Amy Temes asked to clarify that if Staff is comfortable with the level of landscape they achieve in the redesign, that it is okay for the applicant to move forward with CD's At-Risk. She noted that Staff has no outstanding issues with the architectural design or circulation design.

Answer: Chair Sippel said that would be acceptable.

5. DR17-1006, SUPERSTAR EXPRESS CARWASH: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 1.11 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF THE SWC OF POWER AND PECOS ROADS AND ZONED SHOPPING CENTER (SC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Senior Planner Bob Caravona began his presentation on DR17-1006, Superstar Express Carwash. He said the request was for a self-serve carwash with approximately two employees on-site during operating hours. He said the applicant is requesting CD's At-Risk. He said that Staff is comfortable with the building elevations. He said that they had a meeting earlier in the week to take care of an outstanding issue regarding travel lanes, and he believes they have come to an understanding that has now fixed that issue. Planner Caravona shared an aerial photo, noting that the site was in a Shopping Center (SC) with a PAD zoning district and the site was adjacent to Children's Learning Adventures to the south. He indicated that they have a shared access agreement with the Children's Learning Adventures. He said the project meets the development standards for Power Ranch. He shared the site plan, noting that in terms of site plan, this is one of the better circulation plans he has seen for a car wash. He said this design is very simple. He explained how circulation would work on the site. A vehicle would come into the site off of Power Road and enter the express lanes. He said part of the meeting they had earlier, related to the fact that Town Code requires 12' lanes. The applicant wanted to have the islands and cash collections within the lanes, which would narrow the lanes down to approximately 8' 6". He indicated that after a vehicle has cleared the pay windows, the lane would widen back to 12'. He further explained the design of the car wash. He said the applicant was meeting parking requirements. He shared a revised site plan, which showed the way the lane was funneled down to allow payment within the lanes. He told the Commission that they

did not have a copy of this revised site plan within their packet because he had just received the revision. He shared the Landscape Plan, noting that the applicant was responding to 1st Review Comments regarding landscaping. He shared the elevations, noting the simplicity of design. He said Staff likes the design and recommends approval. He said the design has building movement and has a subdued look for the area. He shared the colors and materials board. He indicated that the canopies and the posts would be sand colored. He requested input from the Commission regarding the elevations.

Chair Sippel thanked Bob Caravona for his presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment: Brian Johns agreed with Planner Caravona that this design was one of the better flows that the Commission had seen. He said the elevations match what they have approved in the past. He didn't have any other comments, but said he appreciated the pedestrian connection being located in an area where the customers won't get run over.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said that overall he agreed with what had been said. He said he appreciated the design elements used in the carwash. He thinks the car wash industry overall is doing a better job of designing and bringing a better building to their product. He said he liked where the pedestrian route comes through, but he was a little worried about the fact that they only have a curb. He thinks that once the 90 degree turn is made, the curb is going to get run over all the time. He suggested bringing in the curb a bit more to protect it with some landscape. He said he realizes the area is kind of tight with the angle, but he thinks the curb will be gone pretty quick, which would leave that pathway unprotected. He also said he thought when they make the other turn, once they make the diagonal, he doesn't know if they have enough space in front of it, to make the turn. He pointed out that ADA requirements require a certain depth. He suggested that they look at the radius of the turn. He also asked about the vacuums that front Power Road and wondered how tall they were and whether they would be visible from the street.

Answer: Bob Caravona said he recalls that they are 8' which is the minimum requirement. He said that he did check and they meet the minimum height clearance.

Question: Joshua Oehler said he was assuming there was no canopy.

Answer: Bob Caravona said there were canopies along Power Road on the revised site plan.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said he thinks the building looks good. He noticed that the colors and the elevations are not quite what is shown on the color board. He said it appeared that the red and yellow color used as the two accent colors were brighter than what is showing. He didn't think that would be a problem, but he wanted to point out that it would definitely be brighter. He said he thought the site would flow quite well. He said he initially was concerned

with the landscaping and thought that the 20' Palms along the north property line might be a little tight in the small planter, but even though he thinks it will be tight initially, because they have a 4' square root ball on them, he thinks it will work because they are clean trunk trees. He asked if there was cross access to the property to the south. He also asked if that property was the Emergency Center.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that the property was the Children's Learning Adventure and that they have full cross access.

6. DR17-1007 CALIBER CLUB: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, BUILDING ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 2.13 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF SANTAN VILLAGE PARKWAY AND RAY ROAD AND ZONED REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (RC) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.

Senior Planner Nathan Williams began his presentation on DR17-1007, Caliber Club. He shared that this was a 2.13 acre site located in the Santan Village Crossroads PAD and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. He pointed out that Top Golf was located to the north of the proposed site and Main Event was being constructed to the south. He shared an aerial photo of the subject site, noting where the Caliber Club was in relation to Top Golf and Main Event. He said that the Caliber Club development would be a large indoor entertainment and recreation venue with 22,954 square feet of space. The project has 25 shooting bays, training and office facilities, a VIP lounge, a retail area, cigar shop and restaurant and bar area. It also has a large outdoor patio area. He said the proposed building was one story in height and that the applicant was proposing 83 parking spaces. He indicated that access to the Caliber Club will be through an existing shared access drive from Santan Village Parkway that has been constructed by the Main Event, Top Golf and the apartment developments. He shared the site plan and the landscaping plan and noted the location for retention. Planner Williams shared the building elevations, including a revised graphic with updated elevations. He asked for feedback from the Commission regarding roofline articulation and movement. He pointed out that per the Town's LDC, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has the right of review and comment on any noise sensitive project along the freeway. He said that this was not a noise sensitive project and therefore will not require review by ADOT. He noted that the use of tilt-up concrete helped with noise reduction and was typical for use in a shooting range. He also noted that the applicant had applied for an Administrative Use Permit to allow deferred parking on the subject site and that application is currently in review. Planner Williams shared the colors and materials board, noting that the building has been designed with color and materials that are distinctive to the Caliber Club design and image and they have tried somewhat to be compatible with other existing buildings within the Santan Village area, with the exception of their signature red color. He asked for

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission

Study Session April 5, 2017

input from the Commission if there was enough diversity of materials and textures or if they would recommend a different material. He shared the floor plans. He also showed a graphic of how they would screen their mechanicals, as well as a graphic showing the way in which they stop bullets. He finished his presentation and asked for input.

Comment: Brian Johns said it appeared to him that they randomly changed materials. He said he thought the facility was heading in the right direction, but he said compared to the quality of the facilities around it, it hadn't quite achieved what he hoped for.

Comment: David Cavenee said he agreed with Commissioner Johns and said he wasn't a fan of the elevations. He said he realizes that it is tilt-up concrete, but he thinks there can be a lot more done. He said he would defer to the architects on the Commission to provide detailed feedback, but he said because it is very low profile, and very long and linear, the windows just appear plopped in and he believes the design needs some improvement. He also said he is troubled with the way the parking is laid out on the site plan. He said he doesn't think it is a good idea to have two dead-end runs. He said if the business ends up being popular, that this will be very frustrating for the patrons when they come in and get stuck in a queue of cars that they can't back out of. He said he thought there must be a better way to lay out the site to give a little more flow and circulation. He acknowledged that they are in a unique location and he didn't have any trouble with the access, but he is just concerned with the dead-end parking situation.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said that he shared Commissioner Cavenee's concerns and had the same worry about the parking. He said the design has these long bays that both dead-end. He said he understands that it is a tough site to work with, but he thinks there might be a better way. He said he liked how they had the circular flow in the front and thought that worked well, but he said there were more than two bays going both ways that are dead-ends. He thinks if they shifted their design to one side or the other, they could shorten up one of the dead-ends and bring it back to the other side and create something like a partial cul-de-sac. He said currently there is only a very minor couple of feet that a vehicle could T-turn in to get back out. He thinks it will be very difficult to deal with. He also said they have tried to make connectability for pedestrian access, but he asked if there had been any thought process on how they might get to this site, other than riding in a road or walking in a road.

Answer: Nathan Williams said that issue had been brought up at pre-application. He said it was his understanding that the Main Event site didn't want to cooperate with pedestrian access to a certain degree and it was difficult to connect those two, so this is what they are left with. He said it was brought up, but a solution has not been determined as of yet.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he didn't know the age of the workers, but he thought there might be some younger workers in the restaurant that would need to walk or bike ride to the site. He

was concerned with putting them in the street. He said he didn't know if there was a solution, but thought it would be nice to take a look at it and see if the neighboring businesses could help find a solution. In regards to the building itself, Commissioner Oehler said he wasn't as concerned with the elevations as the other Commissioners, but he did think they definitely needed some more work. He said some of the plane areas needed work. He said the green screens work well in visible areas, but once they get to an area that is low, they kind of get forgotten. He thought using a more substantial material to break it up and that would be more visible from the street would be a good idea. He also said that normally when you pass control joints, it's hard to get the other slab up higher above those windows that cross on all those control joints. So he wondered if they were putting themselves in a position that they can't perform (constructability wise) to what they are providing in their application. He said he really likes the color, but he did say it looked pretty overpowering. He said he doesn't mind color as an accent, and he usually favors it, but in this case, with the large canopy being all red, as well as the bay doors being red, he is concerned that there are large masses of red, instead of the color just being used as an accent color. He thinks they should look at other businesses in the surrounding areas that use the red, but do so in a more subdued way.

Comment/Question: Vice Chair Andersen said he had a few comments on the elevations. He said it looked like a fluted tilt-up concrete on the base. He said it looked like it was going to be painted. He said that most architects he talks to tell him that no one does fluted concrete anymore and it is very dated. He is afraid that if they go forward with the fluted, it is going to look very dated. He said above that area, is another smaller panel with a flat concrete. He said he recommended they look at some other type of surface to do there. He said sitting on top of the concrete, they have another piece of concrete fascia. He said he assumed it would be built into the panels themselves, but he said that is a pretty ambitious task. He asked what would happen when they get to the corners and how will they be fabricated. He said he would be okay with them taking off the top piece altogether and squaring it off. He thought that would make it more aligned with the other two entertainment facilities surrounding this building. He then brought up the entry where the red is and said he thought the size of that element looked way out of proportion to the rest of the building. He said if they are going to continue to go with that, they need to come up with something different. He said it looks very top heavy and out of proportion. He said he likes the introduction of the stone, but he thought maybe more would be less. He said he was really torn, but recommended more attention needs to be paid to those panels and the fascia treatments at the top.

Question: Chair Sippel asked if the applicant desired to go CD's At-Risk.

Answer: Nathan Williams said they would like to pursue CD's At-Risk, but he said from what he was hearing from the Commission, it probably wouldn't be a good idea.

Comment: Chair Sippel said he would agree with that.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he thought they should check the mechanical units. He said looking at them at scale, he thought they needed to be looking at where they will be placed.

Chair Sippel said they would skip Agenda Item 7 and move to Agenda Item 8.

8. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda

Chair Sippel asked the Commission if there were any changes that needed to be made to the agenda. No changes were made to the agenda.

At 6:45 p.m. Chair Sippel recessed the Study Session until after the Regular Meeting. He announced that they would have a quick four-minute break before beginning the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission.

At 7:54 Chair Sippel called the Study Session back to order. He then called Agenda Item #7.

- 7. Z16-11, REVISED SIGN CODE: DISCUSSION OF REQUEST TO AMEND THE TOWN OF GILBERT LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER I ZONING REGULATIONS, DIVISION 4 GENERAL REGULATIONS, BY REPEALING AND REPLACING IN ITS ENTIRETY ARTICLE 4.4 SIGN REGULATIONS, RELATED TO THE REORGANIZATION AND REPLACEMENT OF THE SIGN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE CONSISTENCY WITH RECENT CASE LAW; BY AMENDING THE GLOSSARY OF GENERAL TERMS RELATED TO SIGN DEFINITIONS; THE APPENDIX 1 GRAPHICS RELATED TO GRAPHIC ILLUSTRATIONS; AND BY AMENDING IN PART ARTICLE 4.5 SUPPLEMENTAL USE REGULATIONS, SECTION 4.5013 TEMPORARY STRUCTURES, ARTICLE 4.6 NON-CONFORMING USES, LOTS, PARCELS, STRUCTURES AND SIGNS AND ARTICLE 5.12 ENFORCEMENT RELATED TO UPDATING CROSS REFERENCES TO THE SIGN CODE; AND BY AMENDING IN PART ARTICLE 5.2 COMMON PROCEDURES, SECTION 5.204 NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING AND SECTION 5.205 NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING RELATED TO REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ATTACHED INFORMATION TUBE ON THE POSTED SIGN AND FOR CERTAIN WORDS TO BE VISIBLE FROM 100 FEET.**

Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer began her presentation on Z16-11, Revised Sign Code. She said she wanted to provide a brief update on the progress with the Revised Sign Code. She reminded the Commission that they had initiated the text amendment in August of 2016. Since that time, a lot of hard work has been done by many Staff members, both within the legal and planning departments, in an effort to get the revisions back before the Commission. She said Staff planned to bring this back for Public Hearing in May and it would also be brought to Town Council in May. She briefly discussed some background as to what can be regulated associated

with signs. Since the Supreme Court ruling, they can still regulate the size, height, area, and regulate where a sign is located, as well as make distinctions in the Code between lighted and unlighted, whether they are on-site or off-site advertisements, and they can also make distinctions between the zoning district that it is in, and sometimes even the type of use associated with it. She further shared some guiding principles in this update, in addition to the legal requirements. She said they wanted to focus on making the sign code as easy to use, while retaining as much of the existing code as possible. They also wanted to make sure they had distinct signage opportunities in the Heritage District and within the Gateway Character Area. They also want to continue to preserve their high quality environment and the community's overall appearance, as well as making sure that this is a transparent, decision-making process. She said that within their Staff Report, each Commissioner had a comparison table between the existing code and the revised code. She said the information highlighted in green, was feedback they had received from stakeholders.

Principal Planner Lorbeer then told the Commission she would be sharing the legal revisions, what they did to simplify the code, highlighting a few examples of some of the changes to the standards, and touch on some of the stakeholder input. She began by discussing the legal revisions that were made. She indicated that they removed any content-based regulation and they also made sure that the message contained on the sign was not subject to any limitation. They removed any sign types that were already regulated by state statute or are protected, such as political signs or sign walkers. She mentioned that there was a clause at the end of the new code regarding severability. That basically means that if a portion of the Code was found to be unconstitutional, it would only affect that particular portion, and the rest of the Sign Code could remain intact. She also said that certain signs, which were technically either off-premise signs and were content-based, have actually been eliminated.

She then discussed the simplification they tried to do with the new Code. She said that several areas will now use tables, so that someone can quickly reference if a sign type is allowed or not. They also improved the descriptions of sign area and sign height. They also will be removing some of the outdated Public Notice provisions in the Code that involved posted signs.

Planner Lorbeer then shared some of the actual changes they made to the Sign Standards (see below).

Interest from the business community had been received about expanding the use of certain sign types in additional zoning districts. Staff finds that office and employment uses would potentially benefit from increased allowances for wall signs and electronic changing message displays. Highlights are listed below of where new benefits to the business/development community exist in the revised sign code:

Under 4.409.B.(3) Wall Signs, revised provisions increase the square footage allowance for Office and Employment zoning districts by giving them the same amount of wall sign area as Commercial and Public Facility/Institutional zoning districts. Revised language also increases the number of freestanding monument signs permitted by reducing the amount of additional street frontage needed from 600 to 300 feet in the Commercial, Public Facility/Institutional,

Office and Employment Zoning Districts (see 4.409.B.15 Freestanding Sign: Monument Sign.) Spacing of the monument signs will remain the same at 100 foot minimum and accounts for other street frontage requirements such as driveways, landscaping and drainage.

Under 4.409.B.(10) Wall-mounted cabinet signs, the revised code removes the limitation of 50% of total permitted wall sign area that may be a cabinet sign, which addresses the business concern that corporate logos are constrained in size under the existing code. The cabinet sign still must be stylized in shape, rather than rectangular, to reflect the shape of the printed image. Revised text also adds changing message display provisions to the Heritage Village Center, Office and Employment zoning districts and removes ambiguity about how much of a freestanding freeway or tower sign may contain an electronic changing message display by setting a percentage at 50 percent of the sign area (see 4.409.A.).

Other notable changes in standards include: reducing the time frame allowed for replacement and repair of signs (see 4.407.L & 4.407.M.); increasing the sign height to 8 feet for Residential Subdivision Entry signs because perimeter walls are allowed to be 8 feet high under 4.409.B.(19); and allowing entry signs to be internally or indirectly illuminated under 4.409.B.(19) and 4.409.B.(20).

Planner Lorbeer said they had done some workshops with stakeholders on January 25, February 15, and February 28. She said she had also received some phone calls and emails, as well as some in-person meetings with interest groups. She said she anticipates even more feedback before this goes to Public Hearing, and she will share this feedback with the Planning Commission. She said she is making some changes to the glossary of terms, as well as updating some of the graphics. She said she will be reaching out to stakeholders to remind them of the upcoming Public Hearing dates: Planning Commission – May 3, 2017 and Town Council – May 18, 2017. She said she will also be visiting with the Redevelopment Commission this month. Catherine Lorbeer finished her presentation.

Chair Sippel thanked Catherine Lorbeer and called for any questions or comments.

Question: Mary Harris asked about the table in the packet. She said she wanted to make sure that the material highlighted in green was current stakeholder feedback that may or may not make its way into the recommended document. She asked if this was still a living, breathing process.

Answer: Catherine Lorbeer answered affirmatively. She said she had included this to give the Commission the flavor of the type of input and what sections the stakeholders were concerned about. She also said that in the staff report, she went into more detail on whether they thought the request could be accommodated or what the reason was that they were not considering a change.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Chair Sippel adjourned the Study Session at 8:02 p.m.

Kristofer Sippel, Chairman

ATTEST:

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary