



MINUTES

PIMA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION SUBDIVISION REVIEW SECTION

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING FEBRUARY 16, 2012

AT OR AFTER 1:30 P. M.
201 North Stone Avenue, Public Works Building,
Conference Room C, (basement floor).

1. CALL TO ORDER: At 1:30 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

APPOINTED VOTING MEMBERS:

- Gary Best (Chairman)
- Stacey Weaks (Vice Chairman)
- Wayne Swan
- Don Laidlaw
- Clave Lilien

STAFF VOTING MEMBERS:

- Arlan Colton
- Tom Drzazgowski (for Fran Dostillio)
- Maggie Shaw

NON-VOTING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT STAFF MEMBERS:

- Betty Sanchez, Recording Secretary, Planning Division
- Sue Morman, Senior Planner, Planning Division
- Elva Pedrego, Senior Planner, Planning Division
- Chris Poirier, Projects Administrator, Planning Division
- Daniel Signor, Senior Planner, Planning Division
- Greg Saxe, Environmental Plan Manager, Region Flood Control District

HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE VOTING MEMBER(S):

- Michael Butterbrodt – Catalina Village Council and Save Catalina representative

Chairman Best was absent; Vice-chair Stacey Weaks was acting Chairman for this meeting.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Done

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes from December 15, 2011 were reviewed and approved

CONSENT AGENDA: Staff recommends that the DRC consider each of these requests as a consent item based on applicant agreement with staff recommendations. In the event there are no written objections presented at this meeting from a representative of the local Home Owner Association or from a neighboring property owner, and no request by a member of the DRC to remove the request from the consent agenda; then staff recommends that the DRC consider approving each of these requests that meet the above conditions without first reading the staff report and without deliberation by the DRC.

No Consent Agenda Items

Chairman Weaks announced that two cases C020-09-12 Arber Ridge Cluster Subdivision and Co20-09-03 Arber Ridge Gateway would be presented together and separate motions and votes would be required for each case.

6. Cluster Subdivision

[Co20-09-01 Arber Ridge Cluster Subdivision](#)

Owner: Vistoso Catalina Limited Partnership, Attn: Hinderaker & Rauh Plc

Applicant: Michael Baker, Floerchinger, Sadler, Steele, Baker, Inc

Location: 3451 E Thistle St, Tucson, AZ 85739

Tax Code(s): 222-22-0170

Zoning: GR-1

Homeowner's Association(s): Catalina Village Council and Save Catalina; Michael Butterbrodt was present.

- a) Staff Report: Daniel Signor
- b) Applicant: Martin Floerchinger

VOTE: The motion was made by Member Colton to **APPROVE** case #Co20-09-01 with staff conditions as amended and seconded by Member Laidlaw. Motion **PASSED** unanimously by a 7-0 Vote.

7. Gateway Review

[Co20-09-03 Gateway Review](#)

Owner: Vistoso Catalina Limited Partnership, Attn: Hinderaker & Rauh Plc

Applicant: Michael Baker, Floerchinger, Sadler, Steele, Baker, Inc

Location: 3451 E Thistle St, Tucson, AZ 85739

Tax Code(s): 222-22-0170

Zoning: GR-1

Homeowner's Association(s): Catalina Village Council and Save Catalina; Michael Butterbrodt was present.

- a) Staff Report: Daniel Signor
- b) Applicant: Martin Floerchinger

VOTE: The motion was made by Vice-Chairman Weeks to **APPROVE** case #Co20-09-03 and seconded by Member Lilien. Motion **PASSED** unanimously by a 7-0 Vote.

Staff presented an overview of the cluster subdivision option from the Pima County Zoning Code Chapter 18.09.040 as an introduction to the staff report.

Staff stated that 18.09.040 allows smaller lot sizes and setbacks in return for at least a minimum of 30% cluster open space, which can be natural, functional, or a combination. Staff stressed that residential density can never exceed that density that is allowed by the zoning code. The Comprehensive Plan limits the density for parcels within Low Intensity Urban designations below the Code maximum for the relevant zoning designation; however the Comprehensive Plan also allows the full allowed density to be reached if the cluster subdivision option is used. As an example, for the case under review the maximum density for CR-3 parcels not going through a rezoning is 4 Residential units per Acre (RAC), however the Low Intensity Urban designation in which the parcel is located restricts the density to 3 RAC. If the cluster option is used the full 4 RAC density can be achieved.

Staff presented an overview of the proposed project. The cluster subdivision and the gateway are both portions of a 15-acre rezoning with the cluster subdivision in the northern 7.5 acres and the gateway review only confined to the southern 7.5 acres.

Staff presented an aerial photo of the area surrounding the site pointing out the high density Black Horse Ranch subdivision, the Golder Ranch Commercial Center, several small mobile home parks and a townhome retirement community. An overview of the cluster project was shown and the layout of cluster open space, townhome buildings, drive lanes, parking, pedestrian walkways and recreational facilities were indicated on the layout. Staff concluded the layout presentation. Staff then reviewed the criteria specified by the Code that the DRC should follow in making its determination of whether or not the cluster option should be approved. Staff recommendation was to approve the project with conditions as presented in the staff report. Staff indicated that there was a typo in condition 6 and that several of the references to sections of the Code were duplicated. Staff read the condition without the duplicate references in to the record.

CD included in the packet. The Chair asked staff to clarify whether the units that were removed after the commission hearing were indicated on the Preliminary Cluster Development Plan (PCDP).

A committee member asked if one of the units that is shown on the plan would be removed. Staff responded that this was not the same plan that had been reviewed by the Commission but that it reflected changes requested by public speakers at the Commission hearing.

A committee member asked if there was a depiction of the appearance of the buildings with the second floor removed from the buildings. The applicant responded that there was not. Discussion followed between committee members, staff and the applicant regarding changes to the number of buildings and units that remain after changes made to the plan subsequent to changes made to the design after the Commission hearing.

Staff presented the Co20-09-03 staff report and indicated that the owner was incorrectly identified and the correct owner is the Vistoso Catalina LLP. Staff indicated the required landscape areas, color descriptions, and architectural renderings of the proposed buildings.

A committee member asked staff if color chips were available. Staff responded that the color chips had been provided in the committee packet.

The Chairman asked if there was a landscape plan with the submittal. Staff responded that landscape plans were not required at this point although all of the required landscape plans were indicated on the site plan.

Staff indicated that written concerns from the neighbors had been submitted at the hearing.

The applicant presented the proposal, indicating that he was in agreement with the staff report and conditions.

A committee member asked about the applicant's contact with neighboring homeowners. Discussion followed between committee members and the applicant regarding contacts and about the effect of the proposal on adjoining properties and about access to the site.

A committee member asked about possible uses to include rental of units and assisted living facilities. The applicant responded that the process was not appropriate for an assisted living facility. Discussion followed between the committee member identified the water provide as the Lago del Oro Water Company and asked about water availability.

A committee member asked what the closest off site building was to the nearest proposed building. The applicant responded 150-160 feet with dense vegetation intervening.

A committee member asked about the CC&R's and home occupations. The applicant responded the CC&R's did not preclude home occupations. The committee member asked about pedestrian access to and from the site to the commercial properties on Oracle Road. A committee member asked about the difference between the north and south portions of the rezoning site. The applicant

responded that they would be the same, except that the north lots would be adjacent to open space.

Discussion followed between a committee member and the applicant about the reductions of units from the original proposal. The committee member asked another committee member about the possibility of planned widening of Twin Lakes Road and discussion followed.

Discussion followed between the applicant and a committee member about the types of units.

No members of the public spoke for or against the hearing.

The public hearing was closed.

Committee member Colton made a motion to approve Co20-09-01 with staff conditions as amended. Committee member Laidlaw seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Committee chair Weaks made a motion to approve Co20-09-03 with conditions as amended. Committee member Lilien seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. NEW BUSINESS: None

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The next meeting will be on the third Thursday of the month at 1:30 p.m. in the Public Works Building, basement level, Conference Room "C".

Minutes submitted by: Betty Sanchez, Recording Secretary

Approval of the minutes from this meeting may be considered via Design Review Committee Conference Call or at the next Design Review Committee Meeting if the next meeting is within 60 days.

NOTE:

Meeting audio tapes may be made available for additional information not included in the minutes. Minutes once approved by the Design Review Committee are available online at www.dsd.pima.gov

NOTE TO HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATIONS AND HISTORICAL DISTRICT ADVISORY BOARDS:
All Homeowners' Associations (HOA) and Historic District Advisory Boards on file that are affected (within officially mapped HOA boundaries) by certain DRC projects are notified by the Pima County Planning Division of the Development Services Department as to the project's purpose, and the date, time and place of the meeting. If more than one HOA or Advisory Board is involved, it shall be the responsibility of the several groups to decide among themselves which Association or Board shall have the vote, and to inform this Department in writing of their decision at or prior to the Design Review Committee Design Review Committee (DRC) meeting.