



MINUTES

PIMA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION SUBDIVISION REVIEW SECTION

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING APRIL 19, 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:

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

STAFF VOTING MEMBERS:

(X) Chris Poirier
(X) Fran Dostillio
(X) Maggie Shaw

NON-VOTING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT STAFF MEMBERS:

(X) Betty Sanchez, Recording Secretary, Planning Division
(X) Sue Morman, Senior Planner, Planning Division
(X) Greg Saxe, Regional Flood Control Department

HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE VOTING MEMBER(S): None

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Done

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes from February 16, 2012 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

5. GATEWAY:

Co20-12-02 Camp Bow Wow – Oracle Road (Catalina)

Owner: Linda Burkett

Applicant: Pete Salonga, Oracle Road Engineering

Location: 16725 N. Oracle Road

Tax Code(s): 222-17-001B

Zoning: CB-2

Homeowner's Association(s): Catalina Village Council and "Save" Catalina

- a) Staff Report: Sue Morman
- b) Applicant: Pete Salonga, Jeff Coffeen, Bud Cardinal, Linda Burkett
- c) MOTION: Yes No Continue

Applicant Presentation/Public Hearing: Mr. Perry gave the presentation and answered questions.

Committee members asked questions and received answers from staff and presenter. Discussion among the Committee members followed.

MOTION AND VOTE:

The Design Review Committee (DRC) voted unanimously 8-0 to approve the motion made by Member Laidlaw and seconded by Member Swan to approve Camp Bow Wow in Catalina for compliance to Gateway Ordinance with revisions and addition to staff conditions as follows. The Design Review Committee added sign condition #4 to restrict wall sign size and clarification that sign type was not painted wall sign but a main building wall identification sign.

1. Adherence to the DRC approved site plan, landscape plan, main building wall identification sign, and elevation exhibits;
2. Building, wall colors, and planter box colors as approved by the DRC and shown on the colored Elevation Exhibit, shall be DE6123, Trail Dust, with a 40% LRV (light reflective value); and DE6125, Carved Wood, with a 20% LRV.
3. Camp Bow Wow's main building wall identification sign is acceptable per approved DRC exhibit as long as it is maintained in its original condition with the approved low LRV colors DEA151 Red Ink with 11% LRV. Should the property change use and/or ownership and the sign falls into disrepair, it will be the owner's responsibility to paint the sign area to match the base building color.
4. Sign area shall be a maximum of 60sq.ft. This area includes both the Camp Bow Wow Logo caricature and lettering.
5. All landscape plants shall be from the buffer overlay zone plant list in the landscape design manual.
6. Modified bufferyards 1) along Oracle Road and 2) along Big Wash are acceptable due to existing conditions as shown on approved DRC landscape plan;
7. Provide a safe pedestrian marked cross-walk connection between the Camp Bow Wow building and the farmer's market property to the north.
8. Provide three copies of site plan and exhibits with any changes as approved by the DRC for sign-off within 10 working days of approval. One stamped copy shall be for the record file; one for permitting staff; and the other for the owner. Provide additional copies for signature if extra signed copies are needed by the owner.

Staff Report as presented by Sue Morman addressed the following:

REQUEST

To accommodate existing onsite conditions, applicant is requesting modification to the required 20-foot bufferyard along Oracle Road; relocation of the west bufferyard from the property line to the interior of the site on top of the Big Wash embankment; relief from providing vehicular and pedestrian connectivity to the commercial center to the south; and approval of proposed building wall sign.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff finds the bufferyard modifications as presented meet the intent and aesthetic goals of the gateway ordinance. Staff recommends approval of this project with conditions subject to any modifications per DRC decision. Also due to onsite limitations, staff feels that it is not realistic to provide internal vehicular and pedestrian connection to the existing, south commercial plaza.

GENERAL COMMENTS

The site is just south of the Pinal – Pima County line and is therefore a true gateway project into Pima County and Tucson. This is an infill site which was originally developed as a landscape nursery prior to implementation of the gateway ordinance. It is an example of restoring an old site to meet new code requirements. Building and wall color choices are beiges and browns, with red accent on the wall sign. All colors are less than the gateway ordinance's maximum 48% allowable light reflective value.

DISCUSSION

Member Poirier asked for confirmation from staff that even though the Sanchez Nursery pre-dated the gateway ordinance, the approved bufferyard requirements appear not to be in place. For the record, the DRC is acting on only the Camp Bow Wow portion today. The new landscape plan for Camp Bow Wow, once implemented, only meets bufferyard requirements for the southern half of the originally approved Sanchez Nursery site. If this project is approved through the DRC process today and the SDRC development plan review process, it should be noted that these approvals are specific to the Camp Bow Wow portion. These approvals do not in any way waive the bufferyard requirements for the north portion of the property. DRC decisions today do not address or alleviate any non-compliance issues for the north portion of the Sanchez Nursery site. Staff agreed with Member Poirier's assessment.

Chairman Best asked the applicant, Pete Salonga, to correct for the record that the owner lived in Orange, California and not Orange, Arizona as noted in the applicant's letter to the DRC. Mr. Salonga noted that this was a typo and for the record it is Orange, California.

Mr. Salonga had nothing further to add to staff's report except the owner was looking forward to moving the project forward as soon as possible.

The owner, Linda Burkett, wanted the DRC to know that she was planning on moving to this area permanently once Camp Bow Wow is constructed. She currently owns a home in Oro Valley and wanted to make it clear that she would not be an absentee owner. She loves Tucson, and has a personal interest in the success of this business.

Member Lilien expressed concerns that the play yard seems too close to the south commercial plaza. Were any considerations undertaken to mitigate the potential dog barking noise in respect to adjacent south plaza offices and businesses? Mr. Salonga noted that the play area has an 8-foot masonry wall around it. Bud Cardinal of C&C Construction noted that the Golder Ranch Fire Department required that the play yard wall to be moved back a minimum of 10-feet from the south property line wall. The play yard is connected to the main building, has a covered roof for shade, and the narrow area between the roof and the wall is open for air circulation. Pets in the play yard

area will be under constant supervision. Noise is mitigated by Camp Bow Wow employees. There are indoor play yards as well. Linda Burkett noted that the operation has four play yards none of which are full at any one time. There has to be one attendant in each of the play yards when in use. Staff controls barking to minimize excitement and behavior problems. The intent is to keep the dogs happy and calm so barking is not a negative factor. The dogs are never left unattended.

Mr. Salonga noted that the development to the south is also four feet lower and further separated by the commercial center's PAAL (parking area access lane) which adds distance between uses. Member Lilien asks if there are any sound barrier measures taken. Linda Burkett noted that the construction included baffles. Chairman Best asked for clarification on the 8-foot wall shown in the photograph. Member Shaw clarified that wall shown in the staff report Photo #8 is existing and is separate from the 8-foot wall around the doggy play yard. The play yard wall is located 10-feet from the existing wall on the south property line. Chairman Best asked what was between the walls. Mr. Salonga noted that there will be a drainage ditch to carry some runoff from the parking lot toward Big Wash.

Member Swan asked for sign dimensions and expects that this will be the only project sign. The gateway ordinance has sign design guidelines that need to be respected. Bud Cardinal noted that the sign is within the 125sq.ft of allowable area per Pima County sign code requirements. Mr. Cardinal wasn't sure if the 125sq.ft is the correct maximum area for a main wall sign but assured the Committee that the proposed sign is less than the allowed area per sign code requirements.

Member Swan noted that the sign appears to be about 30sq.ft. and proportionally a larger sign than this may not be appropriate within the gateway. The sign needs dimensions and should be restricted to the area as shown.

In response to Member Swan's concerns, Mr. Salonga circulated an 11"x17" sign exhibit, with sign element dimensions, to DRC members. Member Swan noted that per the exhibit, the sign is approximately 53.34 sq.ft.; the overall sign length is 10-feet from Bow to Wow with 24 inch letter height. The logo is 20 sq.ft. so the total area of the sign is approximately 73.34 sf. Mr. Salonga clarified that the total sign area including the logo and lettering was 53.34 sf. Member Swan concurred with Mr. Salonga's measurements per the exhibit. He stated that this new exhibit needs to be a part of the DRC review and approval process and needs to be submitted through staff for the record. Member Swan asked about the red color choice. Linda Burkett noted that these were the franchise colors.

Chairman Best asked Ms. Morman how the Committee was supposed to address the sign. Staff responded that the sign was important to consider because of the gateway and also noted that the sign is also approved separately through permitting. The DRC should consider whether it is aesthetically acceptable for the gateway to have the sign on the building as shown. Member Poirier noted that the maximum square footage of the allowed main wall sign per CB-2 is limited to 150 sq.ft. It can be calculated as 30 sq.ft is allowed per one lineal foot of building frontage. From a size perspective, the proposed sign appears to be less than 150 sq.ft.

Member Swan noted that not all projects in the past presented the sign for DRC review, but thinks it is a more complete review when signs are a part of the DRC review. Linda Burkett noted that the sign is lighted from the back and is not painted. It is not a wood sign. The letters are aluminum and the red color on the logo is vinyl. Staff asked if there was an exhibit providing the materials and illumination specifications? Linda Burkett mentioned she could provide a color photo of the sign.

Staff noted that eventually for permitting the specifications are needed but for this Committee it is a visual aesthetic issue. Linda Burkett noted that the sign presentation is as shown on the

exhibit, ie. the same colors and same look. Chairman Best clarified that the Committee's task is to review the design elements of the sign for visibility and aesthetics from the roadway. The Committee does not specifically approve the sign. The sign will need to go through a separate permitting process. Linda Burkett understood that this is the case.

Chairman Best noted that the presentation of the sign as an integrated part of the building is unusual. Usually the sign is a monument type sign closer to the roadway. Member Poirier noted that it is within the DRC parameters to review the sign from a design standpoint as meeting the intent of the gateway ordinance. He noted that the Chairman is correct that there will be a more technical review when the sign permit is pulled. Chairman Best noted that this review is important because we care about how the roadway looks and about how the community looks.

Member Laidlaw clarified that this is a building mounted sign not a painted sign. He personally has no problem with a soft illuminated sign at night and thinks if the Committee is satisfied with the sign the way it is colored and how it looks and is configured from the road then the Committee's mission is accomplished. Member Swan is comfortable with the information now that it is not a painted sign.

Chairman Best asked Member Lilien if he had any comments since he lived in the area. Member Lilien responded, no problem with the sign, but has concerns about the play yard being too close with barking dogs to the south commercial plaza. It would be better if the building could be flipped 90 degrees so that the play yard noise travels toward the wash and would be hundreds of feet away from the existing offices to the south. He is concerned with potential complaints regarding barking dogs from the commercial plaza offices to the south.

Member Poirier noted that the code allows a kennel in CB-2 zone provided that any portion of the kennel use area is 100 feet from a rural or residential zone. The wash, although a vacant use, is a rural, RH zone. Therefore, the Code is dictating that the building be oriented more toward the commercial zone. Shifting the building as Member Lilien noted would bring it possibly within 100 feet of the RH zone. However, Member Poirier recognized that Member Lilien had very valid concerns.

Chairman Best noted that the existing, adjoining plaza is zoned the same as Camp Bow Wow and is intended for more intensive commercial use. If it were an apartment building, rural zoning, or other residential, then the concern would override the orientation of the building on the overall lot.

Mr. Salonga added that the western portion of the site is also restricted by a 250-foot erosion hazard setback from Big Wash. This limits building construction within the western portion of the site.

Member Weaks added a suggestion to implement energy saving and passive water harvesting methods for landscaping in the western portion of the site. If the trees are planted closer to the building, their shade would reduce the heat in the building. Project Landscape Architect, Jeff Coffeen addressed Member Weaks' comments as follows. The logic for the landscaping on the west side of the building was to make a park like setting for walking dogs and keep an openness for the future possibility of agility training. Member Weaks suggested that there still may be opportunity for more trees on the west side of the building for temperature cooling.

Member Dostillio asked if there are any measures taken for dust control in the open landscape areas. Mr. Coffeen noted that decomposed granite will cover the ground surface in the open space and landscaped areas.

Staff asked the DRC to consider in their motion any revisions to the staff conditions which

incorrectly referenced the sign as a painted sign, specifically staff condition #3. Member Poirier asked the Committee if this Condition would be acceptable if the word painted were deleted. Member Weaks asked if “on the building” after wall sign may be added for further clarification. Chairman Best summarized that for Condition #3, delete reference to painted and add “on the building” after wall sign or call out as building wall sign. Member Poirier noted that the Code specifies the sign on the building as a “main wall identification sign.” Member Dostillio noted that ‘painted’ should be struck from Condition #1 as well.

Member Laidlaw Moved to Close the Public Hearing.

Motion was seconded by Stacey Weaks and Maggie Shaw.

No Comments from the audience were noted.

Linda Burkett noted for the record that she loves Tucson and is looking forward to living in Tucson and running the kennel business. She is appreciative of any positive direction from the Committee.

Chairman Best asked for a MOTION.

Member Weaks moved to approve Co20-12-02, Camp Bow Wow with staff conditions and modifications to Condition 1 and 3 by removing the word painted and adding building’s main wall identification sign.

Member Lilien seconded the Motion.

Member Swan made a friendly amendment to the MOTION to add that the area of the sign will be a maximum of 60 sq.ft.

Member Weaks accepted the friendly amendment into the motion and Member Lilien seconded the revised motion.

Chairman Best asked if the applicant had any objection to the motion. Mr. Cardinal said that the 60 sq.ft. sign area was acceptable.

Motion was approved unanimously, 8-0.

6. NEW BUSINESS: None

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The DRC meets on the third Thursday of every month. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled at 1:30 p.m. on June 21 in the Public Works Building, basement level, Conference Room “C”.

Minutes submitted by: Betty Sanchez, Recording Secretary. Meeting audio tapes may be made available for additional information not included in the minutes.

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.