



MINUTES

PIMA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION SUBDIVISION REVIEW SECTION

DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING NOVEMBER 15, 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) Maggie Shaw
- (X) Don Laidlaw
- () Clave Lilien

STAFF VOTING MEMBERS:

- (X) Arlan Colton
- (X) Fran Dostillio

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 Represented

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Done

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes from April 19, 2012 reviewed and approved. Motion to approve by Stacey Weaks; Second by Don Laidlaw

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 REVIEW

Co20-12-03 Oracle Road Office Building

Owner: MJM Ventures Two LLC

Applicant: Geoff Harris, PE. Star Consulting

Location: 15560 N. Oracle Road

Tax Code(s): 222-26-0490

Zoning: TR

Subdivision: Twin Lakes Mobile Estates, Lot 7

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

a) Staff Report: Sue Morman

b) Applicant: Geoff Harris, PE

c) MOTION: Yes No Continue

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

Committee members asked questions. Staff and applicant responded accordingly.

Discussion among the Committee members followed.

MOTION AND VOTE:

The Design Review Committee (DRC) voted unanimously 6-0 to approve the motion made by Member Weaks and seconded by Member Laidlaw to approve Co20-12-03, Oracle Road Office Building in Catalina for compliance with applicant's request for modifications to the Gateway Ordinance.

The motion was approved with the following DRC conditions:

1. Site plan shall be implemented as approved by DRC.
2. Monument sign shall be implemented as approved by the DRC.
3. Since Monument sign has no illumination, business hours must correspond to daylight hours.
4. No signs are allowed in the bufferyard.
5. All plants shall be from the allowed buffer overlay zone plant list per the landscape design manual.
6. Shared vehicular easement connecting to the north property line shall be paved. Vehicular connection to the south shall not be required due to natural site constraints.
7. In compliance with rezoning condition #9 and gateway site plan, all areas outside of the disturbance limit shall be preserved as natural open space.
8. Pedestrian connection shall be made from the path in the right-of-way to the front door of the office.
9. Any exterior lighting onsite needs to meet the Pima County Lighting Code and be hooded and aesthetically designed to meet gateway intent.
10. It will be the discretion of the Planning Director, consistent with the intent of the DRC, to determine if any future use change(s) shall require review and approval by the DRC.
11. Applicant shall provide staff with three final complete submittals that include any revisions or additions by the DRC for final signature within 10 working days of DRC approval. One stamped copy shall be for the record file and the others shall be for the owner and distribution to permitting by the owner.

Applicant, Mr. Harris, presented the project and requested approval based on the following:

1. Property was rezoned in 2001 and the applicant's development plan complies with the Board of Supervisor's rezoning conditions;
2. Applicant's development plan conforms to current Zoning Code standards;
3. Purpose of becoming before the DRC today is to show compliance and request modifications to the Oracle Road gateway ordinance standards;
4. This is a reuse of the site;
5. The development plan shows a reconfiguration of the parking area but there is no additional grading;
6. The landscape plan proposes additional plants to the existing landscaping outside of the natural open space; and
7. The owner will re-paint the existing building to conform to required gateway colors and light reflective values.

Member Laidlaw asked the applicant if the development plan for the current gateway review is the same development plan in front of the DRC members today. Applicant responded that the development plan before the DRC is the current rendition and is the same plan recently submitted to the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC).

Staff Report as presented by Sue Morman addressed the following:

Ms. Morman noted that the applicant on the staff report is incorrect but it is correct on the Agenda. The previous presenter is indeed the applicant, Geoff Harris of Star Consulting.

REQUEST

Ms. Morman reiterated the applicant's reference to the rezoning case and the Catalina site location.

The applicant is requesting to embellish the existing landscaping along Oracle Road, therefore, the proposed plant quantities does not meet 20-foot bufferyard requirements per the landscape ordinance. Also, there are some places along the building frontage where the landscape bufferyard is not the required 20-foot gateway ordinance width.

Staff approves this gateway request with the conditions as noted in the staff report.

Some of the history on the reuse of this site is that it was originally the old, Catalina branch of the library system. Staff supports the reuse of the infill site with noted modifications. The project reuse will continue to set-aside approximately 75% of the site as natural open space. This open space is classified as important riparian habitat area per the Conservation Land System plan. The redevelopment uses the existing building and there will be no additional grading. Staff noted that the site was established in earlier days under a different set of zoning and building code requirements. The additional trees shown on the landscape plan along the frontage and building foundation respond to rezoning condition #9.

The Natural Open Space bufferyard along the southern site frontage of Oracle Road is the depth of the southern, east-west portion of the site. This additional natural open space bufferyard more than compensates for those areas in front of the building along Oracle Road that are less than the required gateway bufferyard of 20-feet. In cases of re-development and new development depending on existing conditions, staff allows that an average width of the bufferyard meets the landscape requirements. Under these conditions the bufferyard may be wider or narrower in some areas but average out to the proposed width. However, due to the gateway ordinance's requirement for a 20-foot bufferyard this would be an exception that the DRC would need to grant. Also, staff noted that the additional trees added to the area in front and by the building foundation embellishes the existing vegetation along Oracle Road. This option is preferable to grubbing the existing landscape and re-planting to meet the landscape requirements for a 20-foot 'D' Bufferyard.

Staff finds that this project generally meets the purpose statement and intent of the gateway zone. The applicant is making an effort to meet the 'new' (to this previously developed site) gateway requirements. The owner is proposing to repaint the building and sign with an olive green with 34% light reflective value and an oak brown trim with 44% light reflective value. These colors meet gateway requirements which allow a maximum of 48% light reflective value. The green and brown will blend into the building's predominant natural open space surroundings. The natural riparian area is a scenic visual transition looking east from Oracle Road to the Catalina Mountains. The natural open space in perpetuity provides neighbors looking west with no change in their open view shed. This supports the gateway Purpose statement, Section 18.78.010.

Both the Catalina Village Council and the Save Catalina neighborhood associations were notified and both declined representation of a voting DRC member for this case.

Another exception, which the DRC needs to decide upon, regards one of the rezoning conditions that there needs to be access to adjacent properties north and south of the site. Connective access points are the intent of the gateway because it reduces access points on and off of Oracle Road. For this site, providing access to the north is no problem, but providing access to the south changes the bufferyard modifications and destroys important riparian natural open space. In this circumstance, Pima County flood control, transportation, and planning agencies are in agreement that destruction of the natural habitat and wash in this area is not a preferred option. Also, if an access was punched through to the south there is a natural gas easement along Oracle Road that needs to be respected. The natural gas easement plus the width of the access road would be a 34-foot graded swath adjacent to the Oracle Road right-of-way. This would not be the scenic, visually pleasing view shed that the gateway purpose statement intends. Staff proposes that this rezoning condition and the gateway standards be modified.

Member Shaw to clarify noted that there was some flexibility in the rezoning condition. As the end of the condition states, ".....unless unfeasible due to the natural terrain." The Department of Transportation did acknowledge that it is preferable to have north and south access connection to adjacent parcels but realized it may not be warranted in this case.

The staff report discussion of this issue is on the top of page 3.

Chairman Best asks if there are any further questions or comments.

Member Dostillio noted that staff had concerns regarding the sign and asked staff to explain their concerns about the existing sign and its durability. Staff responds that given the olive background staff is concerned about the visibility of the sign from Oracle Road. Staff asked the applicant to discuss the sign materials and contacted permitting staff as to the conformance of the sign to the sign code. The sign review person noted that the sign is acceptable as a monument sign which is required along a scenic route. Oracle Road in this area is a scenic route as well as a gateway.

The applicant, Geoff Harris, responds that the existing sign is preform stucco with a veneer of hard plastic or a metallic base. The sign copy is affixed to the face. This clear acetate layer would need to be removed so the sign could be repainted and then replaced to protect the sign copy. The copy background is basically white with dark lettering so that it is highly visible from Oracle Road. Chairman Best confirms that the only thing being changed on the sign is the stucco and sign lettering. Mr. Harris responds that this is correct. He also noted that if the Committee requests changes to the sign then the owner would be open to further consideration.

Member Dostillio asked the applicant how the sign meets the gateway sign guideline that the design of the sign needs to be able to withstand extreme weather. Can this sign tolerate extreme weather? Mr. Harris responds that, without knowing the actual materials of the sign covering, upon close inspection and recognizing that it has been standing for several months he is comfortable stating that

it is very durable. Staff notes that the permitting sign review person did not think there was an existing permit for the sign and it would certainly be a requirement if it has not been obtained. Mr. Harris states that a permit would be acquired if one is not in place.

Chairman Best addressed Member Dostillio to ask if it would be appropriate to stipulate in one of the conditions that the sign needs to be weather resistant. Member Dostillio answered that would be fine. Member Laidlaw added to the discussion that who would want to buy a sign that wasn't weather resistant? He stated that it seems unnecessarily redundant to add that into the condition.

Chairman Best asked staff when the picture of the sign was taken. Staff replied that Mr. Harris had supplied the picture. Mr. Harris noted that the picture was taken recently, just within the week before the DRC 2nd submittal.

Member Weaks asked for confirmation from staff, that if the sign were moved would it need to come back to the DRC for approval. Staff stated that the sign would not need to come before the DRC unless it was relocated into the bufferyard. Member Weaks asked the applicant if the sign as is was acceptable to the owner. Mr. Harris replied that it was.

Member Colton asked if the sandwich sign shown in one of the photographs was permitted, still there, and if the intent is for it to remain in what appears to be the bufferyard. He understands that it helps identify the business because it is perpendicular to Oracle Road and is easier for vehicles passing by to see. The monument sign is less legible from Oracle Road as it is parallel to the road with the copy facing the road rather than perpendicular to the road.

Mr. Harris said that the sign in question is a temporary sandwich sign which the owner has placed and removed at various times in the past. Mr. Harris agreed to advise the owner that this sign cannot be permanent, is not appropriate, or allowed in the bufferyard. If it is the DRC's preference, they would support a condition to remove the sign. Staff intercedes and addresses Member Colton letting him know that removing the sign from the bufferyard was the intent of DRC Condition #4 which states "No signs are allowed in the bufferyard."

Member Colton continued that the monument sign graphics has blue lettering and wonders if that will remain? He expressed that as long as the business was operating during the day the sign was more likely to be visible. If he had his preference, he would take the sign and move it 90° so that it would be more visible. Chairman Best asked Member Colton if he is in agreement that if the sign is there then it is there. Member Colton noted yes, he is not here to design the sign for the owner and agreed that since it is there it may remain there. Mr. Harris noted that the owner does not rely on people without appointments dropping in. Therefore, the clients are familiar with the business location. Chairman Best said to clarify that this is more of a destination place. Mr. Harris agreed.

Chairman Best asked if there were any further questions.

Member Colton asked, if there is a motion, that staff re-write Condition #3 from two sentences into one and to Condition #10 add "...consistent with the intent of the DRC..." after Planning Director.

Member Weaks started to make a motion... and then the recording secretary noted that for the record the Chairman needed to make a call to the audience for further comment or discussion.

Chairman Best then asked if the audience had any questions.

The only person in the audience declared that he was Greg Saxe from Regional Flood Control District (RFCD). Mr. Saxe introduced himself as the DRC project review person from RFCD. Chairman Best noted that he knew Mr. Saxe from the materials and was glad to have his input and attendance at the DRC meetings.

Chairman Best then asked DRC Members for a motion.

Member Weaks made a motion to approve DRC case Co20-12-03 – Oracle Road Office Building with the Conditions in the staff report with the changes requested by Member Colton. Member Laidlaw seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously 6-0.

Member Dostillio asked if there was new business.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

Member Colton presented an official County seal Philabaum glass paper weight to each DRC member in recognition of their service and continued service on the Design Review Committee. This appreciation comes on behalf of the County Administrator's Office. Member Colton extended his personal gratitude to the current Design Review Committee members as did staff member Morman.

Member Weaks asked if the Committee's earlier decision to approve minutes with a conference call within a 90 day time period is still in effect. For the most part yes, however, recently this wasn't applied because there were times when staff thought there was going to be a case and then it was pulled. This prolonged staff scheduling a conference call with all the DRC members. Staff will be more conscious of this concern regarding DRC Minute approvals and will re-implement the policy.

DISCUSSION:

In closing up the year, Chairman Best asked the Committee for their thoughts on what the future holds for the development community in the road ahead? Chairman Best conducted a round robin of staff and Committee members asking them to share their comments on the topic. The opinions varied from person to person.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The DRC meets on the third Thursday of every month. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled at 1:30 p.m. on January 17, 2013 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.