



# MINUTES

PIMA COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT  
PLANNING DIVISION SUBDIVISION REVIEW SECTION

## DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING

MAY 16, 2013

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
- ( ) Don Laidlaw
- (X) Clave Lilien

**STAFF VOTING MEMBERS:**

- (X) Arlan Colton
- (X) Tom Drzazgowski
- (X) Jonathan Crowe

**NON-VOTING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT STAFF MEMBERS:**

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

**HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVE VOTING MEMBER(S):**

None

---

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Done

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES from February 21, 2013 and March 21, 2013 were moved for approval by Arlan Colton with a modification to March Meeting Minutes. The requested change is to delete the sentences on Page 4 "The above motion is binding for Co20-13-02, SWC of River & Sabino Canyon Rd. If further clarification is required please feel free to contact me at (520)724-9000." The motion with change was seconded by Tom Drzazgowski. February and modified March Meeting Minutes were approved unanimously by 7-0 Vote.

5. 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\*

**6. HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT ZONE REVIEW**

**Co20-13-03 Jergens Residence 5300 Circulo Sobrio**

**Owner:** Thomas and Darlene Jergens

**Applicant:** Wendi Munsey, Arizona Home Designs

**Location:** Catalina Foothills Estates No. 10, Lot 29

**Tax Code(s):** 108-13-0410

**Zoning:** CR-1

**Notified Homeowner’s Association(s):** Catalina Foothills Neighborhood Association; Catalina Foothills Estates No. 10; and the subdivision’s Cadden Management Company.

a) Staff Report: Sue Morman

b) Applicant: Wendi Munsey

c) MOTION: Yes  No  Continue

**Staff Report:**

Staff began with defining the location of the property as being in Catalina Foothills, south of Sunrise Drive, north of River Road, and east of Hacienda Del Sol Road. The home is on Lot 29 of Catalina Foothills Estates #10.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 14-foot high retaining/patio wall which further extends into a free-standing chimney for a total of approximately 18-feet. The applicant is requesting the following two Hillside Development Zone (HDZ) exceptions: One is to Section 18.61.054G6d of the Pima County Zoning Code which allows for a retaining wall to be a maximum vertical distance of 10-feet. The other is to Section 18.61.054G3a(2) which pertains to the cut and fill requirements of the HDZ ordinance and requires a 6-foot wide plant bench at every 10 foot vertical interval.

The applicant is proposing to put a 6-foot high and 6-foot wide plant bench at the base of the 14-foot retaining/patio wall with native plants to soften the expanse of the wall. The proposed patio addition does not extend the existing grading limits or disturb any of the existing vegetation. This is not an over-grading exception. The house is built into and on top of the slope which leads down the driveway and rapidly drops down to the road along the west property line. The proposed patio appears to affect only the view shed of neighboring homes from the north-northwest. The applicant proposes as shown in Section B to construct a 6-foot wide, 6-foot tall planter with native trees and shrubs to visibly reduce the height of the wall. The mitigation adds another layer of vegetation to the significant coverage of existing trees and shrubs. The applicant brought a color sample for the wall which matches the surrounding house color. The color and construction of the patio is designed to maintain the existing character of the house and neighborhood. As it is, the house is on a large lot and the views of the patio are currently filtered by existing vegetation to remain on the home’s north descending hillside.

The Homeowners Association (HOA) for Catalina Foothills Estates #10 is aware of this project. Staff has been in contact with the president of the HOA. At this time, they have no objections to this proposal with the understanding that the applicant will present this proposal to the subdivision’s Architecture Review Board.

**Applicant’s Presentation:**

Wendi Munsey presented the patio expansion proposal to the Design Review Committee. She clarified that their request letter stated that the planter box be 6-feet vertical by 4feet-8inches front to back and not 6-feet wide as noted in staff’s report. Ms. Munsey verified that they would like to maintain the planter box width of 4feet-8inches and make sure that this was a part of the exception request. The wider the planter box then the greater the height of the terrace/retaining wall. The goal of the new construction is to maintain the height of the existing terrace/retaining wall at 10-feet. In order to do so the planter box width cannot be any wider than 4feet-8inches.

In the DRC's packets, photographs from the street show that the base of the wall can't be seen at all. Also, as staff said, there is only one home that may visually see the terrace, but they will only be able to see the top 3-4feet of the terrace which is the view shed that they have now. There will be no change in neighboring view sheds resulting from this new construction. The chimney is only 3feet-4inches higher than the screen wall. There is not a lot of mass to the outdoor chimney. There is a section exhibit that shows all the proposed plantings to further soften up the new wall.

Applicant provided the DRC with the paint color for the new wall which is the existing color of the house and terrace wall. Also provided is a list of signatures of neighbors within 800-feet. The applicant was unable to get in touch with one neighbor. Those that signed the sheet have no objection to the proposal.

Chairman Best asked about the one owner that didn't sign. Ms. Munsey noted that they tried but were unable to make contact with the owner. This is the owner who may have the limited top 3-4foot view of the new terrace. It is not that they have said no, it is just that they haven't been able to reach them. Chairman Best asked if these neighbors were aware of the project yet. Ms. Munsey responded that these neighbors are probably not aware of this project. She has tried twice to get in touch with them, but she thinks that they may be out-of-town.

Ms. Munsey continued to explain that the only change to this neighbor's visibility is the chimney structure which is 6-foot wide by 3feet-4inches high. The top of the chimney is 6-feet lower than the highest parapet of the house. Member Swan noted that the height of the flue of the chimney and the size of the opening of the fireplace are related. Heat rises and it is important to get sizing of the fireplace opening correct; especially, if you are planning to burn wood.

Ms. Munsey responded that they understood this construction aspect and would definitely revisit the chimney plans to make sure that the chimney functions properly.

Chairman Best asked Member Swan if the discussion was about the draw and the function of the chimney rather than the form. Member Swan responded that heat rises and the relationship between the height of the chimney and the fireplace opening are important for functionality. The form of the chimney is fine. He has no issue with how it relates to the house and the pool deck and has no objections to the project, just concerns about the chimney design and function.

Member Weeks asked what the proposed use of the planters on the deck was. Ms. Munsey said just small desert shrubs. Member Weeks specified that there wouldn't be any cypress proposed, which Ms. Munsey confirmed. Member Colton asked about the plants in the planter box. Ms. Munsey confirmed that as the landscape plan shows what is proposed is all desert shrubs, i.e. acacia, creosote, red yucca, and prickly pear. The largest of the plants could reach a maximum height of 4'-5feet. Member Colton explained that his concern was to make sure that there would be no tree root problems which could over time destroy the construction of the wall. Ms. Munsey reiterated that there are no large trees planned for the planter box, just cacti and desert shrubs.

Member Swan asked if the plants would be irrigated. Ms. Munsey said there is a possibility of connecting to an existing drip system or hand watering over the wall. Member Swan recommends that there be irrigation. Member Lilien suggests that there be irrigation until the plants are established for about a year.

Member Colton asked about clarification regarding the planter box width and thereby revising DRC Condition #2 from 6-feet wide to 4feet-8inches wide. Staff responded that if the DRC was acceptable to this change then this revision could be modified during the DRC motion.

Chairman Best asked staff member Chris Poirier if he had anything to add to the proceedings.

Mr. Poirier stated that he had nothing to add but clarified that staff is supportive of reducing the planter box width based on the plant palette that is proposed. This change can easily be addressed with the motion. Staff cited the section of the code that references the planter box size requirements so there is no change regarding notification in the exception request. Therefore, this is not a procedural issue and the DRC may move forward with their decision and motion.

**MOTION AND VOTE:**

**Member Colton motioned to approve Co20-13-03, Jergens Residence at 5300 Circulo Sobrio Road for the HDZ exception with staff's standard and special requirements with modification to Condition #2 to change 6feet to 4feet-8inches.**

**Revised Conditions are as follows:**

- 1. Wall colors shall match the existing beige house color with a light reflective value of less than 60%.**
- 2. Landscape Planter shall be placed at the base of the proposed wall. Planter shall be a minimum of 5-feet tall and ~~6-feet~~ 4feet-8inches wide along the entire length of the new patio wall.**
- 3. All proposed plants shall be from the buffer overlay zone plant list, as listed in the landscape design manual.**
- 4. Any design changes to wall/chimney heights and landscaping will need to be re-reviewed by planning staff for compliance to this DRC decision and it shall be at the discretion of the planning official as to whether or not the changes will require additional DRC review.**
- 5. This DRC action does not override any subdivision CC&R's or reviews by the Catalina Foothills Estates No. 10 Architectural Review Board.**
- 6. Applicant shall provide staff with three sets of the approved DRC documents for staff sign-off compliance with the DRC decision.**

**Member Weaks seconded the Motion.**

**No discussion.**

**Chairman Best stated an observation to the applicant and the owner that the DRC proceedings and decisions do not constitute approval for the Homeowners Association. Applicant Wendi Munsey assured Chairman Best and the other Committee Members that they absolutely understood this and had already started the project review process with the homeowners association.**

**Chairman Best asked for a Vote. Vote was unanimously approved (7-0) with modifications so noted to Condition #2.**

Ms. Munsey asked if she should be revising anything for final sign-off submittal. Ms. Morman noted that there is no change to the CD since 4feet-8inches was shown on the plans. Usually there is a sign-off on hard copies but this is a CD submittal. Mr. Poirier interjected that since this is a CD submittal the decision letter referencing the CD submittal would be adequate reference for permitting.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The DRC meets on the third Thursday of every month. The next meeting is tentatively scheduled at

1:30 p.m. on April 18, 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.**