

**TOWN OF GILBERT
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, GILBERT, AZ
JULY 10, 2019**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair
Brian Johns
Les Smith
Philip Alibrandi, Alternate
James Torgeson, Alternate

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair
Greg Froehlich
David Cavenee

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner
Keith Newman, Planner II
Josh Rogers, Planner II
Nathan Williams, Senior Planner
Amy Temes, Senior Planner
Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

Nancy Davidson, Assistant Town Attorney
Recorder Dana Desing

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Bloomfield called the July 10, 2019 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:15 p.m. He informed the audience that there is not much reason to request to speak as there are only two items on the Regular Meeting agenda and those will be continued to a future meeting. If someone would like to address the Commission, they may fill out a form located at the back of the room.

- 1. DR19-79 RIVULON LAKE OFFICE BUILDINGS: Master site plan, site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 16.5 acres, generally located at the southeast corner of Rivulon Blvd and Allen Road, and zoned Business Park (BP) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner, presented DR19-79, the Rivulon Lake office buildings. The property is a 16.5 acre parcel located within the Rivulon development, east of Gilbert Road and south of Pecos Road, directly off Rivulon Boulevard and Allen Avenue. The property is zoned Business Park (BP) as are the surrounding properties. The Applicant is proposing two office buildings totaling 353,000 SF and two parking garages. The two building mirror each other. Staff had no major issues with the site plan. Access to the site will be from two private drives to be constructed as part of the project as well as an access point off of Allen Avenue. The project also proposes the development of the Rivulon Lake. Ms. MacDonald pointed out the location of the parking garages and the internal access points. The project provides in excess of the required parking between the surface parking and the two garages. The development is in keeping with what we expect from Nationwide and the Rivulon development, featuring pavers along the frontage, nice entry features, and the lake with pergolas. There is a loading area and service parking at the front of each building. The project appears to meet all of the fire requirements. Traffic had very minor comments. The project is currently in first review and staff may identify some additional comments moving forward, although there are not many concerns with the site layout.

The building elevations were reviewed. A painted metal canopy at the top is an architectural feature intended to serve as an eyebrow similar to what is seen on the Bank of America building that is visible from the 202. The height of the stacked stone piers is consistent with the height of the stone on other buildings within the Rivulon development. A screened wall is planned along the roadway to screen the ground floor parking area.

The building are four-stories, 59'5" to the top of the building, and 71' to the top of the mechanical screening. This is in the Vertical Development Overlay District which allows up to 90 feet. At the top of the building, the Applicant is proposing corrugated metal screening which is in line with what is seen in the Isagenix building and others within the Rivulon development. Ms. MacDonald reviewed some renderings the Applicant provided that were not included in the Staff report. Staff is comfortable with the design and the stone piers. On the parking garage, there is 35' to the top of the architectural feature at the stairwell, which is primarily colored concrete with CMU with engineered wood under the canopy. Colors and materials were reviewed with a considerable amount of glass, stone, aluminum, and metal. Staff is requesting feedback from the Planning Commission on the vertical element of the stacked stone piers, the parking garage exposed stairwells, canopies, and screening of the ground floor parking area.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Smith asked what the issue was with the exposed stairwells.

Ms. MacDonald stated that historically, staff has asked that stairwells be screened as sometimes buildings look better without a visible stairwell. In this case, the Applicant provided CMU at the back, which is one of the only places than an alternate material has been introduced. The question is whether we want to hide the CMU block or are we comfortable seeing the stairs that are typically shielded.

Commissioner Johns has seen the product from the beginning with the Design Review of Rivulon. He felt the painted canopy was pretty much the same as in the other buildings, which has been approved. It is so high that it would not be seen from a pedestrian scale, but would perhaps from across Pecos Road. Regarding the stacked stone piers, at first he was concerned about the horizontal pedestrian level, although it does represent a one-third, two-thirds design element. If those were brought down it would be more like half and half. He likes the scale of it currently. His concern with regard to the pedestrian scale is that the sidewalk is right up against the building with all the glass. Historically, we've had a foundation to the buildings. The project has so much landscape and setback, although landscape does not make up for the building itself. After reviewing some of the slides, he understood that there is some buffer so that people are not walking right next to the glass. He felt the design was elegant how the building sits inside the landscaping and the lake. He noted this would be the first glass building with a lake in front of it. It will have a lot of power as people drive up that street. He had no issue with the piers or the foundation. Regarding the stairwells, he felt they were not really visible from the main thoroughfare and were blocked on one side. He did not see any issues with the stairwells.

Vice Chair Bloomfield thought it was an elegant building. He saw no problems with the columns as they terminate well, especially as the top floor comes out over the columns. The eyebrow is consistent with what we are seeing in the area, although he felt it probably did not have much utility. He asked what staff's concerns were regarding the eyebrow feature.

Ms. MacDonald stated on some of the other buildings within Rivulon they seem a little more substantial. The question is whether the scale is appropriate given the size of the building or does it need to stand out more. The renderings show the extension of the metal canopy up a little higher so it feels bigger than it looks on the elevations.

Vice Chair Bloomfield understood that but felt it would not do much to help shade the top floor, although it is on the north side. He liked the look of it and felt adding that shadow underneath will help darken it and create some interest to set the building off. He will leave that up to the architect to figure out, although he did not see a problem with it. He was excited about the Rivulon project.

Commissioner Johns noted there were removable bollards at the entry and asked for details. Would they be the yellow bollards or ornamental bollards?

Ms. MacDonald had no details on the bollards. She will speak with Fire to see if the fire access plan called for the bollards. She was not sure if other office buildings in Rivulon have the removable bollards, but they are certainly not the big yellow ones.

2. DR19-59 VERDE AT COOLEY STATION PHASE II: Site plan, landscape, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, colors and materials for approximately 3.82 acres, generally located south of the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads, and zoned Gateway Village Center (GVC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim reviewed DR19-59 Verde at Cooley Station Phase II. The site is located on the southwest corner of Recker and Williams Field Roads in the heart of Cooley Station and the greater Gateway Character Area. The first phase and the master site layout were approved in February, 2019. Phase II includes the eastern parking lot, two buildings that are Pad J and H/I, and an amphitheater, Pad M, and the Green. A map of Cooley Station showed future developments in the area, including Lyons Gate currently under construction, three approved projects, a Fry's about to break ground, and Fulton Homes has one project that has broken ground and another that is almost completed. The Springs at Gateway rezoning is not shown on the map.

This site will have the three structures, a green pedestrian plaza, and parking. The site is called Verde and there is emphasis on trees and landscaping in the pedestrian plaza with a green turf area, different types of pavers, and wide sidewalks to provide pedestrian connection and create a space. The front tenants will face the green area and the building frontage will be along the internal private drive. The buildings will have full 360 degree articulation since the back of the buildings will be seen from Recker Road. The colors and materials reflect the design guidelines that were approved with Phase I and include stucco, tile, materials with a wood look, and the fuego red brick seen in Cooley Station. Building J will be multi-tenant suites with retail and restaurants. Building H/I will have three different tenant spaces with restaurants. Building M, the amphitheater, is about 1,500 SF. The architecture is contemporary while incorporating the farmhouse motifs in the area. There is a silo as a landmark on the corner of Pad J looking out towards the pedestrian plaza. There will be some outdoor dining patio areas as well as awnings for pedestrian shade. To the south is future multi-family, and the rear of the building will face southeast along Recker Road.

Renderings for the site were reviewed with each tenant space having its own unique identity. The rear elevations will have different types of building materials as well as wall murals to make the area interactive. There is a section that juts in for a service area on the rear of the building. The tenants will be able to create their outdoor dining areas to their liking and will go through an administrative design review process with staff. The architecture of the amphitheater has a hay barn theme with slatted doors that can open or close for movement. The parking lot features approved pole lighting in the parking lot and pedestrian scale lighting throughout the plaza. Staff is currently looking into the building lighting. The two buildings feature a lot of different types of lighting so that each tenant can have their own character. The Design Guidelines allow some more modern LED lighting as well as more historical lighting. Staff is looking for feedback on whether there is enough articulation between tenant spaces, and the different types of lighting. Staff felt that LED and modern lighting will be acceptable with the site.

Staff has worked with Applicant to bring character to the site. This site is almost 4 acres and is part of the Master Site Plan. It can be approved administratively and does not need to come back for a public hearing.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Johns commented that a different amphitheater was shown in prior presentations.

Ms. Bubenheim stated when the Applicant came in with their Design Guideline package, they had conceptual images for future buildings, which would be presented with Phase II. Now that Phase II is being proposed, the amphitheater is a different style.

Commissioner Johns asked if future Pads with more buildings would push toward the street.

Ms. Bubenheim stated that is correct. On the Master Site Plan, the future two- or three-story Pads A, B1, E, and F will all be along Williams Field Road.

Commissioner Johns noted the changes in elevations to differentiate the tenant spaces, although he felt there was not a lot of movement across the frontage, just a change in materials and shape. After looking at the floor plans, he felt there was some movement on the corner and side as well as recessed entrances. Even with awnings, it is still a flat wall, and that is the first thing you will see. It would be nice to see a little more movement on both the horizontal and vertical. There are matching heights of the parapets on the back side. There is no change in form, only in materials. More was done with the store frontages, the arrow building on the north side, and the round tower element. He asked if they were following the same lighting as in the downtown. He assumed the intent was to look as if it was built in phases like different buildings downtown with their own character. It would be nice if the site lighting was more consistent in the parking lot. Even in centers, the building has some type of theme or tie. They are going in a completely opposite direction with this project. He would like staff to continue working with the Applicant on those elements. He asked if the Commission would see this item again.

Ms. Bubenheim stated it would be up to the Planning Commission whether they wanted to see this item again, although staff does have the ability to approve it administratively.

Commissioner Johns thought it was a good project and he is excited to see something happening in the area and looks forward to what we will see along the street front.

Commissioner Torgeson had no concerns on the front elevations. By allowing dining out front, you can change all the setbacks and alleviate any concern about a straight line. He was all for giving as much room as needed to make something unique rather than homogenize it.

Commissioner Alibrandi felt the back portion facing Recker Road needed more articulation and excitement. This is in his area and he will drive by the site often. There is quite a bit of traffic down that road. He suggested some parapets or some other elements to break up the back line. Aside from that, he felt it will be a wonderful project.

Vice Chair Bloomfield mirrored what was said about the lighting and allowing some freedom to create the unique building type appearances. For the parking lot and common area, he felt there should be a common lighting type as that area will be built all at once rather than phased. He also would like to see more articulation. Initially, he thought it looked great with the different materials to create a unique building with each tenant having its own character and space. It will be fun to see what will be created there. He felt the market as well as the people will appreciate that. Regarding the murals, he asked if staff had any concerns or if any theme or style had been proposed.

Ms. Bubenheim advised that the wall murals would not be reviewed by staff. Staff cannot offer any opinion regarding art, although it cannot act as signage or promote what is in the space. Staff had emphasized allowing art in this area to make it more visually interesting and to break up large walls.

3. GP19-03 THE ACES OF GILBERT CAMPUS: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 4.8 acres generally located at the southeast corner of Bluejay Drive and Galveston Street from Business Park (BP) to Neighborhood Office (NO).

Z19-12 THE ACES OF GILBERT CAMPUS: Request to rezone approximately 4.8 acres of real property generally located at the southeast corner of Bluejay Drive and Galveston Street from Business Park (BP) with a Planned Area Development overlay to Neighborhood Office (NO) zoning district.

DR19-82 THE ACES OF GILBERT CAMPUS: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 4.8 acres, generally located at the southeast corner of Bluejay Drive and Galveston Street, and with a proposed zoning of Neighborhood Office (NO) zoning district.

Planner Sydney Bethel presented GP19-03 The Aces of Gilbert Campus located south of the southwest corner of Ray and Power Roads directly at the southeast corner of Bluejay Drive and Galveston Street. The site is

approximately 4.8 acres. It is presently one parcel that is proposed to be split. There are three requests that staff is seeking input from the Commission. The first is a minor General Plan Amendment going from the existing land use classification of Business Park (BP) to Neighborhood Office (NO). The second request is to rezone from Business Park with a PAD Overlay to Neighborhood Office (NO). The third is a Design Review application to construct a 35,000 SF school.

The primary reason for the General Plan Amendment is to match the proposed rezoning from Business Park to Neighborhood Office. The rezoning request is to switch from Business Park with a PAD Overlay to a conventional zoning of Neighborhood Office without any PAD. The Applicant is not requesting any deviations. The reason for the rezoning is because schools are not permitted in the Business Park zoning district. In the Neighborhood Office zoning district, schools are permitted as long as it is off of a collector or arterial.

For the Design Review, the site plan has gone through a first review. The school is proposed in two phases, the first being the site improvement and the 35,000 SF school. The second phase of 4,000 SF will allow for expansion with four classrooms if needed. Phase 1 will accommodate 130 students with 18 classrooms. The expansion would allow up to 150 students, which would be their capacity. The site also contains parking and a recreational area. This K-12 school is unique as it provides specialize education with all students being bussed from the school district. There will be no parent pick up or drop off. There will be eight vans on site for field trips. The parking area is mainly for the approximately 40 staff members.

The primary building material is stucco with some metal accents painted a bronze color as well as green accents. The accent color is used in their other campuses across the Valley. The elevations were reviewed. Staff has provided comments that they would like to see some of the elements such as a paint color or the canopy reflected on other portions of the elevation to create some balance. There are some limitations with regard to windows due to the nature of the school. Staff also suggested adding another material common in the area to the building as it is located within the Gateway Character Area.

Staff is seeking input on the General Plan Amendment, rezoning, site design, layout, and building elevations.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Alibrandi asked who is the legal entity sponsoring the school. Is this an outsourcing from the Higley Unified School District or the Gilbert School District?

Ms. Bethel stated The Aces (Austin Center for Exceptional Children) is representing the school. It is a private entity that partners with school districts across Arizona to provide services for children with a range of disabilities. The students will be taken to this school from their school district for a period of six months to a couple years with the ultimate goal of placing these students back into their public school.

Commissioner Alibrandi was not questioning the social policy. He noted this is land that Higley Unified School District has owned for a few years and felt this would be part of the Higley district.

Ms. Bethel stated ACES is a private entity that provides a service to Higley and other school districts.

Commissioner Bloomfield had no concerns or questions on the General Plan Amendment or the rezoning. Because this is part of the PAD overlay and they are pulling out of that, it will not affect the underlying PAD overlay for the other properties. It is specifically excluded to their portion.

Ms. Bethel stated that is correct. The rest of the 40 acres that is part of the Gateway Point Planned Area Development would stay as is and would not be impacted.

Commissioner Johns asked if staff was in support of the overlay and rezone.

Ms. Bethel stated through the first review staff had no major concerns over the two requests.

Commissioner Johns understood that they used a lot of materials from their other schools. He knew that they took over the old GCA on Elliot and Greenfield. He asked if staff had pictures of their other locations.

Ms. Bethel did not include photos of the other locations in her presentation. They have locations in Tempe, Phoenix, and Peoria. Photos of those locations can be included in the formal presentation for reference. Each location is a little different, although the element that has carried over is the green accent color.

Commissioner Johns noted a photo on the color board had more of a soffitted flat roof which he felt scales better. He stated this project has a big pitch with a standing seam metal roof, which is different than the photo. He noted the rest of the building was stucco with color blocking and glass.

Ms. Bethel stated that is correct and they also have metal accents and metal canopies.

Commissioner Johns thought it would be nice if it could be something more than just flat across with color blocking. The Design Guidelines ask for more than expansion joints and a change in color. He had mixed emotions, although he noted it was not right on Power Road and has a residential area behind it. He felt the design was pretty flat horizontally and there was not a lot of movement. He suggested the Applicant work with staff to add some elements.

4. GP18-14 CORDILLERA: Request for Minor General Plan Amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 39.9 acres generally located at southwest corner of Higley Road and Riggs Road from Regional Commercial (RC) to Residential > 2-3.5 DU/ Acre.

Z18-28 CORDILLERA: Request to rezone approx. 54.7 acres generally located at the southwest corner of Higley Road and Riggs Road from Town of Gilbert Regional Commercial (RC) to approx. 35.8 acres of Single Family 6 (SF-6) zoning district, 4.08 acres of Single Family 8 (SF-8) zoning district and 14.8 acres of Regional Commercial (RC) zoning district all with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Nathan Williams, Senior Planner, presented the request for a General Plan Amendment and rezone for Cordillera at the southwest corner of Riggs and Higley Roads. The site is just under 55 acres. The property was annexed in 2003 and rezoned with the Mountainwood PAD that is now Adora Trails. It was then rezoned to Commercial in 2005. In 2014, there was a request to change the General Plan Amendment from RC to Residential for the entire piece of property, which was denied. The Applicant is now requesting to change a portion of just under 40 acres to Residential Single Family-6 (SF-6) and just under 15 acres at the corner will remain Regional Commercial (RC). They are asking for a PAD on the entire property. This project came in to staff in the fall and there have been a number of renditions to reach a site plan that staff is comfortable bringing forward to the Commission. It is an important piece of property to the town and the residents in the Santan Character Area. Staff is looking for the right mix of commercial and some assurance that what is depicted is what will be built.

The zoning will be primarily SF-6 PAD on 36 acres with a small pocket of SF-8 to buffer the larger SF-10 properties at the southwest corner of the site. Staff has provided some comments on the site design and recommended that the Applicant change the open space area and shift some lots around to create more of a significant central open space and provide a buffer between the commercial and residential. Staff feels the Applicant has provided those changes with the current plan. There was some debate on whether the pedestrian connection between the commercial and residential would be accepted by the residents.

Modifications are being requested in excess of code. The commercial site has some modifications to the rear and side setbacks. They are requesting to change the 45' landscape setback to 30' and the 75' building setback to a variation ranging from 45' to 64'. Those are setbacks for RC which tends to be big box developments and power centers, and the Applicant does not think that RC is viable on this site. This is more of a neighborhood-oriented development, which is what the neighbors expressed that they want rather than big box retail. A neighborhood commercial or shopping center use would have reduced setbacks. The Applicant is also asking for a modification to the 50' by 250' landscape area at the corner. This site is a bit unique as it has 100' right-of-way along Riggs Road and a 35' drainage ditch.

Mr. Williams asked for feedback from the Commission on the mix of uses, changing the 55 acres of RC to 15 acres with 40 acres of SF-6 and SF-8 Residential, the site design, pedestrian connection, and the modifications.

DISCUSSION:

Vice Chair Bloomfield noted that typically when changing from RC or a commercial use to residential, there is some feedback from different groups. He asked if staff received any feedback from Economic Development and the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Williams stated staff has reached out to Economic Development and has not heard back yet. Staff will present this to the Chamber before it comes back to the Commission.

Commissioner Smith asked about the general posture of the neighborhood and also staff regarding the rezoning.

Mr. Williams stated the input is mixed from the surrounding residential neighbors. There were two neighborhood meetings, one in the fall and one a few weeks ago, which are summarized in the staff report. There was some concern with the type of home for the smaller lot homes. They do want some commercial, although there was very specific input from the neighbors about the types of commercial. We cannot restrict uses, but through a PAD we can approve what the site will look like and thereby somewhat restrict what could be built there. The neighbors do not want mini-storage or senior care facilities. They want neighborhood-oriented businesses where they can shop or dine. Mr. Williams thought there was justification for finding the right balance of commercial and residential uses. He did not think power centers were being built anymore. There are about 25 acres on the southeast corner and another 6 acres of Community Commercial on the northeast. There is currently a lot of vacant undeveloped commercial in this area and the Applicant is trying to strike the right balance that will be realistic for the site.

Commissioner Johns used to hunt dove around there. He noted there was no commercial up and down Riggs Road for several miles. He thought this was a good use bringing commercial to that corner. He agreed that power centers are not being built anymore. A coffee shop, deli and other businesses would follow the need of this area. He was a little confused about the comment that residents don't want a pedestrian connection.

Mr. Williams clarified that we see a lot of residential neighborhoods adjacent to commercial that try to lock their pedestrian gates. It can be a touchy subject. Staff wants to see those pedestrian connections.

Commissioner Johns noted the location of the gate at the far end of the neighborhood and felt it should be below the residential and closer to the commercial. He felt the project seems to fit this area.

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt that the Commission was generally supportive of what was presented, especially with the revised layout to create more of a larger common park area. He noted staff had some comments on the 50' by 250' area at the intersection. This project is unique in that it has the regional drainage channel running along the south side of Riggs. The County is working on making Riggs a larger presence through that area. He asked if that will have any effect over to Higley or will that be further to the east.

Mr. Williams stated MCDOT has recently approved that project. Riggs should be a road of regional significance and will obviously be a well-utilized arterial. As far as impact to this site, he did not know that it would impact the demand for this much commercial. A power center would need that level of traffic.

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt given the density of residential in the area, a power center would not be warranted so close to the edge of town. The Gila River Indian Community is right there with no development on it. He was fine with it going to residential and felt the layout accommodates the surrounding uses and buffers them well. He appreciated staff's concern about what is going on in the RC and what we anticipate there. We hear the residents' concerns and desire for services that are close and can be reached by foot or bike. He appreciated the neighbors input and encouraged staff to continue to push for that in this area. He felt this project will work out nicely on this corner, although we do have commercial on the other two corners.

5. Z19-10: BELROSE: Request to amend Ordinance No. 2659 to amend the conditions of development within the Greenfield and Chandler Heights Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay zoning district for approx. 82 acres of real property generally located at the southwest corner of Greenfield Rd. and Chandler Heights Rd.

S19-05: BELROSE - Request for Preliminary Plat and Open Space Plan for 289 home lots on approximately 82 acres of real property generally located at the southwest corner of Chandler Heights Rd. and Greenfield Rd. in the Single Family-6 (SF-6) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Keith Newman presented Z19-10 Belrose Planned Area Development, rezoning and preliminary plat on 82 acres of town-owned property located at the southwest corner of Chandler Heights and the Greenfield Road alignment. The approximate density proposed is a little over 3.5 DU/Acre with 289 lots. The property was originally envisioned by the town for parks and recreation uses; however, due to changes to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Regional Park was relocated to Higley and Queen Creek Roads, so this land was not needed for park space. In 2016, the town rezoned with a General Plan Amendment to SF-8 zoning with a density of 2-3.5 DU/Acre. There was not much interest and in May of 2018, the town initiated an amendment to change the zoning to SF-6 with a PAD overlay and to change the General Plan to a higher density range from >3.5-5 DU/Acre. This was done to establish minimum lot sizes distributed by percentage to create a more diverse residential development. The property went to auction last year and it is currently in escrow with Blandford Homes. Blandford is requesting to rezone the property with a new SF-6 PAD with various deviations. The proposal is for three different lot sizes, 6,000 SF, 7,000 SF, and 8,000 SF lots, to be developed in two phases. The one- and two-story homes will range from 1,700 to 4,300 SF.

The old SF-6 PAD only established lot sizes and the distribution. Each of the three lot sizes were supposed to have a percentage of 30-40%. The new PAD proposes a lot mixture close to the old ranges. The 6,000 SF lots are 40%, the 7,000 SF lots are 29%, and the 8,000 SF lots are at 30%. Staff is supportive of the proposed lot mixture. Per the Land Development Code (LDC), the minimum lot width in the SF-6 zoning district is 55 feet. The Applicant is proposing a 50' wide lot for the 6,000 SF lots that will be narrower and deeper. The LDC requires a 20' front yard setback, with an allowance to encroach into that setback with a covered front porch up to 6' or 14 ft from the front property line. The Applicant is requesting an additional 2' for an 8' encroachment which would bring the porches to 12' from the front property line. The LDC requires that no more than two adjacent lots have the same setback with a 3' minimum variation when adjacent lots are staggered. The Applicant is proposing to have no stagger. The required side yard setbacks are 5' and 10' and the Applicant is proposing 5' and 5'. Per the drawings, it will be more like 7.5' and the request for 5' will provide some flexibility to flip garages, etc. They are proposing that there will be a separation distance of 15' between homes. The minimum porch depth is required at 6' and the Applicant is requesting a 2' deviation for a 4' porch only for the smaller 50' wide lots with the narrow, deep homes. The Applicant is requesting a 2% increase in lot coverage for one-story homes, which will allow up to 161 SF more building area in some instances. Staff is supportive of this request. There is a required 20' landscape setback along Chandler Heights Road. The Applicant is proposing to either reduce or eliminate that completely due to the utility easements they are required to provide: an 8' PUE and an 8' RWCD irrigation easement due to the farming in the area. That would only leave a 4' strip for a landscape setback. Staff's only concern with that deviation is the ability to provide the proper quantities of trees and shrubs along that right-of-way to have an attractive streetscape. Staff is waiting for the second review plans.

The proposed Development Plan contains two main entrances, one off Chandler Heights and another off a collector street along the western property boundary. There is a main central park as well as one to the south. It will be a gated community with private streets. The Applicant is proposing a corresponding preliminary plat and open space plan, which includes the 289 lots in two phases. The proposed private street cross section shows a 33' back of curb to back of curb measurement with 5' sidewalks on each side, for a total width of 43' versus

the 50' standard typically required for local streets. The Traffic Engineer is in the process of evaluating the proposed cross section.

The Applicant is providing a little over 14 acres of open space or 19%. The Applicant has incorporated some entry features that would relate to the Santan Character Area plan. The canopy, standing seam metal, and mortar washed slump block walls give an agrarian-type look with complimentary landscaping. Staff is working with the Applicant to incorporate the agrarian theme along the whole street frontage. The main park with three ramadas, playground structures, a half basketball court, fire pits and grills will provide a nice gathering spot for the community. The main theme walls along Chandler Heights Road will consist primarily of mortar washed slump block with brick caps and stone columns. The Applicant was originally proposing a deviation to decrease the wall height from 8' to 6' along Chandler Heights. The Applicant has now chosen to keep the wall at 8' to maintain privacy for the homeowners that back up to that street. The pedestrian circulation plan was reviewed with a lot of interior sidewalks and a few connecting trails. They are providing over 500 parking stalls, although in SF-6 the Code requires a certain number of guest parking spaces. Staff is still evaluating the parking plan.

Mr. Newman requested input regarding the stagger, side yard setback, porch depth, and landscaping along Chandler Heights Road.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Alibrandi appreciated all the work and effort required when something is created from scratch. He understood the developer trying to put in as many units as possible and that deviations are requested. He always questions every deviation request. Looking at the overview of all the lots, the Applicant is not looking to do staggered but is requesting to go over in the lot coverage, although it is only 2%. Everything seems to be jammed with the small lots. The 1,700 SF homes are important and are good starter homes, although he felt the density here is a little too much. Hearing that it is a gated community with a guard shack and nice amenities, and then hearing about probably two bedroom California ranches of 1,700 SF, he was concerned with all of the deviations. Every deviation seems to take away from the aesthetic we are trying to maintain here through this Commission. His concern was that it is too dense and he suggested the Applicant lighten it up or go with more of the larger homes or lots.

Commissioner Torgeson is of the belief that people should have quite a bit of leeway with what they want to do. He felt nothing about this development is held up aesthetically. He asked if there were any other developments in town that have been given this amount of deviations. If this were not town-owned property in escrow, would we even be discussing this?

Mr. Newman appreciated the questions and asked the Commission to keep in mind that this development is at the minimum density range allowed per the General Plan. They are proposing 3.52 DU/Acre. They could go more dense, but chose to keep it on the lower end of the spectrum. He recently visited one of their developments in east Mesa called Mulberry that is very similar to the homes proposed here, and a lot of the same home plans will carry over to this project. Mulberry is a very nice development and he was surprised that the density could look that nice and have a strong street presence. He showed some pictures of the Mulberry development with a lot of trees and nice streetscape. The houses are close to the street as the developer was going for a narrower street cross section, kind of a neo-traditional design. The development does not feel like it is a densely packed neighborhood. He understood the concerns raised and advised that this is early in the process and staff is still working with the Applicant on the landscaping, street widths, stagger, and other elements that could improve the quality. There is a lot of work left to be done.

Commissioner Johns asked what staff thought of the slump block.

Mr. Newman did not have a problem with the slump block and he liked the mortar wash.

Commissioner Johns felt it was traditional and is coming back in style. He appreciated the photos of the Mesa development which provided some perspective. The Commission will have the opportunity to see this at

another time and will hold it to this standard. He appreciated that the Applicant could go to a higher density, although they are requesting a lot of deviations. He asked about the 14' for the driveways.

Mr. Newman asked if Commissioner Johns was referring to the front porch setback of 12 feet. The Code requires a setback of 20' in an SF-6 zoning district, but there is an exception to allow an encroachment of up to 6' for covered front porches, which would bring the porch to 14' from the property line. They are proposing an 8' encroachment or an additional 2', which would now bring the structure to 12' from the front property line. The driveways will be 20 feet.

Commissioner Johns noted a common concern with too much driveway and parking issues. Why are they asking for a 4' patio as you can't really do much with that size.

Mr. Newman felt that in order to provide the variation in house product on the 50' wide lots while keeping back yard space, they needed to decrease the depth on the porch. Staff is less concerned with the 4' porch depth as they are wide open with columns. If chairs are placed in between the columns, there is plenty of space to not feel cramped. Staff was concerned that there was not enough deviation along the streetscape without the stagger. He noticed in the Mesa development the nice landscaping and trees that distract from the front façades. There is a lot of movement in the elevations and they made sure to not have porches right next to each other.

Commissioner Johns asked how staff will support those elevations with all of the deviations, as it will not be what we are looking at today. Would that be considered at a later date or is there anything to support those elevations?

Mr. Newman stated some of the products that will be approved with the Stratford development will be transferred to this development. There is already a good idea of what those products will look like with the porch depths. A new third series of product will be created for this development.

Commissioner Johns noted that the town sets an ordinance for a reason and it is our job to question anything that moves away from the ordinance and Design Guidelines. He asked if staff supported the size of the homes. He thought there is a market out there as not everyone wants a large home. He did not see this as a starter home as it is a gated community with nice amenities. We are seeing a lot of the smaller homes with our aging community. It is a neat product and we have seen a lot of successful smaller homes come through recently. He was concerned with some of the deviations. He felt if you are going to have a patio it should be useful, although he understood that they are very open. They may put a gate or fence in front of it later on. He would be cautious with the approval of the elevations of the homes and the standard plans.

Commissioner Alibrandi emphasized again that we have ordinances and zoning regulations for a reason. He was concerned with too many deviations. In the free market, there are trade-offs. If we are trading something off here, what does the town get for allowing these variations.

Commissioner Torgeson did not get an answer to his previous question as to whether there is any other place in Gilbert that has had this many deviations.

Mr. Newman could not think of any off the top of his head. He was sure there were other developments in town that were given quite a bit of deviations, although he will need to do more research and get back to the Commission.

Commissioner Torgeson was for a lot of deviations and would rather people have some freedom. Everyone else has a right to look at this. He had also asked if we would even be discussing this if the town did not own the land and is selling it to the developer. What does the town get out of this? How much money is that property in escrow for?

Mr. Newman expressed he was not at liberty to discuss the escrow terms.

Commissioner Torgeson stated that would be public information.

Mr. Newman expressed he did not know those numbers.

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt that everyone on the dais had some concerns on the deviations, but can trust that staff is going into this with the right mindset. This is with a known developer who has a great history of creating high-quality products and projects in the Valley and in Gilbert. While he did have some concerns, particularly about the landscaping, we have this very unencumbered piece of property that has a very typical rectangular section, and we would normally not entertain deviations to this extent. The concern of the Commission is whether these deviations are all valid and well-reasoned, and whether there is justification. What is the benefit to the community? What makes this development special to allow and justify these deviations? He wondered why they were asking for the 5' and 5' side yard setbacks when they will have the separation distance of 15' between homes. They should just call it what it is, 7.5' and 7.5' setbacks. He did not want to do away with the landscaping along Chandler Heights Road. If they are going to the effort to create this special upscale gated community, wouldn't we want that kind of landscaping. They are nudging up against the minimum density required by the General Plan, although he would rather allow a deviation for a little less density if that is what they need to create a special quality development. When this item comes back, he would like to hear the justification for all the deviations. He appreciated the photos. It was helpful to see the kind of product and the type of community they are trying to create.

Mr. Newman appreciated the feedback and stated it is early in the process. Staff has issued a lot of review comments that the Applicant is still working to address. In the second review, he hoped to have some questions answered and have some clarity on some of the concerns. Staff will continue to work with the Applicant to make this a high-quality product that we can all be proud of.

Vice Chair Bloomfield recessed the Study Session at 7:00 p.m. in order to take a short break and then hold the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Bloomfield reconvened the Study Session at 7:14 p.m.

6. GP18-09: NEC Warner and Recker Roads - Request for Major General Plan amendment to change the land use classification of approx. 124.8 acres of real property generally located at the northeast corner of Recker and Warner Roads from 28.4 acres of Business Park (BP), 87.5 acres of Light Industrial (LI) and 8.9 acres of Community Commercial (CC) to 17.7 acres of Residential > 8-14 DU/Acre (R>8-14du/ac), 10.4 acres of Residential > 5-8 DU/Acre (R>5-8du/ac), 65.8 acres of Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre (R>3.5-5du/ac), and 30.9 acres of Light Industrial (LI) land use classifications.

Z18-19 NEC WARNER AND RECKER ROADS: Request to amend Ordinance Nos. 2261, 2378, and 2448 pertaining to the Rockefeller Group North Gateway Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay zoning district, generally located at the northeast corner of Recker and Warner Roads by removing from the PAD approx. 124.8 acres of real property consisting of 87.5 acres of Light Industrial (LI), 28.4 acres of Business Park (BP), and 8.9 acres of Community Commercial (CC) zoning districts; creating the NEC Warner and Recker Roads PAD, approving a new development plan for the NEC Warner and Recker Roads PAD; and changing the zoning classification of said real property from 87.5 acres of LI, 28.4 acres of BP, and 8.9 acres of CC, all with a PAD overlay to 30.9 acres of Light Industrial (LI), 17.6 acres of Single Family - Attached (SF-A), 30.4 acres of Single Family - Detached (SF-D), 19.3 acres of Single Family - 6 (SF-6) and 26.5 acres of Single Family - 7 (SF-7) zoning district, all with the new NEC Warner and Recker Roads PAD overlay.

Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner, presented GP18-09 and Z18-19 for the northeast corner of Warner and Recker Roads. The Planning Commission reviewed this item last year as part of the major General Plan Amendment process. The project went to Town Council and was ultimately sent back to Planning Commission for reconsideration with some direction to incorporate some employment land uses. At this time, the zoning is moving forward on both pieces of the site. The area is currently designated a number of employment uses with

Light Industrial (LI) and Business Park (BP). The site is adjacent to employment land uses to the east and there is multi-family to the north, and residential to the west and south. The Applicant is requesting a major General Plan Amendment to create a master planned residential community. The Town Council recommended incorporating some employment uses that are critical to the resiliency of Gilbert.

The Applicant is requesting roughly 30 acres of Light Industrial at the southeast corner of the site along Warner Road. The balance of the site is made up of residential land uses, including Residential >8-14 DU/Acre, Residential >5-8 DU/Acre, and Residential > 3.5-5 DU/Acre. The greatest density is located on the hard corner, the northeast corner of Warner and Recker Roads. The zoning requested is consistent with the General Plan request. They are proposing Single Family Attached (SF-A), Single Family Detached (SF-D), Single Family-6 (SF-6), Single Family-7 (SF-7) and Light Industrial (LI). The Applicant has met with staff and a lot of consideration went into the development of that Light Industrial site in terms of the depth, access, and the amount of street frontage. Staff is comfortable that the 30.9 acres is viable in terms of its potential to develop. Other iterations did not work for the site. The Applicant has put a considerable amount of time and study into this plan to make sure this product would develop.

The Light Industrial portion is conceptual only and would not be part of an approved development plan and we would not require the configuration to be as it is shown here. However, if the residential portion moves forward to preliminary plat, it would need to be in substantial conformance with what is shown on this application. The Development Plan proposes a total of 484 units, 171 of which are townhomes units located in Parcel A, 75 auto-court products in Parcel B, 71 in Parcel C (SF-6), 86 in Parcel D (SF-7) as well as 84 units of SF-D in Parcel D. The existing General Plan shows a collector road going through the site. Part of this proposal removes that collector road. Staff has provided comments in that regard to the Applicant. All of the roadways throughout have driveways that back out so there is no collector road network to move people out that won't be impeded by potential on-street parking, etc. Staff is working with the Applicant on that issue. Parcels A, B, and E require that a parking and refuse plan be submitted with the preliminary plat. Staff has asked for that parking and refuse plan early in the process because sometimes the development plan that gets approved does not necessarily work with the preliminary plat. The original submission was heavily parked along the street. The Applicant has provided this conceptual development plan that addresses a number of those concerns, although staff has not seen the revised parking plan to date. They have added some pull-in parking at the open space amenity and increased parking in other areas to help alleviate the on-street parking.

The Applicant is proposing a number of deviations. The SF-A zoning district requires a minimum lot size of 2,000 SF and the Applicant is proposing about half that at 1,100 SF with minimum lot widths and depths. The number of stories and overall height are being reduced. The SF-A zoning district permits 65% lot coverage on single stories and 55% on two-stories. The Applicant is looking for 100% lot coverage in order to create a townhome product where the owners do not have their own yards to maintain. Staff felt this seems more like a multi-family product and zoning district than Single Family-Attached. The base zoning district requires a 10' setback to the front and the Applicant is proposing a zero foot setback to a tract or 10' to the street, as well as a reducing the rear setback to 2' or 6' to base of garage. Staff has concerns with the 6' to garage as we typically see a 3' apron to discourage parking in that space. These deviation requests were just recently submitted to staff so they are different than what is in the staff report. Staff needs additional information regarding the tract width in order to be able to evaluate the front setback of zero to tract.

In the SF-D motor court product, deviations are being requested to reduce the maximum height and number of stories from 36' 3-story to 30' 2-story, reduce the front setback from 10' to 8' to living and 20' to face of garage, which is standard for front parking. They are requesting to increase side setbacks to 5' on both sides instead of zero or 5', increase the rear setback to 15' to livable and 5' to a covered patio. The current Code allows for a 10' rear setback and a 3' patio encroachment, for a setback of 7'. This request is not far off from the requirement. The Applicant has indicated that pads would be created for the refuse cans within the front yard. That will take up even more of the reduced yard. Staff is waiting for the parking and refuse plan as well as the full submittal.

Ms. MacDonald requested feedback on the Development Plan and the deviation requests.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Johns appreciated the Light Industrial use which keeps some of the intent. He asked if Economic Development has reviewed this proposal.

Ms. MacDonald advised that there have been discussions with Economic Development as they prepared some revised options. Early in the discussions, the Applicant had presented different options for the configuration and Economic Development was involved in those conversations. She believed they were comfortable with this and understood that this is a piece that is likely to develop. It is somewhat modeled after a Park Lucero type of use. They foresee a warehouse type of use and office. She felt Planning and Economic Development see this as something that is viable. One of the concerns of staff with the previous submittal was the impact the change would have on adjacent property. The Applicant has provided some exhibits showing that they would still be able to fully develop a reasonable site with increased setbacks, and they will still meet the 75' setback.

Commissioner Johns felt the layout seemed very buffered from the light industrial or office. He liked that it was right on the road. It is also buffered as it goes back to the apartments and is very layered. He liked how everything was pulled together. Regarding the deviations, he felt they were actually giving a lot with some of the deviations for SF-D. Does staff have any concerns with the deviations?

Ms. MacDonald was tentative on the reduced front setback, particularly if space would be taken up by the concrete pads for refuse containers in the already limited front yard.

Commissioner Johns stated it seems like every case before the Commission is requesting deviations. He felt they have provided something in return here. They are working with a lot of puzzle pieces in this development. He appreciated that Ms. MacDonald pointed out the parking and he felt the parking was all grouped into one area instead of spread throughout. The units on the outer edges seem a long way from the parking.

Ms. MacDonald stated it is a requirement that guest parking has to be within a certain distance of the units served. She pointed out other locations where there is parking. She believed they will likely have some on-street parking in some locations. Staff has not received the revised parking plan. Staff will verify that the guest parking is within 250' of the units served.

Commissioner Smith asked if there will be a dedicated road on the east side for access to the residential in the back.

Ms. MacDonald stated as this develops the roadway will become a shared roadway with the adjacent development. The signal is further to the east. One of the modifications to this site plan was that they added an additional access point to alleviate some of the traffic and to allow another access point onto Warner Road. There has been a lot of discussion on how to move traffic throughout the site with some of the constraints. The road will not go all the way from the northern boundary south to Warner Road.

Commissioner Smith stated the residences to the north will be somewhat landlocked for the time being.

Ms. MacDonald did not anticipate that there would ever be a connection to the east, so those residents will have to travel down through the neighborhood to reach the access road.

Commissioner Alibrandi's only real concern was with the first deviation from 2,000 SF down to 1,100 SF. That is a 45% reduction. He guessed that it would be required in order to make the whole development work, although it is such a significant change that he would like to have a reason behind it. He asked if there was an alternative way to get around that deviation by rezoning that little section.

Ms. MacDonald stated that was part of the staff feedback to the Applicant in the first review in terms of whether they were really requesting Multi Family-Low. This Development Plan was resubmitted independent of a formal resubmittal for the benefit of the Planning Commission discussion. We will see what the second

submittal brings. Many times Single Family-Attached is a little more palatable than Multi Family. There is an alternate to a different zoning category rather than such a deviation.

Councilmember Alibrandi was concerned that there is a perception out in the public that multi-family is a dirty word. It isn't. It is all part of the whole mix that we have here. The gross change of number was his concern, regardless of whether it is a small Single Family-Detached or Multi Family.

Commissioner Torgeson asked if a zoning change would make it more palatable. He had no problem with the density. This was all residential years ago and we ought to be counting our lucky stars to get anything. He had no problem with the pads. He asked what could be done so that the public perception is a little clearer if that is a concern. His only concern is that it has taken so long to get to this point.

Ms. MacDonald advised that staff did not express a concern with the product, but that it seems to fit better in a different zoning district than what they have requested. They are asking for 100% lot coverage when Single Family-Attached anticipates a development that is Single Family with private back yards. That is the feedback that staff has provided to the Applicant and it is up to them to decide how to move forward with this piece.

Vice Chair Bloomfield acknowledged that there has been a lot of effort on behalf of the Applicant to give answers to all of the questions for the zoning and General Plan Amendment. There is a tremendous amount of detail and effort that has gone into these presentations. It initially seemed like a lot for just a General Plan Amendment and zoning, although there have been a lot of different questions that require this level of scrutiny. He really liked the old plan better. Obviously, the Town Council did not because it didn't have light industrial. He appreciated the path and directing everyone to the corner and through the corner because of the schools there. It can't be that way now because of the density needed with the light industrial that is required. He felt the Applicant has been gracious and has done a good job of trying to accommodate the town's request. He thanked staff for their efforts on this item.

7. ST19-02 STRATFORD (4500 Series): Four (4) new Standard Plans (4501, 4502, 4503 and 4504) by Blandford Homes, for 79 Lots on approximately 63.5 acres within the Stratford PAD, generally located at the southwest corner of Greenfield Road and Germann Road and zoned Single Family Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

ST19-03 STRATFORD (3500 Series): Four (4) new Standard Plans (3501, 3502, 3503 and 3504) by Blandford Homes, for 143 Lots on approximately 63.5 acres within the Stratford PAD, generally located at the southwest corner of Greenfield Road and Germann Road and zoned Single Family Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Nathan Williams, Senior Planner, presented ST19-02 and ST19-03, the Stratford. The Stratford PAD came before the Commission in a Study Session last month for a rezoning of the southwest corner of Greenfield and Germann Roads. Blandford Homes is the same developer for this project and the Belrose. This request is for Single Family-Detached (SF-D) with a PAD on 63.5 acres with 222 lots of varying size. The project meets the minimum density of > 3.5-5 DU/Acre. The zoning case and plat will be coming forward soon. There are two different lot types: 143 lots are 50' by 120' and 79 lots are 60' by 129', essentially 6,000 and 7,000 SF lots. The standard plans for these lots may potentially be transferred to Belrose. The footprint of the plans range from just over 1,700 SF up to 3,000 SF and the livable square footage ranges from 2,500 to 4,000. There are two applications for the 3500 Series and the 4500 Series with four new plans in each.

Staff has minimal comments regarding the architecture and design. These are high-quality products with a tremendous amount of diversity. Mr. Williams did not include every graphic in the packet as there would have been about 800 pages. He tried to break that down for the Study Session presentation. Each series has 4 standard plans and 8 different architectural themes or styles. Those include Spanish Colonial, Modern Farmhouse, Andalusian, Prairie, Craftsman, Italian Cottage, etc. There are 22 color schemes that will be distributed among the 8 different themes. Staff is working with the Applicant on how to organize that much content and information into a format that can be easily digested. A significant amount of diversity is provided

through different types of garage doors, lighting fixtures, decorative pavers, unique windows, and other elements. Articulation is being provided through architectural elements and materials on all elevations. The Elevation Matrix is provided in the agenda packet.

Mr. Williams is requesting input on the architectural design and diversity, the building massing, and the roofline articulation.

DISCUSSION:

Vice Chair Bloomfield felt that the Commission was in agreement with staff. The plans look good and there are plenty of options.

8. Z19-09 VEDURA SANTAN VILLAGE APARTMENTS: Request to amend Ordinance Nos. 1142 and 1230 to amend the conditions of development within the Gilbert Crossroad Center Planned Area Development (PAD) for approximately 7.61 acres of real property, known as Parcel B1, generally located at the northeast corner of Santan Village Parkway and Coronado Road, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Stephanie Bubenheim presented Z19-09 Vedula Santan Village Apartments. This rezoning is to amend the current Planned Area Development that is on the site. The 7.6 acre site is part of the SanTan Village Regional Mall area and is located on the northeast corner of Santan Village Parkway and the Coronado Road alignment. The two entrances shown are existing entrances into the SanTan Mall. The PAD for the Crossroads Center was created in 1999 with a total of 660 acres. That large site includes the freeway that came in with the rezoning and PAD. The site is zoned Regional Commercial and all the surrounding uses are zoned Regional Commercial as well. As development has happened over the years, some of the areas were broken up into different parcels and some was taken out of the PAD and other parts were developed. The PAD allows 20% to be developed as multi-family. The standards in this 1999 PAD limit and restrict multi-family to more of a suburban multi-family where it is two-story and the density is low. That is not what was intended for this area.

Deviations are being requested to create Parcel B1, and to increase the building height from 30' to 55' consistent with the Regional Commercial zoning district and the apartments that have been developed in the area which are four-story. The maximum floor area ratio of 0.5 shall not apply to multi family. These are some clarifications within that PAD as there are some terms that are contradicting each other. The C-2 (old zoning district) development standards will apply to this multi-family development. The current density is limited to 22 and this will increase the density to not exceed 34 DU/Acre. No Conditional Use Permit is required for multi-family. The Land Use Development Plan in the current PAD will be updated with the rezoning.

A conceptual site plan is provided for reference only. The DR case will come before the Commission next month for Study Session. Staff and the Applicant have worked together to figure out how to best layout the site. There will be four 4-story buildings creating a presence along Santan Village Parkway. The smaller internal buildings will be carriage units with first floor garages. Staff is working with the Applicant on how to connect the site to some existing sidewalks at the Santan Mall.

Ms. Bubenheim is requesting input from the Commission regarding the proposed deviations, which are consistent with the Elevations at SanTan development that was approved last June for the same request.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Bloomfield stated at the time in 1999 there were not enough colors in our palette for the zoning and now we have a few more abilities to accommodate what is actually intended and desired in that area.

Ms. Bubenheim stated that is correct.

Commissioner Torgeson believed the zoning in 1999 allowed up to 25 DU/Acre.

Ms. Bubenheim stated the zoning back then allowed up to 22 DU/Acre. Multi Family-Medium allows up to 24. The Applicant is requesting up to 34 DU/Acre.

Commissioner Torgeson noted that the recent Council change that brought in multi-family high density is really what is being asked for. This is not what Elevations has.

Ms. Bubenheim stated Elevations had an approval of 12-36 DU/Acre. Elevations is at a higher density than this proposed project just because of the size and layout.

Commissioner Torgeson commented that we did approve higher than Multi Family-Medium.

Ms. Bubenheim stated that is correct. They did approve a higher density because it is in the Regional Commercial zoning district, which does not have a density limit. She explained that the zoning district is Regional Commercial and the Planned Area Development allows the multi-family for this development.

9. ST19-01 ANATOLE (SEASONS AT SPRINGVIEW): Six (6) new Standard Plans (P908, P913, P914, P917, P919, and P926) by Richmond American Homes, for 58 Lots on approximately 13.45 acres within the Seasons at Springview PAD, generally located at the northwest corner of Lindsay and Ray Roads and zoned Single Family Detached (SF-D) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.

Planner Josh Rogers presented ST19-01 Anatole (Seasons at Springview). The site is located at the northwest corner of Ray and Lindsay Roads. The request is for standard plans for 53 lots on just over 13 acres zoned SF-D with a PAD. The Applicant is offering 6 standard plans and 5 different elevations styles. There is significant diversity in the plan types and elevations styles for the amount of lots. Staff is asking for input from the Commission on the specific design elements for the architectural styles and whether what the Applicant has provided is able to differentiate those styles from each other well. Staff would also like input on the design elements to minimize the prominence of the garage. The lot size is 45' wide and the minimum 2-car garage is required. The garages take up a significant portion of the front elevation. Staff has provided second review comments to the Applicant early in order to get a response before the Study Session. The architectural themes proposed include Spanish, Ranch, Western Cottage, Desert Prairie and Desert Modern.

There were some updates made by the Applicant after the packets were sent out. The patio front entry overhang had a stone element and the Applicant was able to make that a little more separate and welcoming. Staff felt that was an improvement. Double arched entry supports were included to fit with the Spanish style and the windows will be changed to match the Ranch style.

Staff was somewhat concerned with the prominence of the garage and has requested additional design elements to minimize the influence and visual aspect of the garage. Staff has provided some examples of what they would like to see. Staff would be open to enhancing the livable side of the elevation to draw the eye away from the garage or add some design element to spruce up the garage. The Applicant has made some significant changes on the two-story. Staff is looking for input on the first story elevations.

DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Johns thought there was a requirement that the garage be less than 50% of the elevation.

Mr. Rogers advised that the Design Guidelines state that 40% is the maximum we would like to see; however, with the width of the lot, that is impossible to meet. In this instance, the garage is 47-48% of the elevation.

Commissioner Johns noted that one of the elevations showed a massive amount of roof. He asked if something could be done to change that. There are some long elevations of roof on the sides. He agreed on the entries.

Commissioner Alibrandi asked how they got roped into the 45' width to begin with?

Mr. Rogers stated the Applicant purchased this property from a home builder who had previously asked for a PAD. He was unsure whether they deviated from the standard lot width for SF-D. This was part of a rezone that was done by a previous developer and the Applicant has since acquired the property.

Commissioner Alibrandi asked if this was starting from scratch and not something grandfathered, what would be the minimum lot width? The lots are very long and narrow. He asked if we are stuck with the 45' width.

Vice Chair Bloomfield stated it has already been approved.

Commissioner Smith felt the pop out features of either the porch or the garage make all the difference. He was unsure whether the drawings do justice to the elevations to show the diversity and the appearance of the layout. He felt it looks awfully bland.

Mr. Rogers agreed that the elevations look bland and staff has provided some comments in that regard. The Applicant insisted on using the renderings that were available. Sometimes the 2D drawings don't do the elevations justice. He would like to keep the eye off the garage or add a few elements such as wood lattice over the garage to spruce it up. Staff has tried to be financially sensitive in their requests. Staff has also requested more appropriate windows and iron elements such as pot shelves below the window to provide more of a Spanish feel. Staff also suggested that painted tile be added around the archways to provide a little something extra that is consistent with the design theme but also fairly inexpensive.

Vice Chair Bloomfield asked if the Applicant has been willing to work with staff on some of those requests.

Mr. Rogers stated the Applicant has been very responsive. The second review comments were provided to the Applicant early to allow them time to respond. We are just at an impasse regarding the design elements that were requested.

Vice Chair Bloomfield stated on a 45' wide lot these will be lower price point homes which sounds like their target market versus upper scale smaller homes like we have seen in some of the more recent projects. This seems like more of a starter home instead of an empty nester type of home. He encouraged staff to continue working with the Applicant. He appreciated staff's efforts to push for the best product.

ADJOURN STUDY SESSION

With no further business before the Commission, Vice Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Study Session at 8:05 p.m.

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary

**TOWN OF GILBERT
 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
 COUNCIL CHAMBERS
 50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE, GILBERT, AZ
 JULY 10, 2019**

COMMISSION PRESENT:

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair
 Brian Johns
 Les Smith
 Philip Alibrandi, Alternate
 James Torgeson, Alternate

COMMISSION ABSENT:

Brian Andersen, Chair
 Greg Froehlich
 David Cavenee

STAFF PRESENT:

Sydney Bethel, Planner II
 Stephanie Bubenheim, Planner II
 Ashlee MacDonald, Senior Planner
 Keith Newman, Planner II
 Josh Rogers, Planner II
 Nathan Williams, Senior Planner
 Amy Temes, Interim Principal Planner
 Eva Cutro, Planning Division Manager

ALSO PRESENT:

Town Attorney Nancy Davidson
 Recorder Dana Desing

PLANNER	CASE	PAGE	VOTE
Ashlee MacDonald	DR19-46	2	Continued
Sydney Bethel	UP19-15	2	Continued

CALL TO ORDER OF REGULAR MEETING

Vice Chair Bloomfield called the July 10, 2019 Regular Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Torgeson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Recording Secretary Dana Desing called roll and determined that a quorum was present.

11. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Vice Chair Bloomfield read the items on the agenda: Item DR19-46 Maserati Alfa Romeo (Consent), which is expected to be continued, and Item UP19-15 AZ01-101 Stella (Non-Consent), which is also expected to be continued.

As there were no requests to speak from the public, Vice Chair Bloomfield requested that Item UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA be moved to the Consent Calendar, since it will be continued.

MOTION: Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Agenda with the recommended change; seconded by Vice Chair Bloomfield. **Motion passed 5-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

12. COMMUNICATION FROM CITIZENS:

At this time, members of the public may comment on matters within the jurisdiction of the Town but not on the agenda. The Commission's response is limited to responding to criticism, asking staff to review a matter commented upon, or asking that a matter be put on a future agenda.

There were no requests to speak.

13. REPORT FROM COUNCIL LIAISON ON CURRENT EVENTS:

Councilmember Brigette Peterson was not in attendance.

PUBLIC HEARING (CONSENT)

All items listed below are considered the public hearing consent calendar. The Commission may, by a single motion, approve any number of items where, after opening the public hearing, no person requests the item be removed from the consent calendar. If such a request is made, the Commission shall then withdraw the item from the public hearing consent calendar for the purpose of public discussion and separate action. Other items on the agenda may be added to the consent calendar and approved under a single motion.

Vice Chair Bloomfield opened the Public Hearing (Consent). As there were no requests to speak, the Public Hearing (Consent) was closed. Vice Chair Bloomfield called for a motion on the Consent Calendar.

- 14. DR19-46 MASERATI ALFA ROMEO: Site plan, landscaping, grading and drainage, elevations, floor plans, lighting, and colors and materials for approximately 1.95 acres, generally located south of Pecos Road on the east side of Gilbert Road, and zoned Regional Commercial (RC) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Move to continue DR19-46 Maserati Alfa Romeo to the August 7, 2019 public hearing.

- 15. UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA: Request to approve a Conditional Use Permit for approximately 0.83 acres of real property located west of the northwest corner of Cooper Road and Merrill Avenue to permit a Wireless Communication Facility (75' feet high) in the Light Industrial (LI) zoning district with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Move to continue UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA to the August 7, 2019 public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Alibrandi moved to approve the Consent Agenda as follows: Item 14. DR19-46 MASERATI ALFA ROMEO - continued to the August 7, 2019 public hearing; and Item 15. UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA - continued to the August 7, 2019 public hearing; seconded by Commissioner Torgeson.

Motion passed 5 -0.

MOTION: Commissioner Alibrandi moved to Continue Item 14. DR19-46 MASERATI ALFA ROMEO, and Item 15. UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA to the August 7, 2019 public hearing; seconded by Commissioner Smith.

Motion passed 5-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (NON-CONSENT)

Non-Consent Public Hearing items will be heard at an individual public hearing and will be acted upon by the Commission/Board by a separate motion. During the Public Hearings, anyone wishing to comment in support of or in opposition to a Public Hearing item may do so. If you wish to comment on a Public Hearing Item you must fill out a public comment form, indicating the Item Number on which you wish to be heard. Once the hearing is closed, there will be no further public comment unless requested by a member of the Commission.

15. UP19-15 AZ01-101 STELLA.

THIS ITEM WAS MOVED TO THE CONSENT AGENDA.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

16. Planning Commission Minutes - Consider approval of the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of June 5, 2019.

MOTION: Commissioner Alibrandi moved to approve the minutes of the Study Session and Regular Meeting of June 5, 2019; seconded by Commissioner Johns. **Motion passed 5-0.**

COMMUNICATIONS

17. Report from Chairman and Members of the Commission on current events: None.

18. Report from Planning Services Manager on current events: None.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Planning Commission, Vice Chair Bloomfield adjourned the Regular Meeting at 7:14 p.m.

Carl Bloomfield, Vice Chair

ATTEST:

Dana Desing, Recording Secretary