DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

Friday, October 7, 2016 - 7:30 a.m.
AGENDA
Public Works Building, 3rd Floor North Conference Room
201 North Stone Avenue
Tucson, Arizona

STUDY SESSION

Call to order

Roll call of DRB members

Robert Page (Chair)	David Marhefka
Mike Anglin (Vice Chair)	Savannah McDonald
Eric Barrett	Nathan Kappler

Approval of minutes from September 16, 2016

NEW CASE:

DRB-16-14- Interstate Commerce Park Lot 11, landscape and screening modification request, 5.7 acres (251, 490) [C9-00-23, DP14-0167, D07-0028]

The applicant's project is a portion of a Planned Area Development (PAD) associated with rezoning case C9-00-23 which was effectuated in October of 2007. The PAD allowed for the development of a Commerce Park Development located near I-10 interstate with commercial and light industrial uses that adhere with C-2 and I-1 Zoning. This portion of the project consisted of Lots 1-12 with site grading, roadway, utility, drainage along east and west property line, landscape and screening improvements.

The Applicant's Request

Eric Barrett, Principal of ARC Studios, Inc. on behalf of his client, RG3 One, LLC. is requesting a landscaping and screening modification requests as provided in Section 3.11.1.B.3, the Design Review Board shall review the request and make a recommendation prior to a decision by the PDSD Director per *Unified Development Code (UDC)* Section 3.11.1.D.1.C.

The project has previously been reviewed and approved by city staff with screen walls along the east, south and west portions of the site. Below is a summary of the proposed modifications to improve the overall development and better integrate screening elements into the project and surrounding area.

Proposed Site Improvement at Lot 11. Lot 11 is currently approved and under construction to provide a service station including; parking, access drives and pylon signage to the south. The approved plans included screen walls along the East, South and West property borders. Five-foot screen walls are required along the east property line. Six-foot wall is required along the south property line due to sign and loading zone requirements. Per original development plans, screen walls of 5' were also proposed along the west with ornamental steel paneling or other design features but are not required by the UDC. Only a 30-inch vegetative screen is required along the west property border.

Proposed Screening:
Per code the East and South Border are required to provide screen walls as they abut State land that could be sold off. The property to the east could be developed as residential requiring the screen wall. The south property could also be sold and allow for other less intensive uses, however, area suggests land would be used for later overhead interstate exchange. Our site is considered the higher intensity use and therefore the interior borders require screen walls to be placed with our development.

East Interior Border: The project is lined with a four-strand wire fence placed at or near the property line. The existing drainage channel, approximately fifty-feet wide includes salvage and volunteer plantings and rip-rap rock slopes. We proposed to utilize the existing fence, channel, rock slopes and provide additional native vegetative screening on the west bank. This will allow limited disturbance to the existing channel and improve the screening of the development. No additional structure is proposed due to existing conditions and impacts it would have to established habitat of the wash. The vegetative screen shall consist of Jojoba and Hopbush with additional tree plantings including Net leaf hackberry, Velvet mesquite and Whitethorn acacia to complete the border.

South Interior Border: This border is adjacent to native undisturbed land. We proposed to utilize the existing four-strand wire fence and enhance the perimeter with a vegetative screen that shall consists of Jojoba and Hopbush with additional tree plantings including; Desert willow, Velvet mesquite and Whitethorn acacia to complete the border. We are challenging staff to review and revisit the required curb and asphalt access drive to the pylon sign for the limited loading period. We are proposing to provide wedge curb and stabilized aggregate drive with hammerhead turnaround. To limit access in the area, we are proposing to provide tubular steel fence east to the channel and west to the increased vegetation and provide vehicular access gates at wedge curb.

West Street Border: The existing drainage channel, approximately forty-feet in width includes salvaged, volunteer and enhanced plantings on either side of the rip-rap rock channel. We proposed to utilize the channel, rock slopes and provide additional native and drought tolerant vegetative plantings on both sides of the channel. We will be required to obtain approval from TDOT for the additional right-of-way planting. This will allow limited disturbance to the existing channel while integrating a natural screen to the project. The vegetative screen shall consist of Jojoba and Hopbush along the southern portion and transition to Goldeneye, Baja fairy duster, Desert spoon and Ocotillo. Tree plantings shall include; Screwbean mesquite, Velvet mesquite and Desert willow to complete the border. Structured screen of rusted gabion cages filled with cullet glass and steel panel fence sections are proposed at the access drive improve the identity the south entry. Additional understory plantings are proposed along the access drive and within right of way.

THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD (DRB) HAS REVIEWED THE APPLICANT'S PROJECT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH UDC Section 3.11.1.1.B.3 CRITERIA AND RECOMMENDS TO THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR (APPROVAL) (DENIAL), FINDING THE PROJECT
(IN COMPLIANCE) (NOT IN COMPLIANCE) IN UDC SECTION 5.12.7.C 1-15 AND SITE DESIGN STANDARDS IN SECTION 5.12.7.D (SEE ATTACHMENT 'B').

RND PRE-APPS

The purpose of the pre-application portion of the meeting is to provide potential Rio Nuevo Area (RNA) applicants with an opportunity for non-deliberative discussion with the DRB about the project and the RNA process, prior to actual submittal of the application.

Call to the Audience

Adjourn

If you have any questions concerning this DRB meeting, please contact Michael Taku at 837-4963.

S: zoning administration/drb/081916agen.doc

ATTACHMENT A:

SECTION 3.11.1.C. "SPECIFIC FINDING FOR SETBACK AND WALL HEIGHT MODIFICATION REQUESTS"

3.11.1. DESIGN DEVELOPMENT OPTION (DDO)

A. Purpose

This section is established to provide an administrative process by which specific development and dimensional standards of the UDC may be modified under certain criteria applicable to a land use within a zone. A Design Development Option (DDO) is intended to encourage the following:

1. Flexible design solutions that are within the intent of the regulation, encourage efficient use of land, do not create a nuisance on adjacent property, and address situations where strict application of a requirement may not be practical;
2. Energy conservation through site and building design;
3. Innovation in site planning and architectural design; and,
4. Enhancement of community aesthetics.

B. Applicability

The following dimensional, screening, and landscaping standards may be considered for modification under this Section:

1. Setbacks;
2. Height of accessory walls and fences when the wall and fence heights do not exceed two feet above the maximum height permitted;
3. Landscaping and screening standards when the modification does not decrease the required area in square footage of landscaping or height of a screening feature; and,

4. Structural setback and parking space length requirements for carports only in single-family and duplex development.

C. PDSD Review and Decision

1. The PDSD Director shall review and make a final decision on a DDO in accordance with Section 3.3.4, 50' Notice Procedure. Approval of a DDO request may only occur based on the findings in Section 3.11.1.D below.

2. For landscaping and screening modification requests as provided in Section 3.11.1.B.3 above, the Design Review Board shall review the request and make a recommendation prior to a decision by the PDSD Director.

3. Only one application is required when more than one DDO is being requested and may be processed concurrently in accordance with the most restrictive applicable procedure. For example, applications requesting a modification to the setback and landscaping standards shall go to the Design Review Board for a recommendation prior to a decision by the PDSD Director.

D. Findings for Approval

1. General Findings for All Modification Requests

For all modification requests, the PDSD Director may approve a DDO request only if the request meets all of the following findings:

a. Is not a request previously denied as a variance;

b. Does not modify a conditional requirement or finding to determine whether the use should be allowed in the zone;

c. Is not to a condition of approval for a rezoning or Special Exception Land Use application;

d. Does not modify a requirement of an overlay zone, such as, but not limited to, Scenic Corridor, Environmental Resource, Major Streets and Routes Setback, or Airport Environs;

e. Does not result in deletion or waiver of a UDC requirement;

f. The modification applies to property that cannot be developed in conformity with the provisions of this chapter due to physical circumstances or conditions of the property, such as irregular shape, narrowness of lot, exceptional topographic conditions, or location;

g. Does not create a situation where proposed development substantially reduces the amount of privacy that would be enjoyed by nearby residents any more than would be available if the development was built without the modification;

h. Does not create a situation where proposed development will block visibility within the required visibility triangle on adjoining streets for either vehicular or pedestrian traffic;

i. Does not create a situation where the proposed development will cause objectionable noise, odors, trespass lighting, or similar adverse impacts adjacent properties or development; and,

j. Does not create a situation where the development will result in an increase in the number of residential dwelling units or the square footage of nonresidential buildings greater than would occur if the development was built without the modification.

2. Specific Findings for Setback and Wall Height Modification Requests

In addition to the findings in Section 3.11.1.D.1, the PDSD Director shall find, in the case of setback and wall height only, that the modification:

a. Does not create a situation where proposed development will obstruct significant views of dramatic land forms, unusual stands of vegetation, or parks from nearby properties substantially more than would occur if the development were built without the modification;

b. Provides design alternatives to better integrate the development into the design character of the immediate neighborhood;

c. Does not apply to a setback requirement of a Flexible Lot Development (FLD);

d. Does not create a situation where the proposed development will interfere with the optimum air temperature or solar radiation orientation of buildings on adjoining properties substantially more than would occur if the building or structures were built without the modification; and,

e. Does not create a situation where the proposed use of the property will impose objectionable noise levels on adjoining properties greater than would occur if the buildings or structures were built without the modifications.

f. The modification is not for an increase in height of more than two feet to an accessory wall or fence, except that an increase of up to four feet may be considered for entry features on walls and fences.

3. Specific Finding for Screening Modification Requests

For screening modifications, in addition to the findings in Section 3.11.1.D.1, the PDSD Director shall make a finding that the modification does not lower the height of a required screening device to a point where it does not accomplish its purpose.

E. Appeals

A party of record may appeal the PDSD Director's decision on DDO applications. Appeals are considered by the Board of Adjustment in accordance with Sections 3.10.1 and 3.10.2, Board of Adjustment Appeal Procedure. Appeals must be filed within five days of the effective date of the decision. The complete appeals material must be filed within 30 days of the effective date of the decision. An appeal under this section shall be based upon an error in the Director 's decision finding compliance or noncompliance with the applicable findings. The Board of Adjustment shall apply the applicable findings as provided in Section 3.11.1D, Findings for Approval, when rendering its decision.

F. Expiration of Approval

Any Design Development Option (DDO) approval granted by the Planning and Development Services Department (PDSD) Director shall be null and void if building permits are not issued implementing the DDO or compliance with conditions of approval does not

occur within 180 days from the date of approval. One extension of up to 180 days may be granted by the PDSD Director for go**od cause.**

(Am. Ord. 11070, 5/14/2013; Am. Ord. 11127, 11/6/2013)

PDSD Review and Decision