



NOTE: THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE WITHOUT NOTICE. PLEASE CALL 480-312-7000 THE DAY OF THE HEARING FOR FURTHER INFORMATION.

MARKED

REVISED AMENDED* AGENDA**
SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
AUGUST 22, 2002
1:00 P.M.

* ITEM #15, 41-DR-2002, MOVED TO EXPEDITED AGENDA

** 33-DR-2002 (IWDS RECOVERY WELLS) MOVED TO EXPEDITED AGENDA (NEW ITEM #8)

ROLL CALL

Board Member Anne Gale Absent

MINUTES APPROVAL

Item 1 Approved 6-0; Motion R.P.

1. July 11, 2002

EXPEDITED AGENDA - Any item may be requested to be removed for separate action by the Development Review Board.

EXPEDITED AGENDA

Item 2 Approved 6-0 with amended stips; Motion RP

Continued	2. 82-DR-1998#14	Benihana Restaurant (Bldg. 3)	Kurt Jones
from 7-11-02		Site plan and elevations for a restaurant	
		Promenade Shopping Center, NEC	
		Scottsdale Road & Paradise Lane	
		Archicon, Architect/Designer	

Item 3 Approved 6-0 with amended stips; Motion RP

Continued	3. 31-DR-2002	Desert Cove Medical	Jason Yaich
from 7-11-02		Site plan and elevations	
		9097 E Desert Cove Dr	
		The Orcutt/Winslow Partnership,	
		Architect/Designer	

Item 4 Approved 6-0 with amended stips; Motion RP

4. 38-DR-2002	City of Scottsdale Well No. 123	Bill Verschuren
	Site plan and wall elevations	
	NEC of Scottsdale Rd & East Princess Blvd	
	SHJ Studio, Architect/Designer	

Item 5 moved to Regular agenda; Approved 6-0 with amended stips; Motion JTE

- | | | | |
|----|---------------|---|-------------|
| 5. | 118-DR-1999#3 | Summit @ Scottsdale Pad Building 5 | Kira Wauwie |
| | | Site plan and elevations | |
| | | 32409 N Scottsdale Rd | |
| | | Nelsen Architects Inc, Architect/Designer | |

Item 6 Approved 6-0; Motion RP

- | | | | |
|----|------------|---|-------------|
| 6. | 17-DR-2002 | Sterling Office Building | Jason Yaich |
| | | Site plan & elevations | |
| | | 8205 N Via De Negocio | |
| | | Reigle & Associates, Architect/Designer | |

Item 7 Approved 6-0; Motion RP

- | | | | |
|----|------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 7. | 18-PP-2002 | Mirabel Village 14 | Kira Wauwie |
| | | Preliminary plat, Village 14 | |
| | | Cave Creek Rd & Mirabel Club Drive | |

Item 8 Approved 5-0; Motion RP; JTE abstaining due to possible conflict of interest.

- | | | | | |
|--------------|-----|------------|---|-----------|
| Continued | 14. | 33-DR-2002 | IWDS Recovery Wells 1, 2 & 3 and IWDS | Suzanne |
| from 7-11-02 | 15. | | Recharge Wells | Gunderman |
| Moved from | 8. | | Site plan, site walls and utilities | |
| regular | | | Northeast of Pima & Cave Creek and | |
| agenda | | | northeast of Desert Mtn Parkway & Cave | |
| | | | Creek | |
| | | | H & S International, Architect/Designer | |

Item 9 moved to Regular agenda; Continued 6-0 to 9/26/02; Motion TN

- | | | | |
|----|------------|---|-------------|
| 8. | 34-DR-2002 | Subway Regional Office | Jason Yaich |
| 9. | | Site plan and elevations | |
| | | 8674 E San Alberto | |
| | | Architecture Plus Ltd, Architect/Designer | |

Item 10 moved to Regular agenda; Continued to a Date to be Determined; Motion JTE

- | | | | |
|-----|------------|---|-------------|
| 9. | 35-DR-2002 | Church Meeting In Single Family | Kira Wauwie |
| 10. | | Residence | |
| | | 8020 E. Dynamite Blvd. | |
| | | Classic Stellar Homes, Architect/Designer | |

Item 11 moved to Regular agenda; Approved 6-0 with amended stips; Motion JTE

- | | | | |
|-----|------------|--|-------------|
| 10. | 36-DR-2002 | Bariatric Care Center | Jason Yaich |
| 11. | | Site plan and elevations | |
| | | Southwest corner of Princess & Perimeter | |
| | | Dr | |
| | | Beta Design Group, Architect/Designer | |

Item 12 moved to Regular agenda; Approved 6-0 with amended stip; Motion MS

44. 37-DR-2002	Mirage of Scottsdale MEDCP	Kira Wauwie
12.	Via Linda, 132nd St. to 136th St. (N/A) Architect/Designer	

Item 13 Approved 6-0; Motion RP

42. 40-DR-2002	Traffic Street-calming Improvements	Suzanne
13.	Oak Street Pedestrian Bridge, Oak and Palm Streets from 68th St. to Scottsdale Rd, Intersection of 69th St. and Almeria Rd, and Crosscut Canal pedestrian bridge at Oak St.	Gunderman

Item 14 moved to Regular agenda; Approved 5-1; Motion JTE; TN dissenting

43. 88-DR-2001 #2	Highlands Church	Kira Wauwie
14.	Elevation changes 9050 E. Pinnacle Peak Road Bardusen Architectural Group, Architect/Designer	

Item 15 approved 6-0 with amended stip; Motion RP

Moved from regular agenda	15. 41-DR-2002	Zocallo Corporate Center Site plan & elevations SWC Dial Blvd & Greenway-Hayden Loop Deutsch Associates, Architect/Designer	Bill Verschuren
---------------------------	----------------	---	-----------------

REGULAR AGENDA

There are no items on the regular agenda.

ADJOURNMENT - Approximately 4:10 p.m.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD CONSISTS OF:

Tom Silverman, Councilman	Anne Gale, Development Member
Tony Nelson, Commission Member	J.T. Elbracht, Design Member
Raymond Potter, Vice Chairman	Mark Soden, Design Member
E.L. Cortez, Design Member	



Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the City Clerk's Office at 480-312-2412. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange accommodation.

APPROVED 9/5/02



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
AUGUST 22, 2002
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Tom Silverman, Councilman
Tony Nelssen, Planning Commission Member
Raymond Potter, Vice Chairman
E.L. Cortez, Design Member
J.T. Elbracht, Design Member
Mark Soden, Design Member

ABSENT: Anne Gale, Design Member

STAFF: Kurt Jones
Suzanne Gunderman
Jayna Shewak
Bill Verschuren
Kira Wauwie
Jason Yaich

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Silverman at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

OPENING STATEMENT

COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

APPROVED 9-5-02

MINUTES APPROVAL

July 11, 2002

VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 11, 2002 AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. ELBRACHT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

EXPEDITED AGENDA

- | | | |
|----|---------------|---|
| 1. | 82-DR-1998#14 | Benihana Restaurant (Bldg. 3)
Site plan and elevations for a restaurant
Promenade Shopping Center, NEC
Scottsdale Road & Paradise Lane
Archicon, Architect/Designer |
| | | |
| 3. | 31-DR-2002 | Desert Cove Medical
Site plan and elevations
9097 E. Desert Cove Drive
The Orcutt/Winslow Partnership
Architect/Designer |
| | | |
| 4. | 38-DR-2002 | City of Scottsdale Well No. 123
Site plan and wall elevations
NEC of Scottsdale Rd & East Princess Blvd.
SHJ Studio, Architect/Designer |
| | | |
| 5. | 118-DR-1999#3 | Summit @ Scottsdale Pad Building 5
Site plan and elevations
32409 N. Scottsdale Rd
Nelsen Architects Inc., Architect/Designer |

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

- | | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 6. | 17-DR-2002 | Sterling Office Building
Site plan & elevations
8205 N. Via De Negocio
Reigle & Associates, Architect/Designer |
| | | |
| 7. | 18-PP-2002 | Mirabel Village 14
Preliminary plat, Village 14
Cave Creek Rd & Mirabel Club Drive |
| | | |
| 8. | 33-DR-2002 | IDWS Recovery Wells 1,2, &3 and IWDS |

APPROVED 9-5-02

Recharge Wells
Site plan, site walls and utilities
Northeast of Pima & Cave Creek and
Northeast of Desert Mtn Parkway & Cave
Creek
H & S International, Architect/Designer

(MR. ELBRACHT DECLARED A CONFLICT AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN
THE VOTE.)

9. 34-DR-2002 Subway Regional Office
Site plan and elevations
8674 E. San Alberto
Architecture Plus Ltd., Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

10. 35-DR-2002 Church Meeting in Single Family
Residence
8020 E. Dynamite Blvd.
Classic Stellar Homes, Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

11. 36-DR-2002 Bariatric Care Center
Site plan and elevations
Southwest corner of Princess & Perimeter
Drive
Beta Design Group, Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

12. 37-DR-2002 Mirage of Scottsdale MEDCP
Via Linda, 132nd St. to 136th St.
(N/A) Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

13. 40-DR-2002 Traffic Street-calming improvements
Oak Street Pedestrian Bridge,
Oak and Palm Streets from 68th St. to
Scottsdale Rd, Intersection of 69th St. and
Almeria Rd, and Crosscut Canal
pedestrian bridge at Oak Street.
14. 88-DR-2001#2 Highlands Church

Elevations changes
9050 E. Pinnacle Peak Road
Bardusen Architectural Group,
Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

15. 41-DR-2002 Zocallo Corporate Center
Site plan & elevations
SWC Dial Blvd & Greenway-Hayden
Loop
Deutsch Associates, Architect/Designer

VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 82-DR-1998#14 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATIONS REGARDING SHEEN ROOFING MATERIAL. CASE 31-DR-2002 WITH THE SAME STIPULATION REGARDING THE ROOFING SHEEN. CASE 38-DR-2002 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATION THAT THE COLOR PALETTE IS MATCHED TO THE PRINCESS ENTRY FEATURES AS CLOSELY AS POSSIBLE. CASE 17-DR-2002 WITH THE STIPULATIONS IN THE PACKET. CASE 18-PP-2002 WITH THE STIPULATIONS IN THE PACKET. CASE 40-DR-2002 WITH THE STIPULATIONS IN THE PACKET. CASE 41-DR-2002 WITH THE REVISED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. ELBRACHT.

MR. ELBRACHT REQUESTED AN AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION ON CASE 31-DR-2002 THAT THEY SPECIFICALLY REFERENCE APPROVAL TO THE ELEVATIONS AND DETAILS DATED 8/19/02.

VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 33-DR-2002 WITH THE STIPULATIONS IN THE PACKET. SECOND BY MR. CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0) WITH MR. ELBRACHT ABSTAINING.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. 118-DR-1999#3 Summit @ Scottsdale Pad Building 5
Site plan and elevations
32409 N. Scottsdale Rd
Nelsen Architects Inc., Architect/Designer

APPROVED 9-5-02

MS. SHEWAK presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She stated the sample boards show two different stone veneer finishes that are applied to this building. Pad Building 5 is a combination of Arizona Sunset and Chocolate. She further stated the Board might want to pick up the discussion and discuss some other options for the Scottsdale Road side. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

GEORGE MELARE, Nelsen Architects Inc., discussed the character of the elevations. He stated the selection of stone is consistent with the stones that have already been used on the project on this site. He also discussed the transformer pad on the north side of the building. He stated the transformer locations are consistent within the project. They have been screened with integral colored block to match the buildings in those areas.

COMMISSIONER NELSEN stated his main concern is that Pad 5 seems to be the closest structure to Scottsdale Road and basically being able to see in that building in the evening. He further stated planting a mature tree between the west elevations on Scottsdale Road could solve that. **MR. MELARE** replied they would be willing to plant a tree in that location.

MR. ELBRACHT stated he noticed that there are no trees along the wash corridor. He further stated he would recommend a minimum of four 24-inch box native trees are placed on the north side of the building between the building and the edge of the wash corridor.

MR. SODEN stated he would like the Applicant to move the transformer as far west as possible to allow the storefront that faces the wash to have a clear open area to the wash view. **MR. MELARE** stated they would work with the utility company to slide the transformer farther back.

MR. ELBRACHT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 118-DR-1999#3 WITH THE ADDED STIPULATIONS:

- 1) **A MINIMUM OF ONE MATURE NATIVE TREE IS PLANTED BETWEEN THE WEST ELEVATIONS ON SCOTTSDALE ROAD TO MINIMIZE THE IMPACT OF SIGHT LINES FROM SCOTTSDALE ROAD INTO THE STOREFRONT.**
- 2) **MINIMUM FOUR 24-INCH BOX NATIVE TREES ARE PLACED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE BUILDING BETWEEN THE BUILDING AND THE EDGE OF THE WASH CORRIDOR.**
- 3) **THE TRANSFORMER BE MOVED AS FAR WEST AS POSSIBLE TO ALLOW THE STORE FRONT THAT FACES THE WASH TO HAVE CLEAR OPEN AREA TO THE WASH VIEW.**

SECOND BY MR. CORTEZ.

APPROVED 9-5-02

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

9. 34-DR-2002 Subway Regional Office
Site plan and elevations
8674 E. San Alberto
Architecture Plus Ltd., Architect/Designer

MR. YAICH presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. ELBRACHT inquired about the shared access easement and where the Development Review Board has its limitations. **MS. BRONSKI** stated the Development Review Board is concerned about access but staff has determined the existing easements and the existing exits will be sufficient for those properties. She further stated unless the Board disagrees there is not much to say on that particular issue.

MR. ELBRACHT stated he wants to make sure if the Board is approving this site plan that there is not an access easement issue because there are not a lot of choices if an access issue is raised later to make changes that would work within the existing footprint. They would have to do a dramatic site plan change. **MS. BRONSKI** discussed how the site is physically laid out. She stated staff believes the 12 feet on either side are sufficient for use by the respective property owners. It would not be a normal two-way but that there is not a lot of traffic from front to back and that seems to be sufficient for emergency access. There would be a stipulation that the driveway would not be blocked so it is sufficient for one car to go in and out. **MR. YAICH** presented an overview of the geometry of the site and discussed where the easement begins and ends. He also presented information on how staff came to that conclusion based on knowing what type of trips are going in and out.

MR. ELBRACHT stated for clarity, the additional driveway to the east is not currently an access easement. **MR. YAICH** replied in the affirmative. He stated the owner and developer of the property were required to provide that initially when this case went through and was approved by the Development Review Board and that easement has never been recorded. Despite that fact staff still feels the existing easement is adequate. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated maybe that is one of things that should be followed up on.

MR. NELSEN requested that the issue of the storm water retention waiver be addressed. **MR. YAICH** stated there are some questions as to what the final design will be of the storm water storage or waiver on this site. Initially the Applicant had requested a waiver for the site and in fact waivers have been granted in this area in the past. He further stated it is his understanding that the Applicant has found they can provide all of their storage on site.

(COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

APPROVED 9-5-02

ANDY MOORE, 3101 N. Central, Suite 1000, Phoenix, AZ, stated he is here on behalf of Computer Dynamics Inc., the next door neighbor who has two lots that were approved in 1998 and built in '99-2000. He further stated they are here to request a continuance because they felt it was premature to have a site plan approval without resolving the access and storm water retention issues. He noted they have just heard from staff that when the Computer Dynamics site was approved and they were required to provide that additional bit of easement. When they were approved there was a stipulation on their case that reads: "The existing cross access easements on the east and west property line shall be modified as necessary to cover the shared driveway locations." In other words, when they came to develop the Subway property to the west already had the existing APS electrical panel. The Computer Dynamics Inc., property also has on the other side of their property an existing APS electrical panel. Computer Dynamics inquired into the cost of moving it in 1999 and the cost was approximately \$30,000.00. They instead wanted to find a way around that.

He stated Computer Dynamics in the development of their case was required to provide additional easements in order to cover that area. In this case the only stipulations regarding roadway or driveway that staff has placed on the Subway property reads: "The site access shall be the existing joint access (ingress and egress easement) with the adjacent parcel to the east".

He remarked he felt the case should be continued to allow the Applicant an opportunity to discuss the access and water retention issues with Computer Dynamics Inc.

MR. ELBRACHT requested that Mr. Moore reread the stipulation regarding the CSI case regarding access. **MR. MOORE** stated the stipulation reads as follows: "The existing cross access easements on the east and west property line shall be modified as necessary to cover the shared driveway locations". **MR. ELBRACHT** stated to him that reads very clear that CDI was obligated to provide access easement over the shared driveway location that is physically built today. He stated that as he interprets the stipulation, CDI needs to provide an easement for the bump out just as the one shown on the east side. If we had that easement, this whole issue goes away. **MR. MOORE** replied that obviously they interpret it differently. Their concerns are still valid and they don't know how this is going to be worked out. If it is not sufficiently worked out then they would need a different site plan. **MS. BRONSKI** stated staff could look at if CDI is willing to dedicate that cross access easement then both properties could be similarly stipulated

and this issue could be resolved. The staff recommendation was to accommodate the fact the CDI property on the west did not have a cross access easement and they were trying to work around that and not go back and request them to do it at this point. If CDI would like to commit right now do to that then that issue would be resolved and you could re-institute that stipulation on the Subway parcel. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated he would direct staff to follow through with the existing stipulations and then they would not have to do anything more on this. **MR. MOORE** stated that their interpretation is different. He felt

they need to discuss this issue with the Applicant and City staff. He further stated this does not resolve their issue regarding storm water retention.
(COUNCILMAN SILVERMAN CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY)

MR. SODEN requested clarification on how the storm water retention is proposed to work on the Subway site. **MR. YAICH** stated staff does agree with the engineer's report that it could be met on site based on the current site plan.

MARK FREDSTROM, Architecture Plus LTD, stated their civil engineer is out of town. He further stated the calculations have been provided to the staff and they are satisfied with them.

MR. SODEN inquired if there was any inter-linkage between Subway's storm water system and CDI's. **MR. FREDSTROM** replied there would be no inter-connection. **MR. SODEN** inquired if rainfalls on their side of the shared access drive if it would flow towards CDI's storm water drainage basin. **MR. FREDSTROM** replied the driveway is sloped to the west so if it falls on their driveway it drains to the west.

MR. NELSEN stated he does not like to see things come forward with disagreeing parties. He further stated valid issues have been brought up with differences in opinions. He remarked he would be in favor of a continuance so the details could be worked out.

MR. CORTEZ stated he felt the issues should be resolved before approving the site plan.

MR. NELSEN MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 34-DR-2002 TO THE NEXT AVAILABLE DATE THAT THE PARTIES CAN AGREE TO COME BACK. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

10.	35-DR-2002	Church Meeting in Single Family Residence 8020 E. Dynamite Blvd. Classic Stellar Homes, Architect/Designer
-----	------------	---

MS. WAUWIE presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She stated staff and the applicant have proposed the following new stipulations:

Trees used for screening the parking lot shall be 24-inch box specimens spaced in an irregular manner not less than 30 feet on center and the species shall be native tree types and subject to final plans review approval.

She stated the Applicant is proposing either a new stipulation or a modification to an existing stipulation to address on site lighting.

APPROVED 9-5-02

No new lighting on the property or to go ahead with the Desert Foothills Character plan recommendations for outdoor lighting. Or a new stipulation to replace On Site Lighting Stipulation 3.4 to state: Outdoor lighting shall not exceed the height of the native trees and to be screened to prevent spillage into adjacent neighborhood areas.

The character of the signs should respect the traditional rustic character of buildings in the area.

Staff recommends approval subject to the new and attached stipulations.

COMMISSIONER NELSEN stated the stipulation regarding lighting is something he has taken issue with for quite a while although it is in the design guidelines it is a misnomer. Obviously limiting the height of the lighting to the height of the canopy of the trees would put it up to about 24 feet, which is kind of ridiculous. He further stated the issue should be why is lighting required. He would suggest eliminating the need for additional lighting.

He stated there is a requirement for blacktop paving. This is a dirt road. He felt they should stipulate to keep the disturbance to the desert down to a minimum. He further stated he cannot understand putting in 35 more parking spaces for a temporary use.

He discussed the access issues to this house. He stated he does not understand why access to this house is required off of Dynamite. He further stated this is an opportunity to look at a different access either off of Hayden Road or 182nd Street.

He stated another issue is that we have a General Plan trail that comes across here with no provisions for a trail crossing on the driveways. He further stated there are a lot of details that have not been addressed except in the last two days.

He inquired if the Applicant would be willing to bring the color up to existing ESLO light reflective values. The sign material should be in keeping with the Desert Foothills character. He inquired where the sign would go. He felt the sign would have to be moved back so far that he did not know what purpose it would serve.

VICE CHAIRMAN POTTER inquired if this was a permanent or temporary use of this residence.

MANJULA VAZ, Beus Gilbert, 3200 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1000, Phoenix, AZ, stated this is a temporary use. They intend to be in this location for three years. There is a new location for the church but the DR process has taken longer than they anticipated and has curtailed their fund raising. She remarked with regard to the color of the house they would work toward getting the house in compliance with the ESLO. She further remarked that regarding the sign they would bring it back to the Board to ensure it fits within the Desert Foothills character.

MR. ELBRACHT stated he agrees with the comments made by Mr. Nelssen. He further stated he felt there needed to be landscaping up against the house. He noted the driveway plan lacks definition.

MR. NELSEN stated he would like to see a stipulation that there would not be a temporary vinyl sign hanging from the eaves of the house. He further stated he does not understand why there is a requirement for paving. He requested additional information regarding the left turn lane off of Dynamite Road. **MR. VAZ** stated they would agree to a stipulation regarding no vinyl signs. **MS. WAUWIE** discussed the options regarding the left turn off of Dynamite. **MR. NELSEN** stated he would recommend staff looks at these entrances off of Dynamite and they look at the possibility of eliminating any access off of Dynamite. He inquired why are they making all of these changes off Dynamite for a temporary use. He added he would like to see the traffic issue, the parking issue, and the landscape plan come back.

MR. SODEN requested staff address the issue regarding the trail. **MS. WAUWIE** stated the only trails she has received information on from the Trails Coordinator are on Dynamite and ability to provide a trail on Hayden although that is not formally planned.

MR. SODEN stated he was concerned about the overflow parking and the lack of detail. **MS. VAZ** stated their hope is to never use the overflow parking, which may contribute to the lack of detail. **MR. SODEN** inquired if they could double load the parking. **MS. WAUWIE** presented information regarding the different parking options. **MR. SODEN** stated he would like to see them not disturb the drainage areas.

MR. NELSEN stated the neighborhood trails plan is under study by a consultant. The trail along Hayden is a proposed trail. The trail along Dynamite is a General Plan trail. In the Desert Foothills area they are trying to use the drainage corridors.

MS. VAZ inquired if there was a way to approve this case pending discussion with staff. They can work on the parking situation and address the landscaping. There will be no lighting and the sign would come back to the Board.

MR. ELBRACHT stated there is not enough information on the key issues.

MR. ELBRACHT MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 35-DR-2002. SECOND BY MR. NELSEN.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

11. 36-DR-2002

Bariatric Care Center
Site plan and elevations
Southwest corner of Princess & Perimeter
Drive
Beta Design Group, Architect/Designer

APPROVED 9-5-02

MR. YAICH presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

STEVEN EARL, Earl, Curley & Lagarde, 3101 N. Central, Avenue, Suite 1000, Phoenix, AZ, stated he would like to clear up the confusion that may have occurred in study session regarding the color. He reviewed the revised color palette. He reported the efface color would be a darker shade of the original color. He reported the roof would be mallard green, which is a matte finish.

MR. ELBRACHT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 36-DR-2002 WITH THE REVISED COLOR PALETTE THAT WAS SUBMITTED TODAY, WHICH INCLUDED THE MALLARD GREEN METAL ROOF AND THE DARK COLOR FOR THE STUCCO EFFACE FINISH. SECOND BY MR. CORTEZ.

MR. NELSEN requested the motion indicate the mallard green metal roof would be a matte finish.

MR. ELBRACHT AND MR. CORTEZ agreed to the amendment.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

12. 37-DR-2002	Mirage of Scottsdale MEDCP Via Linda, 132 nd St. to 136 th St. (N/A) Architect/Designer
----------------	---

MS. SHEWAK presented this case as per the project coordination packet. She stated the applicant has agreed to remove the roof structure over the entry walls. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. ELBRACHT inquired if there are some entry structures that have roofs that have already been approved. He further inquired if those projects are covered by the MEDCP. **MS. SHEWAK** reviewed on the map where those approvals are. She stated they are not covered by the MEDCP. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated that if they are not part of the MEDCP he would like to see the roof part removed from the MEDCP. He would recommend they remove the roof elements from the gate structures.

MR. SODEN stated regarding the Circulation Plan, it appears that with parcels A, B and E there is not a way for the residents to access the trail that follows that wash. **MS. SHEWAK** addressed the concerns regarding getting into the wash. She stated the washes in this area are unlike a lot of desert washes. They are very deeply incised. The edges are steep, there are a lot of vertical walls, and to get down into the wash through a trail would be very difficult. The trails staff prefers easy entry where there is trail node and those types of connections.

KEN CALDWELL, LVA Urban Design Studio, 7502 E. Main Street, presented a brief overview of the trail access for this project. He noted that the wash is deeply incised.

MR. SODEN asked a series of questions regarding the trail access and the condition of the wash. He inquired if someone lives on parcel B can they walk to parcel E without going onto Via Linda. **MR. CALDWELL** stated there are internal walk systems. He provided a brief overview of the internal walk system. He further stated it is their goal to bring people down through the communities. He reported parcels B, C, and E would be developed by the same developer.

MR. CALDWELL requested the study session be waived and they deal with the roof structure in regular session. He stated they would be willing to remove the roof structure from the entry features.

MR. ELBRACHT stated he had some concerns regarding the trails system. If there was zoning criteria and influences that talked about the inter-connectivity of paths it should be included in the MEDCP. He expressed his concern that perhaps they were putting the cart before the horse that there are plats that have been approved and the MEDCP has not been approved yet. If the plats are approved ahead, it makes it very difficult to ensure that those connections happen. He felt it would be necessary to revise the pedestrian trails circulation system to match both with the zoning as well as give them a cohesive path and trails system which they can judge future subdivision plats by. **MR. CALDWELL** stated this is very complicated. He reviewed the approvals they have already received. He further stated that very soon they would be seeing a DR package that shows all of B, C, and E. He discussed the pedestrian linkages that have been provided. **MS. WAUWIE** stated this is complicated because it is not like a traditional master plan community in that the parcels are a little disconnected. She provided background information on what has occurred. She further stated the intent of the MEDCP is to provide an overall backdrop for all of these parcels so there is some type of uniform consistency for all the parcels together. She remarked there are trail requirements as part of the zoning and as part of the platting requirements. She presented information on the trail locations. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated there is no direction given to ensure those linkages occur there is only direction for sidewalks. He inquired if zoning was comfortable with just sidewalks and no other pedestrian connections. **MS. WAUWIE** replied in the affirmative.

MR. NELSEN stated he would like to address the wash issues between parcels A, B, C, and D. He further stated he does not understand why they cannot access the wash. He discussed his concerns regarding this issue. **MR. CALDWELL** stated there would never be a path into the wash because the Federal Core of Engineers prohibits any modifications. **MR. NELSEN** inquired if there would be the possibility of access easements in areas between the properties. **MR. CALDWELL** stated he would have to discuss that issue with the owner. He further stated he knows the NAOS on this site is very tight.

MR. SODEN stated he would suggest they add a stipulation that the circulation plan be revised to accommodate pedestrian linkages between 134th Street and Parcel E and Between Parcel E and Parcel F.

MR. SODEN MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 37-DR-2002 WITH THE FOLLOWING STIPULATIONS:

- 1) THE ROOF STRUCTURES BE ELIMINATED FROM THE ENTRY FEATURES.**
- 2) THE CIRCULATION PLAN BE REVISED TO ACCOMMODATE PEDESTRIAN LINKAGES BETWEEN 134TH STREET AND PARCEL E AND BETWEEN PARCEL E AND PARCEL F.**

SECOND BY MR. CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ONE (1) WITH MR. ELBRACHT DISSENTING.

MR. NELSEN inquired if the study session on this case has been waived. **MS. SHEWAK** stated this case could be removed from the study session agenda.

14.	88-DR-2001#2	Highlands Church Elevations changes 9050 E. Pinnacle Peak Road Bardusen Architectural Group, Architect/Designer
-----	--------------	---

MS. WAUWIE presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

MR. ELBRACHT inquired what would the towers look like that are on the main church. **MS. WAUWIE** showed a graphic of what the towers would look like. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated so there are no changes to the original approval. **MS. WAUWIE** replied in the affirmative. **MR. ELBRACHT** stated he is fine with the new tower the way it is.

MR. NELSEN inquired about the difference in height between the towers. **MS. WAUWIE** stated the towers on the larger building are shown at 40 feet above the grade and the proposed towers are 20. **MR. NELSEN** stated that the way it is drawn it almost looks like a lighthouse. He further stated part of his concern is the proximity of the building and the view to Pinnacle Peak. Part of the issue was we would be looking through a palette of different stone colors and textures as opposed to a painted stucco tower. Part of the issue was to make that lay down into the landscape. He stated he has an issue with having all of these vertical elements and making them lighter than the

mountain backdrops so they would stand out. He would like to see them blend in. He requested information on the tower colors that were not clad in stone. **MS. WAUWIE** stated brown stained stucco. **MR. NELSEN** inquired if the main reason for not wanting to put the stone on the towers is cost.

STEVE BARDUSEN, Bardusen Architectural Group, 1600 W. Broadway Road, Suite 110, Tempe, AZ, stated the reason they did not want to put stone on the towers because they did not want them to look like chimneys. They are referring to this as the lighthouse of hope. He discussed the colors they would be using. He noted they would be consistent with the use of color throughout the project.

MR. NELSEN stated he felt regardless of the stone use the towers would look like a chimney. He encouraged the Applicant to use the new ESLO colors on their project. He stated he would support more stone and more natural materials as opposed to painted stucco. He remarked he personally has a problem with five painted stucco towers.

MR. ELBRACHT noted this tower does match the other towers and character.

MR. ELBRACHT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 88-DR-2001#2. SECOND BY MR. CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO (1) WITH MR. NELSEN DISSENTING.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters

APPROVED 9-5-02