

APPROVED 9-4-03



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD  
KIVA - CITY HALL  
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD  
AUGUST 21, 2003  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Cynthia Lukas, Council Member  
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman  
James Heitel, Planning Commission Member  
Anne Gale, Design Member  
Jeremy Jones, Design Member  
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

**ABSENT:** Michael D'Andrea, Design Member

**STAFF:** Donna Bronski  
Suzanne Colver  
Tim Conner  
Laurel Edgar  
Kroy Ekblaw  
Kurt Jones  
Curtis Kozall  
Tim Curtis  
Randy Grant  
Jayna Shewak  
Bill Verschuren  
Al Ward  
Greg Williams

**CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Lukas at 1:30 p.m.

## **ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

## **OPENING STATEMENT**

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

## **MINUTES APPROVAL**

July 10, 2003 Development Review Board Minutes

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JULY 10, 2003 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

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

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated case 35-DR-2003 has been moved from consent agenda to the regular agenda.

181-DR-1987#3

Infiniti Of Scottsdale  
Site plan & elevations for expansion  
6910 E. McDowell Road  
John Mahoney Architect,  
Architect/Designer

30-DR-2003

Hilton Garden Inn  
Site Plan & Elevations  
8550 E. Princess Dr. (Perimeter Center)  
Todd & Associates, Architect/Designer

32-DR-2003

Adobe Animal Hospital  
Site Plan & Elevations  
7712 E. Indian School Road  
K & I Architects, Architect/Designer

35-DR-2003

Scottsdale & Shea  
Site Plan & Elevations  
Shea Boulevard east of Scottsdale Road  
Perlman Architects Inc.,  
Architect/Designer

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA.)

49-DR-2003                      Scottsdale Road Widening/Improvements  
Scottsdale Road: Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd  
To Thompson Peak Pkwy  
City of Scottsdale, Applicant

47-DR-2003                      Wingate Inn & Suites  
Site Plan & Elevations  
14255 N. 87<sup>th</sup> Street  
Lamb Architects, Architect/Designer

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 181-DR-1987#3 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 30-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 32-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. CASE 49-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. AND CASE 47-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. HEITEL.**

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

**REGULAR AGENDA**

35-DR-2003                      Scottsdale & Shea  
Site Plan & Elevations  
Shea Boulevard east of Scottsdale Road  
Perlman Architects Inc.,  
Architect/Designer

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

**MR. JONES** stated the majority of this project is fine. He further stated he would like the applicant to reconsider the use of materials and colors on the façade.

**STEVEN KIM**, Perlman Architects, stated they could reconsider the colors and materials on the façade. They could continue the stones further out on the columns and change the molding to match. He further stated they would be willing to work with staff and make the necessary changes.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 35-DR-2003 SUBJECT TO THE RECONSIDERATION OF THE USE OF MATERIALS AND COLORS ON THE FAÇADE. SECOND BY MS. GALE.**

**MR. VERSCHUREN** requested specific direction.

**MR. JONES AMENDED THE MOTION THAT THE REVISED FAÇADE BE RESUBMITTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD IN A STUDY SESSION FOR REVIEW OF THE USE OF COLOR AND MATERIALS ON THE FAÇADE.**

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

36-DR-2003

Scottsdale First Assembly of God  
Dream Center  
Site Plan & Elevations  
South of Pima & Via Dona Roads  
Debartolo Architects. Architects/Designer

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

**MR. SCHMITT** inquired if there were any future expansion plans. Mr. Curtis replied that would be a good question for the applicant, noting he was not informed of the overall plans for the future of the campus.

**JACK DEBARTOLO JR.**, 4450 N. 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Phoenix, AZ, architect, stated they would be making a presentation in a duet fashion.

**JACK DEBARTOLO III**, 4450 N. 12<sup>th</sup> street, Phoenix, AZ, provided an overview of the history and thinking that occurred. He discussed the characteristics of the site and provided an analysis of the property. He also discussed where the NAOS would be located on the site. He reviewed where the parking would be located on the site. He provided information on how the site would be shielded. He provided an overview on the siting of the buildings. He reviewed the elevations of the site.

**MR. DEBARTOLO JR.** presented information on the challenges on the site with regard to the topography. He discussed the clustered approach to minimize the impact.

**MR. DEBARTOLO III** provided information on the proposed cool-tower that would be located in the plaza. He reported the 40-foot cool-tower/steeple will passively cool the plaza as it invites the cool air from above to fall to the plaza floor below. The top of the tower, fabricated of perforated fiberglass resin, is translucent – evoking the changing ambient light of the desert and rising above the surrounding structure creating a soft edge to the sky. The plaza will be shaded by native desert vegetation. He further reported this element is important because it serves as identification of the building.

**MR. DEBARTOLO III** stated with the significantly increased setbacks, the site lends to preserving the quality of the desert without limiting the vision of the church. Through sensitive development and preservation of nature, this new congregation will gently occupy the site and fulfill the demand for culture and faith in the north Scottsdale community.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** inquired if the tower would be lit. Mr. Debartolo III replied in the negative.

Councilman Lukas inquired about the expansion plans for the future. Mr. DeBartolo III stated the plan does represent long-range growth, but there are no specific plans at this time.

**MR. HEITEL** stated he is fortunate enough to live in the Desert Foothills neighborhood and has had the opportunity to visit with Pastor Friend and Mr. Debartolo III but there are still a lot of unanswered questions. He requested clarification on the application before the Board. He noted he was confused by the letter sent out to number of the neighbors on August 18<sup>th</sup> by the applicant's legal counsel that referenced reducing the height of the tower to 24 feet if they were allowed additional signage. He inquired if the application in front of the Board has been amended by virtue of this letter.

**WENDY REIDELL**, 4800 N. Scottsdale Road, stated many of the neighbors have expressed concerns regarding the proposed height of the tower so in the spirit of compromise the idea was proposed that they increase signage adjacent to Pima Road and the tower height would be reduced to 24 feet. She further stated the City is in the process of a Signage Text Amendment and as a part of that amendment they would hope to get additional signage on Pima Road. If that is approved in the next 18 months, they would be satisfied with the tower at a maximum height of 24 feet. If the amendment is not approved, they would go forward with building the tower at 40 feet as is proposed today.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** requested legal counsel comment on the potential process that was just suggested. Ms. Bronski reported there would be significant difficulties with doing that type of stipulations because there are a lot of unknowns. If the Board wishes to proceed in that direction they could certainly

pursue that but they would be relying on an ordinance that has not been passed. She noted they are not sure how it would be worded.

**MR. HEITEL** stated the way he read the proposal and from the information, he has heard at this hearing that it seems straightforward. Ms. Reidell stated from their perspective it can be accomplished legally. Councilman Lukas noted there are two different legal opinions.

**MR. JONES** stated he would prefer that the Board judge the case on its merits noting that he does not like the lets make a deal approach.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated there are 57 citizen comment cards and 55 are in favor of the proposal.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**TONY NELSEN**, 7730 E. Redbird Road, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated there are a couple of things he would like to set straight. This case was started under the premise that the Desert Foothills Overlay allowed churches to be built above 24 feet. It specifically did not but the underlying zoning did. Desert Foothills overlay on R1-190 property is 24-foot height. That presented a conflict with ESLO. ELSO II was changed not to be in conflict with Desert Foothills overlay with no exceptions for churches and that was unanimously approved by City Council. He reported Desert Foothills Overlay does have a provision for variances in height above the 24 feet and if it goes above 25 percent those issues come before this Board and beyond 25 percent goes to the City Council. This tower is in excess of 25% and this decision needs to be made by the City Council.

Mr. Nelssen stated he would like to compliment the architect design team and Pastor Friend for the siting of this property. He further stated he felt the contemporary design does not fit in with the character of the area. He presented pictures of buildings that fit in with the character of the area. He also presented pictures of contemporary architecture that do not fit in with the area.

Mr. Nelssen stated he wishes the Dream Center well but times change and people move out and what they will be left with is a commercial building on a residential lot, which is unfortunate.

Mr. Nelssen stated he had a couple of concerns about the trail easement and the stipulations on the LRV. He further stated there is also an issue regarding the galvanized steps noting reflective surfaces are not allowed in ESL. He concluded by discussing why it is very important not to allow an exception to the 24-foot height and the issue of discrimination.

**MR. HEITEL** inquired if one of the issues is that the tower would be very visible because it would be located on a high portion of the landform. Mr. Nelssen stated the siting provides considerable screening for the Dream Center from Pima Road but the neighborhood would take the brunt of it.

**GARY GARRETT**, 15650 N. 83<sup>rd</sup> Way, spoke in favor of the request. He stated he has a business on Frank Lloyd Wright and Pima and he lives in Fountain Hills. He further stated he would like the Board to look at this request without the heavy weight of the discrimination issues. There could be an equal point made that if they have made height exceptions in the past that it might be discriminatory not to make one for this church.

**SANDRA PANEK**, 14248 N. Ashbrook Dr. No. 3, spoke in favor of this request. She stated that she resides in Fountain Hills but owns a Day Spa in Scottsdale. She further stated above and beyond this being a church this is a community. She noted she raises her daughter alone and has been involved with the church for two years and it is a great place for her daughter to go. She commented on the importance of buildings having signage or a landmark to appeal to the community.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**MR. JONES** stated he felt this site blended into its surroundings. He further stated he felt diminishing the tower would diminish the spirit of the building and they should not consider that. He added he is in favor of this project.

**MS. GALE** stated she supports this project. She further stated she is persuaded the architects have made a very careful analysis of the site and have been sympathetic. The materials that have been chosen are clearly contextual with the site. The architecture is so simple that it blends with the desert. This seems to sink into the desert gracefully and offers dignity. She concluded she supports the project as it is submitted.

**MR. HEITEL** stated he agrees that a lot of work has been done in locating the site and working the building into the landform and he would congratulate them on doing that. He further stated he would like them to consider the spirit of the Desert Foothills area noting he felt it would be compromised by placing a 40-foot tower with a glass element. He further stated this is a particularly fragile area and that is why he is in favor of the applicant's proposal and compromise to bring the height of the tower down to 24 feet. This compromise shows consideration for respecting the spirit of the neighborhood. He noted he would like to work toward getting legal staff to come up with a way to deal with entry feature and the signage. He further noted he felt they could deal with that down the road so the applicant can get moving on this project but the neighbors would have a comfort level that they are not going to see a 40 foot tower in the sky.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated he was perplexed when he first saw the trade off for the lower tower for additional signage on Pima. After further study he felt it would result in an unfortunate consequence to the architecture, taking an element that is nicely proportioned to the building and the site particularly given the distance from the property line. Also given it is mostly shielded by desert vegetation. He remarked he thought it would be a compromise to the project to reduce the tower. He further remarked this sets a dangerous precedence to consider putting larger signs in the scenic corridor. He concluded he supports this project as submitted.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** stated one of his major concerns has been addressed when the applicant stated it would not be a lighted tower. He further stated he does not have an objection to the cool-tower element.

Vice Chairman Cortez requested additional clarification regarding the conflict between the ordinances. Ms. Bronski provided clarity on this issue. She stated the code provisions allow for height up to 24 feet it is the underlying zoning in R1-190 that has a height requirement of 30 feet but it would allow going up to 45 feet. So 24 feet is the baseline but if the Board believes that there are reasons that would allow them to go to a higher point the maximum of 45 feet would be allowable.

**MR. HEITEL** expressed his concern about this Board moving forward under a nonspecific resolution to the authority of what they can do with regard to heights. Ms. Bronski reviewed the Board's authority in this case. Mr. Heitel reiterated his concern that they are moving into ground that they don't have the authority. Ms. Bronski stated that although they have different views than Mr. Heitel staff believes the Board has the authority to act and make a recommendation.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated she appreciated the neighborhood input. She stated she would like staff to address Mr. Nelssen's concerns about the trail easement, LRV, and the galvanized steps.

Councilman Lukas stated the whole question seems to stem around if this is compatible with the neighborhood. She further stated she is familiar with this neighborhood and felt that it is compatible because of how the buildings are sited and the shielding of the site. The colors and materials are compatible with the desert. Taking all of those points into consideration she felt it is compatible.

**MR. CURTIS** stated with regard to the trail easement there is a trail easement stipulation for the Rawhide Wash.

**MS. REIDELL** stated the galvanized steps are out. She further stated the LRV are well below 35.



**MR. DEBARTOLO III** provided information on where the trails are located on the site.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** requested additional information on how the water would be integrated into the cool-tower. Mr. Debartolo III provided information on the technology used for the cool-tower. Vice Chairman Cortez stated it is important to keep in the mind the maintenance that would be needed for the cool-tower.

**MS. GALE** inquired if the galvanized steel would be used elsewhere on the project. Mr. Debartolo III replied it would be used on the underside of the tower to prevent water from dripping on peoples clothing.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 36-DR-2003 AS PRESENTED WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

**MR. HEITEL** stated he is not able to support this request. He further stated he couldn't emphasize enough his disappointment that regarding after the 20 years of effort that has gone into the Desert Foothills Overlay and the ESLO that it is set aside with regard to height issue. He remarked that is immensely disappointed and he is very, very upset.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** requested that Ms. Bronski go over one more time so that they are clear they do have the authority to do this despite the Foothills Overlay and the recently passed ESLO II. Ms. Bronski stated because the language in the ESLO II provides that the maximum height in district would be 24 feet or if the DRB decides it is warranted to go to the maximum height in the underlying zoning which in this case is R1-190.

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

39-DR-2003

Northsight Parcel  
Site Plan & Elevations  
8680 E. Raintree Drive  
KDRA Architects, Architect/Designer

**MR. VERSCHUREN** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. He stated the applicant is requesting a staging plan for this project so staff would like to add to the following stipulation: The applicant must follow the staging plan. He reviewed the staging plan. Staff recommends approval subject to the attached stipulations.

**KIMBERLY GRIMM**, Continental Properties, 10850 W. Park Place, Milwaukee, WI, provided an overview of this retail project. The building elevations have a

consistent theme, which features a trellis system along the front of the building. She discussed the materials and colors that would be used. She requested reconsideration on the Retail B building, allowing the vestibule to remain on that building. Staff is recommending the vestibule be removed and that be an open canopy so people can walk through. They don't want to lose the energy efficiency if it is opened up.

**MR. SCHMITT** inquired if there was a reasonable compromise that would allow the vestibule to come in to allow for a generous walkway and safe passageway. Ms. Grimm replied she felt a compromise could be made. She stated they could take a look at decreasing the width of the vestibule area in order to have more sidewalk outside of the vestibule area and would be willing to work with staff.

**MS. GALE** stated she would like to see the applicant eliminate the pre-finish zinc coat P4 to change the color of the metal awning P1 and to reconsider the use of ledge stone. Ms. Grimm stated that would not be a problem.

**MR. JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 39-DR-2003 WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDED STIPULATIONS:**

- 1) **REEVALUATION OF THE USE OF COLORS AND MATERIALS ON THE FAÇADE. CONSIDER CHANGING THE (P-1) AWNING COLOR, USE A DULLER COLOR FOR THE ZINC METAL COPING (P-4), AND REPLACE THE STONE WITH SPLIT FACE BLOCK.**
- 2) **REDUCE THE WIDTH OF THE VESTIBULE AND INCREASE THE WIDTH OF THE SIDEWALK A FEW MORE FEET ALONG RETAIL BUILDING 'B'.**
- 3) **ACCEPT THE STIPULATION FOR THE PHASING OF THE PROJECT.**

**SECOND BY MR. SCHMITT.**

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

9-ZN-2003

McDowell Village  
DRB Review of the Proposed Amended  
Development Standards  
NWC of Granite Reef and McDowell Roads  
8302 E. McDowell Rd  
City of Scottsdale, Applicant

**MR. CURTIS** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. This is a request to review the proposed amended development standards for the McDowell Village development. Because the site is in a designated redevelopment area, all proposed amendments to the development standards are required to first be heard by the Development Review Board. Comments

made by the Development Review Board will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council.

**MR. JONES** stated he felt this is a very important project to design an entire complex and make creative use of the zoning to bring these things together in a senior environment. He further stated the way he is interpreting these drawings is to imply all of the apartments are flats and each unit is on an entire floor. Mr. Curtis stated it would be a three-story building with each individual unit on a single floor.

**MR. HEITEL** stated he thought it is a great effort in concentrating a lot of uses and he supports the mixed-use plans. He further stated the development standards need to be changed to accommodate the mixed use element so he is supportive. He inquired if the homeowners of the single-family homes to the north are comfortable with the landscape screening plan that is being shown. Mr. Curtis reported they have had numerous neighborhood meetings and they have received positive comment regarding the setback and the landscaping. He further reported staff would continue to work with the neighbors in this process.

Mr. Heitel inquired if the constraints of the site don't allow for some landscape tract along the perimeter. Mr. Curtis replied in the affirmative. He noted the one thing they are trying to achieve is enough parking for everybody so they do not have to park in the neighborhoods.

**MR. SCHMITT** inquired about the decrease of width in the landscaping on McDowell Road frontage. Mr. Curtis stated the intent was to maximize the active open space. Mr. Schmitt stated his reaction is that they are taking 5 feet of space from what might be enjoyed and have value to a lot of people driving up McDowell Road and the landscaping buffer would make this project look a little nicer. He further stated the building and parking could move 5 feet to the north along McDowell because the courtyard is very generous and there would not be any loss of function. Ms. Edgar reviewed the constraints of the site. She stated what they are trying to accomplish in the common area they want a lot of different passive and active areas in that space.

Mr. Schmitt stated he is supportive of this plan. He further stated he hopes they are not short sighted on how this impacts what happens outside of this development with regard to how it is viewed by the public. He commented this is an important project and should generate other positive things up and down McDowell Road so if they short-change the public aspect it might impact what happens around it.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated Mr. Schmitt brings up a good point that this will set precedence for the entire corridor so they want to do something wonderful, and give serious thought to these issues.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**NORWOOD SISSON**, 7431 E. Portland, stated if they want to talk about setbacks they should look at the McDowell streetscape plan. He further stated the Los Arco Redevelopment Plan is planned for commercial and is not planned for residential or public buildings. He remarked A.R.S. 361471 No. 17 definition states that this area should be commercial and if they are considering anything other than commercial; they should be considering an amendment to the redevelopment plan.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** requested legal counsel comment regarding whether they need to amend the redevelopment plan. Ms. Bronski stated this issue has been raised and is a matter of some litigation so she would recommend they proceed as is.

**GLADYS OLSON**, 7312 E. Palm Lane, stated she thought by now the ground would have already been broken on this site. She stated she goes to the Senior Center on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street everyday and is amazed by all of the new faces that appear weekly so she knows this will be a popular project. She reported they need to have adequate parking for this facility. She further reported she felt this is a wonderful concept. She concluded she hopes they can get the project going as fast as possible.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** commented he felt this is a reasonable request and the amendment of the standards they have on this site. He further commented the only hesitation he has is regarding the landscaping. It appears they are reducing the amount of landscaping they have with regard to the requirement on mature trees significantly. He inquired if they could consider an increase in the percentage of mature trees from 25 percent to something higher. Mr. Curtis stated they are still looking at the types of trees, the quantity, and the maturity so they appreciate that comment.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated his previous comment regarding the landscaping on the public side is one thing that he would like passed on in the form of the meeting minutes. He further stated parking is also an issue. He commented on the west, north side of the property the single loaded drive aisle is inefficient, and if there is a way to squeeze in from the west or north a little bit would be a way to pick up additional parking along the perimeter.

**MR. HEITEL** stated generally he is supportive of the proposed standards and there is a lot going on in a tight sight. It is a beneficial project and there are a lot of good uses on the site. He remarked he felt the comments about the parking should be kept in the forefront of the discussion. He further remarked he felt the

open space in the interior of the site was very important for all of the proposed activities.

**MR. JONES** stated he felt this was a good example of how a project should be worked out with all of the uses and activities on one site. He further stated he would agree with Mr. Schmitt about the efficiency of the parking and the concern about setting a precedent.

**MS. GALE** stated she would second the comments of the Board that have already been made.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated she is very excited to see this project move forward. She further stated she does agree with Ms. Olson that they need to get it done as quickly as possible. She commented she felt the parking is important and they are trying to put so much on this site but as they are moving forward it is creating a lot of synergy. She further commented they need to make sure that the landscaping plan and setbacks would be compatible with the McDowell Road Streetscape. She concluded she is favor of the amended standards that allow the flexibility that is needed.

44-DR-2003

Lund Cadillac  
Site Plan & Elevations  
SEC Loop 101 & Scottsdale Road  
Perspective Architecture LLC,  
Architect/Designer

**MR. JONES** presented this case as per the project coordination packet. He passed out revised stipulations that deal with the display pads. He discussed the other changes to the stipulations. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached and revised stipulations.

**KAREN TAYLOR**, 11201 N. Tatum, Phoenix, AZ, representing John Lund and Lund Automobile Dealership. She introduced the members of the design team. She stated the request before the Board is for the site plan, landscape plan, and elevations. She discussed the site location noting this is the first parcel of the Stacked 40s project noting this is a prime location for automobile sales. She noted one constraint they have is the vertical difference between the roadway and the building site of approximately 20 feet so they have had to consider that. She provided information on the surrounding land uses noting they are zoned for relatively intense and dense uses.

**TREVOR BARGER**, Swaback Partners, provided a detailed overview of the site plan. He reviewed the design concepts. He discussed the buildings and lighting on the site. He commented on the Scottsdale Resort Spa character of the development. He further commented they are viewing the automobiles and building as art. He discussed the building materials and landscaping for the site.

He stated located at the rear of the site is the Hummer test track. He provided a brief outline of the proposed signage that would be located on the site.

**JOHN LUND** provided background information on the project. He discussed the concept for this site plan. He presented information on the design evolution of the Cadillac. He remarked they felt architecture is a powerful form of art. He also provided information on the interior space of the showroom. He reported they put an enormous amount of care and time into the design of the building.

**MR. HEITEL** stated when the Stacked 40s Project came before the Planning Commission there was an expectation that it would set a new standard for the area and their first phase is starting on that vein. He further stated he felt this is something very remarkable.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** stated she received an email from the President of the Gray Hawk Homeowners Association expressing their opposition to the off road test track. Ms. Taylor stated the test track is located approximately a half mile from Gray Hawk and is separated by the elevated freeway and several hundred acres of intense zoning. She further stated it is anticipated that there would only be 8 to 10 Hummers on the track per day and the noise would be minimal.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**NORWOOD SISSON**, 7431 E. Portland, asked what kind of zoning do you need for a 500 horsepower engine and 1000 horsepower engine. He stated with regard to the test track, he has not heard anything about dust suppression or EPA regulations. He stated this area will get a lot of water and flooding that will come out on Scottsdale Road from the north. He inquired about their storm water drainage plans. He remarked he felt this request should be continued until they have an acceptable plan for storm water retention and dust suppression.

(COUNCILMAN LUKAS CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

**MS. TAYLOR** reported the surface of the test tract is decomposed stabilized granite and they don't anticipate the vehicles would be going over 5 mph so they don't anticipate a dust problem. She further reported there have been a significant amount of drainage improvements made on the site.

**COUNCILMAN LUKAS** inquired if staff were satisfied with the drainage plan. Mr. Jones replied in the affirmative.

Councilman Lukas stated this plan does seem to be following all of the high expectations for this site. She further stated she is pleased with how it looks.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** requested information about the perimeter site wall to the east of the buildings.

**TOM PANSING**, Perspective Architecture, 4425 E. Vermont Avenue, Phoenix, AZ, stated the height of the wall would be six to eight feet high and will be a masonry construction. He further stated they would need to work with ADOT to see if they would allow them to do something different with the chain link fence. Vice Chairman Cortez reported that typically they do not allow chain link fences. Mr. Pansing stated the fence is owned by ADOT and they would work with ADOT noting their preference would be wrought iron.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** inquired if there have been heat gain studies done with all of the glass on the building. Mr. Pansing replied in the affirmative. He reported they will deal with that issue.

**MR. SCHMITT** stated the sculptural nature of the project is very interesting and potentially a very exciting project. He further stated originally he had concerns that it was going to be a stark white project but has since heard it would be a earth tone or stone color and he wanted to confirm that is correct. He requested that as staff reviews final plans that they pay attention that there is a graceful transition between the landscaping and the scenic corridor on Scottsdale Road to be sure the resort landscaping does not become a dominant feature on the scenic corridor. He also requested the staff pay attention as the project develops that this building maybe has a bit of an anchor into the site. It seems to be a monolith that comes out of the site, and he understands there is a base that is elevated. How the edge of base is treated might make a good transition.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 44-DR-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED AND REVISED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. HEITEL.**

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

3-MS-2003

Lund Cadillac  
Request approval of Master Sign Plan  
SEC Loop 101 & Scottsdale Road  
Perspective Architecture LLC,  
Architect/Designer

**MR. JONES** stated that staff does not have a presentation prepared on this case but would be happy to answer any questions.

**COUNCILMEN LUKAS** stated the new stipulations state there would be a maximum of six displays. Mr. Jones replied that relates to the DR case and there are no changes to the Master Sign plan.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** asked about staff's position with regard to the Hummer sign on the roof. Mr. Jones stated staff has addressed that sign with

the applicant on several occasions and now they are comfortable with that sign. He further stated typically signs on roofs or portions of roofs are not desired in the City of Scottsdale but staff is comfortable with this signage. Vice Chairman Cortez inquired if there were any recommended compromises. Mr. Jones stated staff made some recommendations but none of them were specific.

Vice Chairman Cortez inquired if staff was aware of any other cases where they denied the application with regard to signage of this type. Mr. Jones replied he was not aware of any. He stated what they have going for this case is the fact they came through a master plan to the zoning district and they planned a community district to allow for flexibility to the design standard. Through the development agreement in the zoning case there was a understanding the sign package would not be the typical sign package. He added staff is comfortable with the sign package as presented.

**VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ** inquired if the signage would remain lit during the evening hours. Mr. Pansing stated the applicant would like the signage to remain illuminated.

**MR. HEITEL MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 3-MS-2003 WITH THE ATTACHED STIPULATIONS. SECOND BY MR. JONES.**

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

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters