MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, May 16, 2012 held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Rivers called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Baron.

3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

   Chairman Leigh Rivers
   Vice Chairman Stephen Veitch
   Commissioner Matthew Pridemore
   Commissioner Andrew Baron
   Commissioner Katy Cunningham
   Commissioner Bill Donaldson
   Commissioner Phil Ryan

   Also present:

   Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Manager
   Mr. David de la Torre, Principal Planner
   Ms. Jodie Novak, Senior City Planner
   Mr. Bill Dermody, Senior City Planner
   Mr. Erik Swanson, City Planner
   Mr. Glenn Brockman, Assistant City Attorney
   Ms. Joyce Radatz, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   MOVED BY COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE, seconded by **COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2012 Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 6-0 with 1 abstention. (Vice Chairman Veitch was not present at the meeting).

5. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS
   CHAIRMAN RIVERS informed the audience that prior to the meeting Commission and Staff met in a Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda and the consent agenda will be approved by a single vote. After Staff reads the consent agenda into the record, the audience will have the opportunity to pull any of the items for discussion. There were no items pulled for discussion.

A. DVR12-0011 EPICENTER CHURCH – WESTECH

Approved.

Request rezoning from PAD to PAD amending the permitted land uses within Westech Corporate Center to allow a place of worship/church use in Building 9. The property is located at the southeast corner of Arizona Avenue and Palomino Drive, north of Warner Road.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit A, Development Booklet, entitled "Epicenter Church - Westech" kept on file in the City of Chandler Current Planning Division, in file number DVR12-0011 except as modified by condition herein.
2. Compliance with original conditions adopted by the City Council as Ordinance No. 3812 in case DVR06-0005, except as modified by condition herein.
3. A church or place of worship use shall occur only within Building 9 of Westech Corporate Center Lot 34. Building 10 is no longer permitted to have a church use. Parking related to this church shall occur in accordance with the representations in the Development Booklet.
4. There shall be no drop-off/pick-up type childcare use Monday through Friday. "Support childcare" for church members, as indicated in the Development Booklet and on the floor plan, in conjunction with scheduled church activities, meetings, and services is permitted any day.

B. DVR12-0012 E OF THE NEC QUEEN CREEK & GILBERT ROADS

Approved.

Request the establishment of initial City zoning of Agricultural (AG-1) on an approximate 2.3-acre site located east of the northeast corner of Queen Creek and Gilbert roads.

Upon finding consistency with the General Plan, Staff recommends approval of the establishment of initial city zoning of AG-1 on an approximate 2.3-acre site located east of the northeast corner of Queen Creek and Gilbert roads.

C. LUP12-0007 YUMMY BUFFET LLC

Approved.

Request Liquor Use Permit approval to allow liquor sales as permitted under a Series 12 Restaurant License for a new restaurant. The property is located at 2100 South Gilbert Road, Suite 1.

1. Expansion, modification, or relocation beyond the approved exhibits (Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new liquor Use Permit re-application and approval.
2. The liquor Use Permit is granted for a Series 12 (Restaurant License) only, and any change of licenses shall require re-application and new liquor Use Permit approval.
3. The liquor Use Permit is non-transferable to other restaurant locations.
4. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

D. ZUP12-0005 BALDWIN BROTHERS AUTOMOTIVE, LLC

Approved.

Request Use Permit approval to allow automotive repair within Planned Industrial District (I-1) with a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay, I-1/PAD zoning. The property is located at 305 East Comstock Drive, Suite 7, east of Arizona Avenue and south of Elliot Road.

1. The Use Permit shall be effective for one (1) year from the date of Council approval. Use Permit extensions, for similar or greater time periods, shall be subject to re-application to and approval by the City of Chandler.
2. Compliance with original conditions adopted by the City Council as Ordinance No. 3984 in DVR07-0043, except as modified by condition herein.
3. Expansion or modification beyond the approved exhibits (site plans, floor plan, narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new Use Permit application and approval by the City of Chandler.
4. The Use Permit is non-transferable to any other property.
5. The property shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

E. ZUP12-0007 DESERT SPRING ADULT CARE

Approved.

Request Use Permit approval to continue to operate an adult care home within a single-family residence for up to five (5) adults. The subject property is located at 1641 E. Yellowstone Place, south and west of Cooper and Ocotillo roads.

1. The Use Permit shall be granted for a period of five (5) years, at which time re-application shall be required. The five-year time period shall begin from the date of City Council approval.
2. Compliance with city provisions regarding the operation of adult care homes.
3. The maximum number of residents receiving care shall be five (5).

MOVED BY VICE CHAIRMAN VEITCH, seconded by **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** to approve the Consent Agenda as read into the record by Staff. The Consent Agenda passed unanimously 7-0.

6. BRIEFING: ZCA12-0001 PARKING AND LOADING REGULATIONS
Briefing to discuss proposed amendments to Article XVIII Parking and Loading Regulations of the City of Chandler Zoning Code.

MR. DAVID DE LA TORRE, PRINCIPAL PLANNER, stated that Staff briefed Commission on March 7 regarding several initial concepts for amending the Parking and Loading Regulation Section of the Zoning Code. At that time, Staff received feedback from the Commission and prior to that on February 29th they had briefed the Council Subcommittee and received feedback from them. Staff took the feedback from Council Subcommittee and Planning Commission and used it to refine their concepts and to the text amendments that are before them tonight. He said

tonight Staff is not requesting any action from the Commission; no voting action is requested. They simply want their feedback regarding the proposed text amendments that they have before them. Staff plans on coming back on June 20 with a final draft for their approval at that time and then they would go to the City Council on July 26 for their approval at that time.

In preparation for tonight's meeting, Staff mailed postcards and sent e-mails to more than 150 Stakeholder's. These were land use attorneys, developers, architects, contractors who have been associated with a new development with Chandler within the last couple of years. The notices included links to a City website where they could download the text and then print it out. They also sent notices to a number of professional organizations including the Downtown Chandler Community Partnership, Chandler Chamber of Commerce, Valley Partnership, Arizona Multi-Housing Association, The Homebuilders of Central Arizona and the Arizona Chapter of the Commercial Real Estate Development Association. These notices were mailed two weeks in advance prior to tonight's meeting.

To date, Staff has received three responses from Stakeholders. Two of them provided constructive feedback and Staff has made revisions using that feedback to the text amendments. One of them was general comments in favor of the direction that Staff has headed. He said that before he goes into the draft he would like to very quickly review the reason why they are proposing these amendments. As they may recall in 2010, the City hired a Consultant to interview developers and assess the development process in Chandler and one of the comments that came out from the report which is a textile report was that Chandler's requirements for the number of parking spaces were too high and hurts Chandler from a competitive standpoint and parking ratios need to be reduced. Other potential negative effects of high parking ratios include reduced development feasibility, particularly for small in-fill projects and retrofits, discouragement of mixed-use developments and reduced densities in areas where they want to see more densities such as in downtown, reduced streetscape quality and negative environmental effects such as contribution to the heat island effects and storm water runoff.

More recently, the Mayor convened a Committee of more than 20 business professionals. They represented a spectrum of business industries including the development industry. Their task was to look at aging commercial centers and come up with recommendations for revitalizing these areas. These exerts here that he has on the screen are exerts from the final report which was issued about one month ago. They read: Current City parking ratios are a challenge to redevelopment. Development should not have to park for future use. Parking should be based on the needs of the center today. The City needs to incorporate more of the shared parking model and the process to change parking requirements is a hindrance to both new development and redevelopment and Staff should have additional flexibility to determine parking requirements without Council approval. Using the comments from these reports and from these two Committees Staff extracted these two primary goals which are in support of their purpose of amending the parking code. The first goal is to reduce parking ratios that are too high and the second goal is to enable flexibility at the Staff level – again, to be more responsive to developments that have varying parking needs.

At this point he said what he would like to do is stop the presentation and go through the draft page by page and he can point out some highlights and get their comments and questions for each page and they can go through it that way.

They should have a draft in front of them dated May 10, 2012 on the top right corner of the page. These revisions contain the latest revisions except for one revision which he has distributed to Commission and that is for page 7, so when they get there he'll talk about those revisions but otherwise these are the latest revisions.

On the first page Staff elaborated quite a bit on the purpose and he pointed out number 1 and 2. Number 1 reads 'ensure that adequate parking is provided to meet the typical parking needs of the uses'. What he would like to emphasize is the word typical. What they are really shooting for is the average parking ratios not for the anomalies. They don't want to try to plan for the anomaly that required too much parking or that doesn't require a whole lot of parking. If they shoot for the higher parking ratios, then they run the risk of those negative effects that he talked about earlier. If they shoot for the low parking ratios, then they run the risk of creating a whole new set of issues such as illegal parking on neighboring properties, over parking on public streets and potentially creating traffic safety issues. What they are really shooting for is the average parking ratio and how do they know what the average is? They use a number of sources. They had a consultant from Carl Walker to help them compare their parking ratios with a number of different sources which includes the National Planning Association, Urban Lands Institute, The Institute for Transportation Engineer. Those are national organizations, professional organizations that study parking needs across the nation and they come up with averages and recommendations for a city to adopt. They have those at their disposal and they also look at other cities in the area and compare our ratios with theirs. Lastly, they also look at Parking Studies that have been done for specific uses that are in the area as well. They have extracted from all of these different sources and have taken a look at every single parking ratio in the City of Chandler to determine if they are high or not high. So number 1 again is shooting for the average parking ratio. Number 2 says it acknowledges those anomalies. They also want to be flexible to be able to respond to the atypical parking through allowances for reductions or increases to the number of required parking spaces. On one hand they want to shoot for the average but on the other hand they also want to be flexible and provide Staff with additional tools to be able to respond to those anomalies. Number 3, the purpose is to encourage higher densities, mixed use developments, in-fill developments and adaptive reuse of existing buildings and areas as set forth by the General Plan by allowing parking reductions for uses sharing parking. This purpose really identifies or speaks to the comments they received from the Mayor's Four Corner Retail Committee.

Mr. De la Torre went to the 2nd page of the Draft Parking Code Amendment. He said the top half of the page has a lot of red but it is really just housekeeping. They are adding a lot of language to make sure that it is consistent with the language that they have further down in the Draft. If you park your vehicle on a different property, they need to make sure that there is an agreement recorded with the County Assessor's office and filed with the City prior to issuing a building permit. On the bottom of the page it addresses parallel parking. It identifies the dimensions as 8

x 22 feet. This is what they were using on Arizona Avenue and this is what many cities in the valley are using for their dimensions. It also requires a 3-foot wide unobstructed path on each side of the parallel parking space. If there is anything higher than 6-inches within that 3-foot wide space next to the parking space, then an additional 2 feet will be required on the width of that parking dimension.

Moving on to page 3 he said they address alternative permeable paving materials. The will clarify that Council can adopt other time periods as they have done in the past through Use Permits. On number 11 the explicitly state that parallel parking spaces may be counted towards required parking and multi-family and any non-residential districts. Then number 16 previously the tandem parking was not allowed to qualify for required parking spaces and now they are changing that so that it is allowed and may be counted towards required parking in multi-family developments where tandem spaces are assigned to the same dwelling units and non-residential developments where valet or a parking attendant is on-duty at all times.

COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE asked if a tandem space is for only 2 cars or can it be more than 2 cars if it can fit in a tandem space. Mr. De la Torre said that was a good question but they don't specify that in their language. It is assumed that it is only a 1 deep space but it is not stated that way. **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** said that is what he was leading to. If they are measuring it by standard space, 9 x 19, so if they can start doing multiples of 19 can they count each one of those?

KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER, said in a situation where say multi-family where it is a 2 bedroom unit and the 2 bedrooms have their tandem spaces, he could see a situation which you wouldn't want to get 3, 4 cars deep and have to move 3 or 4 cars to get to the last one. **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** said what if he is trying to squeeze it in. He needs a couple extra spaces. Mr. Mayo said he could see it in a convention venue or something where they do have valet parking like at the Met with that project out at the mall. It was valet parking for the entire restaurant that was there. Having valet attendants, he can see the ability to go 3 or 4 cars deep in the event that they end up being kind of a pull through, pull out and they just stack them in deep. He thinks moving forward he would like the flexibility to be able to consider that for entertainment venues and things like that. Everybody comes at once and leaves at once and so they had not really thought about that question-it is a really good question. **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** said say he is sitting there trying to meet his parking calc. and he is squeezing things in and if a space is defined as 9 x 19 and he realized you are only going to get 2 deep but if he has the room and the layout works and he can get 19 x 3 times, could he count it? He is putting that on the table because it wasn't clear to him what he was looking at. Mr. Mayo said as their code is currently proposed, there is nothing that says you can't count it and so it allows them to look at it on a cases-by-case basis. **COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE** said it came down to the definition of a tandem space. Is it defined to the point that it is only saying 2 cars or is it saying 2 or more cars in a line? Mr. Mayo said that is a good comment and they will take that back and figure out whether or not they should define it or maybe clarify in here that the flexibility exists for extenuating circumstances like event facilities or something like that.

CHAIRMAN RIVERS said if you are going to make the parking space usable for 3 or 4 or 5 cars, can you still call it a tandem space since tandem normally means two or would it then be a multi parking space? Mr. De la Torre said it could be considered tandem. If they are directly in front of each other those are considered tandem spaces. Tandem does not restrict it solely to one space in front of another. **CHAIRMAN RIVERS** said so Tandem doesn't mean 2 in this case? Mr. De la Torre replied correct.

Moving on to Page 4 they begin with the parking schedule and the first land use category that they are proposing to revise the parking ratio for is multi-family. He had mentioned in a previous briefing that this land use, multi-family, is one that they have heard from different applicants in the past that they felt our parking ratio is too high. This is one they took a really good hard look at. What they are doing is separating efficiency from 1 bedroom. Currently efficiency and 1 bedroom are grouped together and the code requires 1.5 spaces per unit. They are separating them and they are requiring less for efficiency rooms and they are keeping the 1 bedroom at 1.5 spaces per unit and then they are also separating the 2 bedroom and additional bedrooms. Currently those are grouped at 2 spaces per unit but keeping the 2 bedroom rooms at 2 spaces per unit and for each additional bedroom that would be an extra quarter of a space. In addition they are also eliminating the provision for 1 guest space for each 4 multi-family units. The real goal here is to make sure that there is enough parking for both guests and residents. They want to get out of the business of prescribing how many guest parking spaces each multi-family development has to have. As long as they have enough parking spaces for both guests and residents, that meets the City's goal and it would be up to each developer to decide how many of those spaces they would want to reserve for the residents and how many they would want to keep open to be shared among the residents and guests.

They are proposing 2 new categories for Library and Museum and those parking ratios come from the National Parking Association but they are also consistent with what they have been doing here in Chandler. The Sunset Library is a good example where that is located within a commercial shopping area and they applied the same retail parking ratio for them which is 1 space per 250.

COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE said he had a comment on the formatting. He wanted to know if they could get the word 'Plus' indented in the schedule and/or the line between the category and the word 'Plus' removed and then the word 'Plus' removed. Right now they are all reading at the same level and at a quick glance he thinks they could potentially miss that they're just taking the very first one. It's not just the one space per classroom on the Elementary and Jr. High you have something else you need to do-he understands that most people are going to catch that. People that work on site layouts understand what they are doing. At a quick glance it doesn't read right in his mind. Mr. De la Torre said he agrees 100% and they will make that change.

Moving on to Page 5, the top portion of the page addresses recreational centers. If they look at the 3rd row down from the top that starts with the words 'Dance Halls' and the last use on that list is 'Recreational Centers'. There are so many different types of recreational centers that it starts to

become difficult for them to plan the same parking ratio, 1 per 200, for all of them. So what they did was sub-categorize or re-categorize them into the categories they see here. Gymnasiums, fitness centers; those are recreational centers with multiple amenities such as swimming pools, ball courts and weight lifting. These are the private institutions like the LA Fitness and so on. The next category down, recreational community center, these are also recreational centers with multiple amenities but these are the public and non-profit organizations like the YMCA or the Boys and Girls Club. So those are kept at 1 per 200 square feet and then the recreational assembly uses are not multiple uses. These are single recreational uses such as the amusement centers, skating rinks, bounce gyms, party places and so on. The difference here is that they had a Parking Study done. It was a very thorough Parking Study that looked at a number of single recreational uses that included cheerleading training, bounce gyms. Kevin Mayo, Planning Manager said it also included gymnastics, dance, bounce and an indoor soccer facility. Mr. De la Torre said it was a pretty broad list of single recreational uses. It was a very well done Parking Study that came out to 1 per 300 so that is what they are basing it on. If you see at the very end of that category it also says 'not hosting tournaments, exhibitions or other similar events'. The intent here is not to try to capture and provide for those tournaments which may draw more of a greater parking need. The intent here is to provide for the daily training facilities. If they do want to have tournament space or exhibitions, they are not saying they can't do that but what they are saying is they need to get them a parking study so that they can determine what the appropriate number of parking spaces would be for that. The tournaments and exhibitions may vary by type of use. Fencing tournaments may require a different number of parking spaces than the gymnastic exhibition or whatever it may be. They want to really look at those individually and determine the parking need for each of those individually, if they were to have those tournaments.

COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE said he knows they brought this up the last time but he wanted to use the fencing studio as an example again. He said so he is a new company coming into Chandler to open a fencing studio. As of right now, he does not host tournaments and he doesn't have any intention of hosting tournaments and he comes into the City based on now 1 to 300. Two years down the road, he has the opportunity he never saw coming to host a tournament. Now is it just handled as a Special Use Permit to come in for that event? How is that dealt with? This is where he was confused last time. He doesn't know coming in what he is going to need. Right now he is this so he falls into a particular category. How do you handle that? Mr. David de la Torre replied the way he sees it is they would have 2 options. The first option would be to submit a Parking Study to the City to see if the existing location can handle a tournament for their use. The second option would be to find another location to have their tournament. They could continue to train and practice there but they could find another venue for the actual tournament itself.

KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER stated that currently today what they are looking to make sure they do with this parking code is to give Staff additional tools necessary to enforce the underlying intent of the parking code; to ensure that all uses provide on-site parking. Today if they came in by right because they truly don't have a number, they would say they fall into the dance halls, recreation centers and things like that at 1 to 200. That would probably be over

parked for the day to day use of a fencing school. In terms of a tournament - probably not going to cover it. The 1 in 200 would probably be eclipsed by what truly is getting out to that center. Let's just say that happened and they started parking all over on either neighboring properties, dirt, out on the street, blocking public streets and things like that. Our code currently has the tools necessary to enforce that they provide parking or move. What their proposed code does is have a few more administrative tools that will allow Staff to work with that property owner to say, 'listen, you can maintain your day to day needs all day long'. It's those couple times a year that their tournaments either they are unknown or they are just really kind of outrageous. They are looking to get some additional tools that they can work with administratively to secure off-site parking agreements, adjacent parking agreements with an adjacent property owner or nearby property owner to deal with that so they don't build huge parking lots like Crossroads Town Center that gets used once or twice a year. Currently, their code does have teeth that are sometimes at a bureaucratic speed to deal with those types of anomalies. In this instance they are looking to kind of nail down what the average parking is and then like David said if they want tournaments, they need to talk and figure out where realistically it is going to be and that is something that becomes a 'do it' and let's make sure it works. That is kind of what they are looking to get. It's going to be a lot more Staff intensive than what was previous but he thinks it is going to allow them to build what is appropriate and then find ways to make the infrequent things work. Let's say they are doing tournaments every weekend and that starts to become part of your business model, then you are sited to carry that parking but it does allow Staff some flexibility in terms of how they provide it.

COMMISSIONER PRIDEMORE said again going back to his example he comes in and he's a new fencing school. He doesn't believe he is going to be holding tournaments but he honestly doesn't know. What do they hold him to? Mr. Mayo, Planning Manager, said they would hold him to the 1 to 300. Then in the event he starts having tournaments, they would either find out that the applicant wants to approach them and says they are looking to do this so what does he do. We would work with them or they are going to get a call from neighboring property owners or citizens saying this stuff is all into their neighborhood now and our code today would be further strengthened with this code amendment, which has the tools necessary to get you back to making sure that their impact stays on their land and/or a designated other piece of land.

COMMISSIONER DONALDSON said he knows what a swimming center is and a martial arts center but what is an amusement center? Can they give him an example of something they have in the City that would be considered amusement? In general, it looks to him like that would be multiple opportunities in one location. What would be an amusement center?

MR. MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER, said it falls under the single use like an amusement arcade although it is a bunch of different kinds of arcade games, places like the skate place that went in at Pecos and McQueen, there are a few different types of recreational amusement things that are in there and that one probably gets into the grey area of are you a duck or are you a goose. The amusements are really those types of places. He wouldn't say that it is a Dave & Buster type thing because they start getting even more things wrapped into them like Food and other things like that, amusement arcades or a laser tag indoor facility or something like that.

COMMISSIONER DONALDSON said those are all specifically stated like laser tag, arcade and those are all individual types of amusements. Again, he was thinking of the combination effect of amusement. There was a park back in the Midwest called 'Amazement Park' and it had a lot of different things going on so he just thinks of an amusement center being multiple. It's just his thought. Mr. Mayo replied that it is really intended to be a center that is more of a focused amusement definition – almost putting a place holder for a definition that they don't know because if they went back 40 years and someone said laser tag they would have said laser what? There are things that they may not even know that someone might try to do from an amusement standpoint that would be more of a focused thing and they are just trying to put that all into one – having multiple ideas for one category.

MR. DE LA TORRE, PRINCIPAL PLANNER, said perhaps what they could do is make it clearer and where it says recreational assembly uses they could make the title of that category single recreational use. Add the word single to that title and then up where it says gymnasium and recreational community centers, add the words multiple uses to that title so that it is clear that these are multiple, these are single - so that it is really clear. The intent of that amusement center is for a single use and not for a multiple use so maybe that would clarify that.

CHAIRMAN RIVERS said going back to the fencing school. If the fencing school has their tournament that they weren't planning on a weekend and the parking jams up everything, they mentioned that there are tools in here to deal with that. How would you deal with complaints from the neighbors on Monday? If the neighbors complain on Monday and tell you that they couldn't pass on their neighborhood streets on Sunday because of the overflow parking from this facility, what teeth are in this to deal with that? Mr. Mayo replied the teeth are currently listed in their code elsewhere in that they can't do that and they would either go out there and sign the street - it would either be signed or it would get signed 'No Parking' and then you have a municipal code that the police can enforce. What the teeth that this starts to get to is the long term solution for how you provide parking for what is going to happen because of that use. More than likely in the terms of fencing schools because they don't generate any parking until there is a tournament. They will have more Staff flexibility in terms at looking at off-site parking agreements, shared parking models. Maybe there is an office center that is next to this thing that people aren't parking there but that fencing school could approach the office development and ask if they can broker out a deal that they can use their parking for tournaments and then they can end up creating signage that says where the parking is for the fencing tournament. Whatever that may be, currently our code doesn't allow us that tool administratively. It would have to come back through Council for approval of some type of share parking model. The new code will allow them that flexibility to be able to respond to it much quicker.

MR. DE LA TORRE said they are keeping medical and dental office at 1 per 150. They have discussed that at the previous briefing. For general offices they are proposing to reduce the parking ratio from 1 per 200 to 1 per 250 and they are excluding call centers because they are also adding a call center right below that at 1 per 150 again due to the nature of the more number of people in call centers and the greater need for parking. For hotels they are proposing to reduce the parking ratio from 1 and 1/3 spaces per room to 1 space per room and then they are

also adding 1 per 100 parking ratio for meeting space, banquet space, restaurants space that are not intended solely for the hotel guests and for staff; the idea being that if there is going to be weddings or receptions or parties that those need to be parked accordingly as well.

Moving on to Page 6 they are adding several new categories such as childcare or child daycare at 1 per 300. That parking ratio comes from another detailed parking study that was done for childcare uses in the area. For motor vehicle repair they are adding a requirement for 3 and ½ spaces per vehicle. The service bay is actually formalizing a practice that Staff has been implementing for many years it just hasn't been on the books until now. For motor vehicle sales and rental is consistent with their retail and office requirements and then for 'Plus' they will make sure to indent that. That would be an addition that wouldn't require 3-1/2 spaces per vehicle service bay being consistent with the motor vehicle repair requirement. Moving down to manufacturing and warehousing, currently the code groups them together. They are proposing to separate them into 2 different categories. Manufacturing would be reduced from 1 per 500 to 1 per 1000 square feet and then in addition to that the office would need to be parked separately. Warehousing they are proposing 1 per 500 square feet for the first 10,000 square feet and then after the 10,000 square feet any remaining area would be parked at 1 per 5,000 square feet. A larger warehouse would require less parking. In addition, any office space would be parked separately.

Moving on to Page 7 this is the new page that he distributed to the Commissioners at tonight's meeting due to a last minute revision. The revision was made after receiving a comment from a Stakeholder in downtown. The new revision proposes for Number 5 City Center District is they are referencing a separate section in the zoning code because currently there are 2 different sections that address parking in the City Center District. This one right here and then there is another section within the City Center District zoning section that addresses parking as well. To eliminate confusion they figured it would be a better idea to only talk about it in one area and to reference it here to the other area. The City Center District is really unique in that it has additional requirements that other zoning districts don't have within their section like signage and parking. It addresses all of that within its own section. It's better to reference this to the City Center District and any amendments can be done within the City Center District if needed.

No. 6 is really a place holder for parking districts and if the City ever wants to create a parking district in the future such as for downtown although it could be anywhere else, it doesn't limit it to downtown, the City would be able to create such a district and determine details at that time such as what determines if a use is participating in the district and where the boundaries of the district are. All of those details would be determined at the time when the parking district is created. The City has no intention of creating a parking district at this time or any time in the near future but they did want to add a place holder in there for the future.

Moving on to No. 8 maximum parking spaces, the City is proposing to establish a maximum parking percentage of 125% and they list a number of exceptions right below it. He said he wouldn't go through all of them but he did want to point out 8e which has changed since their last briefing. They have said if they want to provide parking at more than 125%, they can do that

if they have a Parking Demand Study that justifies their need for more parking and you cover your parking area with at least 50% of any one or combination of the following options. The options include paving materials that have a solar reflectance index as required by the latest edition of the International Green Construction Code. It could be shaded by architectural structures, open trellis or by trees or they could use open grid pavers or other permeable paving materials. All of these options actually are derived from the Leeds Standards as well as from the International Green Construction Code. Both of them require the same standards for it addressing the Urban Heat Island effect. That is where these standards come from.

GLENN BROCKMAN, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY, asked if the International Green Construction Code is something that the City has adopted. Mr. De la Torre replied no the Green Construction Code has not been adopted by the City.

Mr. De la Torre moved on to Parking Reductions, Section 1807 the first part of which is shared parking. He stated they are pretty excited about this new provision. It basically allows 2 or more Uses to reduce their parking by following the table that is provided in paragraph d. A Use may come to the City and say their business or use doesn't really match any of the uses in the table. They could provide a parking study to give them additional data so that they know what their peak parking times are and what their distribution is and so on. They would have to show us that their peak times do not conflict with the other peak times of the other uses that they area sharing parking with. There is an opportunity if they don't fit into this table nicely you can still submit a parking study to see how they could share parking. On the flip side to that if there is a use that says their use matches these time of use distribution in the table but for some reason the Zoning Administrator has a reason to believe otherwise that his use does not match that they are claiming to follow, the Zoning Administrator would have the authority based on what they are proposing to require additional data such as a parking study to prove and justify that they indeed have off peak times when compared to the other uses that they are sharing parking with.

Moving on to the Parking Demand Studies, Mr. De la Torre said they are also very excited about this. This gives Staff an additional tool to be flexible and to be more responsive to any development that would like to increase or reduce their parking and could submit a parking study to justify their request. It would have to be quantitative analysis. They couldn't just provide any data they would have to have it done by a professional consultant to use information from the Urban Land Institute or the Institute for Transportation Engineers to qualify and justify their request. It is not really a free for all. There are limitations that they are proposing. Staff would have authority to reduce up to 40% of the parking required. Anything over 40% would have to go to Council for approval.

KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER, said he had a quick note in terms of these Parking Demand Studies. When they start to read through it, it can be read as a free for all. While Staff is really excited about this kind of flexibility, it is one of those things that they are going to take extremely seriously for the reason being that if they get it wrong, they then have to go into enforcement mode and nobody ever wants to be there. All this language they see in here really helps set the stage and gives them teeth and gives them direction on how they are going to

implement these Parking Demand Studies to make sure that they are putting the time and energy necessary to make sure they get it right.

MR. DE LA TORRE stated the last section is just allowing credit for on street parking spaces as they discussed in the previous briefing. If the builder builds on street parking spaces as part of that development, they would be able to reduce or include that as part of their parking requirement. He said that concludes their proposed text amendments.

CHAIRMAN RIVERS said he had one question about the credit for on street parking spaces. Is it assumed that such spaces would be marked? Mr. De la Torre replied that Staff would keep track of which development would have that credit and that would be kept in a zoning file or a development file of some sort. **CHAIRMAN RIVERS** said they might not necessarily be marked but they would be documented. Mr. De la Torre replied they would be documented.

COMMISSIONER BARON asked if this would occur on arterials as well. Mr. De la Torre said it would be allowed only where on street parking is allowed. Arizona Avenue is considered an arterial and they have on street parking but not all arterials allow on street parking. It would have to pass by the technical street details. Some streets allow them some don't so they would have to follow that. **COMMISSIONER BARON** said so there is something that says it can't happen on Germann just because they have frontage there. Mr. de la Torre replied that they have Standard Details that dictate where you can have on street parking.

KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER, thanked the Commission for their efforts this evening. They are really excited about this Parking Code Amendment. It is something that as they are starting to come out of this economy, their office is getting very busy. They are getting inquiries and the development activity is just really picking up with a decent surge. The funny thing is that most of them are not typical things. Everybody is coming out and they are either a round peg trying to fit into a square hole or what have you. They are really excited about some of the tools that this gives them to more quickly respond to todays and tomorrows development needs. He thanked them for their efforts this evening and some of their questions and guidance and they will be bringing this back to them as David said at the upcoming June meeting.

7. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mayo said there was nothing to report.

8. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRMAN RIVERS wished Chandler a happy 100th birthday. The Centennial celebration is scheduled for this Thursday the 17th in the City Hall Plaza. They will be having different events from 4:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. On Friday in Dr. A. J. Chandler Park in downtown Chandler from 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and then Saturday at Tumbleweed Park there will be many activities starting from 4:00 p.m. and ending with fireworks at 9:00 p.m. For more information on the Chandler Centennial events including full descriptions of all activities and entertainment you can visit www.chandler100th.com.

CHAIRMAN RIVERS announced that the next regular meeting is June 6, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Chandler City Hall, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:23 p.m.

_____

Leigh Rivers, Chairman

_____

Jeffrey A. Kurtz, Secretary