

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, May 4, 2016 held in the City Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago Street.

1. Chairman Pridemore called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance led by Commissioner Donaldson.
3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

Chairman Matthew Pridemore  
Commissioner Katy Cunningham  
Commissioner Bill Donaldson  
Commissioner Ryan Foley  
Commissioner David Rose

Absent and Excused:

Vice Chairman Andrew Baron  
Commissioner Devan Wastchak

Also present:

Mr. Kevin Mayo, Planning Manager  
Mr. Erik Swanson, Senior City Planner  
Mr. Glenn Brockman, Asst. City Attorney  
Ms. Lucy Vazquez, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES  
**MOVED BY VICE COMMISSIONER DONALDSON**, seconded by **COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** to approve the minutes of the April 20, 2016, Planning Commission Hearing. The motion passed 5-0. (Vice Chairman Baron and Commissioner Wastchak, absent)
5. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS  
**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** informed the audience 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 are two action items that will also be read into the record and the applicant will have the opportunity to present and speaker cards will be announce, then audience will have the opportunity after to pull any of the items for discussion.

C. LUP16-0011 FRY'S MARKETPLACE

**Approved.**

Request Liquor Use Permit approval to sell and serve liquor as permitted under a Series 9 Liquor Store License and Series 7 Beer and Wine Bar License within a new grocery store located at 2929 E. Ocotillo Road, southwest corner of Ocotillo and Gilbert roads.

1. The Liquor Use Permit is granted for a Series 9 Liquor Store License and Series 7 Beer and Wine Bar License only, and any change of license shall require reapplication and new Liquor Use Permit approval.
2. The Liquor Use Permit is non-transferable to other store locations.
3. Expansion or modification beyond the approved exhibits (Site Plan, Floor Plan and Narrative) shall void the Liquor Use Permit and require new Liquor Use Permit application and approval.
4. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.

D. PDP15-0017 FIRST CREDIT UNION PLAZA

**Approved. (CONTINUED TO THE MAY 18, 2016, PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING)**

Request Preliminary Development Plan approval for building mounted signage. The subject site is located at 25 S. Arizona Place, east of the northeast corner of Arizona Avenue and Boston Street. **(REQUEST CONTINUANCE TO THE MAY 18, 2016, PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING)**

E. PDP16-0001/PPT16-0004 STELLAR AIRPARK ESTATES II

**Approved.**

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for subdivision layout and development standards for a custom single-family home residential subdivision with aviation-related uses and Preliminary Plat (PPT) approval on approximately 10 acres located at the southeast corner of Chandler Boulevard and Galaxy Drive, west of McClintock Drive.

**Preliminary Development Plan**

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit A, Development Booklet, entitled "STELLAR AIRPARK ESTATES II", kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. PDP16-0001, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

**Preliminary Plat**

1. Approval by the City Engineer and Planning Administrator with regard to the details of all submittals required by code or condition.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he had one speaker card for Item E. and asked Mr. Fred Borns to provide name and address for the record.

**FRED BORN, 6. S STELLAR PARKWAY** stated he lives 400ft. away from the development and is completely in support of it. He was glad to see Mr. Prad reconfiguring it. He wanted to make a note on the original approval that the street was redirected and the city's traffic data indicated that it had a beneficial effect on the Stellar Parkway traffic from reducing it from 850 to about 440 cars per day; but unfortunately, for those 440 cars around 65% of them exceed the speed limit and 20% exceed the 10mph over the speed limit. He wants to the city to know that the wonderful development is located is in an area where the traffic is speeding around the corner and it might be some value for the city to look at the speeders on Stellar Parkway.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked the audience and commission if they had a question for the speaker. There were none. He also asked the speaker if he wished to speak on the other item he submitted a speaker card for.

**MR. BORNS** stated he would want to wait until that item was discussed.

**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** seconded by **COMMISSIONER FOLEY** to approve the Consent Agenda as read in by Staff. The Consent Agenda passed 5-0.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated they will go in order of the two action items and explained a presentation will be given by staff, then the applicant will have an opportunity to speak and after that the speaker cards and the audience will get a chance to speak. The applicant will have an opportunity for rebuttal after that then the discussion of the dais will occur.

**ACTION:**

**A. DVR15-0037 ALLRED PARK PLACE**

**Approved. REMOVAL OF PDP STIPULATION NO. 3**

Request rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) and Agricultural District (AG-1), to Planned Area Development (PAD) for an employment business park campus, including a Mid-Rise Overlay for buildings up to 150-feet in height, with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for site design and building architecture on property totaling approximately 62 acres located at the southwest and southeast corners of Price and Willis roads.

**Rezoning:**

Planning Staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan and South Price Road Employment Corridor, recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of the Rezoning from AG-1 and PAD for commercial, office, conference center hotel, and business park uses including a Mid-Rise Overlay for buildings up to 150-feet in height, to PAD for an employment business park campus with commercial, office, conference center hotel, and business park uses including a Mid-Rise Overlay for buildings up to 150-feet in height under an Innovation Zone, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled "ALLRED PARK PLACE" and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR15-0037, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.
3. Undergrounding of all overhead electric (less than 69kv), communication, and television lines and any open irrigation ditches or canals located on the site or within adjacent right-of-ways and/or easements. Any 69kv or larger electric lines that must stay overhead shall be located in accordance with the City's adopted design and engineering standards. The aboveground utility poles, boxes, cabinets, or similar appurtenances shall be located outside of the ultimate right-of-way and within a specific utility easement.

4. Completion of the construction of all required off-site street improvements including but not limited to paving, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks, median improvements and street lighting to achieve conformance with City codes, standard details, and design manuals or as otherwise approved in a development agreement.
5. Unless otherwise included as part of the City's Capital Improvement Program, the developer shall be required to install landscaping in the arterial street median(s) adjoining this project. In the event that the landscaping already exists within such median(s), the developer shall be required to upgrade such landscaping to meet current City standards.
6. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
7. Approval by the Planning Administrator of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls and the Transportation & Development Director for arterial street median landscaping.
8. Sign packages, including free-standing signs as well as wall-mounted signs, shall be designed in coordination with landscape plans, planting materials, storm water retention requirements, and utility pedestals, so as not to create problems with sign visibility or prompt the removal of required landscape materials.
9. Notwithstanding any provision of the Development Booklet or of any other conditions of the Rezoning, no data center use of any type, unless ancillary and secondary to a primary use, shall be a use permitted for the property that is the subject of this Rezoning.
10. Maximum building height shall be limited to 150-feet.

**Preliminary Development Plan:**

Planning Staff, upon finding consistency with the General Plan, recommends Planning Commission motion to recommend approval of the Preliminary Development Plan request subject to the following condition:

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled "ALLRED PARK PLACE" and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR15-0037, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
3. As represented in the attached Development Booklet narrative, the initial tenant in any employment building shall be a minimum of 20,000 square feet in size.

**KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER** stated Item A, DVR15-0037 ALLRED PARK PLACE is a rezoning request for couple pieces of property and although his memos starts off with the most recent conversation of an end with that piece of presentation. The site is comprised of two parcels, the first one being 29 acres piece of dirt on the southwest corner of Price Rd. and Willis Rd. zoned PAD in 2013, and amended in 2014. In a nutshell for two single users consistent with Price Rd. uses, the conference center hotel included 150 ft. midrise overlay on the southwest corner. It was zoned as part of the larger Park Place master plan that encompasses the property at the northeast corner of Price Rd. and goes all the way to the 202. He stated the second property tied with the piece for the zoning request tonight is a 33 acre site located at the southeast corner of Price and Willis roads. He explained that tonight they will discuss the southwest and southeast corners. The immediate southeast corner is vacant and zoned A-G1 Agriculture often referred to as the former dairy site. He stated to start the zoning request with a

look at the General Plan. The General Plan (GP) identifies the property as being within an employment designation and also following within the South Price Road employment corridor, they call that a designation as well and will go in detail later one. The request is to rezone both properties, one being PAD and the other A-G1 and to bring them under a single PAD for employment business park campus that also includes a midrise overlay for 150ft. building height. All under an innovation zone as contemplated by the GP. He stated that you hear a lot of statements under the General Plan, South Price Road Employment Corridor innovation zoned for the benefit of the new commissioner and it has been a while that a case and come through on Price Rd. and also for the audience.

The South Price Road Corridor is south of the 202, most rigidly applied on south of Willis Rd. and it is often referred to Chandler's premiere employment corridor. It started with Motorola, Intel, Mobile sciences and over the years the city's land use policies for the South Price Rd. have ultimately memorialized in the general plans that have occurred going all the way back into the late 90's with the General Plan with the concept of Price Rd. and the development policy guidelines were for it. He explained when they go from the 90's and into the 2001 General Plan, there is a designation that calls out for large single use high tech employment, single use on parcels generally no less than 15 acres and development has occurred. In 2007, there was fever of the market and started to identify the conflict of build out of chandler. A report was done in 2007 and it identified the shifting development trends that were occurring in Chandler and how to get Chandler from a policy standpoint prepared to deal with the shifting development trends. One of the areas studied and identified in that report was the Price Rd. corridor. In the report it started to frame the evolving nature of business and how to do business. The concept of entertaining the flexibility in terms of the single user, they are entertaining some level of multi-tenancy was really born in that report. That transitioned into the 2008 General Plan when the innovation zoned concept came to be. The concept basically took the list of uses that were permitted on Price Rd. and the single use 15 acre and chiseled it down even further by saying multi-tenancy can become a compatible mix with the flex office space when it's set on a larger campus like environment and a key component to that innovation zoned was the idea of the hub. One of the examples of the innovation zone ultimately became a continuum in chandler that the former Motorola site. However, the hub was seen as the central focus of the innovation zone and provided amenities that ended up serving the larger innovation zoned campus and further out into the Price Rd. Corridor. He explained as they move from the 2008 GP, they have been living with that for about 9 years and just now finished the GP update process and just went to Council on April 14<sup>th</sup>. As part of all that discussion, they have a concept of Price Rd. and the concept of multi-tenancy has continually remained his mind. In terms of the innovation zone and its applicability tonight, the request is to rezone and see a level of multi-tenancy and under the innovation zone they do have to point to the hub. As part of the southwest corner of the property when it was rezoned in 2014, it did include a conference center hotel. That site remains today and in fact is an invested zoning, because it was zoned with a piece to the north and with the construction of the retail building, the conference at the hotel is vested and they are utilizing that as their primary hub as it is seen in their development booklet, there is also a string of other different hierarchal sized pedestrian hubs all tie in the campus together. In the 2008 General Plan, there is language that talks about the success of a innovation zone and is really depended upon pedestrian, vehicular, circulation where all the different amenities within an innovation zone can move in around themselves. He referred to the development booklets that show a couple exhibits that really show an aggressive approach to vehicular circulation and all the other pedestrian hubs.

He stated there are areas for gathering, and amphitheater and they all lead to the larger hub of the conference center. As part of the request, all things on Price Road from a design standpoint do go to the Design Review Committee. The project did go to DRC on March 2, 2016, this year. The committee was complementary of the campus design and building architecture. There was a desire to see the parking garage on the exhibit page 43. Showing what it would look like. A lot of the buildings took off the office building shown in the southwest corner. The booklet sets the stage for a cohesive campus that from a building architecture, site design, landscape design; orientation really plays and continues to build on the campus that was approved at the northeast corner of the original piece of Park Place. As the neighbors are reached through the process, there were two neighborhood meetings due to the midrise overlay. Both were fairly well attended 5 people in each meeting, mostly asking questions. Traffic came up, and Willis Rd. extends without a stop sign from Price Rd. all the way to Dobson. The neighboring property owners that attended were concerned with the speed. He stated he had conversations with Transportation & Development Director and Engineer which are working with the Police Dept. to monitor speed and the bus pick up being an issue. However, over all everything was positive and no one showed opposition to the request. He has her from a representative from an owner on the west side of Price, and he will speak citing concerns with the request regarding for a lack of PDP specifics in terms of what is going to build, a timing of the conference center hotel, because the hub is the critical component of the innovation zoned and a time has not been identified; also, a desire for intensity on the property. The booklet and narrative indicate the insurance of the conference center's development viability. One, the derestriction that property to only conference center hotel, two, in the phase one of that piece, they are going to put the infrastructure necessary to support the conference center hotel. When the conference center hotel operator becomes ready they don't have to go through the timing installing the infrastructure.

On April 16, 2016, the General Plan Update went before City Council and one of the topics was South Price Rd. It brought forth strategic policies that would drive in part from a 2013 study that was done also referred as the Maguire report. He stated in the report there were guiding recommending principles to look how to change the policies for Price Rd. moving forward. One was to identify how application establishes minimums rather than maximums, allowed development requirements with the intention to force a greater employment density, intensifying the property and the utilization of land. The discussion at the GP hearing centered around that concept of intensification. The discussion ended with an objective to develop a corridor with a higher level of intensity. Also with a mid-rise development, as defined in the GP and zoning code, that buildings greater than 45ft. in height and concentrate that intensity along the Price Rd. frontage and as it gets closer to the homes on the east, the height would come down. The case was continued to this hearing to reevaluate the applicability to the request. Over all, the campus and landscape plan, pedestrian and vehicular connectivity and the sign package within the development booklet meets the intent of the direction derives from both the 2008 and the 2006 GP Update. Staff did add a PDP condition requiring the buildings along the Price Rd. frontage be developed consistent with mid-rise development for building taller than 45ft. The applicant is not an agreement with that stipulation and does wish to speak. He stated staff recommends approval with the additional stipulation.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** thanked Mr. Mayo for the history of the case and asked the dais if anyone had any questions.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** asked Kevin if the mid-rise is applying only to the first building along Price Rd., no matter how further back it is from Price Rd.

**MR. MAYO** stated he did not say it applied to the first building because it is built on the far eastern end of the southeast corner. It will be the building adjacent to Price Rd. The buildings closest to Price Rd. will need to be up height mid-rise development. It follows the guiding principles that were provided in the Maguire report, but paired in the mid-rise development policy that talks how to transition down as you head down to lower intensity uses such as single-family homes east of Ellis.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** turned it over to the applicant

**STEPHEN EARL, 3101 N. CENTRAL AVE #100** stated he was there on behalf of the Douglas Allred Company and David Allred, the president and CEO of the company as well as his Chief Assistant, Cathy Exeter who runs all the programs. He stated also present was West Balmer who is the architect for all the buildings north of Willis Road, which they call Park Place. He stated he appreciated everything that staff stated in the report as well as what Mr. Kevin Mayo stated regarding the history of Price and tentatively the history of Park Place. He stated they only disagree on one thing, which is stipulation No. 3 of the PDP. The reason why they disagree is that it sets a minimum building height, not a maximum building height. He thinks it's almost unprecedented anywhere in the valley and including Price Rd. to require that a building must be mid-rise. It cannot be anything lower than mid-rise. When he stated that it is unprecedented, they are not aware of any other project in the Price Rd. corridor that has been stipulated in a PDP to be at least mid-rise in height. He stated many applications may have come forward and requested 3,4,5,8 stories and indeed their PAD asks for flexibility to go up to 10 stories because they want to build the tallest and most intense building that they can and it will be consistent with the market and the needs of their tenants. However, with the notion of saying for example if an Apple Corporation asks David Allred that they want to go on the first building on Price Rd. but don't want to have a mid-rise building that is not consistent with the collaboration with the large foot print where they can have all of the people on the same floor and mixed together. They might have high intensity but they don't want it in 3 or 5 stories, they want it on 2 stories. But they will meet all other objectives of the corridor, they would be high tech, high paying job and they would be consistent with high tech manufacturing and research and development. All those things would be consistent except they don't want to have a taller building. He doesn't want to have to say no to that major company, that otherwise would be a dream for the Price Rd. corridor. Not only do they think the height is unprecedented, they don't agree with the intensity which is called for in the Maguire report and was discussed in the GP, but the intensity equates the building height. He stated there is sort of a notion in the stipulation that the only way to get intensity is to go up in height but many corporations want to have a large open floor plan for collaborations. But certainly means they want to intensify the area. For him, when he talks about intensity and density, he believes that it doesn't necessarily have to be height. However, they are seeking authority to go up to 10 stories and referred to the imagery in the PDP that shows buildings all the way from 2 up to 8 stories including the hotel. Another concept that he thinks is inconsistent is a mid-rise requirement as opposed to an allowance. In the GP, Maguire report and others studies Kevin mentioned, there is a focus on, high-tech but manufacturing, biomedical, research and laboratories. All of those uses are intended for this corridor in which would be a significant addition to the city. However, they don't necessarily work at higher building heights. For example, research and development doesn't want to go up but wants to go out.

There are low barring factors that relate to going up in height. Another example is manufacturing, how many facilities with manufacturing and office go to mid-rise height?

Generally they are at the 1 or 2 story levels. He stated to him it is about the flexibility to respond directly to the major fortune one-hundred companies that they are trying to bring to the corridor. He referred to an exhibit that they put together showing what David Allred and Douglas Allred company had built north of Willis Rd., also known as Park Place. So far there are six buildings that have been built in that area; it is the intent of the GP to have one user per building. North of Willis does not apply. He is trying to point out that in the six buildings that have been built. David Allred has put a single tenant in five of the six and one still being marketed. The sixth building has two tenants. For example, Infusion Soft came to David and asked for 64,000 sq. ft. At the time it was a small company. Now, that same company occupies the three buildings on the left side, on Spectrum Dr. They almost have 250,000 sq. ft. and have hundreds of employees. It is a high paying job just the kind Price corridor wants. They are the only tenants in those three buildings. Because they want to go to 500,000 sq. ft. they asked them, would they want a mid-rise building or do they prefer to have more of the buildings that they have. They stated they want a campus of the buildings that they have because of the collaboration aspect of their employees. They also mentioned it was not their cooperate culture to go high. However, you can see the addition to the Infusionsoft and on the east side of Spectrum Blvd. you have Health Waves, which is 92,000 sq. ft. tenant with 460 employees. Both floors make up 68,000 sq. ft. and have 345 employees. EDMC is another 100,000 sq. ft. building with 605 employees and the southern building is being finished and being marketed. There are also three hotels; one of them is under construction, when it is completed and the corporate center for the hotel comes together, that will be over 750 rooms that will be in the Park Place project.

He explained the total footage in Park Place 1 or north is already 615,000 and already 2,329 high paying jobs. Exactly what the corridor wanted to see. He believes that the investment south of Price Rd. and the project he displayed will be more than double of that. He explained some of the buildings in the first phase that make up the 223,000 employee base. He explained the expansion. The convention center hotel that is at the southwest corner of Willis and Price Rd. is now being folded into the larger master plan of 62 acres. He explained that all of the buildings surrounding the project are hemispheric. The landscaping setbacks are over one hundred ft. He stated they have numerous of outdoor amenities for the employees to go to. It is part of the innovation which is allowed in the GP by having more than one tenant per building. There are high amenities and high open space. He believes he complies with every one of the requirements; the campus environment, the high value employment, density, aesthetics and they seek the flexibility allowed. He was asked at the Design Review Meeting to talk about the parking structure, he showed an exhibit displaying a parking structure more than a football field away from Ellis Rd. and explained it should not have any impact on any single-family area because it will be surrounded by taller buildings. He stated the important part of a campus plan is the connection between unites, not only vehicular but most importantly, pedestrian connection. He stated they have a significant improvement over a normal sidewalk. They have pedestrian hubs or amenities that are much wider that lead to shaded areas and also lead into the outdoors and amphitheater, however, all of the enhanced sidewalks lead to the conference center. They believe that is the hub, they agree that it should be built as soon as the market allows it to be built and it is important to the master plan.

The only disagreements with some comments they heard is that they should build that first, and everything else should be frozen until that gets built. If the market calls for a major cooperate user that says they want to build now, but the hotel says they are not ready to build yet, but they built everything ready for it, that is what they can do in the marketplace. They can de-restrict the property as Kevin mentioned to only be a hotel. He stated what they can do is force the market to

start building before it's time. He displayed an exhibit and stated in both PAD and PDP, there are pedestrian hubs that are between buildings with places to sit, relax, and socialize and other gathering places that are all part of this project. He stated he's had experience involved with business parks and he does not remember a master plan that is significant in its amenities package and connectability as this one. He stated it truly is a premier business park. He stated he's heard some points that they are not showing enough of the sides to the buildings in the images, however, the two sides that are showing in the exhibit are pretty what all four sides look like. The images are to show that they want to have buildings and displayed two images with three story buildings and also displayed a 7 story building. He displayed the image of the hotel that's already been approved that is 7 stories high and has 10,000 sq. ft. of convention facilities and ballrooms and 264 rooms. He displayed images on the eastside of the Price Rd. that could be two or three stories that are all complimentary of architecture. He displayed an exhibit that showed how far they will be from a residential home, well more than a football field and surrounding future buildings. He explains the reason why they pulled the item off the consent agenda was to talk about the one stipulation of PDP. He stated they wish to build building from two to 10 stories, depending upon the needs of the market place and major users. They have demonstrated in phase 1, that they want to have single tenants in the building and that is their goal. It is counter intuitive for David to build a building which he generally builds for other tenants and fills the building with a small user when he has 100,000 sq. ft. to put in at a 10,000 sq. ft. user. The buildings are designed for one user but when you go out in the market place and find a financing entity. They can only fill it with one tenant, so they will need the flexibility for multi-tenant in a single building and he mentioned the higher they go up, the more obligation they have. However, he does not see a reason to put a requirement to be a certain minimum height because that is not consistent with any requirements that have been placed on any other projects in the corridor that is not consistent with the desire to have that kind of users that the GP calls for such as; biomedical, research and development and maybe manufacturing elements that call for a more intense building at a lower level. He requested that stipulation three of the PDP be removed. He also clarified that they are willing to de-restrict the hotel site to be a hotel only or conference center hotel that was done with in connection with the ability to build out the entire master plan. It is connected to the stipulation and it makes it very different to restrict. He also mentioned that in the report in phase 1, they want to build the entire infrastructure for the hotel and want to make it so it is ready. However, the only exception to that would be is if they have a wonderful company that comes in and wanting to go on the eastside of Price Rd. then they might have to put that building in first. Those are the desires and plan and have committed to them, he asks that stipulation No. 3 be removed otherwise they loved the staff report.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked if there were any questions for the speaker. There were none.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he had a couple of speaker cards for the same item and in no particular order he will announce them. He announced David Allred is in favor the case, however, did not wish to speak. He announced West Balmer who is also in favor of the item, however, did not wish to speak. He complimented Mr. Balmer on his architecture and stated he put together a very good packet. He then announced Craig Miller and he did wish to speak.

**CRAIG MILLER, 2490 W. MULBERRY DR.** stated he is a 25 year Chandler resident and property owner and Chandler Business owner at the innovation tech incubator. He stated he is also a vice president of the Pecos Ranch Estate HOA, which is the subdivision with 105 property owners directly south of Willis and east of Ellis Rds. He is happy to see what has come forward

in terms of proposed development. His concerns are twofold; one regards the city's plans for Willis Rd. At its current stated and traffic, it is inadequate, specially the stretch between Ellis and Price. Road service is substandard, the grading collects water and the Police do not enforce the posted 35mph sign. There are kids waiting for the buss and the current traffic, coming in off of Dobson going to Infusionsoft and other tenants from Park Place 1, disregard that. One question he has is what the anticipated employment for this development is. If 2 to 3,000 people coming and going on a daily basis on top of what is already more than what the road can handle. He stated they can't support that. He stated he has spoken to CPD and Transportation and Development. They came forward with no mediation plan at all. He owns the property directly on the corner of Willis and Ellis so he is individually and familiar with the problem. His personal standpoint, he has views of the mountains and 15 story buildings are not something that anybody who fronts Ellis Rd. is going to support. It was a major discussion at the HOA meeting and took place Monday night and he was elected to hear what was to be said. However, nobody who fronts Ellis is going to support any kind of mid-rise development. He stated he knows it's already in the plans but people will be told to voice their concerns earlier, but he is telling them now what the position is of those property owners. He stated if they do have employment projection, he would be interested in that and he is also interested in what the street plan is to support all that additional vehicular traffic.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked if anyone had a question for the speaker. There were none.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated it was his understanding that the city is still looking at the traffic issues, specifically on Willis Rd. However, making a statement at Planning Commission helps staff work to address any issues that may exist. He asked Mr. Mayo if there were any other comments regarding the traffic aspect.

**MR. MAYO** stated in terms of the road way itself, the west of Ellis is currently half constructed. The north side possibility still has the original asphalt. When the campus builds out the second half of Willis will be completed and will be to its full width from Price all the way down. In terms of speed, he had a conversation with RJ, Transportation Director and he's been working with Mike Mah to get officers out there. After April 20<sup>th</sup>, he spoke with Pete from the same neighborhood and attended the neighborhood meetings. He was also concerned with speeding vehicles and school bus stop. He stated he had the unfortunate please of watching two vehicles drive around a school with the lights flashing and stop sign out. That hit the radar pretty hard and Mike Mah and RJ are going to be working with the cops about enforcement and long tern what to do with Willis Rd. As part of this request, they did have a traffic impact analysis done and it does take into account anticipated direction of travel and where the majority of people go and it did indicate Willis Rd. will receive additional traffic. However, at build out of Willis Rd. it will take the additional cars even though the majority will be heading north to the 202.

**MR. MILLER** asked if there were any plans to widen Willis to an equivalent as German.

**MR. MAYO** responded no because it will always be a collector street. Not and arterial St. like German. It will still be a two lane road. However, they are going to look to see what to do because it will be a mile long collector street without a stop and have effectively three major intersections down that street.

**MR. MILLER** stated he appreciates the fact that it is getting looked at.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** stated he wanted clarification on that the folks on Ellis wouldn't support a 15 story building obstructing their mountain views. The height is also important to him however, it looks like the developer presented that the height would come down from Price Rd. towards the area of the neighborhood. It would not be the intention to have ten story building which they are requesting approval for up to ten. But would not be the intention even ability to have with ten story buildings along their most eastern property line as close to the homes as they can get.

**MR. MAYO** stated that is correct. They end up utilizing the mid-rise policy to guide how to implement mid-rise development. A strong aspect of that policy is compatibility with adjacent lower intensity uses such as residential and it talks about that. It would be that intent.

**MR. MILLER** stated he understands that and was happy to see that the hotel is on the left side of Price. The tallest building is furthest away. However the applicant was looking for nothing compelled to build at a certain minimum height where the maximum height is far of that. So the question is what does that mean. He thanked Commission and Staff.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he had another speaker card for Mr. Hays that wished to speak as well.

**GARY HAYS, 2198 E. CAMELBACK RD** stated he represents Doug Echelon, who is a property owner on Price Rd. He stated Mr. Mayo stole all his thunder and explained all his concerns. However, his main concern is the lack of specificity in the PDP. The neighborhoods do not know what is being built. His client doesn't know what is being built. It could be one story, it could be 10 stories and it could be whatever they decide what it's going to be. That is the concern he has today.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked the audience and dais if they would like to make a comment. There were none. He asked the applicant to come up and make a closing statement if desired.

**MR. EARL** stated he wanted to respond to Mr. Millers comments. It is not their desire or intent to have tall buildings on the eastside of the project. They are more than a football field away from Ellis Rd. They want to make that clear and that is the reason why they showed the exhibit that has the Kovach property in between. That is the building that will be the closest to the neighborhood. The buildings as they get closer to the neighborhoods are the building they want to have two stories. They would agree to a cap on the eastside of Price Rd. of four stories, as long as they can build between one and four stories. They asked for mid-rise, because the city pushed them to have taller buildings on Price Rd. However, from Park Place North, two stories is what they have been building since it fits the desire and current paradigm of businesses that are in the marketplace today, including fortune 500 companies that are currently talking to them. There is also a fortune 100 company that advised them they are not interested in building 10 story buildings but rather a two. If the commission wanted them too, they would be willing to cap the buildings on the eastside of Price Rd. no higher than four stories. They certainly do not want to have a negative impact on the neighbors. They will be improving the south half of Willis Rd. and will become a fully function collective road. He understands speed is a factor, but in terms of a total load on the collective road is well below its design capacity. He would ask the Police Dept. to enforce speed limit laws, if that's the issue. According to their traffic study, about 85% of their traffic volume will utilize Price Rd. There are certain numbers of them if they live

in a certain area to the north along the 202; they might go to Dobson to go up to the interchange. They have assumed about 15% would make that choice, but the buildings are out on Price so that if you are already on Price, you make take it to Germann, which take one to the entire Southeast Valley. He believes they will not have a significant impact on Price Rd. In terms of the number of employees projected, 2,300 already and it would certainly be that or above. However, the projected traffic value should not impact. He stated the comment that Mr. Gary Hays made regarding the lack of specificity in the PDP. They have shown a number of high end designs and two sides of all of them, with the understanding that those two sides would be mirror image on the other two sides. He believes it is a strong representation. In the staff report, Kevin mentioned that the imagery that they have provided is a bar for quality. They cannot build less quality than what they are showing. They might make minor modification to design but not less quality.

He stated Kevin indicated that there is a bar for height. He stated they have shown a six-story and seven-story building but they can't build a five story building and that is what they disagree with. They showed imagery that allows them to do what the narrative talks about, two-story up to potentially ten-story. He believes in intensity, just like the GP does and they also believe in campus plan and thinks they have designed one of the best in the valley.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** stated that Mr. Earl talked about being able to accomplish the density at low of heights, depending on the tenant. What he sees is a real campus environment with lots of amenities and pathways with greenery. If the footprint of the building changes because the low of height but equal density to a tall building, how much of that takes away from the campus lush setting and all the amenities.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** directed the question to staff.

**MR. MAYO** stated it is tough to say, they can flex 100ft. one way and 50ft. another way without having a concept plan in front to say it does meet it. They use it as a measuring stick and a campus organization level of scale and level of pedestrian, amenity richness. He stated his job after Councils approval is to implement in substantial conformance. What in between does and doesn't, it is tough to say it in words without having a plan. However, in the end, as the memo indicates, it sets the bar of expectations for the level of design, campus integration, and landscape richness. It is over the top in terms of the pedestrian amenities and that is the bar that gets set, so they have to insure that gets delivered.

**MR. EARL** stated he agreed with the answer and they are not seeking to make changes to the footprints of the buildings they showed in the master plan that would somehow destroy the richness of the pedestrian environment and amenity packages.

**COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** stated if the project was approved as it is with the mid-rise, and then there is contact with fortune 500 company and they wish to reduce the height. Would they bring that back to staff for an exception and could that be possible?

**MR. EARL** responded that is there problem. Because they are going to have to live by the approval that is going to be given to them and Mr. Mayo mentioned that a bar will be set for the richness of the environment. So if someone would come in and ask them instead of a three-story building they would like a two-story building. They would have to wait essentially six months to go through the process. Allred has been very successful at in the marketplace, is anticipating the current high value tenants and anticipating their needs and building the building before so they

are ready to move in. He stated at the very least they want to have the entitlements done, so it would be building to building to suite. However, the notion of going back to an entire process to get another floor or reduce a floor would be problematic and believes they would lose the tenant.

**MR. MAYO** stated it would be a judgment call with each situation and ultimately, what will get approved from Council will be the measuring stick in which they would have to implement.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** asked Mr. Mayo, the current master plan they looked at, how many of those buildings are already two-story building?

**MR. MAYO** referred to page 31 and stated everything eastside of Price Rd. with the exception of the service retail building at the immediate corner is two-story, then it's three, and believes the conference center is six to eight story.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** asked if Mr. Mayo could point out which building would have the minimum height requirement. Will it be the four that are fronting on Price Rd. on the eastside?

**MR. MAYO** stated it would be the three larger buildings per the stipulation. Not including the retail building at the corner.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** stated it feels like it is a real deviation from what they are looking at the in the package and if the package is suppose establish a theme, he feels like it is destroying it.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he thinks the project and the bar that is being set is nebulous in certain ways but he thinks there is enough of information. He thinks for him, there is a comfort level based on the developers past experience on the same corridor. He has seen many projects come for the same piece of dirt and it is still dirt. He would love to see all of the ones put before them but unfortunately, they are still there. He stated he would take the hub no matter what height the buildings are along Price. He believes the architecture looks great wants to see it and would hate to lose it. He commented if stipulation No. 3 should go away or handcuffing the developer with that stipulation. He agrees that it would be a precedent for other developments that come through. However, he would rather give them the flexibility to go out instead of going up. They would not lose anything in his opinion and is in favor with the proposal and in favor of removing stipulation 3.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** stated he sees the Price Rd. corridor as an opportunity for density and for employment. However, when he noticed the mid-rise mandate in the stipulation, he thought about it while listening to the developer who is doing a great job on the corridor. He stated he has pretty good confidence that they would continue to do a great job. He struggles with saying mid-rise but then he like the idea of density.

**COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** stated she looked at the development; it appears to her that on the west side of Price, it appears they have designed taller buildings. On the eastern side, there is diagonal where the site range neighborhood is not as direct. She stated it appears to be an 8<sup>th</sup> of a mile jog east of Price. So if everything is left mid-rise, the site of the mountains will be moved and lessened for the people who live along Ellis. By requiring the mid-rise on the west side, she thinks it makes sense. However, she does not understand making it on the eastside

when the eastside of Price is much closer to the neighborhood. She would ask that if the stipulation is not removed that it should be amended to require the mid-rise on the left side.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** stated in having some experience in office development in Phoenix, he thinks they need to give the developer the flexibility to do two-story buildings. If not, he thinks it is going to take quite a long time to get this built out. He stated he is in favor of removing the stipulation.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked the city assistant attorney if he could make a motion.

**GLENN BROCKMAN** stated if no one else is going to make a motion, he certainly may.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** before making a motion he would like to turn it to staff regarding Ms. Cunningham's comment.

**MR. MAYO** stated based on the exhibits and as indicated in many ways, it sets the bar and the floor and the mid-rise overlay sets the ceiling. Based on the exhibit on page 31, it did set the floor with a minimum three-story on the west and two-stories on the east. They were preparing a stipulation to clarify that it is the minimum. If the stipulation is removed, he would need to clarify then that the commission's preference is the two-story to ten carries throughout the entire development just so that it is clear for both the applicant and future brokers and also for council and staff. It could be split or neither, it is really up to commission how they want to work that stipulation.

**MOVED BY CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** seconded by **COMMISSIONER ROSE** to approve Item A with the removal of Stipulation No. 3 of PDP as read in by Staff. The item passed 5-0

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated Planning Commission is only a recommending body and all the items will still go on to City Council. Item A will go to council on May 26<sup>th</sup>.

B. DVR16-0003 ALTA SAN MARCOS

**Approved.**

Request rezoning from Planned Area Development (PAD) Golf Course to PAD (Multi-Family Residential) including a Mid-Rise Overlay for buildings up to 55 feet in height with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for site layout and building architecture. The approximately 5.4-acre site is located at the southwest corner of Chandler Boulevard and Dakota Street, west of Arizona Avenue.

**Rezoning**

3. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled "ALTA SAN MARCOS" and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR16-0003, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
4. Right-of-way dedications to achieve full half-widths, including turn lanes and deceleration lanes, per the standards of the Chandler Transportation Plan.

5. Future median openings shall be located and designed in compliance with City adopted design standards (Technical Design Manual #4).
6. Undergrounding of all overhead electric (less than 69kv), communication, and television lines and any open irrigation ditches or canals located on the site or within adjacent right-of-ways and/or easements. Any 69kv or larger electric lines that must stay overhead shall be located in accordance with the City's adopted design and engineering standards. The aboveground utility poles, boxes, cabinets, or similar appurtenances shall be located outside of the ultimate right-of-way and within a specific utility easement.
7. Completion of the construction of all required off-site street improvements including but not limited to paving, landscaping, curb, gutter and sidewalks, median improvements and street lighting to achieve conformance with City codes, standard details, and design manuals or as otherwise approved in a development agreement.
8. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
9. Building heights shall be limited to a maximum of fifty-five (55) feet in height.
10. Construction shall commence above foundation walls within three (3) years of the effective date of the ordinance granting this rezoning or the City shall schedule a public hearing to take administrative action to extend, remove or determine compliance with the schedule for development or take legislative action to cause the property to revert to its former zoning classification.

#### **Preliminary Development Plans**

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the Development Booklet, entitled "ALTA SAN MARCOS" and kept on file in the City of Chandler Planning Division, in File No. DVR16-0003, modified by such conditions included at the time the Booklet was approved by the Chandler City Council and/or as thereafter amended, modified or supplemented by the Chandler City Council.
2. Approval by the Planning Administrator of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls and the Director of Transportation & Development for arterial street median landscaping.
3. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
4. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
5. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
6. Sign packages, including free-standing signs as well as wall-mounted signs, shall be designed in coordination with landscape plans, planting materials, storm water retention requirements, and utility pedestals, so as not to create problems with sign visibility or prompt the removal of required landscape materials.
7. Preliminary Development Plan approval does not constitute Final Development Plan approval; compliance with the details required by all applicable codes and conditions of the City of Chandler and this Preliminary Development Plan shall apply.

#### **Preliminary Plat**

1. Approval by the City Engineer and Planning Administrator with regard to the details of all submittals required by code or condition.

**MR. ERIK SWANSON, SENIOR CITY PLANNER** stated on the record so there is no confusion; he is filling in for Jodie Novak as she is out sick. The request is for Item B for a rezoning from PAD for golf course to PAD for multi-family residential and includes mid-rise overlay for building heights up to 55ft, along with a PDP approval for layout and building architecture and lastly a preliminary plat approval. Surrounding the site is Chandler Blvd. and to the east is Dakota and north of Chandler Blvd. is the single-family subdivision. A number of homes that front Chandler have been either converted to business or have gone through the residential conversion policy through a use permit process. To the eastside there are the San Marcos Commons Condominiums and he believes there is vacant land just north of that and currently owned by chandler site 3. The golf course is south and west is the Focus Cooperate Plaza office condominiums development. The site is approximately 5.5 acres and what is being proposed is a total of 273 luxury apartments which there is a rough density of 16.5 units per acre; Something that they haven't quite seen before. As they look at those new types and out of the ordinary development as conformance to the GP. He stated in this particular case the GP designates the site for residential but it further outlines with a couple of development policies. One, being the south Arizona Ave. corridor policy and also the Chandler redevelopment plan. The high capacity transit corridor is also included.

He explained for those three plans, the site just outside of the specific boundary. For those plans are necessary and look at the buffer area around it. In both of those plans, high density is considerable. There is also the high capacity transit corridor that is really three streets that fall into that plan which are Arizona Ave., Chandler Blvd. and Rural Rd. With that high capacity transit corridor, the idea behind that is they want to see high density along those corridors or have the option to place those. The site meets all the requirements and the density calculation is considerable for the area. If you look at the site design, they are approaching more of an urban design standpoint. The unit location rather than being pulled into the site which is typical with apartment; it is pushed out to the street frontage. So it is a really an urban dense form that one feels right out on the street of Chandler Blvd. He stated there are a couple of things that represent that street scene along one of the major corridors, but also hides a lot of the parking lot which are not very attractive usually. There is going to be some redesign with the front along Chandler Blvd. with the inclusion of a wider sidewalk to make it safer for those resident and pedestrians.

In addition, there is a total four buildings, a building along the southern end which is adjacent to the golf course and another one centered to the site. South of that and adjacent to the golf course is where the amenity center is. It has pools, courts, bbq's, bean bag toss, a dog park and cabanas. It really is an amenity package for that type of development. He stated the primary access would be provided off Chandler Blvd. and is a gated community. There is egress at Dakota St. which is on the east-end and there is an emergency exit on the west end that will lead into the Corporal plaza park. The Transpiration Dep. has looked at it and comfortable with the current design of it and with those access point. A total of 273 units are provided, broken down to 184 studios and one-bedroom units, 83 two-bedroom units and six penthouse units. The penthouse units are what are triggering the midrise. The main masking of the development is going to be a standard studio one and two-bedrooms unite below the 45ft. it is the penthouse suites that push it up above and create the mid-rise. They always take parking into consideration and code would require 432 parking stalls and what is being provided are 392 stall. It gives 1.43 parking stalls per unit which accommodates guest. He stated it is very similar from an allocation standpoint to what has been approved already in the downtown with the other office Steel Yard plan and well as the undeveloped DC Heights. They are willing to deviate from 432 stalls with the idea that a lot of

residents are going to be utilizing some of the downtown services. So having the additional parking is not necessary due to more pedestrian activity. Overall, staff is in support.

He refers to the site plan and development booklet and states the project calls out for 85 tandem spaces, however, on pg. 9, there is a detailed site plan and how the tandem plan works. There's additional space when you look at all the garages that is not very clear on the regular site plan but it is shown clear on pg. 9. The building overhang comes out, so they'll have the garage to pull into and the tandem stall will be below that. He stated they have insured that the minimum drive isle is still provided, which is still 24ft. and they are providing 26ft. Overall, it is a little different from what they are used to seeing from a development standpoint in an apartment complex but in the downtown area it meet the requirements. He stated he passed out a perspective of the architecture and addresses the entry along Chandler Blvd. The idea is showing up the breaking up of the massing of the brown stones. The architecture design is more east coast brown stone style. He stated one of the things they can get hung up on is how are they going to take the brown stone approach, break up the massing to make it so it is not just one big building of all the same. The development team has done a really good job in breaking that up through color usage and also applying the stucco and including stone veneer to help it. The building all has some pop outs that are not related all over the place that are the same to break up some of the area along the building frontage. Overall, they are excited about it and he noted they appreciate the approach that they took and it is unique and new to chandler and they support it because it meets the requirements to give the additional building height as well as density. There were two neighborhood meetings due to a mid-rise requirement. Roughly, ten to twelve neighbors attended both meetings. There were some support and also heard a lot of concern. In the memo, there are petitions attached that were signed. A lot of those concerns were from property owners to the north as well as the Corporate Plaza to the east and owners to the west. From a design standpoint, the neighborhood to the north had concerns with the overall building height and the appropriateness to the area. Comments that staff has receives is that the project is nice and attractive but it does not quite fit the location and more appropriate along Arizona Ave. There are concerns from the history standpoint with eliminating the golf course views and development. With it being the first golf course in Arizona and there is historic value to it and it should not go away. There are concerns regarding visibility and the overall massing of the building being right out on the street frontage and being 55ft. tall. Lastly, there is a concern with traffic. There is only one primary entrance on Chandler Blvd. Although it is going to be located where it's full access and aligned with Dakota St. What does it do to allow circulation outside of that neighborhood because it is forcing all entrances at that one location? Those are the concerns, but they also heard a lot of neighbors that were in support of it. Planning staff recommends approval and he asked the dais if they had any questions.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** thanked Mr. Swanson, and asked staff how tall is Alta Steel Yard?

**MR. MAYO** stated he does not think they did a mid-rise overlay for it. He guesses about 45ft. and there were few pieces of mechanical penthouse that took it up to the 45ft. cap.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** asked Erik if any of the homes that are directly north on Chandler Blvd. still considered residential or are they all use permit for business.

**MR. SWANSON** stated a number of them have either gone through the conversion process, some have converted back and believes the majority are businesses but there are still a couple that are residents.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** commented that the history comment Mr. Swanson made triggered his question.

**COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** asked Mr. Swanson if he could cite for her how many parking spaces they won't be getting because recently trying to find a parking space in downtown Chandler is impossible even on a week night.

**MR. SWANSON** responded from a standpoint of parking in the downtown, everyone is aware that as Chandler is becoming more involved in redevelopment and making downtown more vibrant, parking is an issue. They are looking at incorporating some parking garages with future development. The site requires 432 spaces per code and what is being provided is 392 spaces, so roughly 40 stalls that will be short but with the idea that there is going to be a lot of pedestrian movement because of its proximity, or at least that is the hope behind it.

**MR. MAYO** stated it is important to acknowledge that the parking code in the majority of the zoning code was developed at a time when 5 units per acre was not contemplated. The number will be based on more of the suburban multi-family model and not an urban multi-family model. Thankfully, through a PAD they can work with the applicants to what does it need, not what a suburban code says it has to have. It is always in their best interest to provide enough parking because it becomes a struggle to lease if people can't park.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** turned it over to the applicant.

**NICK WOOD, 1 ARIZONA CENTER** stated Wood Partners is the fourth largest developer of multi-family units in the country. They specialize in urban product; high end luxury urban product and every one of their projects look different from another one. There are many multi-family developers and has represented some in the past who have the same design and can always tell which project it is. Wood Partners like to design based on site, area and location. He stated he has been a zoning lawyer for the east valley for 30 years and since 2007, 99% of the work he has done has been infill and infill is unique because you look at the context of the site in relationship to the immediate surroundings of the site. And when there is infill in downtown, particularly in Chandler the fourth largest city of the state, it is more unique. The reason is because there is already a vision that has been established by the city. It is represented in the GP. Planning Commission, City Council, Staff, the members of the downtown businesses community and residents from down spent years looking at the GP and how they want the a dynamic downtown to unfold. However, in order for downtown to be sustainable and dynamic there has to be a critical mass of people living there. He stated that Ms. Cunningham mentioned parking and to respond to that, his wife grew up in Chandler and is a Chandler High Graduate and they both live almost ten minutes from downtown. They both love to eat at Vintage 95 and other places and it is awful trying to find parking spaces. The nice thing about having people living in downtown, they don't have to drive they walk there. He explained it is going on in downtown Tempe, downtown Phoenix, downtown Gilbert and others. He stated it is their job as the developer to embrace that vision and more importantly, to enhance it. So every time they go in a downtown with a project, they spend a significant amount of time working with staff, Council,

Planning Commission and stakeholders to make sure that the vision is incorporated into their project.

He stated that two years ago they came through Planning Commission with Alta Steel Yard and it was a very nice project and vision for that area. When they visited with staff and Council they were made to understand what that vision was. Since it was very close to City Hall, they needed a very luxury product and an edgy design. Something that was modern and appealing that would draw people to downtown. They were looking for people that were highly compensated and professional because they are the ones that go out on weekdays and weekends and patronize the bars, restaurants and all other retailers downtown. There was a lot of skepticism whether or not that project would ever be built because it would cost millions of dollars to design it. Not only did the Wood Partners do what they promised to do, but they built it in a very short period of time and has been a tremendous success. It has also been a success for the City of Chandler. They should be receiving their certificate of occupancy within the next four months and they started out leasing the buildings that were completed and the average income for the residents in the building is \$85,000 a year. A high percentage of them are young single professionals and already beginning to spend money in downtown Chandler, so it has been a great success. There was a lot of opposition from the neighbors since it is against existing single-family homes. Their concern was the value of their properties as well as traffic. Not only has it been successful for the client but the value of the properties around it and the intensification has beginning to happen to the communities to the south. There are a lot of positives and he understands when a new project comes in an existing neighborhood, there will be a lot of fear and concerns and respects that.

When the new project started six months ago, they did the same exercise. They met with staff, Mayor and Council and others to determine the vision for that site in downtown. He mentioned that Wood Partner do what they promise to do and in his opinion Alta Steel Yard is the finest multi-family project in Chandler and thinks it is the highest quality and investment. So when they met with everyone in Chandler to talk about the vision, they mentioned that they did great job on Alta Steel Yard, now can they make Alta San Marcos better and also if they can create the first luxury downtown resort multi-family project. There are very few downtowns that have the assets of having a resort and golf course right in the middle of it. In respect to the design, Chandler wanted them to take advantage of the golf course. As it gets designed there are some challenges because the site is not a nice rectangular or square rather than some challenging geometry to it. They also said they didn't want the project to turn its back to Chandler Blvd. A decision was made a time ago to extend Dakota St. the eastern boundary of the site and goes from Chandler Blvd. south and stops at the resort. He refers to the exhibit and explained the idea is by not turning their back on Chandler Blvd. is by activating the street respect to the design and residents can walk out on the street to downtown.

Another thing in respect to architecture, they wanted something different, memorable and something that will catch people's attention. There are different kinds of architecture that is not memorable and there's also the kind that creates dialog whether it's liked, dislike it or in between and it creates that interest level. It creates that memorable component and they want people to remember downtown Chandler. He referred to an exhibit and explained that the Economic Development Dept. circulated something to give out to investors, developers and anybody else in downtown that shows the future multi-family site, Alta Steel Yard and the transportation corridors. He displayed the site and landscape plan and stated the architect did a great job of trying to utilize all of the elements that is part of the vision in the discussion with city staff. He also showed exhibit of the high amenities areas in the center and view fencing that is not cheap

however, very expensive and high-end fencing. The pool has different elements for different uses and also activities such as dog-park. There is no connection to the golf course, there's a bocce court, bean bag toss and ping pong. There is a very large activity area so the residents can take advantage of the resort. He showed the entry way and believes they did pretty well with, it is very large and wide, not because the volume of traffic that is being generated because there is only a 273 dwelling units. Alta Steel Yard is 303 dwelling units so 273 is not going to generate that much traffic but what they didn't want to do as mentioned earlier is create buildings that are long and huge and overpowering on the street. To break it up, they created a very wide entry feature basically four lanes of traffic, even though there is not much traffic. In fact, they it produced so little traffic that they did not have to produce traffic impact analysis which is typical. All they have done is a traffic study review done but not a full traffic impact analysis. Traffic will enter off of Chandler Blvd, which is six lanes with the seventh middle lane and either sides of the entries are E's meaning gates so it is secured. If you're a guest you'll pull up into the guest parking where the club house is and if you're a tenant, there is a key fob and you can enter through either side of the gates. On the far eastern end there is also a secured gate that people will go onto Dakota St. and on the far west side there is an emergency gate that had to be worked out with the office condos. It is designed to look very well and incorporate the vision of the City.

In respect to landscape, he stated they were told not to turn their backs to Chandler Blvd. The reason why Andy Baron is not here is the landscape architect and could not participate in the process. But what he did, is follow the direction and vision of respect to Chandler Blvd. He referred to the exhibit and showed the extensive of landscaping along Chandler Blvd. behind the sidewalk. He also explained how the building articulates and stated one of the worst things you can have is a flat building, no matter what length it is. There should be visual changes in the depth and the angles so it creates interest rather than boredom. Particularly, for people who drive by it every day and for people who live across the street from it. He explained that Wood Partners never cuts corners and he mentioned that you can see that at the Alta Steel Yard. The issue of the townhome use is that a couple of people have said this is Arizona not Brooklyn, New Jersey or Manhattan. So they spoke with the architect and he said it is not something that supposed to be like the ones in Brooklyn or Manhattan, it's the type of design that is all over the world. He showed an exhibit that displayed some examples from Germany, Netherlands, and Shanghai to all the way to Brooklyn. He stated the idea is to create that visual interest and also be conservative and be unique; rather than, something that is the same and with its back on Chandler Blvd. He stated his office is in the Arizona Center and it is designed by turning its back on 3<sup>rd</sup> St. They created an element with a lot of different components along Chandler Blvd. such as the railing are different and every one of the balcony designs are different. The stoops that go off of the street into the central corridors so people who live in the building are given opportunities to go down and elevator, change buildings and use the stoop off on Chandler Blvd.

He explains that all the first floor units have doors that exit out onto to the street and they all have a patio area. He reiterates that it creates opportunities, activation on the street and it complements the neighborhood that is across the street. He mentioned the exhibit is the view from the golf course and he displays another exhibit that illustrates the variations of heights, depths and all the other elements. He explains the reason why they have the mid-rise request is because there are six penthouses and the idea is that you put the penthouse up and let them have a little better view of the golf course itself. Those are the only tall elements; the rest of the building are 44ft high and lower. He stated they were asked to do some additional changes to the façade; one suggestion was with respect to the parapets, rather than having a straight line, maybe raise them or lower them to create a difference in the actual façade of the building. They raised

the parapets at the balcony overhangs throughout the building, along Chandler Blvd. and elsewhere. He stated to add some interest elements. They added window pattern changes in the middle; where each one of the windows instead of having rectangular box windows, now have metal pieces in there to create a visual change. However, in respect to the cornices, they were asked why do they have the same design of cornices, so what they incorporated were balustrades to create that visual interest and something special. He displayed an exhibit and he stated the purpose of the exhibit is to show the architecture by standing across the street catty corner from the site. There is a very wide entry way, which allows them to view through and in between the buildings. He referred to the exhibit to show the different make up and break up and the balustrades on the top of the penthouse. He stated although Alta Steel Yard is the finest multi-family project in Chandler, the requested one will be above that as well.

He mentioned for those that know him, they know he spends a lot of time with outreach. He explained he does not want to go to a hearing and have people saying they've never talked to anybody from his team or never got a chance to ask question, etc. They did have the two requisite meetings for public interest and met with several people. They had a separate meeting for the folks at the San Marcos County Club Estates. It is a gated community so they couldn't knock on those doors; however, they were invited to meet with them about 20 of them went. With the exception of one person they have support and thought it was great. They also did presentations to the Chamber of Commerce and presentation to the downtown Chandler partnership and to the downtown merchants. They also went door to door. He stated that Commissioner Donaldson asked a how many of them are business and residential. They put together a slide that shows them. Of the six that are across the street, five of them have been converted to businesses. The one that has not says private residence; and it is interesting because it is locked up, there are no covers and they were told by the people in neighborhood, that people never goes there so they do not know if it's a second home or what. However, they tried numerous times to knock on their door. Will all the neighborhood outreach they did. In the packet there are 117 individual letters of support. He stated they do not do petitions and the reason for that is because there are 20 lines on them and people scribble on them and you wouldn't know the difference if there was a signature from a person at a stop sign. They are individual letters of folks who either live at their home that are listed as well as their contact information. They do that show the level of support and the number of people that support it. He stated that he had been doing this for a long time and no matter how big the project there will always be people that will be unhappy with it and what he does is meet with the group or meet with them one on one; for example, Mr. Michaels is present and he has been in his office and owns one of the unit on the northwest corner of the site. He spent two days at separate times in his conference room in that building. He advised him that his participation in the process is important, where he loves it or hates it. He wants him to participate and send information of the reasons why because in the results of his participation if it's ultimately approved it will make it a better project. He stated everyone has their own ideas of how things should be and he understands. He also understands the concerns people have when something new comes into the area.

For the longest time, it was an empty space. There were trees planted there that were salt cedars and heard a couple of people say that they tour their trees down. He stated the reason why they were cut down was because they are in invasive plant and they grow like weeds. He also heard that people said they will no longer have the golf course view and the concern that it will generate too much traffic. He tried to sit down with them and share that there will only be 273 units and on Chandler Blvd. and the impact to Chandler Blvd. is nominal. The Fairway

Apartments are 252 units and have been there for a long time. He respects their concerns and thinks they are very nice people. He tried very hard to listen to them and respond to their request and create something that will raise their property values. He thinks it is a very special project and thinks it deserves a lot of attention and explanation as to how the project got that far and the way it turned out the way it looks. He stated they have spent hours with the Planning and Development Staff, Fire and Street staff and they were wonderful people to work with.

**COMMISSIONER ROSE** stated the applicant stated that Dakota St. will get extended south, and asked staff and Mr. Wood if that is just a plan they are looking at or if that is going to happen for sure.

**MR. MAYO** stated that the concept of extending Dakota south was born with DC Heights the multi-family development south of the resort. It is underway and the city has been moving forward and it will be extended.

**MR. WOOD** stated that Commissioner Cunningham asked about parking and explained to her that Wood Partners has extensive experience in building product because that is all they do. However, one of the things they would never do is build a project that is millions of dollars and not have enough parking for the residents. It would be a disaster. What they do is design based on experience with demographics. They also have that experience with the folks that are living at Alta Steel Yard, for example, most of them are single people with no cars. They are comfortable that they have more than enough parking for visitors and residents.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked Mr. Wood if there was any consideration into stepping down the building along Chandler Blvd. He stated does not have an issue with the height and thinks it is appropriate but asked if they considered in stepping down the project.

**MR. WOOD** stated the question had been asked by others as well. The respond was and honest one, because the site is so weirdly shaped they are down to 273 units as it is and to take out a floor along Chandler Blvd. it would not make an economic sense and couldn't happen.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** had a speaker card for Mr. Borns.

**FRED BORNS, 6 S. STELLAR PARKWAY** thanked Commission for allowing him to speak again. He thanked Mr. Wood and Mr. Shuartz for their grace and outreach to them and the community. He went to one of the events at Steel Yard and they were very nice and very well attended. Their presentation was very professional and certainly reveals the things that someone like him would be interested in knowing. He has piece of property, which is location #6 in the exhibit that faces Chandler Blvd. Both he and his wife spend two years developing the property and integrations with Planning and Development. He stated they have a product that they are very proud of and quite different from what is being proposed. He mentioned his enthusiasm with Alta San Marcos project is low and he will explain a few reason why. He believes that the 273 units and 180 being studio apartments are a little too much on a 5.4 acres and that comes out to a total of 50 units. He read on some other cities and it is three times the threshold for urban high density living so it seems like a little bit of a stretch even relating back to the city zoned visions. He also has traffic concerns, one of the concerns the applicant already stated, Chandler Blvd. is a busy St. He mentioned that Mr. Erik Swanson might have made a mistake by stating the main entry was opposite of Dakota St. However, it is not. It is opposite Nebraska St. which happens to be on the north side of his property. He stated that everyone knows that Nebraska St.

is one of the main streets to Chandler High School during the school year. For some reason the high school bought a piece of property from him east of his and put in ball fields and a nice parking lot but that is not really open to the students to use so a lot of the student park along the street on Nebraska because it is the closest to the school. So he stated he has an issue along Chandler Blvd. As far as the parking for the 273 luxury units, not interpreting that each unit was going to be a luxury unit; however often there is two cars per unit. So  $270 \times 2$  equals 540 and the city just mentioned their criteria would set it at 430 and it is going to roll back to 392 because of the experience based on what Mr. Wood cited. He respects all that and does not know much other than trying to drive down Chandler Blvd. and dealing with vehicles parked in front of his property. He is also glad to hear there will be room for visitors for the gated project. The final item that concerns him would be the architectural design. He mentioned the applicant cited it is a classic brown stone and he agrees that it is classy. He also mentioned the applicant displayed examples around world where it is prominent and he has seen some of that style in the Bronx and Cleveland. It looked really nice when it was fresh and people moved there back in the 20's and the 30's; however, he is not sure if that is what you would find today in Tempe along University Ave. which is similar and would be considered fresh and exciting.

A four stories and 55ft. for him is incongruous, he mentioned it might be good on the southeast side of the downtown. However, it is going to be right up to Chandler Blvd. and what used to be a golf course which is expendable is now going to be a canyon affect. It might be attractive to somebody however if anyone ever stood on Chandler Blvd. for more than a half hour or any week day, you would discover how annoying, 27,500 cars a day actually pass. He stated he knows it is not the busiest street in Chandler; down by the Fashion mall there is more traffic. Another thing you would find; is about six stop light. It is incomprehensible how people are going to get in and out of the complex off Chandler Blvd. without someday requiring a stop light. He stated thankfully there is another access onto Dakota, it is a very narrow access but by judging by the view he saw there is really no room for more than car. He thinks the city might of considered the property as part of a an expansion, called the Adaptive Reuse Overlay (AROD). He is a confused how that policy which is in draft form since September of 2015, and how it is represented properly as being under the AROD. He referred back to the GP that was written in 2008 for build out and beyond. It is intended to guide developments throughout the city and in particular in the downtown area. The current Chandler zoning map does indeed show the Alta San Marcos site as being Plan Area Development (PAD). He stated he looked at it on the website last Sunday and it did not show PAD, however, today it evident on the city website. It appears to be a precedent set by the Planning and Zoning memo 00-117 in the year 2000 and thinks there is a seminal piece to the AROD. He stated the document was intended to envelope the downtown area, since there are buildings that were built in the 20's and 30's and have an appearance like the project proposed with no setbacks from the street except for the sidewalk and there's nothing on the side neither on the back. That particular Planning memo 00-117 does restrict the height to 45ft.

He mentioned the building has areas that are down to 45ft. fronting Chandler Blvd. and is a change that he was not aware of. On page 32 of the 2008 GP, states that the plan recommends that they mitigate land use impacts on existing residential neighborhoods and the applicant was really careful to point out that five out of the six buildings that are directly across the street from the proposed site had been converted through residential conversion. One of the homes, which is his is now commercial office space. However, when he went through the conversion process two years ago, it was reinforced to him over and over that it was a residential conversion. He stated he is going to adhere to the motion that even though five of those six properties are residential

conversions and can still be converted by to residences. On page 35 of the GP shows that a map is downtown and he thinks the map does not overlay the property. The western extend of the map today is Dakota St. On page 45 of the plan cites that Chandler Blvd. is a high capacity transit corridor and as of last year 2015, it is 27.5 thousand vehicles per day. Page 48 of the GP states a buffer should be established between residential areas and potential growth areas. On page 49 it states "with respects to revitalization infill, the Planning visions affordability is specially need for low and modern income populations". He stated it is a direct quote "families in crises and unskilled workers". He asked if that was the target demographics for that type of development for Alta San Marcos. He also cited on page 51 "coordinate growth area project scale with existing infrastructure, future improvements especially public transit maybe considered special attributes, however, overbuilding should not be allowed far in advance of transportation system infrastructure" he also stated it specially shows a reference casual to light rail. He knows that the city has does a lot of work with the transportation group and they do have express busses that travel east and west and north and south and that area is really rich with bus travel. However, in his view, it is just a part of what is everywhere. There are still 27.5 thousand cars a day, regardless where the busses are coming from.

He mentioned Joni Mitchell one wrote, "They pay for paradise and put a parking lot" and that is his sentiment about it. On the vacant space that they referred to is where he and his wife married in 1991. He stated he is not so naïve as to imagine that the 100 year old golf course across the street from the property is some sort of a grandfathered entitlement and it's knows it. However, believes that the owners of the nearby residential property have the right to request that Chandler restrict the type of residential organization that might occur on the site. He mentioned it is not the same as the Alta Steel Yard no matter what anyone has heard. The 273 units on 5-acre is almost three times the threshold which is 18 units per acre in high density that the city once recommended. In consort with the motion that it is going to happen one way or the other, whether it's today or five years from now. He thinks that the apartment that has come in should follow the design of other accepted potentially cookie cutter precedence that is found in the area. He referenced one, the Mark Taylor residential at San Cervantes, 400 N. Coronado is a very attractive and not quite as intensified and fits in well with the older neighborhoods in north Chandler. He also thinks that the building heights should be restricted well below 45ft and more in line with the height level as the Fair Way complex. He thinks access to the complex should be restricted to Dakota St. and no access except for maybe emergency unto Chandler Blvd for the reasons cited earlier. He is very enthusiastic to see an apartment in arrangement to the site. He stated people need to think more about the density, traffic and the architecture.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked if anyone had a question for the speaker, there were none.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he had a speaker card for Paul Arch that did not wish to speak however, wanted his speaker card read into the record stating He is opposed to any construction on the lot, but would like any construction limited to two stories.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he had a speaker card for Kevin Michaels.

**KEVIN MICHAELS, 200 N. NEBRASKA ST** stated he lives across from the massive project proposed. He thanks Chairman and Commissioners for the opportunity to address his concerns. He stated the main access point as pointed out by Fred and Erik is directly across from Nebraska St. and his property. His biggest issue is traffic; there have been many accidents at the intersection over the past 8 years that he has owned the property. So adding 273 units are only

going to complicate that issue. He has a median to the left, there is just no easy way to enter and exit Nebraska St. for the High school students, the homeowners in that area and any of the businesses and his clients that visit him. He always warns everybody as dangerous as it is now. There is going to be quite more traffic. The issues are; one, the volume of the east and westbound traffic is 27 thousand cars a day. He stated turning south on the eastbound, you must watch your rear-end because it is dangerous. The jog doesn't come into play where it restricts the line of site. If you are pulling out of Nebraska, look left and the north lanes are not visible and you do not know the traffic that is coming at 40mph driving west bound and 45mph driving eastbound. It makes it difficult to determine if you can pullout and there is no center lane to pull onto. On the left there is a median and it's proposed to put a turn lane in there. That turn lane is going to complicate the situation. Right now they wait for traffic to release from Alma School and Chandler Blvd. 30 to 50 cars during peak hours and wait for the traffic to clear. Then you hope there are not any problems eastbound and wait for that traffic to clear. However, if they put a turn lane there it is only going to complicate the situation. He will have to wait for 2 or 3 in the queue to clear and have traffic going against him from the east that will be released from the stop light on Alma School and Chandler Blvd. He does not know how they are going to get around it, by having the main access point directly across from Nebraska. That is not what anybody anticipated when purchasing the land there.

He mentioned the number of units and cars, if there is 368 beds between the studios, the two and three bedroom. There will be a car per bed. The majority will not be single units. There is the mom and dad and kids, there will be two cars. There will be 368 cars give or take coming and going during peak hours. His other point is the monstrosity of being 45 -55ft. tall. He is 100ft. from it and he when takes walks out on the street for two blocks there will be a big wall. He mentioned he did not want to lose the view of the golf course. He stated he enjoyed the salt trees and the golf course and played the golf course today. He explained that is the one history gem that the city has so if it's closed no one will know it's there. He is opposed to it, however, thinks it's a great project but doesn't think it's the right location. It could be in different location but with the height restrictions and the issues. He thinks an office complex or even multi-family units. He appreciated everyone's time.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked the audience if anyone else would like to speak. There was one.

**ERIK FUENTES, 415 W. TOLEDO ST.** stated he is directly behind property no. 4 and has a house that was built in 1950 rather than 1946. He owns several properties in the Chandler area and has lived in Chandler for 34 years. He would like to make a couple of statements beforehand with all due respect the developer is someone that is there to make money and that is what they do. An apartment complex is a transitory residence for people that come and go and are not permanent residents. The neighborhood directly across the street is the Park Meadows. The last time he checked, it is designated a historic neighborhood. A development that is modern and good looking is really in congress. If one looks at the entire corridor from Arizona Ave. all the way to Alma school Rd., you don't see anything beyond two-stories. Most of the two-stories are recessed from Chandler Blvd. with nice trees and kind of attractive. So from that standpoint, he is very much opposed to the project in terms of the height. He looks at it directly and stated if there will be a four-story penthouse, they will be looking directly into his backyard and he does not want to lose his privacy. That is exactly what will happen. It is an n old neighborhood and most people have lived there for at least 15 or 20 years. He stated he travels quite a bit and all of them with the exception of one are minority owners. They work long hours that they don't have

time to go to the meetings or have the ability to direct Commission that they are not very happy with the project. He thinks it would be an adversely effect on a historic neighborhood. He is concerned with the traffic and can see an increase of traffic of 300 or 400 hundred cars additionally. He has been rebuilding his home for over a year now and spent a lot of money into it and he does not want to stare at an apartment complex across the street. It is out of character for the neighborhood. He found out about this when he was overseas and came back to find the trees gone. Those trees have been there longer than anyone in the room. They were planted in the 1900's and maybe they were vicious species but they still look nice and had been there for a long time and added to the area. He thanked everyone for listening to him and wanted to point out that his neighbors who he managed to speak with are not very happy about it but the fact that they are all minority and feel pressed upon that maybe it was not fully explained with the exception of two people that got spoken to. He urges for Commission to reconsider this.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** turned it over to Mr. Wood to respond.

**MR. WOOD** stated his father would give him and his sister guiding principles, and one of them was one constant in every changing role there is change. For example, the conversions of all of the single-family home residences are businesses as a result of change in the downtown area. Chandler Blvd. was a small 3 lane road and across the street was a golf course and his wife reminded her that her father was the bank president at First American Bank in downtown. As time changed, there is more people that have moved into the area, more development occurred downtown and enjoy its resurrection. Chandler Blvd. went from 2 lanes to 4 lanes now it's six lanes so the traffic volume changed. It is designed to carry 42k cars a day, which is the capacity. The point is when the use of the property changed is because the change that was going on downtown Chandler along with everybody. In order for downtown Chandler to survive the vision of the city is a high-end, high quality and luxury apartment buildings. Mike Taylor do two-story product but are on 20-acres and they can afford to do that because of all the land. They are stuck with a 5-acre site and it's intended to be multi-family. In speaking with one of the neighbors, they asked why it could not be office like the one that is next door. The traffic engineer did an analysis of a two-story office building. Office generates 2 out of three times more traffic especially around rush hour because that is when people come and go to work. Even if it's two bedrooms, people would like to have an office or an extra room for other things. He stated with respect to the density but who cares how many people are there. The question should be, is the density going to drive more traffic volume.

He also mentioned he is not a traffic engineer and that is why he turns to the city's traffic engineer and their own engineer. He is very forthcoming with people; whether it is good or bad it doesn't matter. In speaking to traffic folk, he said they need to go and count the cars. They know that there is the Fairway project, half a mile to the west and should know how much traffic that goes in and out of Nebraska and they know how much traffic 273 units compared to the 352 units at Fairways apartments. If you put it together, it reflects the traffic counts by the traffic engineer during the week, that take all the cars into account whether it's high school, people going to work, etc. and they peak time numbers. He displayed an exhibit reflecting the numbers. Number one, reflected Evergreen and Chandler Blvd site and that is where the main entrance is for the Fairway 352 unit apartment complex. Number five, illustrates the Nebraska St. main driveway in Chandler which is across from the project. They took into account not only the existing cars that go in and out of the neighborhoods to the north, but also the traffic generation as anticipated based upon the proposed project number of units. And the fact there is an exit out on Dakota and the other exit on Chandler Blvd. He illustrated traffic number during peak time

hours. For the westbound traffic, there are 1,618 cars going west on Chandler Blvd. and in the evening because of the status of direction, it goes down to 1,020 cars. He stated that the number of cars going in and out of Evergreen is much greater. There are 58 cars that turn left in the morning and 21 cars that turn right; in the evening the numbers decrease. For their project, the cars that go into Nebraska, turning off of Chandler Blvd is 50 cars in the morning and 39 cars at night. Cars going out of the proposed project and turning left are 29 cars in the morning and 22 in the evening. Turning right, there's 16 cars and in the evening 15 cars. He mentioned there will not be a lot of traffic generated from their entrance. The information was provided by traffic engineers and City engineers. He stated that traffic would not create a problem for anybody but he does understand the concerns.

He stated as far as density and building height, it is downtown. When someone owns property in a downtown or across the street from downtown, there will be density, traffic and building height. His job as developers is to minimize and mitigate that as much as they can, however, it is going to happen and mentioned the proposed site is not going to accommodate anything less than four-stories. He stated it is a great project and they are very proud of it and thanked everyone for their time.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked the audience if anyone had any question for the speaker. There were none. He turned to the dais.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated when he first saw the project he was not a fan and thinks it is ugly. He stated he did not want to offend anybody especially the architect; however, he doesn't get it. He does not agree in the direction that it is going in, even in looking at what is in their packet and what the inspiration was; he believes it was missing a mark. He appreciated some of the imagery that Mr. Wood showed from around the world, but he thinks they started off on the wrong foot and what they are going to get, no matter what, was something he was not going to be a fan of. He stated he does not have an issue with higher density and is not opposed to development on the site but in terms of the architecture, he is not a fan. He asked commission if they think they should go to design review to talk about it more before a recommendation is done to go forward. He stated the he appreciated the renderings especially the one looking from the golf course side and he doesn't have an issue with the wall occurring along the golf course. However, from Chandler Blvd. he would have liked to see more articulation. Unfortunately, when Mr. Wood said, they didn't want to turn their back on Chandler Blvd. and showed the picture of Arizona Center, it didn't help them. He stated there is nothing in the packet that is going to convince him to like it. But he is torn because he does not have an issue with a higher density project on the site, however, cannot support the architecture. He asked if there were any comments from commission.

**COMMISSIONER CUNNINGHAM** stated she does not like the fact that the main entrance is on Chandler Blvd. increasing further traffic. She also does not like that the project does not fit the San Marcos. It is not a design that compliments and she believes they need to focus on the jewel that it is and like the neighbor said, it hides it. She understands it's a private property and it doesn't belong and it is not a part of the San Marcos, however, it was lucky for several years to have the beautiful trees if they liked salt cedars. She stated she does not like salt cedars because they have a lot of scorpions in them; however, if they have to put that many people there, they can come up with a design that meets the area.

**COMMISSIONER ROSE** stated that he is speaking from a first time experience and it is his second full meeting at Planning and Zoning. He mentioned that when Steel Yard came in, he shook his head and said there is no way that one is going to build a building in south Chandler. When it was built it actually turned out amazing. He was really impressed and sounds like it is generating a lot of new residents to the area and it sounds like they are almost leased out of everything they have. But seeing the new project and talking about parking in downtown Chandler, the time is ticking. He stated he thinks it looks like an awesome project and doesn't think it is the time to wait. He doesn't want to see things go through them, three, four times with different people and small architectural changes. He believes it is a beautiful neighborhood and there is high demand in that area for young professional to come in. What he would like to see is the club house paying a lot of homage and having a lot of historical reference to San Marcos and the golf course and also to the Chandler pioneers who made the great town. He would like to see the project go through.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** stated he agrees to the point that Chairman Pridemore made supporting the density and being adjacent to downtown. He thinks it is the right location for the height, density and product type and has no problem with it. Personally, he likes the design. He thinks it is cool and different from what they and he supports it.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** stated he is in support of density and location and thinks those are the kinds of projects that need to be in that area. Initially he was not crazy about the design but thinks that the renderings have been a little less representative of the design that it really is. But they got better in showing the differences in the buildings. The one concern that he had were the stoops and the entry out to Chandler Blvd. He thinks Chandler Blvd. is a very busy street and doesn't think of it as a brownstone, Bronx or Brooklyn entry road. However, as mentioned the design has grown on him. He did dig into the landscaping area from the front of the building to Chandler Blvd. to the end of the sidewalk and is more comfortable than what he was when he first saw it. What they did to the depths of the building sections go a long way to his concern about being a busy street. He is in support of the project and is hopeful that it drives residents to downtown Chandler.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** asked if there was any interest from the dais on sending the project back to Design Review. He stated he would be in support of that.

**COMMISSIONER FOLEY** stated he is fine with the design.

**COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** stated he is fine with the design.

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated if there are no additional comments he will look for a motion.

**MOVED BY COMMISSIONER DONALDSON** seconded by **COMMISSIONER FOLEY** to approve Item B. DVR16-0003/PPT16-0006 ALTA SAN MARCOS as read in by Staff. **CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated he will vote no on the item and wants to qualify that with his issue being the architecture. He was prepared to provide feedback and probably vote to approve it. He is not a fan of the architecture and is voting no against the project but is in favor of the project going to commission but needed it to look different then what they have been shown. The item passed 3-2.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Kevin Mayo had nothing to report.

7. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CHAIRMAN PRIDEMORE** stated the next regular Planning and Zoning meeting is May 18, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers at the Chandler City Hall, 88 East Chicago Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

---

Matthew Pridemore, Chairman

---

Jeffrey A. Kurtz, Secretary