

INFO #1
September 11, 2008

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, August 20, 2008 held in the City Council Chambers, 22 S. Delaware Street.

1. Chairman Flanders called the meeting to order at 5:41 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance led by **COMMISSIONER RIVERS**.
3. The following Commissioners answered Roll Call:

Chairman Michael Flanders
Vice Chairman Mark Irby
Commissioner Michael Cason
Commissioner Leigh Rivers
Commissioner Kristian Kelley
Commissioner Stephen Veitch
Commissioner Christy McClendon

Also present:

Mr. Kevin Mayo, Acting Planning Manager
Ms. Jodie Novak, Senior Planner
Mr. Bill Dermody, Senior Planner
Mr. Erik Swanson, City Planner
Mr. Jason Crampton, City Planner
Mr. Glenn Brockman, Asst. City Attorney
Ms. Joyce Radatz, Clerk

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MOVED BY COMMISSIONER CASON, seconded by **COMMISSIONER KELLEY** to approve the minutes of the August 6, 2008 Planning Commission hearing. The motion passed unanimously 7-0.
5. ACTION AGENDA ITEMS
CHAIRMAN FLANDERS informed the audience that prior to the meeting Commission and Staff met in a Study Session to discuss each of the items on the agenda and the consent agenda will be approved by a single vote. After Staff reads the consent agenda into the record, the audience will have the opportunity to pull any of the items for discussion. There was one action item – item B.

MR. KEVIN MAYO, ACTING PLANNING MANAGER, stated the following items are on the consent agenda for approval.

A. DVR08-0018 SOUTH CHANDLER BUSINESS CENTER

Approved.

Request action on the existing Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to extend the conditional schedule for development, remove, or determine compliance with the three year schedule for development or to cause the property to revert to the former Agricultural District (AG-1) zoning. The existing PAD zoning is for a light industrial park on approximately 12 acres. The property is located at the northeast corner of Ocotillo Road and the Pinelake Way alignment, one-half mile east of Arizona Avenue on the north side of Ocotillo Road.

C. DVR08-0025 1850 E. QUEEN CREEK ROAD

Approved.

Request rezoning from Agricultural District (AG-1) to Airport District (AP-1) on approximately 35.7-acres located at 1850 E. Queen Creek Road (West of the northwest corner of Cooper and Queen Creek Roads).

D. DVR08-0028 STELLAR AIRPARK ESTATES

Approved.

Request to amend the Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning to eliminate a zoning condition requiring copper supply plumbing for several undeveloped lots within a residential single-family subdivision located approximately one-half mile south of Chandler Boulevard and west of McClintock Drive off of Stellar Parkway.

E. PDP08-0008 ALOFT/DOWNTOWN OCOTILLO

Approved to continue to the October 1, 2008 Planning Commission Hearing.

Request Preliminary Development Plan approval for a five-story, 144-unit hotel on approximately 4.2 acres. The subject site is located south and west of the southwest corner of Dobson and Queen Creek Roads. **(THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A CONTINUANCE TO THE OCTOBER 1, 2008 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING.)**

F. PDP08-0020 WELLS FARGO OCOTILLO SERVICE CENTER

Approved.

Request Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for a 432,000 square foot service center and associated site improvements. The site is located west of the northwest corner of Price and Queen Creek Roads.

1. Compliance with original stipulations adopted by the City Council as Ordinance No. 3389, in case DVR02-0021 WELLS FARGO OCOTILLO CORPORATE CENTER, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Development shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit A, Development Booklet, entitled "Wells Fargo Ocotillo Service Center", kept on file in the City of

Chandler Planning Services Division, in File No. PDP08-0020, except as modified by condition herein.

3. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
4. Approval by the Director of Planning and Development of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls and the Director of Public Works for arterial street median landscaping.
5. A median shall be added to the driveway from Queen Creek Road. The median shall extend to the first cross-aisle and shall be landscaped in a manner similar to the site's other driveway medians.
6. Phase Two of the data processing service center shall be architecturally compatible with Phase One, using similar forms, materials, and colors and emulating the same level of quality.

G. UP08-0031 MGD MOTORS

Approved.

Request Use Permit approval to allow an auto broker/used car wholesaler within Planned Industrial District (I-1) zoning. The property is located at 128 West Boxelder Place, Suite 103, which is west of Arizona Avenue and north of Elliot Road.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with exhibits and representations.
2. Expansion or modification beyond the approved exhibits (Floor Plan, Site Plan, Narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new Use Permit application and approval.
3. The Use Permit shall remain in effect for one (1) year from the effective date of City Council approval. Continuation of the Use Permit beyond the expiration date shall require re-application to and approval by the City of Chandler.
4. There shall be no auto mechanical work, auto body, auto detailing, or washing of vehicles.
5. On-site advertising of vehicles for-sale is prohibited.

H. UP08-0033 405 S. DELAWARE STREET

Approved.

Request Use Permit approval to allow construction of a new single family home on a vacant lot zoned Multiple Family Residential (MF-2). The property is located at 405 S. Delaware Street, south of Frye Road and east of Arizona Avenue.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the exhibits and representations.
2. Approval by the Zoning Administrator of all project details required by Code or condition.

I. UP08-0034 425 S. DELAWARE STREET

Approved.

Request Use Permit approval to allow construction of a new single family home on a vacant lot zoned Multiple Family Residential (MF-2). The property is located at 425 S. Delaware Street, south of Frye Road and east of Arizona Avenue.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with the exhibits and representations.
2. Approval by the Zoning Administrator of all project details required by Code or condition.

J. UP08-0040 MCDUFFY'S GRILLE

Approved.

Request approval of a time extension for a liquor Use Permit to sell liquor (Series 12 Restaurant License) for on-premise consumption indoors and within an outdoor patio at an existing restaurant within the Monterey Vista Village commercial retail center. The property is located at the northwest corner of Pecos and McQueen Roads.

1. Expansion, modification, or relocation beyond the approved exhibits (Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Narrative) shall void the Use Permit and require new Use Permit re-application and approval.
2. Any substantial change in the floor plan to include such items as, but not limited to, a bar serving area or the addition of entertainment related uses shall require new Use Permit reapplication and approval.
3. The Use Permit is granted for a Series 12 license only, and any change of licenses shall require re-application and new Use Permit approval.
4. The Use Permit is non-transferable to other restaurant locations.
5. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting. The site shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
6. The landscaping in all open-spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners' association.
7. The site and patio shall be maintained in a clean and orderly manner.
8. Entertainment activities indoors and outdoors including live music such as bands, individual performers, and karaoke, disc jockey's, speakers emitting music, and the like are not permitted.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS stated he wanted to make a comment on Item F, which is the next phase of the Wells Fargo Ocotillo Service Center project, which he remembers when it came through originally. They were all excited about that. They have seen it built and are glad to see this next phase and is impressed with the quality of the design. He said Mr. Leo Baumann of Wells Fargo is in the audience tonight. He thanked him for bringing them a quality project.

MR. BAUMANN thanked the Commission on behalf of Wells Fargo for recommending the approval to the City Council. They hope they also continue with the same standards

that they have established along Price Road for all the future corporations that become their neighbors and friends. He also thanked Staff who assisted them through the process. They are a great team and they see them as an extension of their team.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there was anybody in the audience who wanted to pull any of the items for a full presentation. There were no items pulled. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the Planning Commission. There were none.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY, seconded by **COMMISSIONER KELLEY** to approve the consent agenda with added stipulations as read into the record by Staff. The consent agenda passed unanimously 7-0.

ACTION:

B. DVR08-0019 CHANDLER AIRPARK BUSINESS CENTER

Request rezoning from Agricultural District (AG-1) to Planned Area Development (PAD) with Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) approval for a business park development with aviation-related uses on approximately 19.2-acres located at the northwest corner of Cooper and Queen Creek Roads.

1. Development shall be in substantial conformance with Exhibit A, Development Booklet, entitled "CHANDLER AIRPARK BUSINESS CENTER" kept on file in the City of Chandler Current Planning Division, in file number DVR08-0019, except as modified by condition herein.
2. Right-of-way dedications to achieve full half-widths, including turn lanes and deceleration lanes, per the standards of the Chandler Transportation Plan.
3. The landscaping in all open spaces and rights-of-way shall be maintained by the adjacent property owner or property owners association.
4. Approval by the Director of Planning and Development of plans for landscaping (open spaces and rights-of-way) and perimeter walls.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Completion of the construction, where applicable, 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.
8. 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.

9. The developer shall be required to install landscaping in the arterial street median 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.
10. The source of water that shall be used on the open space, common areas, and landscape tracts shall be reclaimed water (effluent). If reclaimed water is not available at the time of construction, and the total landscapable area is 10 acres in size or greater, these areas will be irrigated and supplied with water, other than surface water from any irrigation district, by the owner of the development through sources consistent with the laws of the State of Arizona and the rules and regulations of the Arizona Department of Water Resources. If the total landscapable area is less than 10 acres in size, the open space common areas, and landscape tracts may be irrigated and supplied with water by or through the use of potable water provided by the City of Chandler or any other source that will not otherwise interfere with, impede, diminish, reduce, limit or otherwise adversely affect the City of Chandler's municipal water service area nor shall such provision of water cause a credit or charge to be made against the City of Chandler's gallons per capita per day (GPCD) allotment or allocation. However, when the City of Chandler has effluent of sufficient quantity and quality which meets the requirements of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality for the purposes intended available to the property to support the open space, common areas, and landscape tracts available, Chandler effluent shall be used to irrigate these areas.

In the event the owner sells or otherwise transfers the development to another person or entity, the owner will also sell or transfer to the buyer of the development, at the buyer's option, the water rights and permits then applicable to the development. The limitation that the water for the development is to be owner-provided and the restriction provided for in the preceding sentence shall be stated on the final plat governing the development, so as to provide notice to any future owners. The Public Report, Purchase Contracts, and Final Plats shall include a disclosure statement outlining that the CHANDLER AIRPARK BUSINESS CENTER development shall use treated effluent to maintain open space, common areas, and landscape tracts.

12. No television, communication towers or stand-alone antennas shall be constructed on the property. All structures on the property shall remain below the protective surfaces as defined in Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 and/or in relation to limits established in FAA determined Terminal Procedures (TERPS). All construction cranes shall be installed and operated in accordance with FAA rules and regulations including notification through the filing of FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration.

13. Prior to building permit issuance for any structures the developer shall provide a DETERMINATION OF NO HAZARD TO AVIATION approval as issued by the FAA after filing an FAA Form 7460, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration.
14. The project landscaping shall comply with the Commercial Design Standards.
15. The landscaping shall be maintained at a level consistent with or better than at the time of planting.
16. The developer shall provide the City with an avigational easement over the subject property in accordance with Section 3004 of the City of Chandler Zoning Code.
- 17. The 8-foot screen walls between Lease Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18 shall be raised to a height of 10-feet, with 2-feet of additional sound attenuation measures placed on top. Details to be worked out with Staff.**
- 18. Additional evergreen trees shall be installed between Lease Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18, 12-feet high at the time of planting.**
- 19. The applicant shall work with Staff to provide a temporary sound abatement system along Lease Lot B, Lot 18, to the western edge of Lot 17. This shall be installed prior to airport access.**

MR. KEVIN MAYO, ACTING PLANNING MANAGER, stated that this item is a request for rezoning from AG-1 to PAD with PDP for a business park development with aviation related uses on approximately 20 acres at the northwest corner of Cooper and Queen Creek Roads. This is Chandler's first through-the-fence access agreement development meaning this development will have aviation related uses that will have access to Chandler's Taxiway into the Municipal Airport. The PAD land use request is for office uses, industrial uses, retail showroom/warehouse uses, as well as aviation related uses. They will see in their booklet detailed drawings of the site plan, the landscape plans and building elevations while these represent a formal PDP approval. It is seen as a quazi conceptual nature in that currently they show 18 lots but there is the opportunity that maybe one or two lots could combine and they could build a larger single building. They show the worst-case scenario and they could go with fewer lots if they needed to.

First and foremost, the site design has paid very careful attention to its layout from a security standpoint. FAA requires vehicular access and pedestrians to not be able to get to the taxiway and ultimately onto the runway for obvious security reasons. He said they have done a great job at separating those two traffics while there is the need to bring pedestrians and vehicular car traffic into the site. They have done a great job of separating the two traffics that with the aviation uses just from a safety standpoint and also from a visual standpoint. It really has created a nice business park feel to it plus they are allowing taxiways and hangars and associated aprons.

Mr. Mayo said they had two neighborhood meetings. They are aware of neighborhood opposition to this and they will elaborate more on their concerns. It was his understanding that it is noise from the future aircraft that could be their impacting their homes just south of Queen Creek (south and west of this site) as well as the visual

impact. They will see in the site plan that the applicant's has purposely laid this out so that on Queen Creek facing south, you will see buildings not hangars. The doors are purposely oriented to the north and to the east and west so that they don't face the homes. That not only controls not only noise but the visual impacts as well. You will also see between each building there is an 8-foot block wall that connects each building that serves to screen visually the aircraft but it also serves to screen the noise from any aircraft related uses that are going on.

As identified by the developer, they have the intention and have stated it will be in their CC&R's that the aircraft are not allowed to fire up in the hangars. They don't fire them up and drive them out to the taxiway. They are towed out to the taxiway and then they fire them up. It's another measure they are taking to reduce any potential noise impact. Mr. Mayo said he received a letter Monday from one of the neighbors indicating that he had contacted the Governor and the Director of the Arizona Dept. of Environmental Quality in relation to a concern about a long time past landfill site and businesses that use to be out at the airport that were crop dusting and such that used chemicals such as Malathion and DDT, both which are very toxic chemicals. His concern is that those are just out in the dirt and this project through its future aircraft jet wash and prop wash will stir that up and it will get air born and get down to the neighbors. This property is south and east of that and the future taxiway that is shown that cuts across the city property is also very much south of that. They won't have the issue of the jets kicking up that dust. The property that the landfill sat on is city owned property and they would be developing that as airport uses. As the city develops it, they will be running through whatever mitigation issues they have to for whatever contaminated soil issues that may be out there.

He said Staff is very much in support of this. He said this is exactly what the vision of the Airpark Area Plan called for. It has the taxiway access and it is a high quality business park. They are establishing a conceptual PDP as design intent and guideline, but what they have established has set the bar very high. It has a very contemporary design and it has an aviation flair to it that really relates back to the airport. Staff does recommend approval. Through the Study Session there was some discussion about insuring that we have architectural compatibility yet diversity. They don't want the whole thing to develop out looking the same with a collection of the same buildings. They do have a potential condition no. 16 which is:

The developer shall work with Staff in implementing the design guidelines to ensure a balance between architectural compatibility and diversity.

This is to ensure that we don't get 18 of the same looking buildings. The bar is set very high. Staff does recommend approval and is happy to answer any questions.

MR. BRENNAN RAY, 702 E. OSBORN ROAD, PHOENIX, ARIZONA, stated he was here on behalf of the applicant Chandler Airpark Business Center LLC. He said they are very excited about this project. As Kevin mentioned, this is one of the first through-

the-fence development that will take place at the airpark. They have worked hand in glove with various staff disciplines trying to get to this process all the way from the airport, public works, economic development, legal and planning staff. They are very appreciative of Mr. Mayo's thorough memo and his thorough discussion now and they are certainly all right with the stipulations 1 through 15 and the additional stipulation no. 16 that was just read in. As you see the airpark develop, looking at it from McQueen to Gilbert Roads and from Queen Creek to Germann, there is a lot of excitement and energy in the area and projects that have come before this Commission and Council and that have been approved; ones that will continue to generate jobs and generate the type of asset that everyone hopes this area becomes. This is another piece of the overall puzzle to make the airpark area sustainable and have a lot of success. As Kevin mentioned and as indicated in the Staff report, this is exactly the type of development that is contemplated by the General Plan. The General Plan designates the site as employment and refers us to the Chandler Airpark Area Plan. The Chandler Airpark Area Plan specifically calls for this site to be a commercial office business park with taxiway access. This has been designed exactly as the vision of the Chandler Airpark Area Plan. He said they would request their approval in conformance with Staff's recommendation. He said he would be happy to go through some issues of the plan as it is presented but he didn't think that was what they were here to talk about. He thought they were here to talk about some of the issues that have been raised and he can go into as much detail as they would like but he is certainly available to answer any questions now.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the applicant. There were none.

BRENNAN RAY stated that as Kevin mentioned they have been through the neighborhood process and they have had 2 follow-up meetings. As they look at the site, it is 23 acres and an odd triangle shaped site. One of the concerns that Kevin mentioned and we have heard of deals with noise and primarily, the noise that this potential project would generate. As we have gone through and looked at this site plan and as they have thought there way through some of these things, there are 3 areas that are key to understanding any potential noise; one will be minimum and two, they have gone to great lengths to mitigate some of those noise concerns. Clearly, the first thing you look at is the number of operations that this small development will generate. Presuming, that all 18 lots have 18 planes. He said he was looking at the total operations of the airport based on the averages and what 18 planes in this area and this type of development would generate. They believe the data amounts to a little less than 1% increase in the total overall operations of the airport. It is a relative drop in the bucket in terms of the existing operations that are occurring on the airport today. It's a minimal amount of noise that is going to be generated in terms of operation. Operationally speaking, as Kevin mentioned in his overview and presentation, the planes will be towed out of here to the staging area and then towed up to the internal taxiway. The project is serviced by 2 internal taxiways. He showed where they are. When they get to the internal taxiway, it is an east/west alignment, clearly pointing away from the residential neighborhood. It is that point that they will start their engines and proceed over to the airport. As we look at a different and

bigger picture of what is going on, the planes will idle taxi over to this point (he showed where that is). This is where the connecting taxiway will go. Clearly, it is not in at this point but the planes will taxi across this connecting taxiway and the majority of the take offs occur at 22 left and 22 right on the northeast end of the airport. The planes will idle up to this point, idle taxi up to there and once they get up to the runway, they will go through their pre-flight procedures and power up and proceed to take off. As Kevin also mentioned in the CC&R's it would state that there is no run ups allowed or permitted in the airpark as people are traveling over to the airport.

Mr. Ray stated there would not be planes or helicopters taking off from the airpark through the development agreement that was approved by City Council. Once they cross onto the airport property they become just another airplane on the airport - no difference than people who are hangared on the airport themselves. If they look at site design and layout with this internal taxiway, it provides not only security but it provides screening. It is screened from the neighbors to the southwest by the buildings themselves. These are 45-foot buildings solid concrete title panel construction. In addition, there is as Kevin mentioned an eight-foot high solid concrete wall as well that will occur in these locations between the buildings. They have considerable separation away from the residential neighbors to the southwest of our site. They are approximately 349 feet from the face of our closest building at this point here to the face of their residence there. At build-out Queen Creek Road is anticipated to be six lanes. There is a lot of stuff that is going on around there. Lots of landscaping-there average landscape setback along Queen Creek Road is 32 feet. They feel that the amount of operations of less than 1% and the internal operations that they have establishing the CC&R's as well as site design and separation is more than adequate to mitigate any potential noise from this development.

As Kevin mentioned, there was a letter and although they can certainly respect and appreciate some of those concerns, they believe that this is a city issue and that it is something that has existed and was taken care before DWO got involved in the picture. Mr. Ray said he would be happy to answer any questions and reserve the right to rebuttal.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the applicant. There were none. He went to the audience and said when he calls their name to please step forward and state their name and address for the record.

CHRIS SORENSEN, 12539 E. QUEEN CREEK ROAD, CHANDLER, stated he opposes this project. It is going across the street from his whole frontage of his property. There is going to be jet fuel storage there and he believes Mr. Ray just stated that there is 149 feet the building to the nearest resident - that 149 feet is his property. He is really concerned with the buffer. How can they use his property? He said he saw the picture where they pull the jet out but when it makes the right turn, it fires right at his house. How nice is that going to be? They are talking 200-250 feet. The maps aren't matching up with the aerials. Some of them show their project beginning about the middle of his property and then you will see an aerial where it's past his property. He doesn't think this project will mix with residential. There are more homes being built in the area.

They are going to be within 100 feet – maybe another 20 homes going in. He is really concerned about the jet fuel storage, the exhaust and the noise. He didn't think they would like something within 200 feet of their house to keep you up 24/7. They just said the jets are going to be towed out, but they are only getting towed out of the hangar to the taxiway. Once they are on the taxiway they are fired up. That taxiway is no farther from his house than the hangar. Those are his concerns.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS asked him to please point to the diagram on the Elmo and show them where his house is. He said he visited his house over the weekend. He asked him how far his house is from Queen Creek Road? Mr. Sorensen said he believes it is 150 feet of grass before his building starts. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** asked him if he had any concerns for the noise that Queen Creek Road creates for him? Mr. Sorensen said Queen Creek Road doesn't create any noise for him. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** said he stood out there at the edge of his property by the line of palm trees he is just planting and when cars were going by, he couldn't hear the planes taking off. He was just wondering if he found the noise on Queen Creek Road is objectionable? Mr. Sorensen said the car noise doesn't bother him at all. Helicopters 200 feet above his house and that are there 24 hours of the day does. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** asked him if he knew where the helicopter facility is? Mr. Sorensen said it is on the northeast side of the runway. It used to be about midpoint but it has been moved. They are still allowing new houses to be built. How can you keep putting residential and this airport deal together. He doesn't think it is going to work. As far as the noise on the road, it might affect your hearing a little bit, but when you breathing jet fuel and fumes that's a health issue.

TIFFANY SORENSEN, 12539 E. QUEEN CREEK ROAD, CHANDLER, stated she lives in the same house they were talking about. First and foremost, public health and welfare needs to come first. What is really confusing is that the hangars on the other side of the airport are clearly in the 65 dnl. You come and bring 18 lear jets that are 150 feet away from her property line, they are bringing the 65 dnl. She knows the FAA discourage through-the-fence operations and they can't control and regulate what goes on in there. What they have told her what they can do is that the city doesn't abide by the noise abatement laws. You start putting people in the 65 dnl they could lose federal grant money. It is hard for her to even fathom – airports close every day for this type of reason. The other thing is it is beyond her comprehension how a private developer can come in and take 150 feet of her private property and use that as a buffer. That would certainly be treading on a very fine line of constituting a 'taking'. She showed where her fence is the property line and her barn. That's approximately 150 feet. You can see the difference of 150 feet. It's not very much. It's a little more than the length of this room where 18 jets are going to be coming all the way. The buffer they are taking is everything inside her fence. That jet fuel tank is only going to be another 100 feet behind that. Her property 330 feet in length and those jets go all the way across. She showed where the project starts and where the entrance is. The fuel station is going to create noise. There is going to be an 8-foot screen wall but they are admitting that the engines are going to be above 8 feet. The developer himself said she would be subject to

vibrations and rattling of her windows in being that close. The FAA said if they had 18 leer jets 150 feet from you private residence, you undoubtedly are going to be pushed up closer into the 70-80 dnl. There is no sound retention and she thinks something needs to be reworked. Everything they ask of the developer they refuse to budge on any of the issues. For the viability of this airport to continue it needs to be addressed. She is a county island on 2 and ¼ acres. In her front pasture, which is a 150 feet that they want to use as a buffer, she has the right to parcel down to 1 acre and build a house right there. So then what does her buffer decrease to. 150 feet just left that buffer zone that they are saying they are going to give you. This is something that needs to be looked into a little further including the three entrances. It is her understanding that in their project where those gates are and all those entrances that is going to be a gate and that's where those jets are going to be – parked in that alleyway and an 8-foot fence isn't going to cover up 18 leer jets.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the speaker and thanked her for her comments.

GEESJE STEVENS, 3151 S. EAGLE DRIVE, CHANDLER, stated she is basically opposing this because it is just too close to the residential area that we are in. They are creating more excessive noise, pollution and hazards. It's just not right to subject them to this. There is no buffer. She showed a picture standing in their field. This noise echoes all the way down this subdivision road and the only buffer they basically have is this highway on Queen Creek Road. There are also houses behind over there – it's a horseshoe residential area. There are a lot of homes. They are already subject to a lot of the excessive noise. The other thing that concerns her with this is that they say there is probably not going to be that many aircraft. Their CC&R's will state that they have to be towed. They all know how CC&R's work. How are you going to guarantee that every pilot or person adheres to that. The other problem she has is they will be permitted to have related uses such as charter operations, pilot training, aircraft sales and leasing, aircraft hangar subleasing and other aeronautical activity uses. It's just putting more and more on top of this residential area. There is no concern for them. They are subject to all of it and she thinks they need to be taken into consideration.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the speaker and thanked her for her comments.

GUY PEPOY, 3115 S. DIAMOND DRIVE IN THE TWIN ACRE SUBDIVISION, CHANDLER, stated if he was the Planner of this project and someone posed to me to design this and provide the most amount of noise, jet exhaust and intrusive pollutants, that pretty much is the plan you see. He attended both of the neighborhood meetings and there were about ten families there. They are a pretty tight neighborhood. They are a rural neighborhood with livestock and share an irrigation ditch and they are always talking and have a couple of parties a year. It's a pretty tight neighborhood. Based on his conversations with other people in the neighborhood, he knows of no one that is in favor of this. They may not be here tonight but they are not in favor of this project. They are

all in opposition. If someone polled each and every one, they would find that to be a fact. His concern is that they have the through-the-fence industry at the southwest corner of the property. He is not in opposition to the project. He thinks it could be a good project. What he is in opposition to is the way it is designed. He thinks it was designed with a careless disregard for the fact that there are people that live across the street and that got him upset. He asked some questions. Why can't they move this up he asked at the first meeting. The response was "it would be inconvenient for the pilots and there's an old landfill up there that had contaminated soil and they don't want to disturb that". His second concern was that if you want to increase traffic and make it more obnoxious to neighbors, put a fueling station right on the corner at that entryway. They would have to redesign their property because it was fundamentally flawed in the first place. They should have the entryway up to the northeast. There is nothing up there. Other people would be able to design around the entry if you moved it that way. Yes, it might be inconvenient to pilots, but it is going to be pretty inconvenient to him and Raoul who lives across the street and the Sorensen's who live directly across the street. The three concerns he had were the location of the entry, the fueling station (not so much that it is a fueling station, but the location) that combined with the entryway it seems to maximize the amount of noise and pollution they can get. At the airport, he lives on Diamond Drive and occasionally when the wind is coming in the right direction, there is a leer jet that takes off and gets the wonderful smell of jet fuel. They have no idea who is going to rent this. If they have any calculations that they could come up with is wild conjecture. The Magic 8 ball would be perfect. It would be as accurate as the utilization projections that they are coming up with. That's insulting. One of the things that was the most insulting was the fact that when one of the developers at the first meeting explained very carefully to the audience how an 8-foot brick wall was going to protect them from sound from an engine that was eight feet off the ground. His response was if they could make that wall twenty feet tall or even 15 feet tall. Can they do something? They have a 30-foot tall building and then there is this span in between it. Can they give them a little protection? They were stonewalled on every concern they had. He thanked the Commission for listening to him.

Mr. Pepoy said he was the one that wrote the letter to the Governor. If they want to find out what has been dumped on that site, they explain very carefully how the jet traffic exhaust is towards the northeast. They dumped some really, really nasty stuff. He pulled both the reports from 1987 and 1990. The primary concern of the site review at that time was water contamination. They really skated over the soil contamination and that was pretty lightly dealt with. From his investigation and in talking with Mr. Sorensen (he grew up there and knew what was put on the ground) there were some nasty, nasty chemicals dumped on the ground. Whether this goes through as shown or not, at some point someone is going to want to put something right across the street, 20 feet away, on Cooper Road. You have issues. He didn't raise that issue, Staff did. Also on another point, one of the explanations when they are talking about noise, Commissioner Rivers brought up the point of noise from Queen Creek Road. There is not a whole lot they can do about that. The noise goes down significantly at night when they are sleeping and it's not so bad in the morning when they are waking up. It gets a little bit heavier in the

afternoons. It is going to be widened to six feet. One of the concerns was about the fire station. It's going to make a lot of noise and that's going to be a lot worse than this facility. The fire station is there to protect and serve. He is happy that the fire station is going to be a 100 feet from his door. When he has an aneurism or one of his people are hurt, they are right there. That is wonderful. He supports them. They are there to help him and he is there to help them. There is going to be six lanes and there will be more road noise. These guys are coming in and developing this and they are going to make a profit and all of the problems they are creating are going to remain here and they are going to have to deal with.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the speaker. There were none. He thanked him for his comments.

DOUG COMBS, 2525 AIRPORT BLVD., CHANDLER, stated he has property on the airport, one of the hangar condominiums. He is not affiliated with the contractor or the project developer. He is familiar with airport operations and airport operations of this nature. He has been a professional pilot for 33 years. He has operated out of a similar facility at Scottsdale and in Molene back in the Midwest. One of the things he sees about the development that he wanted to bring to their attention is the entryway onto the airport isn't something the developer designed. It is designed to line up with the plan that is already in the master plan. The airport developed it 15 years ago when they put in taxiways in the 2nd runway. There was a stub that was brought out in that location. As far as moving that, they would be moving something that was already engineered and designed and FAA approved about 15 or 20 years ago. With regards to the various complaints about different noise issues, in fact an 8-foot fence isn't the best solution, having a slightly taller fence or perhaps an attenuation strip across the top. The big airports have them. They have slotted slaps that cause the noise to reflect upwards. It might be a better solution than just a straight block fence. However, he would point out that the use of block concrete hangars and tilt up slabs and fences at places like Scottsdale and in between the hangars acts to channel the noise. It channels it by hitting the fence and driving it up and hitting the hangars and driving it up. As a result, it creates more of a silent area underneath it for the people that are the users on the other side of the airport. He said he couldn't offer anything about that particular fuel station that is offered. He can offer his experience as an operator of a corporate jets and later airline jets. Nobody likes to start those things up until it is time to drive to the runway. A typical method of operation is you have a Staff and crew that tow the airplane out. They tow it down and get it fueled. They bring it back to load the passengers. You then tow it to your debarkation point and start it up. You sometimes you start it and taxi out. In any event, you want to minimize the fuel flow on the ground. Because the fuel flow at taxi is approximately the same fuel flow as what you are using at altitude on the earlier jets. With regard to the issues of noise and jet fuel smell, he would point out that wasted jet fuel and smell is typical of a stage 1 jet which would be a very early sixties style leer jet. You don't see very many of those in service any longer simply because they are not economical to operate. They typically have gone overseas or underground. Most of the things that you see operating today are stage 2 and stage 3 which are very high bypass

turbo fans. They don't whine, they hum. You really can't hear them coming and going. Forty feet away from his hangar on the other side of the airport (he is noise sensitive himself) he has two jet operators. He can't tell you when they come and go. They pull the airplane out and take it down and fuel it. They bring it back and load people up. He hears a starter and they are gone 15 seconds later. They don't start and they don't taxi until they have a clearance and the ability to leave the airport. They are not hanging around for any period of time because it is just too expensive. He is in favor of the project not because he is going to have any use for that outside of the airport or operate an airplane off of it or care about the developer. For this airport to stop developing its infrastructure at this point in time, the alternative for that plot of land likely as not would be for the city to acquire it at some point in the future from the developer after we tell him to go away and then build 300 light aluminum hangars like they already have on the other side to accommodate even more traffic. He thinks probably the use of this concrete barrier between the residential areas and frankly, between the residential area and the current heliport is about the best noise attenuation use on the airport that they could come up with. That is going to have a minimal impact as far as traffic.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the speaker and thanked him for his comments. He asked if there was anybody else in the audience that would like to speak on this item.

DENNIS STEVENS, 3151 SOUTH EAGLE DRIVE, CHANDLER, stated he lives 600 feet away from this project. He would like to bring up a point that the developer reported that this is within the Chandler Airpark Area Plan. It's within the Area Plan from eight years ago but it is not within the Area Plan now. They have designated their neighborhood as residential and the Area Plan says that they are transitional and it isn't any more. Now they are a residential property. They wouldn't allow a residential community to come in next to the airport. Why would they allow the airport to come in next to them? On the fueling station, the city won't allow gas stations to be on any corner of the airport area. That is dangerous. So they want to come in and put a fueling station where you won't allow a gas station? He thinks the fueling station is ill conceived. They could service these people's airplanes by the airport itself. The fueling station right across the street from us is a hazard. Why would you allow that to happen when you wouldn't allow even a gas station in the neighborhood?

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any questions of the speaker and thanked him for his comments. He asked if there was anybody else that wanted to speak. There was no one. He went back to the applicant.

BRENNAN RAY stated that this development is exactly what the Chandler Airpark Area Plan calls for. It's a plan that has been in existence for approximately 10 years. Even so much as to designate where this through-the-fence access will occur. As he stated and will continue to state, this development is exactly in compliance with the Airpark Area Plan. With respect to the amount of separation, he will speak from their property line to what's going on to the nearest taxi lane. Queen Creek Road at build-out will be six lanes

of traffic. That's 135 feet of right-of-way. As you approach their property, they have an average of 32 feet landscape setback along there. You have a parking lot and additional landscaping that is occurring to the building. Their buildings are set back approximately 100 feet from their property line. So all totaled, from the south side of Queen Creek Road at build-out they are looking at 230 feet. You take an additional 50 or so feet to the length of their building. It could be more but he is guessing approximately 50 feet. That takes them to 280 feet. By the time they get up to where the Airpark taxiway is they are probably close to 300 feet in terms of separation from the south side of the future Queen Creek Road to the taxiway. In between there as he mentioned, you have lots of landscape. You have a solid concrete tilt building.

The planes operationally under the CC&R's must be towed out up to this point. That is something that as they went through the neighborhood meeting they heard from the pilots. One of the things they said was for starting a plane up for a variety of reasons, including safety reasons, noise concerns out of courtesy and respect for others, they are not going to be firing their airplane up next to this building. They are going to have their own people working in this building. It would not be productive for these people who own the plane and run the business out of there. Secondly, with respect to the FAA they have worked hand in glove specifically with public works, with the airport manager and with legal to ensure that this development does not jeopardize any of the FAA Grant Assurances that are on this airport. This project was submitted to the FAA, not specifically this site plan, but the development agreement, the access agreement and a copy of the site plan were sent as well. He could be mistaken on that. The FAA has had an opportunity to review this proposal and the comments that he received back from the FAA dealt with some minor modifications to the term of their agreement and some additional provisions possibly to ensure the city has enough enforcement mechanisms to be able to enforce what's going on. He deferred to the City Attorney that the airport has complete control over their ability to access the airport. Once an airplane gets on the airport it is subject to the airport rules and regulations, same as any other plane on the site. They can certainly appreciate and understand FAA concerns but they have worked through those. From their perspective, it is kind of non-issue. In the event an FAA issue does come up, there is a catch all provision within these agreements, which will govern this development. It says the city can yank it and they can't have through-the-fence access until they resolve the FAA concerns. Clearly, the city has complete control.

The last thing he wants to talk about is with respect to the way this site has been designed. As he has indicated, it was designed and very much driven by the connecting taxiway which has been dictated to us by the city and airport. The fuel facility that is proposed to be located in this will be designed in accordance with all applicable rules and regulations, the EPA and ADEQ. It's no different than a fueling facility that is located on the airport. This one just happens to be located outside the airport. It is one that is not general sale aviation for the public. It is for private use only. He believes he has addressed most of the major concerns dealing with noise and separation and FAA and the fuel facility. Again, this is exactly what the Chandler Airpark Area Plan calls for. He

would request your approval in accordance with Staffs recommendation and in accordance with what the Airpark Area Plan calls for.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS if there were any questions of the applicant.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said in listening to the adjacent neighbors talking about this thing. Is there only one home that abuts to the front of their property? Mr. Ray said that is correct-it is the home of the Sorensen's. The rest of the property to the east of that is all office condo not residential. Is that right? Mr. Ray said that was correct. The majority of their frontage has office development to the south. **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY** said he was listening to what their comments were. They don't really have 18 planes going past their property with the exception as they tie in to the taxiway as they go into the airport. The only buildings that really front them are Lot 18 and leased Lot B if he is reading the site plan correctly. They made a good point about some aircraft having their engines up high and an 8-foot wall. The majority of this frontage on this one property is blocked by those two buildings, possibly with a small gap in between them. I don't see that much impact on that particular lot. They are near an airport and they are always going to be near the airport. The majority of this stuff is quite a bit away from them. Maybe there is some additional sound control between those two buildings that might be appropriate. He wasn't sure if you need it between all the rest of the buildings but maybe between lots 17, 18 and lot B. This is about the only area where you have any gaps in the sound. Is he correct? Mr. Ray replied that as we look at this area that is adjacent and closest to the residential neighborhood, he thinks they will have an 8-foot solid concrete wall there and 8-foot solid concrete wall here (he showed where). Certainly, we can look at maybe some additional things to mitigate noise. **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY** said their lot is almost the only building that is really fronting them. The building that is really fronting them is that Lot B, lease lot. Their property line is kind of between Lot 18 and Lot B. That is the only gap he sees where they are going to get the possibility of some sound. Larger trees or a grove of trees help reduce sound. Maybe that wall becomes 10 or 12 feet at that point. Mr. Ray said they would be happy to provide some additional landscaping in that area to the extent they are able to. One of the things they can also look at is a strip across of the wall. They can certainly look at some other materials or something across the top of the wall to help mitigate noise. **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY** stated he couldn't see everything along Queen Creek Road needing to be a 15-foot high wall in between buildings. It becomes too big of a barrier but he thinks possibly between Lots 17, 18 and Lot B where it impacts the neighbors. He thinks that an area where they may increase their wall height or some type of system of raising it whether it's to somewhere like 12-feet tall. Then you add some landscaping and some trees that gets you some more height and he thinks between the trees and the wall you are going to minimize a lot of sound impact to the residential area. **CHAIRMAN FLANDERS** said he would agree with that. Mr. Ray said one of the things they can do with Commissions recommendation is they can look at raising that wall 8 feet to 10 feet and maybe they would need approval for that to go over 8 feet. Clearly, it is not in the booklet. They could certainly agree to going to 8 feet and providing some additional landscaping in that area as well. **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY**

said they only have a small impact up against these particular houses that they have control on. The rest is the city's portion. He's thinking about doing some type of wall structure, some type of noise abatement type wall and maybe getting it up to 12 feet. He thinks if you add a lot more trees in between Lots 17 and 18 and Lot B to add to that buffering. He thinks the problem is solved from his point of view. **CHAIRMAN FLANDERS** said he would agree to that with some stipulation between Lot 17, 18 and Lot B at those open areas would provide in combination with the buildings would definitely aid the sounds. As one speaker indicated, when it hits those buildings the sound goes straight up and dissipates. He thinks if they can at least go ahead and provide some type of an area that would act as the same thing would definitely help the sound mitigation and also any other sites and smells.

KEVIN MAYO, ACTING PLANNING MANAGER, said he is writing down a potential stipulation and hasn't given it a definite maximum height but there are probably various materials and things that can be applied to top of walls that don't have quite the visual impact of a 12-foot tall masonry wall. Maybe it is the sound slab that may actually have a height that may be more appropriate. What he has crafted is:

The sound attenuation measures shall be installed upon the top of the 8-foot screen wall along Queen Creek Road between Lease Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18.

He said if we want to add a maximum height to that they can.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS stated as mentioned 12-feet would be a good height unless somebody else has another opinion.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said he thought 12 feet is probably appropriate along with the addition of trees.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS stated the speaker had already suggested a wall height of 10 feet, so if you had additional slatting on top of it that would bring it to 12 feet. Again, the diagram is showing only one tree so additional trees would be a great benefit as well.

COMMISSIONER VEITCH said he agreed with two feet of sound attenuation on top of a 10-foot wall as opposed to four on top of an 8-foot wall.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked if there were any other comments.

COMMISSIONER KELLEY stated he just wanted to note that the tree species that they have listed there currently are all semi-evergreen deciduous trees and he thinks in adding to the stipulation that those trees should be the evergreen species.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said in addition to that they are selling lots. Obviously, this is not being built out completely in one phase. If we add these stipulation, but maybe

those are the last buildings being built. The wall needs to be continuance at least at that location. **CHAIRMAN FLANDERS** said yes to provide a temporary solution.

BRENNAN RAY stated it has been a while since he looked at the development agreement, but they can't have access to the airport until certain conditions are met. One of which is that this connecting taxiway be built. In terms of sequencing, he can certainly appreciate the desire to get it in sooner but to specifically stipulate it to Phase I, he is not sure that it gets us to where they need to be in terms of what they are obligated to do before they can get access. They can't have airplanes on the site until they have access. There is a list of things he can look at and drill down specifically what those items are that must be completed before they can access the airport. He does know that one of them is the construction of this connecting taxiway.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said they could change it to 'prior to the taxiway being operational'. His feeling is if these lots are the last ones built, they are going to still have a sound problem. When the taxiways become operational, then this temporary fencing will be in place and landscaped.

KEVIN MAYO, ACTING PLANNING MANAGER stated that stipulation no. 17 should read as:

The 8-foot screen wall is between Leased Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18 shall be raised to a height of 10 feet with 2 feet of additional sound attenuation measures placed on top. Details to be worked out with Staff.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS said they were also talking about some additional landscaping. Mr. Mayo said they have it as a second stipulation, stipulation no. 18.

Additional evergreen trees shall be installed between Leased Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS stated they probably need to be a certain height at time of planting. A lot of times they do 20 foot on center and 12 foot at time of planting. At least that will provide a double edge sword.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said that if somehow they can word in 'temporary' for these lots. Maybe this wall is your temporary solution until lots 28 and B are developed. **BRENNAN RAY** stated that with respect to how they envision this project developing it is very much market driven and as they represented in their project booklet, Phase 1 will include the streetscape landscaping, the interior lots and then rough grade these lots. They can't really predict how these buildings are going to build-out. They certainly appreciate and understand the concern but this is a very much market driven development in terms of vertical construction. What they are considering is some type of temporary fence? **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY** stated maybe it's the normal fence; maybe it's a 10-foot wall for whatever the width of your taxiway is in turning the corner. It doesn't help the residents Lots 18 and such are the very last ones developed. **BRENNAN RAY** stated

they would propose something along the lines to work with Staff to come up with some kind of temporary noise abatement that would occur from Leased Lot B over to the edge of Lot 16 – the west edge of Lot 17. Certainly working along the lines in working with Staff to come up with temporary noise abatement. **VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY** said maybe they would have a solution for that by the time you get to City Council.

COMMISSIONER VEITCH stated they should also word that final stipulation ‘to provide that temporary barrier be in place before the airport access is operational’.

COMMISSIONER RIVERS asked Mr. Ray in regards to the diagram that is currently on the screen to point where the fuel station is going to be located. Mr. Ray pointed to the area where it is located. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** also said rather than running the temporary fencing if these two lots never get sold, it wouldn’t necessarily need to run along the landscape front. It could run from the corner of the building to the taxiway. That would still block all of the sound that was coming that way. The fuel station location is how far approximately from Queen Creek Road? Mr. Ray said from Queen Creek Road to this point they were up to 300 feet. This is an 80-foot wide taxiway. He would probably guess 425 or 450. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** asked if he was correct in his assessment that they chose that location for a fuel station because it is the only place in this development that everybody must pass before it goes to the taxiway? Mr. Ray said that is correct. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** said on first glance one might say could you not move Lot 6? If you put Lot 6 down there in the fuel station at the north end, then you would have a whole bunch of people that would have to take their planes very much out of their way to go to the fuel station. Is that correct? Mr. Ray replied that was correct and then they have conflicting traffic. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** asked if there was a time constraint on these businesses as to when they can use their aircraft? Do they have to be parked before midnight? Is there any kind of a time constraint at all? Mr. Ray said there is no time constraint. They were told at the neighborhood meeting that the airport operates 24-hours. Clearly, this being an industrial business park, typical business hours would be the operation of this but there is no specific time limitation on the operation of the plane. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** said would it be fair to say that 80% of the aircraft movement will be during normal business hours or doesn’t he know? Mr. Ray said they do not know. **COMMISSIONER RIVERS** asked if they were using the south taxiway as opposed to the north taxiway, you don’t get to choose? The airport is going to have that taxiway and you can use it? Correct? Mr. Ray said yes that was correct.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS said he was going to allow one of the neighbors to come back up and make a rebuttal.

MR. PEPOY said he is out of time dealing with this issue because up to this point it hasn’t been dealt with very well at all. Reference was made how this project is in compliance with the airport’s local area plan. He has a copy of the Airpark Area Plan dated November 5, 1998 and there is something in there they might want to see. He showed it on the Elmo. He showed the development in question and Queen Creek Road. He said as he is reading the diagram from the Plan in 1998, that is a thru-the-fence

entrance. If that were a thru-the-fence entrance, they wouldn't be taking up their time. They have the thru-the-fence entrance here. He is curious how that came to be? One of the responses they had from the city was the city wants it that way. How can he respond to that? This was the plan adopted in 1998 and if they would just compromise and bring it down a little bit.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS asked Staff who would make the determination of that location? As they are looking at the General Plan, is it a graphic thing or was it something that was planned? Was it something not concrete at that particular time or is it there now?

KEVIN MAYO, ACTING PLANNING MANAGER, replied that the answer is a combination of all of that. The Airpark Area Plan, as in most area plans, is not intended to be parcel specific. They are just land use designations. Where that taxiway access is you would expect to have multiple taxiway accesses accessing everything that is listed as Commercial Office Business Park with taxiway access. All the light blue they see surrounding that 55-dnl line that runs northeast, all of that could have taxiway access. To assume that it would all function off of one taxiway access off of the runway, it wouldn't - you would need multiple. There has always been a plan to have one somewhere down south of the one shown on that map. The Airport Master Plan is what further governs that to say where they are. That Master Plan (he didn't know the specific year) was approved and right now the entire length of that taxiway is not built. There are two stubs already in there. There are two stubs between the one you see on the map and south of it. One of them is the one this one is using and a future stub at the City owned property similar to stubs you see on the southwest side of the runway. They stub into the existing hangars over there. He said he knew this was a long-winded answer.

MR. PEPOY said a comment was made about how the proposed development is very close to just the Sorensen's property. Raoul lives right across the street. Not too long ago, this organization and the City Council approved Madeira, which is the Madeira subdivision. He showed where they were located. They are supposed to be very upscale homes, \$600,000, \$700,000 to \$1,000,000 homes. That is not far from the entrance as well. He went to that development about a week or so ago and it appears to be stalled along with many other housing developments in the vicinity. At some point there is going to be some more people that are going to be living fairly close to this southwest proposed entrance.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS said he was going to close the floor for discussion and possible motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said he had one questions for Staff. Behind tab 10 – he sees an entry sign feature on a 45-degree angle. When you look at the sign design, it shows some panel signs on both sides. It seems to him that if anybody were driving eastbound on Queen Creek, would they be able to see the signage at all?

KEVIN MAYO stated per the sign matrix plan termed GD100 underneath tab 12, 3rd exhibit back, you would be looking at what's referred to as M2. A couple pages beyond that, GD02 is M2. That is what you would be seeing – that sign there. They have it set at an angle under tab 10.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said if you are headed westbound he thinks you would be able to see signage. He's not sure with landscaping and the angle whether you are going to see any of the sign if you are eastbound on Queen Creek.

KEVIN MAYO said he would want to defer to the applicant to see what their true intention of the orientation of the sign is.

BRENNAN RAY said they are exactly right – that sign should be perpendicular along that area with tenant panels on both sides.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY asked if that is something they need to clarify now or is that something that will get fixed?

KEVIN MAYO said no there is a standard stipulation that refers to the time packages. They will be designed so they don't run into conflict with landscaping. That is something they could administratively adjust to its true orientation.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said he looked at all the site screen walls. They are all somewhat perpendicular or parallel to the street. He didn't know if they needed to clarify that.

KEVIN MAYO stated it has been clarified now and it's on the record so they are o.k.

VICE CHAIRMAN asked Staff to read the stipulations they discussed and see if they make sense.

KEVIN MAYO said he would be happy to. He did read in stipulation no. 16 regarding the balance of architecture and style.

16. The developer shall work with Staff in implementing the design guidelines to ensure balance between architecture compatibility and diversity.

17. The 8-foot screen wall between Leased Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18 shall be raised to a height of 10 feet with 2 feet of additional sound attenuation measures placed on top. Details to be worked out with Staff.

18. Additional evergreen trees shall be installed between Leased Lot B, Lot 17 and Lot 18 - 12 feet high at the top of planting

19. The applicant shall work with Staff to provide a temporary sound abatement system along Leased Lot B, Lot 18 to the western edge of Lot 17. This shall be installed prior to airport access.

VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY said the only thing he wasn't sure they covered was stipulation no. 18 about the spacing of trees. He asked if that needed to be called out.

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS said they could probably work that out with Staff at the time they come in with their plans whether it's 20-foot on center. He thinks that is probably what they did before.

KEVIN MAYO said since they are not dealing with just straight linear landscaped areas, they kind of have trapezoids and triangles. Staff understands the intention to get as many trees as they can get in there from a longevity standpoint from the tree. They understand the intention to get as many trees as they can; evergreen 12-feet high at the time of planting.

COMMISSIONER KELLEY said it is also important to understand that whatever species ends up getting selected is going to dictate how far those trees should be apart. They don't want to say 10 feet and end up getting something that just grows together and the health of the trees is compromised.

MOVED BY VICE CHAIRMAN IRBY, seconded by **COMMISSIONER VEITCH** to approve DVR08-0019 CHANDLER AIRPARK BUSINESS CENTER with additional stipulations as read in by Staff. Item passed unanimously 7-0.

6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Mayo said there was nothing to report.

7. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHAIRMAN FLANDERS announced that the next regular meeting is September 3, 2008 at 5:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 22 S. Delaware Street, Chandler, Arizona.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:14 p.m.

Michael Flanders, Chairman

Jeffrey A. Kurtz, Secretary