

5. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A. 18-344 Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-06)
7125 E Lincoln Drive - Lincoln Medical Plaza

Paul Michaud, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the project. The packet has the revisions from the last meeting. The narrative contains a lot more information regarding height and the applicant has provided updates to their landscape plan. The renderings have been updated to show signage and roof equipment. A trip generation statement was provided but they do not have all of the materials for site circulation. Under the Statement of Direction (SOD), the applicant must provide a narrative regarding the intensity of use. A medical marijuana dispensary would also require a separate Special Use Permit (SUP) application. The hours of operation for the site will be from 7:00 AM to 8:00 PM, Monday through Friday. He then provided the specific hours of operation for the pharmacy and urgent care uses.

Mr. Miller suggested that they make it clear that a medical marijuana dispensary requires an intermediate special use amendment.

Chairman Wastchak agreed that they need to be very clear.

The applicant, Benjamin Tate, commented that the previous SUP did not specifically prohibit medical marijuana dispensaries, which is why he stated that they are subject to the regulations of Article XI requiring a separate amendment to the SUP.

Chairman Wastchak stated that if there was a prohibition in the SUP they would have to come back and amend the SUP to remove the prohibition.

Mr. Miller stated that the only way they could get a medical marijuana dispensary is to go through the SUP process.

Mr. Michaud stated that the applicant has now provided more information regarding the roof design and heights. The graphics now show the setbacks of the parapets. They are setback around 20 feet from the roof edge. The smaller parapet is about eight feet setback from the roof's edge.

Commissioner Lewis asked how high the parapet is.

Mr. Michaud responded that the smaller parapet is 32 inches high and the larger parapet is 36 inches. The Commission identified that at the last meeting, the direction was to lower the atrium roof and this was not done. Rather, the narrative indicates that it provides an architectural expression and screens roof AC units.

Chairman Wastchak asked the applicant to provide some feedback on this issue.

Mr. Tate indicated that the latest site plan was responsive to the Commissioners' comments given in the last meeting. They moved the building and trash enclosure further into the lot. They also reconfigured the parking and the south side of the building. They want to keep the height entry feature because it helps to create a better-looking building. The SUP guidelines for medical centers allow for an increase in height. Additional height is allowed for architectural features. The roof also provides screening of roof top mechanical equipment. He noted that they moved the parapets back 20-25 feet from the roof's edge to minimize the visual impact of the screening. If the roof feature is lowered, then they will see the mechanical screening from Lincoln Drive.

Commissioner Georgelos requested a drawing of how the building would look without the additional atrium height.

Mr. Tate stated that they will put one together.

Chairman Wastchak agreed that if they push the roof lower that it would make the building look plain and flat.

Mr. Tate stated that they have now included the trees on the perimeter of the site in the rendering.

Commissioner Lewis asked what are the tree species.

Mr. Tate stated that he does not have that information but it should be in the landscaping plan.

Commissioner Lewis stated that architecturally, he is still not satisfied because the entrance is modern looking and the vertical members are fairly small. They need more substance in them.

The applicant's architect stated that they do not want to make them too big.

Commissioner Lewis stated that he would like to see these revised prior to taking a vote.

Chairman Wastchak clarified that the trees are a Chinese Pistache species.

Commissioner Campbell reminded Commissioner Lewis that they did

speak about solar being installed on the parking shade structures.

Chairman Wastchak stated that he likes where the project is going.

Commissioner Campbell indicated that architectural elements called out in the code refer to chimneys and other small elements. The plans are showing a significant portion of the building going above the allowable height. It is a one-story space and does not need to be 2-1/2 stories tall.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the lobby is only one corner of the building and is helping to provide articulation for the building. They are not trying to stretch the height across the building. This property is not looming over residential. The building has been setback an additional eight feet from the front.

Commissioner Lewis commented that they are setting a precedent for what will go in next door. The building is more modern than he would like.

Commissioner Wainwright stated that there needs to be a compelling reason to go above 30 feet and he is not sure that screening is a compelling reason.

Mr. Tate mentioned that if they did not care about the Town's guidelines, they would not have taken the time to put a section in the narrative as to why they feel it is appropriate. They need to bolster their justification. He indicated that Paul Gilbert spoke in the last Council meeting and indicated that SUP guidelines are guidelines, and not meant to be strictly adhered to, like a zoning ordinance. The concern about setting a precedent is that all SUPs are unique and he urged the Planning Commission to look at each project individually.

Commissioner Georgelos agreed that these are unique SUPs. They still need to consider how others have been treated and some precedent will be set. If they go above the height requirement, she would like additional justification. She wants to see how the building will look without the additional height allowance. She feels that the height on the corner is more than a fireplace.

Mr. Tate stated that architectural elements need to be looked at within the context of the type of building they are talking about.

Commissioner Wainwright commented that he likes the direction they are going. The property is surrounded by commercial and precedent does not weigh into this. He leans more towards the roof corner being an architectural feature. If it can come down that would be a good thing.

Commissioner Anton stated that the applicant is missing a compelling reason to increase the roof height.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the raised element on the right-hand side is uncomfortable for him to look at. He believes that there is enough articulation without the height increase. He believes that this is a structural enhancement and not an architectural element.

Commissioner Lewis stated that he loves the nature of the cantilevered roof on the left and the shade element. He believes that this design would be more inviting if utilized on the entrance.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the open space criteria and mentioned that the Planning Commission seemed to not have an issue with it. The building has been moved back an additional five feet further south to meet the SUP requirements for distance from the right-of-way. It is unclear if the parking on the perimeter of the site is covered. A four-foot setback will be required. There are no guidelines for the covered parking.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he is concerned with the covered parking structures on the property line.

Commissioner Lewis noted that it is next to C2 zoning.

Commissioner Campbell stated that the tenants will most likely want the covered parking for their vehicles.

Mr. Tate indicated that they will clarify this in the next submittal.

It was suggested that if they are going to add covered parking on the property line that they should do it on the AJ side.

Commissioner Georgelos asked if the south property is residential.

Chairman Wastchak responded that it is a resort use.

Mr. Michaud noted that the trash enclosure was relocated to the east side of the site and there are no employee areas on the site.

Chairman Wastchak asked if they do not show the amenities now could they put it in later.

Mr. Michaud commented that they would have to analyze what level of amenities they are. He suggested that they address this now. Also, they do

not have all of the details for the lighting plan and traffic counts. They are meeting the guideline for lot coverage at 25%, with a proposal of 18.3%. However, staff is not clear if this includes the roof overhang and the parking canopy. They are probably still under the guideline but that numbers needs to reflect all structures.

The applicant noted that the landscaping meets the visual corridor plan.

Chairman Wastchak asked Jeremy Knapp if the frontage is close to what they would like to see on this corridor.

Mr. Knapp responded that the General Plan calls for a 30-foot total cross-section for major arterials.

Commissioner Campbell asked if they normally have screen walls within the right-of-way.

Mr. Knapp indicated that no parking or structures are permitted within the town right-of-way. He is not sure that there is a full dedication of the 65 feet of right-of-way. The two parking spaces and everything along the front property line fall within the right-of-way.

Mr. Tate indicated that this is one of the points in the statement of direction that they negotiated with the Town Council. The amount of landscape buffer and setback that they would be required would not be a hard and fast rule but the Planning Commission could take other things into consideration, like the size and shape of the property. By moving the building back, they were able to pick up another five feet of landscape buffer. In order for this project to move forward, they cannot add more landscaping buffer. Tenants are looking for a minimum of five spaces per 1,000 square feet. They are already below this and do not want to lose more. The margins are razor thin and it may be a better option to do tenant improvements to the existing buildings.

Chairman Wastchak asked if they have addressed which portion of the 65-foot right-of-way is dedication compared to easement.

Mr. Tate stated that they have not discussed this in detail with staff but they are amenable to discussing the areas that will be dedicated and those that will have an easement. He indicated that he wanted to receive direction from the Planning Commission on this issue.

Chairman Wastchak stated that they need to make a proposal to staff and start this dialog. He cares about having the physical space for the landscaping but wants to have staff review their proposal.

The owner of the medical plaza indicated that the Town is wanting the right-of-way for free. He does not care what the combination of the easement and dedication are as long as everyone gets what they want. He wants the parking and the Town wants a sidewalk on the south side of Lincoln Drive.

Commissioner Campbell mentioned that right-of-way dedication is always part of the SUP discussion. He indicated that they could move the parking out of the dedicated ROW area and only lose one parking stall. He asked if they can use screen berms in the right-of-way instead of the walls. The signs could be move back as well. The peninsulas throughout the site could be reduced or eliminated. This is the first parcel in a major redevelopment area and if they need 130-foot right-of-way, then the Town should get the 130-foot right-of-way.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the Council still wants the entrance for Andaz through the property. He was told that the Andaz resort does not want this entrance. He asked the applicant to comment on this point.

The owner of the medical plaza stated that there have been some discussions but their focus has been to work out the right-of-way issues first. He is willing to do it but not at the detriment of their plan.

Commissioner Campbell suggested that Andaz use the Quail Run Road alignment to get access to Lincoln Drive. There is a light going in at Quail Run Road.

Chairman Wastchak commented that this would bring people in through the back, whereas if they came in through the applicant's property then it would bring people to the front of the property. He asked the applicant to work with staff on these issues.

The owner of the medical plaza stated that if they have to push the sign back it will be a detriment not having directional signage for his tenants. He mentioned that he is willing to give up a left-out entrance if needed.

Mr. Michaud stated that they will need to get more information regarding site drainage in the utility section of the narrative.

Mr. Tate stated that they are working to get all of the question marks filled in for the next work session.

Mr. Michaud commented that they will need more information regarding the traffic statement and any changes to the entrances will affect the traffic

statement.

Mr. Tate suggested that if all of the questions have been answered except for the entrance, the Planning Commission could act on everything else and allow the Town Council to decide on the entrance.

Commissioner Lewis concurred with this. They have to look at the whole strip.

Commissioner Campbell requested parking data for the next meeting.

The applicant commented that the traffic count is on the conservative side. The lobby area won't be leasable space.

Mr. Michaud indicated that they can get another two feet of parking length from the landscaping overhang. There did not seem to be a lot of interest from the Planning Commission with regard to community spaces. The Planning Commission will need to act by October 16, 2018. They have another meeting on October 2, 2018, but there is not a lot of time to get the packet out. The applicant will have to hold a neighborhood meeting and must provide a minimum of 10 days notice prior to the meeting.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he would like more time. He asked the applicant if they can squeeze everything in.

Mr. Tate indicated that they will try to be ready for the October 16, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Michaud stated that they will need to notice the meeting. He suggested that they hold the neighborhood meeting soon. He reviewed the applicable dates and deadlines.

One of the Commissioners requested that they provide some outdoor space so they won't have to come back later for an amendment.

Chairman Wastchak stated that he wants to see the access road cut out and not included in the Planning Commission recommendation.

No Reportable Action

6. ACTION ITEMS

None

some changes to Article 22 adopted by the Council on May 10, 2018. The Hillside Safety Manual was adopted on June 14, 2018. He then reviewed the scope of the three amendments.

- Definitions: Removing several definitions that are no longer in use in the code; modifying some definitions to be in accordance with the recent amendment adopted in the safety manual and code update. He directed the Commission to the new and modified definitions presented in bold. These included:
 - o Adding a definition for Chair.
 - o Adding clarification of the Hillside Committee.
 - o Defining Storm Drainage Design Manual
- Expiration of Hillside Applications: Language has been added to the code requiring the applicant to receive committee or chair approval within 18 months from the date of the application. They can request a one-time six-month extension and the Town Manager may grant two six-month extensions based on circumstances out of the applicant's control.
- Pre-application Submittal: The recently adopted Hillside Manual has a pre-application process so this amendment will align the code with the manual. This is similar to what staff does now.

Mr. Burton indicated that today is a citizen review hearing and they can take public input. A public hearing will be held on August 21, 2018, and the Commission's recommendation will then be forwarded to the Council.

Chairman Wastchak thanked Mr. Burton for his presentation. He then asked for public input. There was none. He requested that the Hillside Ordinance be included in the next meeting's packet.

No Reportable Action

B. 18-306

**Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-06)
7125 E Lincoln Drive - Lincoln Medical Plaza**

Paul Michaud, Interim Community Development Director, presented the staff report regarding the SUP 18-06 Lincoln Medical Plaza. He explained that the applicant is proposing to demolish all of the two-story medical structures and build a new structure. The property contains 2.1 acres and the new building will be approximately 5,500 square feet larger. The building will have two stories and covered parking will be provided behind the building. The use of the site will remain medical.

There is a lot more information in the narrative than was provided in the last work session meeting. They removed reference to the single tenant as they are retaining the allowance for multiple tenants. A pedestrian connection is

provided from the building to the street. They have not spelled out which specific uses will be in the building. It would be helpful for them to cite a specific section of the zoning ordinance.

Chairman Wastchak asked if the Special Use Permit will limit the list of uses or will they have the freedom to put anything in the building.

Mr. Michaud stated that they will need to detail the types of uses being proposed and reference the code. They may want to restrict specific types of uses as well. They are proposing to keep the pharmacy which is already allowed on this property. Some of the existing uses are tied to a specific suite number, so they will have to be tied back to something specific in the new building like square footage. There are hours that are restricted under the existing Special Use Permit. The existing Special Use Permit stipulations mimic the zoning ordinance.

Chairman Wastchak asked if the Special Use Permit allowance for a pharmacy was included in the documentation.

Mr. Michaud responded that was provided in the last meeting.

Chairman Wastchak commented that if they are going to allow the pharmacy they will need some general parameters.

Mr. Michaud commented that there is a requirement for public amenities in association with the Special Use Permit. The applicant will need to address this in the narrative as to how they are going to meet this or align it with the vision of the Commission.

Commissioner Covington asked him to be more specific.

Mr. Michaud likened amenities to something you would find in a resort development. As this is a medical facility, public amenities are limited but the applicant could propose the incorporation of public art.

Chairman Wastchak asked if any of the Commissioners feel strongly about having public amenities.

Commissioner Lewis commented that with his experience with the children's hospital, art was extremely important. He is not sure if a medical office necessitates that level of art. He would like to see some art throughout the premises so it does not become a sterile environment.

Mr. Michaud indicated that the applicant has provided more information in the narrative to justify the 36-foot height. The buildings will meet the Class A

building standards and contain 15-foot floor to floor, with five-foot ceiling space. They have related their context to other buildings nearby that are 36 feet or taller in height. They provided information regarding view sheds that are being blocked by existing trees on the Smoke Tree resort side. The existing structure does not meet the open space criteria and neither will the proposed structure. They mentioned this in the narrative. He believes that a rendering would be helpful to show the criteria. The Commission requested a roof plan to show parapets and equipment location.

Chairman Wastchak commented that in tab seven they show one picture of the roof which gives them a sense of what is being planned for the roof. He suggested that they get a few more angles to show the roof design.

Mr. Michaud commented that a little more information is needed to demonstrate that the whole roof is not at 36 feet.

Commissioner Anton asked what would happen if the applicant decided to come back later on to add solar on the roof.

Mr. Michaud responded that there are four levels of Special Use Permit amendments. The first level is a managerial amendment which can't be visible or above 1,000 square feet. The next level is a minor amendment.

Commissioner Lewis asked if the parapet is perpendicular or does it have a slight cant to it. He suggested that a canted design might soften the visual impact.

Chairman Wastchak stated that illustrations show the parapet straight up and down but a canted or battered design may be worth consideration.

Commissioner Lewis indicated that the height of the building will set a precedent to the neighboring parcel to the west.

Chairman Wastchak commented that on the issue with height the Commission needs to consider if the applicant has provided justification. The property to the west will need to justify their height as well.

Mr. Michaud commented that the elevation shows building height being measured from finished floor. It will need to be shown measured from grade on the elevations. The Planning Commission requested that the applicant shows the HVAC units in the elevations. He asked the Commission if they felt the applicant made enough justification on their building height in the narrative.

Commissioner Campbell stated that 15-foot floor to floor stories is a

modern standard for medical buildings. These buildings have a lot of equipment that require ceiling space. These duct spaces get really full. The second floor could require a drain that cannot be punched through duct work. He believes that the northeast entrance is over height. He does not see the necessity for more height in this location as it has a one-story element. He believes that the 30-foot height would be fine in this location. He suggested the parapet be setback. He is comfortable with the height throughout the rest of the building.

Commissioner Covington stated that the roof height for the other side of the building from the main entrance is only 30 feet.

Commissioner Anton agreed with Commissioner Covington and commented that the building should meet the 30-foot building height on the front. The HVAC units can be pushed back so the parapet wall is not as visible. He stated that the 15-feet per floor seems to justify going over the height allowance. It was noted that the additional space needed between the floors does not apply to the entrance.

Chairman Wastchak stated that there is justification for the height in regards to HVAC units and agreed with Commissioner Campbell that the entryway does not need to be 36 feet and should be brought down to 30 feet. He stated that he wants to see the height of the mechanical equipment and does not think they need six-foot high parapets. He asked what is staff's recommendation on how to measure height.

Mr. Michaud commented that they know what the grades are as they have been established in the Special Use Permit. They do not use finished floor.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he wants to know what is being installed on the roof and what the insets are and can they pull the parapet in more.

Commissioner Campbell suggested that they put the solar panels on the carports. He stated that even low sloped roofs need to drain and he assumes they will drain to the perimeter of the building.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the drain will usually be installed adjacent to the parapet.

Commissioner Campbell commented that the drain will be raised one inch for every four feet. He indicated that the additional six feet of height can be used up.

Mr. Michaud continued with the narrative. He indicated that they added

more information regarding the landscape buffer. The dimensions are the same for the buffer. The building will meet the 40-foot front setback using the 33-foot-wide right-of-way, which was confirmed in the title report. The Statement of Direction allows flexibility to consider something other than a 50-foot buffer measured from a 65-foot right-of-way. The larger buffer would result in parking loss and financial feasibility. A landscaping plan has been submitted. They stated in the narrative that it meets the draft Visually Significant Corridor plan palette. Staff does not feel that it meets this 100 percent.

He stated that elements not fully addressed included:

- Existing right-of-way was verified at 33 feet but staff would like them to get to a 65-foot right-of-way.
- The applicant could consider moving the building at least five feet south to meet the 40-foot setback with a 65-foot right-of-way and increase the landscape buffer.
- The applicant could do a reconfiguration of their parking lot to obtain more landscaping.
- The plant list does not include many of the Visually Significant Corridor plants.

Mr. Michaud presented the Commission a copy of the landscaping plan and stated that the visually significant corridor is located along Lincoln. There is a discrepancy between the landscape plan and the narrative.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the landscape plan has a row of ash trees. He asked what coordination is being done with the landscape architect and the Visually Significant Corridor plan.

The applicant stated that because this landscape plan was put together prior to their last work session it was not revised. They were trying to get their plans to staff prior to the work session so there may be some discrepancies that they can change and make consistent.

Mr. Michaud commented that they have not seen the parking study yet, but he is anticipating that it will meet the 144 spaces provided in the plan. The Town does not have parking standards but requires a parking study.

Commissioner Anton stated that he does not think the 144 spaces will be full at one time but believes there will be more demand for accessible spaces pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act. He suggested that they look at getting more accessible spaces.

The Commission generally agreed with this suggestion.

Chairman Wastchak asked about a drop-off area.

Commissioner Anton responded that they have wide drive aisles to accommodate drop-offs. He indicated that there will be a lot of emergency vehicles on site to take people to the hospital.

Chairman Wastchak commented that if someone is dropping off then it will block one of the drive lanes.

It was suggested that they provide drop-off stalls for customers.

Chairman Wastchak asked the applicant's attorney, Benjamin Tate, if he could comment on the right-of-way dedication and moving the building on the site.

Mr. Tate responded that the number being discussed for parking is five spaces per 1,000 square feet. They are already below this number at 4.7 spaces per 1,000 square feet. It will be hard to lose the additional spaces and still attract tenants they are seeking.

One of the Commissioners commented that five spaces per 1,000 square feet would equate to 155 spaces.

Mr. Tate explained that they have discussed this issue at length and even came up with multiple site plans showing more parking and even a concept with ground mounted mechanical equipment. If they had to do the full right-of-way dedication and landscape buffer it would result in a smaller building and fewer parking spaces. This would be a deal killer and the numbers would not make sense.

Chairman Wastchak commented that it is not the Town's job to make these deals profitable and they need to look out for the interest of the Town. These projects are typically not purchased until the zoning approval is in place. He asked Mr. Michaud if there were some options if they could not get the full right-of-way and a landscape buffer.

Mr. Michaud commented that one option is to get 40 feet of right-of-way and 25 feet of easement.

Paul Mood, Town Engineer, stated that they would have to get an easement and a stipulation to allow parking, site wall, and signage in the easement. He stated that the parking stalls are too small. They are only 16 feet in length and the code requires at least 180 square feet with a 9-foot by 20-foot dimension. If there is an overhang, the applicant can request to

make up two feet in the overhang. The driveway separation does not meet the Department of Transportation standards, as their centerlines are only 135 feet apart and the standard is 250 feet. There will be a center median installed on Lincoln Drive, so this property will only have a right-in right-out entry.

Chairman Wastchak stated that they need to have the conversation regarding the Smoke Tree resort for a shared driveway. He asked Mr. Tate if he has spoken with the owners of this resort.

Mr. Tate indicated that he spoke with Dawn Cartier prior to the meeting, as she is doing the traffic project and is in a position to understand their project.

Chairman Wastchak stated that there needs to be an owner-owner conversation because they will need an entrance on the Smoke Tree resort side and will eliminate the west entrance.

The Commission agreed that it would be in the best interest of property owners to work together.

Commissioner Campbell asked what the function of the landscape strip in the back.

Chairman Wastchak indicated that this is the top of the island.

Mr. Mood clarified that the dimensions of the islands did not get shifted in the plans. He will need to look at the turn distances in the parking lot to see if vehicles can make the turn.

Commissioner Lewis asked where are they on the issue regarding the alignment of the front curb. He expressed concern that there is only a hiatus of eight inches that someone could run into. This difference occurs between the Smoke Tree resort and the medical plaza.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he will have to go out and take a look. He asked if it juts out on the east side.

Commissioner Covington commented that this is the case.

Mr. Mood stated that their capital project will align the road.

The Commission then consulted Google Street View and inspected the property.

Commissioner Covington indicated that it may be on the Smoke Tree resort side.

Mr. Michaud continued with the narrative. He stated that the applicant included information on nuisances like noise. He suggested that they state if there are outdoor employee areas in the narrative. They show trash collection on the Smoke Tree resort side. Staff had suggested that they put this on the AJ grocery store side.

Chairman Wastchak commented that he would like to talk about this later on.

Mr. Michaud stated that they will need more information on the exterior lighting plan. Information related to walls and exterior fences needs to be outlined.

Commissioner Campbell commented that he is worried about the north to south landscape area and asked what is its function.

Mr. Michaud commented that it is for landscaping.

Commissioner Campbell suggested that the landscaping island be removed to get longer stalls.

A Commissioner asked why staff suggested moving trash to the other side.

Mr. Michaud responded that they wanted to get it away from the Smoke Tree side and the resort and put it on the commercial side of the property.

Commissioner Campbell expressed concern regarding the area that is being proposed. He feels that it will be awkward for the garbage truck. The geometry of the trash truck works better on the east side.

Mr. Michaud commented that the applicant submitted the drainage statement and they are waiting for water utility impacts. They will need to address Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) design aspects for the property.

Chairman Wastchak asked if there had been any reference to CPTED standards.

Mr. Tate commented that they have not made any reference to CPTED in what was submitted but they will address it.

Mr. Mood stated that they miscalculated the preexisting condition in the

drainage statement. They will need to recalculate this.

Mr. Michaud stated that the narrative has been revised to account for the second access onto Lincoln Drive. Access was added on the Andaz resort site to the south of the property, along with accommodation of the Andaz sign. A traffic/parking circulation study is needed. The parking spaces are under sized. Driveway aisle widths can be reduced from 26 feet to 24 feet.

Chairman Wastchak asked if they want patron of the Andaz resort driving through their property.

Mr. Tate responded that he is not sure and they will need to address this in the traffic impact analysis in light of the shared access consideration with Smoke Tree resort.

Chairman Wastchak was surprised that the Andaz monument sign was included in the drawing. He commented that the Council expressed a desire to have all of the entrances off Quail Run Road. He believes that it would be fantastic to have an Andaz entrance on Lincoln Drive but the problem is that they will be adding all of this traffic to a place that already has a lot of traffic. He feels that this is a big deal.

Commissioner Anton stated that he and Commissioner Covington spoke with the general manager of Andaz and he did not have any concern regarding building height. He does not see having his customers travel through the medical facility parking lot to get to the resort as a positive. He feels that there will be parking issues between the properties. He is 90 percent against the idea.

Mr. Michaud continued that the covered parking needs to be included in the lot coverage calculation. They should show the floor area ration and lot coverage of the existing site. They need to call out the dashed line as a roof overhang. They have an APS and telephone easement that needs to be shown. There are some new perspectives from different sides. He asked if they have any comments.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the perspectives are helpful.

Commissioner Lewis stated that he does not care for the architecture of the building. However, the landscaping does mitigate some of his issues. He does not want to lose the trees next to the building. He commented that he wished the building did not have a mundane grey color. The front of the building looks fun but the back of the building looks like a prison.

Chairman Wastchak commented that the trees around the building are

mostly Live Oaks.

Mr. Michaud indicated that the next Planning Commission meeting is on August 21, 2018 and September 4, 2018. The packets for the August 21st meeting will go out next week. If the do not get anything by Thursday, he is not sure staff will have enough time to review the plans.

Mr. Tate commented that having another submittal by Thursday is unlikely.

Mr. Michaud commented that he will let the Chairman know if they get something worth meeting on.

Mr. Tate explained some of his concerns with getting a shared access on Smoke Tree resort. Smoke Tree's application may be delayed and make coordination difficult.

Chairman Wastchak asked if Mr. Mood has any advice.

Mr. Mood responded that Smoke Tree resort could move their driveway now.

Mr. Michaud indicated that Smoke Tree resort is in operation and they may have interest in wanting to have a shared driveway due to the forthcoming median improvements.

Chairman Wastchak commented that this is a good point.

Mr. Tate asked if the new drive would require a Special Use Permit.

Chairman Wastchak asked the Community Development Director to comment.

Mr. Michaud indicated that it depends on how they are moving it. They could use this entrance. A minor amendment will move quickly through the process.

No Reportable Action

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

6. ACTION ITEMS

None

7. CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Campbell suggested additional landscaping at the northwest area, west of the parking lot.

There was discussion on the proposed wall and whether an additional 3 feet will have any effect on restricting noise. There was also a concern that if a "no man's land" will exist between the walls it should be gated and secured. It was noted that a gate will be added at each end of tall wall.

Commissioner Lewis had concerns on drainage. Mr. Jorden acknowledged that they will need to comply with the new manual. They will provide additional detail at the permit stage. There was discussion on the lack of retention on the site. It was noted that a stipulation should be added regarding drainage and that additional information is necessary.

Changes to the spa were discussed. It was noted that the spa currently has one treatment room. They are proposing to increase to 3 treatment rooms and 5-6 pieces of exercise equipment. It was explained that there used to be a friends of Hermosa program, the narrative will be revised to explain this in more detail.

Lastly, Commissioner Anton had concerns regarding the proposed string lights and their visibility. One idea is to add shields to the lights. Perhaps a stipulation can be added to provide shields if there are any complaints. The Commission would like photos of the possible shields.

No Reportable Action

B. 18-279

Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-06)
7125 E Lincoln Drive - Lincoln Medical Plaza

Paul Michaud presented the application in accordance with the application packet.

Chairman Wastchak asked when the public hearing is scheduled.

Mr. Michaud noted the hearing is scheduled for October 16th and then it will go to Council for review.

Mr. Michaud reviewed the Statement Of Direction (SOD).

Chairman Wastchak asked if the applicant has a landscape plan in accordance with the Visually Significant Corridors Plan.

The applicant stated that he can discuss the landscaping, but has no plan at this time.

Mr. Michaud continued to discuss and outline the development (setbacks, height, floor area, etc.).

Mr. Michaud presented each SOD item to the Commission and the next steps.

Additional information is still needed from the applicant. Mr. Michaud identified the pending items that are needed.

Chairman Wastchak noted there will not be a break in the Commission review. The Planning Commission will continue to review documents as they are provided. Chairman Wastchak advised the Commission to be mindful of the SOD items. He also asked Mr. Michaud to identify which SOD items are satisfied as the application goes through Commission review. Chairman Wastchak stated it is ok if the SOD tracking document is sent to Commission even a day before the meeting in order to keep it as fresh as possible.

Jason Morris, applicants' representative, introduced Ben Tate, who will give the applicants' presentation. He stated the proposal provides a similar use that is better than what is currently there. The additional height is needed to accommodate current medical standards. Also, they don't have any residential neighbors.

He reiterated that they are building a better version of what's there. This is their goal. Mr. Tate outlined the scope of the request and history of the lot. The current building does not meet the current medical office needs and standards.

Chairman Wastchak asked for additional information on the increase in height. He noted that the lobby is an architectural feature that is at the maximum height.

Mr. Tate stated that the additional height will not affect the view sheds. He discussed the medical standards, in which medical HVAC equipment requires a 5' clearance which results in 15' floor to floor, in addition to the

required roof mechanical screens.

Chairman Wastchak is not satisfied that there is a need for roof mounted ac units, and that ground mounted systems are an option. He wants the applicant to vet this point.

Jason Morris noted ground mounted units will result in more ground space being utilized which may take up parking spaces.

Chairman Wastchak requested that the applicant provide realistic perspectives (e.g. what is the view or massing from the property line), including perspectives from across the street looking south (back towards the building). Also, show a comparison of the existing and new building from across the street.

Commission Campbell questioned whether the applicant has considered a central ac plan. That is not known at this time.

Mr. Tate explained the requested height. He stated it is contextual appropriate. He identified the height of the buildings on the surrounding properties. He noted, that although the building does not meet the OSC, it will not block any existing view sheds.

Chairman Wastchak noted that additional landscape buffer is necessary along Lincoln Drive. Something can be done.

Jason Morris stated he does not believe the Town has the legal right to require the dedication of land along Lincoln Drive.

Andrew Miller does not necessarily agree with Mr. Morris's assessment.

Mr. Tate stated there needs to be give and take with the ROW dedication and the landscape buffer for this project to work, as there is simply not enough land. The more landscaping that is added will hide the building from those trying to find it.

Chairman Wastchak asked if the landscaping will be compliant with the VSC requirements.

Mr. Tate stated this has not yet been considered.

Chairman Wastchak stated this is an important element that should be complied with. How well does your plan meet VSC? Maybe it can be accomplished even without all of the ROW dedication.

Mr. Tate noted their proposed landscape plan balances both visibility and a sufficient amount of plants. Ben presented the proposed landscape pallet. Civ Tech is working on a traffic impact analysis; however, since it is the same use and roughly the same size building, it will not have any adverse impacts and can accommodate the new building.

The applicant discussed signage and the request for building mounted signage.

Commissioner Lewis questioned the architecture of the building. He does not believe it is very inviting. Wants a more friendly building that gives you a sense of confidence.

Commissioner Wainwright stated he wants a class A building, and that the proposal is an improvement over the existing site.

Commissioner Covington believes there is no context around it, and that this building would stand out. The building will not disappear with additional landscaping.

Commissioner Campbell is supportive of the 15' floor to floor since he works on a lot of medical buildings. Believes there will be enough height on adjacent properties so it will be in context. Willing to give the extra height for the dedication of the right-of-way. Additional landscaping is needed at the street frontage. Wants to hide the building more due to the additional height.

Commissioner Georgelos believes the key word is flexibility. Must be workable for the future. The architecture should fit into the community.

Commissioner Anton's concern is from the building on out. He doesn't want more traffic and believes this is our gateway to the Town. We will need the extra footage on the roadway. We can be flexible on the landscaping. This is doable.

Paul Mood explained that he will be getting the 30% plans for Lincoln Drive. Also, the applicant has parking spaces located in the ROW which is not allowed and the parking spaces are smaller than that recommended by code. The parking analysis must address all access points.

Chairman Wastchak requested that the applicant confer with CivTech on the traffic study being done for Smoke Tree Resort. There was discussion of shared entrances between SmokeTree and the Medical facility.

No Reportable Action