



## Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 19-085      **Version:** 1      **Name:**  
**Type:** Study Session Item      **Status:** Agenda Ready  
**File created:** 2/22/2019      **In control:** Planning Commission  
**On agenda:** 3/5/2019      **Final action:** 3/5/2019

**Title:** Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-12)  
10555 N Tatum Boulevard - Mountain View Medical Center

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. A. Application, 2. B. Vicinity Map & Related Maps, 3. C.1. Narrative, 4. C.2 Site Plans, 5. C.3 Landscape, 6. C.4 Elevations, 7. C.5 Open Space Criteria, 8. C.6 Signage, 9. C.7. Lighting, 10. C.8. Drainage & Utility, 11. C.9. Parking & Traffic Updated 2, 12. D. SUP Guidelines & VSC, 13. E. General Plan Policies, 14. F. Background & SUP History, 15. G. SUP Existing - Proposed Comparison (03-05-19), 16. H. SOD, 17. I. Compliance to SOD, 18. J. Comments (Updated) 02-25-19

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
3/5/2019	1	Planning Commission	No Reportable Action	

**TO:** Chair and Planning Commission

**FROM:** Dawn-Marie Buckland, Deputy Town Manager  
Jeremy Knapp, Community Development Director  
Paul Michaud, Senior Planner

**DATE:** March 5, 2019

**CONTACT:**  
Paul Michaud, 480-348-3574

**AGENDA TITLE:**  
**Discussion of Major Special Use Permit Amendment (SUP-18-12)**  
**10555 N Tatum Boulevard - Mountain View Medical Center**

### REQUEST

Mountain View Medical Center L.L.C., the property owner of the Mountain View Medical Center, is seeking redevelopment of the existing 9.8-acre medical plaza located at 10535, 10555, 10565, 10575, 10595, and 10599 North Tatum Boulevard (Assessor Parcel No. 168-07-001C). The property owner is requesting a major amendment to the site's existing Special Use Permit - Medical Office zoning. The request includes a 3-part phased demolition of all existing structures. The present site has 6 single-story medical buildings that will be replaced with 4 one-story and 2 two-story medical buildings in approximately the same locations as the existing buildings. Refer to Attachments C.1 through C.9 for more information.

### MEETING PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this work session is for the Planning Commission to continue their review of the application request focusing on the updated traffic analysis report and exterior lighting. Attachments C.2 through C.7 include the updated traffic report and submittal material.

## **BACKGROUND**

### Update from Prior Meeting(s)

The Planning Commission discussed this application at the February 19, 2019; January 22, 2019; January 9, 2019; December 18, 2018; and December 4, 2018 work sessions. The February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting discussion topics were heights/viewsheds and signage. Key points from this work session and public input since the last meeting included:

- Several residents responded to staff after the last work session that they feel the process is a “done deal” and reiterated that they feel the additional 30,000-plus square footage of medical office space is will worsen traffic and other quality of life elements to the Firebrand Ranch neighborhood. At a prior study session, the Commission requested additional traffic analysis which will be reviewed at the March 5<sup>th</sup> study session.
- There was discussion regarding the 25’ wide landscape tract along the rear yard not meeting the 40’ wide Special Use Permit guideline as pressed upon at the prior study session. The Planning Commission wants to hear input from the adjoining lot owners regarding the applicant’s willingness to allow adjoining land owners a say in the landscaping (trees) and wall height/finish on their side. Resident input after the last work session seems to show the neighbors want the 40’ wide buffer.
- Regarding the signage, the Commission preferred the building signs use halo lighting versus internal lighting, the applicant propose the hours when the sign lighting will be turned off by sign type, the site address font size on the monument signs be increased, and the monument signs be reduced to more closely match the Paradise Valley Medical monument signs at 8’ tall and 67.2 sf each side. The applicant responded to staff after the last meeting that they will accommodate these preferences.
- It was noted that Building Official should attend the Commission meeting when construction phasing is discussed again.
- The Commission wants input from the neighbors on the two-story buildings. The Commission may want to reconsider the garden level since it met the 30’ height guideline and loitering and drainage can be addressed in other ways. At this point, the applicant is proceeding with showing the 34’ two-story tall plan and will address this point at the citizen review meeting.

### Council Statement of Direction

The Town Council issued a Statement of Direction (SOD) on November 15, 2018. Attachment H is the SOD.

### Background

Background information on the history and conditions on the subject property, its General Plan and Zoning, and enforcement are available in Attachment F.

## **DISCUSSION/FACTS**

The attached SOD covers a variety of aspects the Council would like the Planning Commission to focus their review for this request. Please refer to the SOD for a complete list of items.

Attachment I describe how the redevelopment meets the SOD. This document will be completed as the Planning Commission reviews the application request. Any updates will be shown in track change

format.

Some possible points for the Planning Commission to consider for the upcoming work session are as follows:

Revised Traffic Analysis Report. The Planning Commission at a prior work session asked the applicant to update their traffic report to cover the points listed below. This report was provided to the City of Phoenix and the Town Engineer. Discussion of this report from the applicant's traffic engineer will be given at the March 5<sup>th</sup> study session.

- Perform the various simulations/volume counts to describe the impact on vehicle stacking while waiting to turn left onto Shea Blvd heading north on Tatum, including the length of this stacking.
- More information on signalized timing, what changes can be made to improve traffic flow on Tatum Blvd.
- Describe impact on U-turns that occur from vehicles heading south from Frys and then going north, include possible improvements.
- Address the need for any bus bays on Shea Blvd or Tatum Blvd. The analysis would note that there is no bus bay along this site on Tatum Blvd since it is north of the intersection. There is also a bus stop 250' south of Beryl that should be addressed.
- Address warrant for any deceleration lanes on Shea Blvd or Tatum Blvd. This is in the provided analysis. However, at the meeting it was discussed that restriping could be done on northbound Tatum Blvd within existing asphalt. This should be explained more with graphics. If you could provide the frequency of restriping on major arterials like Tatum Blvd from the city of Phoenix that would be helpful.
- Address warrant for signalized light at Beryl Avenue.
- Further address parking/traffic from project into the Firebrand Ranch neighborhood.
- Address gating/restricting/removing the Beryl Avenue driveway access (include gating the Shea Blvd driveway).

Exterior Lighting. The Special Use Permit Guidelines suggest the following:

- The light emitting element is shielded and that lighting units do not direct light unto adjacent property,
- Uplighting not be more than 250 lumens,
- Pole lighting not exceed 16' tall,
- Light fixtures are setback the height of the fixtures,
- Illumination not exceed the foot-candle levels based on uses (1.6 fc for parking lots, 5.0 fc on driveways/drop-off areas and 3.0 fc architectural lighting), and
- Illumination at the property to a residential property not exceed 0.5 fc and fixture be less than 3' tall within the setback (60' setback per the SUP Guideline).

The existing exterior light fixtures are 42" bollards and approximate 8" tall spot lights within the

grounds of the site. Building lighting uses recessed soffit fixtures. There are no illumination levels for the existing light fixtures provided. However, based on the approved 1980 plans and site visits, the existing exterior light fixtures appear to fully comply with the current Special Use Permit Guidelines.

There are two proposed light fixtures that illuminate parking/driveway/walkways. Fixtures SA/SB are 16' tall pole lights up to 3,185 lumens and 3,000 Kelvins. The other, Fixture BL, is a bollard up to 42" tall at 728 lumens and 3,000 Kelvins. These fixtures comply with Special Use Permit Guidelines. However, the 16' tall pole light is taller than the existing 42" bollard lighting used today on the site.

The proposed building fixtures shown is Fixture W1. It is mounted at 12' from grade, 2,760 lumens and 3,000 Kelvins. These fixtures illuminate the adjoining entrances/walkways into the buildings. The fixtures comply with Special Use Permit Guidelines. The wall mounted fixtures may wash the building more giving a different character compared to the existing soffit fixtures.

The proposed plan includes no specific landscape lighting. Typical landscape uplighting is 250 lumens and 3,000 Kelvins, or less. Attachment C.7 lighting was updated to remove the prior proposed uplight fixture ST1. However, prior to the Commission hearing, the applicant may reconsider a proposed landscape light fixture that is compliant with SUP guidelines.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT & NOTICING**

Mailing notification will be done in advance of the Planning Commission and Council scheduled hearing to all property owners within a radius of 1,500 feet, along with a newspaper advertisement and property posting. Noticing of the Citizen Review Meeting will be mailed to all property owners within a radius of 1,500 feet at least 10 days prior to that meeting. Attachment J includes all written comments given to staff up to the week prior to the Planning Commission meeting.

## **NEXT STEPS**

The revised SOD provides the Planning Commission until April 16, 2019 to make a recommendation on this application request. It is anticipated there will be another work session on this application at the March 19<sup>th</sup> and/or April 2<sup>nd</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

## **ATTACHMENT(S):**

- Attachment A - Application
- Attachment B - Vicinity Map & Related Maps
- Attachment C.1 - Narrative
- Attachment C.2 - Site Plans
- Attachment C.3 - Landscape
- Attachment C.4 - Elevations
- Attachment C.5 - Open Space Criteria
- Attachment C.6 - Signage
- Attachment C.7 - Lighting
- Attachment C.8 - Drainage & Utility
- Attachment C.9 - Parking & Traffic
- Attachment D - SUP Guidelines & VSC
- Attachment E - General Plan Policies
- Attachment F - Background & SUP History
- Attachment G - Existing- Proposed Comparison
- Attachment H - SOD
- Attachment I - Compliance to SOD
- Attachment J - Comments

C:     - Applicant  
       - Case File