



## Legislation Text

---

**File #:** 19-034, **Version:** 1

---

**TO:** Chair and Planning Commission

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

**DATE:** February 19, 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 Statement of Direction (SOD) points of height/viewsheds and signage. Attachment C2. Through C.7 include updated material. A complete revised set of applicant documents will be recompiled no later than the scheduled Planning Commission hearing date.

### BACKGROUND

#### Update from Prior Meeting(s)

The Planning Commission discussed this application at the January 22, 2019; January 9, 2019; December 18, 2018; and December 4, 2018 work sessions. The January 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting discussion topics were landscaping, infrastructure/utilities, and traffic/parking/ circulation. Key points from this work session included:

- The applicant will provide an updated traffic analysis covering several topics such as simulation data, signalized timing, additional deceleration lane information and bus bays.
- The applicant should consider that the covered parking be located closer to the residential homes since these would be used by staff/physicians resulting in lowering the frequency of

in/out vehicle movements.

- There is a desire that the rear landscaping tract (with some exceptions) comply with the 40-foot wide landscape tract guideline.
- The applicant will provide how the streetscape area along Tatum Boulevard meets the Visually Significant Corridor (VSC) guideline regarding hardscape/site walls, split rail, stone veneer and rustic pavers. The preference is for the landscape tracts along the streets to meet the 50 feet width Special Use Permit (SUP) guideline. However, if there needs to be a trade-off it could be considered along the street. It was noted several times that the landscaping/hardscaping along these streets need to be special since this is a major entry into Town, along a visually significant corridor and the frontage is long at up to 1,000 feet.

#### 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:

Time Extension. The Planning Commission forwarded to Council on February 5, 2019 that the Council extend the date for the Planning Commission recommendation on this application from March 5, 2019 to April 16, 2019. Council is set to act on this extension at their February 14, 2019 meeting. Staff will update the Commission on this extension at the upcoming work session.

Height. The proposed redevelopment replaces each of the 6 existing one-story buildings with new buildings. The SUP guidelines for medical office suggest a maximum height of 30 feet for principal structures, with possible consideration for higher height to accommodate architectural features. The SUP guidelines also suggest a maximum height of 24 feet for accessory structures and 18 feet for service structures. Except for the 9-foot tall parking canopies, all the existing and proposed structures are principal structures since they contain medical uses. As initially submitted, all the proposed structures complied with the SUP guidelines. The 4 one-story buildings have a maximum height of 21 feet. The 2 buildings with two stories were designed at 30 feet in height using a garden level for the first floor that sat 5 feet below the fully restored grade. During the SOD, the Council allowed for consideration of maximum 36-foot tall two-story buildings to remove the lower garden level. This was to avoid having a recessed area where people could loiter after hours, storm drainage constraints of a fully enclosed outdoor area below grade and barriers of additional stairs/elevators to access the

lower level for patrons of the medical center. At the December 4<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission work session, the applicant stated they would redesign the two-story buildings without the garden level, but the height would likely be approximately 34 feet tall. Some of the reasons used to support the over 30-foot tall height might include that current Class A building standards for medical office is approximately 15-foot floor to floor, with five-foot ceiling space. There is an additional 6 to 12 inches of roof height to accommodate proper storm water drainage. The added height may be a trade-off to a subterranean level to mitigate nuisances such as known loitering adjacent to this site. The proposed plans found in Attachment C.4 illustrate no changes to the one-story buildings. Buildings C and D at the Tatum/Shea intersection have been redesigned to remove the garden level. The maximum height shown is 34'0" due to the parapet to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment. The impact of this 34'0" tall mass will be mitigated by the one-story 21'0" tall buildings that flank each side of the 2 two-story buildings, the north canopy at 29'8" tall and the south canopy at 27'8" tall. The full 34'0" tall height on Building C exists only on the west elevation facing Tatum Boulevard for a length of 130 lineal feet. The full 34'0" tall height on Building D exists only on the north elevation facing Shea Boulevard for a length of 125 lineal feet. This full 34'0" tall height is not facing the residential homes but does impact the street view.

Viewsheds. Except for approximately 1-foot of the street-facing roof parapets on Buildings A and F, the proposed structures meet the Open Space Criteria. Refer to Attachment C.5.

Signage. The SUP guidelines suggest medical use properties have 1 ground sign no higher than 8 feet and no larger than 40 square feet at each principal entrance, no moving elements or animation, and traffic/directional signs not exceed 5 feet tall and 12 square feet. There are no guidelines for tenant signs or building-mounted signs. The SOD emphasized attention shall be paid to building mounted signage and the resulting impact to the streetscape including the location, dimensions, and illumination of the signs. At the December 18<sup>th</sup> work session, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to provide elevations/renderings for all the proposed signs and raised concerns over the illumination, number and size of the proposed building signs.

There are four sign types as part of the proposed project.

- *Monument.* The 2 proposed monument signs will replace the 2 existing signs. The proposed signs are the same 8' tall height, but larger in overall sign area than the existing signs. Both the existing and proposed signs exceed the SUP guideline on sign area. The existing signs are at 58.6 square feet each side (67.6 square feet using maximum dimensions). The proposed signs have an overall sign area of 82 square feet each side. The proposed signs are indirectly illuminated, include the address, name of center and have space for up to 7 tenant names. The existing sign includes space for 9 tenant names. Both the existing and proposed signs exceed the SUP guideline on number of signs since double-sided signs count as 2 signs and there are only 3 entrances. These monument signs are generally smaller than the monument signs at the nearby commercial plazas in the City of Phoenix. As a comparison, the recommended monument signs at Paradise Valley Medical on Scottsdale Road was 8' tall, 67.2 square feet, and up to 5 tenant names.
- *Tenant/Suite.* Tenant/Suite signs are presently on the suite entry doors. The proposed tenant signs are on column screening near doors at each suite and may be illuminated indirectly from soffit lights. There are no guidelines for such signs. However, similar signs

exist at other local medical centers. The proposed suite signs are approximately mounted 6 feet in height and are generally not larger than 6 square feet in size.

- *Directory/Traffic Signs.* The site proposes 3 directory signs. These signs comply with the maximum 5-foot tall SUP guideline. They are greater than the 12 square foot sign area. Building A & F will have a monument directory that is 4.5-foot tall, 18 square feet, lists the suite numbers/tenants, includes a site map and is illuminated from up-lighting in the base. Buildings B-E have 1 directory that is 5-foot tall, 75 square feet, lists the tenants, and is illuminated from up-lighting in the base. These signs are setback 75 feet or more from the rear residential property line. The perimeter block wall and landscaping will mitigate visibility of these signs.
- *Building Signs.* The Town has no guidelines for this type of internally illuminated signage. However, the recent Lincoln Plaza Medical Center site and the commercial businesses in the City of Phoenix across from the subject site have similar building signage. Also, Phoenix Country Day School and Paradise Valley United Methodist have building illuminated building signs near the roof line, but not at this amount. The initial proposed signs included 7 total signs, 5 signs that face Shea Boulevard and 2 signs facing Tatum Boulevard. The applicant has reduced this to a total of 4 building signs, each at a maximum sign area of 40 square feet. The proposed plan includes optional locations on the signs on Buildings B, C, D and E. These signs are located on the street facing elevations, not visible from adjoining residential homes. Refer to Attachment C.6 for more information.

Landscaping. The applicant provided a color version of the landscape plan for the tract adjoining Firebrand Ranch. There is no change in the tract width or landscape material. This material provides pictures of the proposed plant material and some existing views.

Known Items for Review. Below is a summary of known items for review:

- Follow up on height/viewsheds and signage from the February 19<sup>th</sup> work session.
- Allowance of Schedule I and Schedule II drugs and consideration of pharmacy hours outside hours of operation specified in Section 1102.2 of the Zoning Ordinance not earlier than 8:00 a.m. and not later than 6:00 p.m. - Monday through Saturday. The intention was that the Planning Commission would follow the direction via action on the Lincoln Plaza Medical Center application. There have been continued delays on that application and waiting for this direction may not be possible.
- Discussion on architectural design.
- Review of draft SUP stipulations. With several items in flux, staff expects to present these to the Planning Commission at the work session before the scheduled Planning Commission hearing.
- Clarify direction for the applicant to provide a noise statement or for staff to draft a stipulation. This relates to the prior discussion of locating possible uses that generate more trips like urgent care and uses that generate noise like trash containers in locations that mitigate impact to the residents of the adjoining homes. The applicant has setback trash enclosures further from the existing condition and is agreeable to restricting certain uses to certain buildings.
- Revisit and have the applicant revise their narrative. This relates to the different allowable uses and hours/times of operation and any parameters; along with construction phasing. Based on preliminary feedback, staff is unaware that the applicant proposes to remove any of

the listed uses, modify the construction phasing or restrict access at the Beryl Avenue driveway. However, the applicant would like to have opportunity to explain their reasoning in why their proposal will not negatively impact the neighborhood.

- Revisit the updated traffic analysis covering several topics such as simulation data, signalized timing, additional deceleration lane information and bus bays. Communication with the City of Phoenix traffic engineering staff is ongoing.
- Revisit the landscaping plan related to elements of the VSC plan, type of trees within the rear landscape tract, perimeter wall height, and widening the rear landscape tract in conformance (or general conformance) with the SUP guideline.
- Revisit exterior lighting since this was touched on, but not fully evaluated by the Planning Commission.
- Review the public comments from the required citizen review meeting. The Planning Commission received a lot of comments already, but items such as how neighbors feel on consideration of an 8-foot wall height, any impact of the parking canopies and the type of trees proposed near the wall are specific items the applicant has been asked to address in the required summary from the citizen review meeting.
- Have the applicant submit all the updated plans/documents in final form on the scheduled hearing date or the work study session prior to that date. Revisions would address agreed upon points discussed throughout the work study session meetings.

## **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 SOD provides the Planning Commission until March 5, 2019 (with a request to Council of 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 5<sup>th</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