



Memorandum

Date: March 14, 2016
To: Mayor and City Council
Through: Karolyn Kent, Assistant City Manger
From: Christine Zielonka, Development and Sustainability Director
John D. Wesley, AICP, Planning Director
Subject: Additional information on approval requirements for the proposed Freeway Landmark Monument sign proposed for property at 1728 S. Greenfield Road, Case Z16-002

At the regular Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Board meeting of January 20, P&Z reviewed and made a recommendation for approval of a Council Use Permit (CUP) Freeway Landmark Monument (FLM) sign for property at 1728 S. Greenfield Road. This request is on the Council agenda for final consideration on March 14, 2016. The staff report in the Council packet is missing some information about the review and approval requirements of a CUP for a FLM sign. This memo provides that additional review information.

CUP

Section 11-70-6 of the Zoning ordinance establishes the review criteria for consideration of a CUP. The four review criteria and staff comments are:

1. Approval of the proposed project will advance the goals and objectives of and is consistent with the policies of the General Plan and any other applicable City plan and/or policies.

Staff Comments: Given the General Plan's emphasis on furthering economic development in the City and helping established business locations be successful, the addition of this sign helps implement the General Plan.

2. The location, size, design, and operating characteristics of the proposed project are consistent with the purposes of the district where it is located.

Staff Comments: The sign height and size meet the FLM Guidelines and are the minimum necessary for this location.

3. The proposed project will not be injurious or detrimental to the adjacent or surrounding properties in the area of the proposed project or improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City.

Staff Comments: The sign serves the commercial site on which it is located and is across the Freeway from the nearest single-residence development. It is not injurious or detrimental to surrounding properties.

4. Adequate public services, public facilities and public infrastructure are available to serve the proposed project.

Staff Comments: Adequate facilities are available for this use.

FLM Guidelines

Pages two and three of the report contain a review of the proposed sign against the FLM Guidelines. One of the review criteria is that these signs shall be located on property having a General Plan land use designation of Regional Commercial or Public/Semi-Public. As noted in the staff report the current General Plan no longer uses these land use designations. Under the current General Plan, the closest designation to Regional Commercial or Public/Semi-Public would be the Mixed Use Activity District, sub-type Regional-Scale. The location of the proposed FLM does not meet this classification. The property is more of a Mixed Use Activity District, sub-type Community-Scale. That means the proposed FLM sign does not meet the specific location and siting requirements in the FLM Guidelines. Section V of the Guidelines allows Council to consider an application that does not meet the requirements of the Guidelines if certain criteria are met. Staff believes the proposed FLM meets the modification criteria therefore Council may modify the Guidelines for this particular case. Below are the requirements and staff's thoughts about why a modification would be appropriate.

- A. The proposed Freeway Landmark Monument incorporates special design features or unique architectural elements that represent superior quality.

Staff Comments: The Design Review Board has made a recommendation for approval and stated the Board thought it was a very high quality sign.

- B. Such modifications or alternatives are consistent with the intent of these Guidelines and will result in conditions that are commensurate with or superior to these Guidelines.

Staff Comments: The intent of the guidelines is to use these signs for larger commercial areas. While this area does not rise to the level of a

regional mixed use activity district due to not having single users that are regional attractions, it is still a significant commercial area that is larger than other locations that have been granted such signs (e.g. Dana Park and Superstition Gateway). Except for the general plan designation other requirements of the guidelines are being met. Therefore, staff believes that the proposal is consistent with the intent of the guidelines and will result in conditions that are commensurate with the guidelines.

C. One of the following is present:

1. An individualized assessment reveals the existence of extraordinary conditions involving topography, land ownership, adjacent development, parcel configuration, or other factors related to the development site; or
2. The proposed or existing development exhibits unique characteristics of land use, architectural style, site location, physical scale, historical interest or other distinguishing feature that represents a clear variation from conventional development; or
3. The proposed site is designated Mixed Use/Employment by the Mesa General Plan Land Use Map and such property is located within two (2) miles of two (2) intersecting freeways.

Staff Comments: Staff believes this request meets the requirements of C.1. Given the unique configuration of the Greenfield Road and US 60 Interchange due to the location of the canal, the development is set further off the freeway than most developments. This was confirmed in how tall the sign needed to be to be visible from the freeway during the balloon test.