

**MINUTES
ORO VALLEY TOWN COUNCIL
REGULAR SESSION
October 5, 2011
ORO VALLEY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
11000 N. LA CAÑADA DRIVE**

REGULAR SESSION

5. **AMENDMENT OF ORO VALLEY TOWN CENTRE AT ROONEY RANCH PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT**
 - a. **RESOLUTION NO. (R)11-66, DECLARING AS A PUBLIC RECORD THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED ORO VALLEY TOWN CENTRE AT ROONEY RANCH PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT, ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT "A" AND FILED WITH THE TOWN CLERK**

MOTION: A motion was made by Vice Mayor Snider and seconded by Councilmember Waters to approve Resolution No. (R)11-66.

MOTION carried, 7-0.

- b. **PUBLIC HEARING: ORDINANCE NO. (O)11-26, AMENDMENT OF ORO VALLEY TOWN CENTRE AT ROONEY RANCH PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT**

Planning Manager David Williams gave an overview of the proposed amendment. The three main issues consisted of:

- Multi-Family Residential
- Convenience Uses (quantity)
- Main Street/Urban Design

Mr. Williams outlined the fifteen additional conditions that had been negotiated with the applicant. He noted that the applicant requested the PAD amendment to allow them more flexibility to develop now rather than continuing to hold the property for a possible main street design.

Councilmember Solomon asked how the density of the proposed apartment complex compared to typical apartment densities.

Mr. Williams responded that the density was right in the middle.

Mayor Hiremath opened the public hearing.

Oro Valley resident Donald Bristow was concerned with the quantity of proposed convenience stores and gas stations. He urged Council to consider the long-term implications of short-term development decisions.

Oro Valley resident Lloyd Johnson was concerned with the current demand for commercial buildings. He opposed gas stations and fast food restaurants. He recommended holding off on any new development at this time.

Oro Valley resident Fred Pfarrius was concerned with building heights reaching approximately sixty feet and obstructing the mountain views.

Oro Valley resident Bill Adler said that market demand was not a tool for zoning. He stated that by the time any project was designed, built and occupied, the market would have changed. He recommended that the convenience uses should be developed along Oracle Road at either side of the entrance, thus leaving the interior of the project for the development of the Main Street concept.

Oro Valley resident Ethel Grayson settled in Oro Valley because of the beautiful environment but felt that it was on the verge of destruction with the proposed amendment. She preferred the idea of pedestrian shopping but opposed convenience uses such as gas stations and fast food restaurants.

Oro Valley resident Kurt Weirich was concerned with the proposed development of 275 apartment units. He stated that it would damage the quality of life in Oro Valley. He opposed convenience stores and gas stations but preferred high-quality, non-convenience use development.

Oro Valley resident Barbara Mostoff was concerned with losing the view of the mountains due to the development of tall buildings. She stated that people moved to Oro Valley to enjoy the mountains. She urged Council to protect the natural beauty of Oro Valley and plan carefully for future generations.

Mayor Hiremath closed the public hearing.

Keri Silvyn, representing the owners of the property, gave an overview of the proposed PAD amendment and stated that the owners were in full agreement of the proposed conditions. Ms. Silvyn covered the following main topics:

- Pedestrian Amenities
- Civic Use Area
- Proposed Height in PAD
- Convenience Uses
- Multi-Family Residential

Councilmember Solomon clarified that unless there was a guarantee or condition on the type of apartments that could be built, there was no guarantee that high-

end apartments would ultimately be built.

Councilmember Solomon asked if the construction of the apartments was linked to the commercial development.

Ms. Silvyn replied "no".

Vice Mayor Snider asked if any consideration had been given to the possible market demand if other apartments would be built in Oro Valley.

Ms. Silvyn replied that had been taken into consideration and that there was an enormous demand for apartments in the area.

Councilmember Garner suggested that the garages on the lower level could be replaced with convenience uses.

Councilmember Hornat preferred to see the apartments spread out instead of clumped together and that more streetscape items needed to be added in order to make it unique and inviting.

Councilmember Waters questioned why gas stations, car washes and fast food restaurants were included in the proposed development since these types of convenience uses already existed within close proximity of the development.

Ms. Silvyn said that the development plan was still unfinished and that it was difficult to market the site with the current entitlements. She said that they were looking for some flexibility but were willing to include additional language that would require specific amenities. Ms. Silvyn clarified that the intent had always been to create a space on the site that would include cafes and amenities while capitalizing on a pedestrian connection with the wash. The site would also include convenience uses off of Oracle Road.

Mayor Hiremath said that it was important to take a logical look at how society had changed because people were more transient in nature since the world operated in a global environment. He clarified that the height of the development wouldn't exceed the height of the homes at Rams Pass.

Mayor Hiremath stated that society today preferred conveniences. The demographics of Oro Valley had drastically changed from 1990 to present. In 1990, approximately 85% of residents were retired. Now, there were approximately 8,000 school kids, 45% of residents were middle-aged and another 45% were seniors.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mayor Hiremath to adopt Ordinance (O)11-26, amendment of Oro Valley Town Centre at Rooney Ranch Planned Area

Development as shown in Exhibit A and subject to the conditions in Attachments #3 & #4.

MOTION failed due to lack of a second.

Councilmember Solomon was concerned with the use regarding the multi-family section and that the commercial section wouldn't develop the way it was envisioned.

MOTION: A motion was made by Councilmember Solomon and seconded by Councilmember Garner to deny Ordinance No. (O)11-26.

Councilmember Solomon made a motion to amend the original motion to continue Ordinance No. (O)11-26. This amendment was agreed to by Councilmember Garner.

MOTION AS AMENDED carried 6-1, with Councilmember Gillaspie opposed.