



APPROVED

MINUTES

TOWN CENTER COMMITTEE MEETING

May 26, 2009 7:30 a.m.

San Tan Conference Room

Call to Order and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 7:30 a.m. At roll call the following people were in attendance:

Committee Members:

Cynthia Buffington
Chris Webb
Jason Gad
Steve Ingram
Toni Valenzuela
Marvin Smith, Jr.
Ryan Desmond
Randy Green
Council Member Barnes
Council Member Mortensen

Town Staff:

Doreen Cott, Economic Development Director
Kim Moyers, Economic Development Mgmt. Asst.
Wayne Balmer, Planning Manager
Fred Brittingham, Principal Planner
Michael Pacelli, Assistant Public Works Dir.
Laura Moats, Community Development Assistant

Others Present:

Kevin Roberts, Dibble Engineering
David Wilson, EPG
Richard Dyer, Independent Newspapers

Absent:

Nancy Diab
Monica Munoz
Brian Frakes

2. Introductions

Chairman Buffington introduced Richard Dyer of the Independent, noting he has taken over the duties of Angela DeWelles.

3. Public Comment: Members of the public may address the Committee on items not on the printed agenda. There were no public comments.

4. Items for Discussion and Possible Action

A. Consideration and possible approval of the April 28, 2009 Minutes:

Motion: Toni Valenzuela

2nd: Chris Webb

To approve the April 28, 2009 Meeting Minutes, as presented.

Vote: All ayes. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Discussion and Possible Action on Landscape Palette

Economic Development Director Doreen Cott deferred this item until David Wilson of EPG arrived to make the presentation and facilitate discussion.

D. Discussion and Possible Action on Traffic Signal Options

Assistant Public Works Director Mike Pacelli referred to his informational memo of May 20, 2009 regarding Decorative Enhancements to Traffic Signal Poles. The Town's current practice, as directed by Town Council, is to utilize galvanized mast arm poles, which are a standard Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) design. The Town Center Committee has previously discussed the options of either painting the poles, or retaining the galvanized metal in the Town Center area. Mr. Pacelli stated the ADOT style single poles can be painted. Mr. Pacelli's memo offers three signal pole options, as well as a Web site for the pole manufacturer at which a number of brochures and pictures are available for review. This Web site provides more decorative options, such as a fluted design or a trombone style, typical of those used in downtown Chandler and downtown Scottsdale. Once a specific pole design is chosen, Mr. Pacelli stated there are then a number of variations to choose from. He cited Tempe signal poles as an example of a contemporary design. Mr. Pacelli stated any time decorative elements are introduced, an additional cost is involved. Staff is available to provide additional information, pictures and prices once the Committee decides on a design.

Council Member Barnes stated he would like to see more decorative street signal poles, and asked how many signals are currently in Town Center. Mr. Pacelli stated signals are currently located at the following intersections

(within Town Center):

- Ellsworth/Ocotillo
- Ellsworth/Rittenhouse
- Ellsworth/Sierra Park Blvd.
- Ellsworth Loop/Ocotillo
- Ellsworth Loop/Victoria Lane
- Ellsworth Loop/Maya
- Ellsworth Loop/Rittenhouse
- Ocotillo/Rittenhouse
- Rittenhouse Road at QC Marketplace
- Rittenhouse Road at Cornerstone

Future signalized intersections will include:

- Ocotillo/Ellsworth (rebuild)
- Ocotillo/Victoria Lane
- Ocotillo/Heritage Loop/209th Way
- Ellsworth/Maya Road
- Ellsworth/Victoria Lane/Heritage Loop Road
- Ellsworth Loop/Aldecoa Road

Some existing poles in Town Center have been built according to the ADOT standard. Mr. Pacelli stated it is possible to go back and paint existing poles at an additional cost. Council Member Barnes stated he does not have a problem with replacing poles since Town Center should have a “wow” factor that is recognizable and is unique.

Principal Planner Fred Brittingham asked if poles that are taken down at one location can be re-used in another location. Mr. Pacelli responded, yes; however it would be necessary to make sure the footings do not have to be replaced. If the footings can be reused, then there may be a decreased cost to the Town.

Ms. Valenzuela expressed her agreement with Council Member Barnes, stating she feels the Town Center needs to be something special. Chairman Buffington thanked Mr. Pacelli for providing the Web site information. She agreed with Council Member Barnes and Ms. Valenzuela in

that she feels the downtown strip should be delineated. She noted this area reminds her of a historical/heritage district such as Old Town Scottsdale. She stated she has a concern that the Committee is setting a precedent for Town Center, and cautioned that Town Center is much broader than just the area between Rittenhouse and the wash. The question to keep in mind is if the Committee wants the entire Town Center done.

Ms. Valenzuela asked for clarification on what exactly is designated as Town center. Mr. Pacelli noted the boundaries as: Ellsworth Loop and Rittenhouse Road, east to past Wal-Mart, past the backside of Target on the west, north to the south side of Ryan Road. Chairman Buffington stated this is a very large area, and cautioned the Committee to address this. Council Member Barnes clarified the area he is referring to is the downtown Ellsworth Road area. Chairman Buffington used downtown Scottsdale as a comparison for the downtown center. She asked if everyone was in agreement.

Planning Manager Balmer stated the signals do not need to be installed today. If needed, the poles can be replaced. If the Committee is specifically discussing the Ellsworth Road piece, it does not have to close the door to expanding in the future.

Ryan Desmond stated he does not want to start to create districts or sub-sets to Town Center, which would be overcomplicated. Ms. Cott agreed, stating this is a long-term vision for Town Center, therefore the Committee should look broadly at the entire area with which it is tasked. At this point, it was clarified that Queen Creek Station is not designated as Town Center.

Council Member Mortensen offered background information as to when Council made the decision regarding what the specific Town Center boundaries would be. At that time traffic signals were not in, and the Council knew funds needed to be stretched, meaning the traffic signal poles would probably need to be painted at some time.

General discussion took place on powder coating versus painting. Mr. Pacelli stated powder coating leads to more costly maintenance and increased lead time, however, it lasts longer than painting after installation.

Council Member Barnes stated the Committee should be cautious of budget, while keeping in mind this project should not be done cheaply; it should be of high quality. He suggested doing powder coated poles in phases and retrofitting along the way so that the poles match and look nice. He questioned if the goal is to have people notice how much money was saved versus how nice it looks.

Ms. Cott asked if there is an option to paint existing poles and attach decorative bases to those poles, rather than replacing the entire pole. Mr. Pacelli stated this is an option that he did not include in his memo. The bases are a clam shell-type that fit over the poles at the bottom, and are at eye level for pedestrians. He reiterated there are hundreds, if not thousands of variations on different designs.

Mr. Desmond stated if clam shell covers are an economical solution, it would be a great way to dress up the existing poles since decorative base covers make the poles look like they are a completely different pole. He stated street lights are not generally thought of as a decorative amenity. But when driving through Old Town Scottsdale, the attention to detail makes a difference. A collection of really small decisions creates an overall atmosphere of quality. He stated even if this is phased in over time, it's the right way to go to dress up the street lights.

Motion: Council Member Barnes 2nd: Toni Valenzuela

To purchase decorative traffic signals with the option of decorating existing painted poles with clam shell bases in the entire Town Center until all can be matched.

Discussion on the Motion: the question of whether the poles are to be galvanized or powder coated was raised. Council Member Barnes clarified the motion should state the new poles should be powder coated.

Voting on the motion: Ayes: 9 Nays: 1 (3 absent). Motion carried.

Council Member Mortensen stated the reason for his "nay" vote is that he prefers painting to powder coating and stated there are additional factors to

consider when looking at the cost differential between powder coating and painting, such as chipping, repainting, additional upkeep, etc.

Ms. Cott stated she and Mr. Pacelli will work together to provide decorative options that are comparable to the pedestrian style lighting at the next meeting. Chairman Buffington requested staff provide more accurate figures on upfront costs in addition to maintenance and upkeep for powder coated poles as well. Mr. Gad noted the choice is to either continue with what is existing, most likely at a lower cost, or go in a new direction in terms of a theme with a supplemental cost involved. Chairman Buffington reminded the group that this Committee is merely an advisory board, and will be making a recommendation that Council may or may not follow based on information that the Committee may not have, but the Council does have.

Chairman Buffington reiterated this committee wants colored, powder coated, decorative poles consistent with the existing color of pedestrian poles in Town Center only. She asked Mr. Pacelli to provide options for a pole with a universal base to which decorative elements can be added.

STREET LIGHT SIGNAGE:

Mr. Pacelli referred back to his May 20th memo, which provides information on LED lighting as well as fluorescent lighting. He stated signs can be posted over the street or mounted on the traffic signals. He informed the Committee to provide direction to him on whether or not they wish to have smaller signs just on Ellsworth, or with all future town signals and how much information they'd like to put on the signs, i.e. street name, block number, etc. He stated there are an infinite number of options.

Chairman Buffington asked what the Town's "Green" policy is at this point, and if it addresses electric consumption. Council Member Mortensen responded the Town is pro-green, but this is still evolving as far as an official policy. Ms. Cott added that any new municipal facilities will follow a "green" policy/standard.

Discussion followed on the cost of fluorescent tubes versus LED panels, single sided signs versus double (back-to-back) signs, costs of each type and life of each type of sign.

Chairman Buffington expressed interest in receiving cost information for putting the Town logo on the street signs, as well as possibly including the logo on the street benches/trash receptacles.

Mr. Pacelli stated that relative to the lighted signs, there would not be an additional expense to include the Town logo; however, it would hinder readability since there would be more clutter on the sign. He stated it would just be an issue of balancing legibility and information on the sign.

In response to a question from Mr. Gad, Mr. Pacelli confirmed that LED signs are single-sided.

B. Discussion and Possible Action on Landscape Palette

David Wilson of EPG facilitated discussion on landscape choices for the Arroyo theme, including Primary Theme trees; Medium (accent) shrubs; and Groundcover. Documents illustrating choices in each category were previously sent to the Committee in pdf form via email. Mr. Wilson stated the choice of trees will be very important in establishing a sense of identity. For example in Tempe, Ficus trees are used predominantly along Mill Avenue.

For each choice illustrated on the slides, Mr. Wilson provided information on the flowering period, the size, and maintenance/upkeep involved. Brief discussion took place on types of plantings that have droppings. Mr. Wilson stated all trees will have leaves that drop to some extent. He noted he has provided this list to the Town's maintenance division for their input, but has not yet received comments from them.

Primary Themed tree choices included:

- Blue Palo Verde
- Citrus (evergreen)
- Desert Willow

- Fantex Ash
- Arizona Velvet Mesquite
- Indian Rosewood
- Texas Mountain Laurel

Accent shrubs included:

- Autumn Sage (medium, evergreen)
- Yellow bells (large, semi-evergreen)
- Cape Honeysuckle (large, evergreen)
- Damianita (small, evergreen)
- Bush Morning Glory (medium, evergreen)
- Desert Spoon (accent, evergreen)
- Deer Grass (accent, evergreen)
- Desert Milkweed (accent, evergreen)
- Baja Fairy Duster (large, evergreen)
- Red Yucca and Yellow Yucca (accent, evergreen)
- Firecracker Penstemon (accent, evergreen)
- Red Bird of Paradise (large, deciduous)
- Regal Mist (accent, evergreen)
- Rio Bravo Sage (large, evergreen)
- Katie's Ruellia (small, evergreen)
- Baja Ruellia (large, evergreen)
- Thunder Cloud Sage (large, evergreen)

Groundcover choices included:

- Trailing Gazania
- Gold Mound Lantana
- Purple Trailing Lantana
- Sandpaper Verbena
- White Trailing Lantana

Discussion followed on which types of shrubs and groundcover will attract bees, as well as the omission of any type of thorny groundcover or bush that would not be pedestrian-friendly. Mr. Wilson stated any type of flowering variety bush/groundcover will attract bees.

Mr. Wilson clarified the Committee's recommendation should include: trees: a primary variety; shrubs and groundcover: what character does the committee want (i.e. no plants that attract bees, or have thorns, etc.) He needs a general sense of direction. He cautioned the Committee to keep in mind the fact that trash will blow into some types of shrubs and groundcover, and depending on the type of foliage and the spread of the shrub, the Committee should be cognizant of what will be more difficult to maintain/clean, etc. He stated groundcover should be limited to accent areas, as there will need to be a level of commitment to pruning and maintaining the groundcover, for which Town staff will be responsible.

Kevin Roberts from Dibble Engineering reiterated that the Town has hired them as experts; however, they still want direction as to the main thematic tree that will dominate the corridor and will bring character and a sense of place and space to the area. He asked the Committee to not decide on specific plants, but to decide on a theme.

Discussion followed on continuing the use of the Fantex Ash as the Town's main theme tree, since it is currently the Town's trademark tree. When grown, the tree has a large canopy, which will provide shade.

Ms. Cott stated comments from the Parks & Recreation Department will also be taken into consideration.

Discussion turned to choices for the accent trees. Council Member Barnes stated he prefers the Orange Tree as an accent, in order to bring back the Town's heritage. This tree also provides shade. Chairman Buffington stated she likes the idea of citrus trees as an accent choice; however, she is concerned this type of tree will require additional maintenance. She suggested if this tree is chosen as an accent tree, some type of program such as an "Adopt-A-Tree" program be implemented so the fruit is not wasted. She further suggested a Pecan tree, since it is similar to the looks of a citrus tree, but will not put fruit on the ground. Mr. Brittingham questioned if trees could be treated to prevent fruit from growing, to which Mr. Wilson responded, "yes".

Council Member Mortensen stated he would like a small Ash, such as the Texas Mountain Laurel, as an accent tree. This fits well with the Ash, has vibrant purple flowers, has a nice fragrance and provides lush greenery.

Chairman Buffington stated she likes the Arizona Yellow Bells when grown into a tree. She cautioned the Committee to not repeat colors, but provide a wide spectrum of color.

Motion on Primary Tree Choice:

Motion Jason Gad 2nd: Ryan Desmond

That the main theme tree be Fantex Ash with the accent tree/shrub to be Texas Mountain Laurel. All ayes. Motion carried 10-0.

Gordon Mortensen left the meeting at 8:47 a.m.

SHRUBBERY/GROUND COVER

To simplify the choice of shrubs, Mr. Wilson suggested the Committee express what it does NOT want as a choice of shrubs. The Committee responded it does not want to use the following shrubs: Desert Spoon; Milkweed; Yucca; Deer Grass. Discussion followed on which types of groundcover do better in shade versus full sun. Mr. Wilson stated that initially, ground covers may not get a lot of shade due how quickly or slowly the main tree grows, but once the tree has matured, the shade over the ground cover would increase.

Discussion briefly took place on Torch Glow Bougainvillea. Chairman Buffington asked that the Yellow-Dot be added to the ground cover palette.

C. Discussion and possible action Site Furnishings

Mr. Wilson of EPG provided choices of benches and matching trash receptacles with color samples. He stated whatever powder coating is selected for street lighting should match what is incorporated into site furnishings. Several manufactures of these furnishings were provided on the slides. They all provide a rural feel. For site furnishings, Mr. Wilson asked that unless there is a strong feel for what should be used, he is simply looking for general discussion on what the Committee would like to see. He will

incorporate specifics if the Committee has a strong feeling on one over another.

Ms. Cott noted that as developments come in, they provide benches and trash receptacles complementary to their specific development. She questioned if Planning staff needs direction on choosing two or three theme elements.

Discussion followed on incorporating middle rails into the chosen bench style, the costs for including this element, and the comparison of poly-wood to plastic. Mr. Wilson noted that all styles provided are recycled wood products. Council Member Barnes suggested the Committee choose benches made from recycled materials in keeping with a "green" policy. He also asked the Committee to keep in mind these benches should complement the existing developments.

Chairman Buffington requested information on whether or not benches are heat-repairable in the event something is carved into the bench.

To summarize, Chairman Buffington stated the Committee desires a bench with a poly-wood feel and a center rail. In addition, the Committee would like to receive information on customization of the benches (i.e. Town logo).

Mr. Brittingham reminded the Committee the appropriate choice for a theme bench would be at the street, while benches and receptacles located behind the streetscape complement the existing development.

Mr. Desmond left the meeting at 9:04 a.m.

Further discussion took place on the placement of agreed-upon benches and whether to keep current metal slatted benches or add a new variation of what currently exists.

Chris Webb stated he likes the recycled plastic slat style bench with the matching trash receptacle. The style of this bench is a cross of old town/heritage style and new style.

It was noted these benches are for placement at the street edge. Council Barnes pointed out the manufacturer logo on the bench, suggesting this be replaced with the Town logo.

Motion: Chris Webb. 2nd: Steve Ingram
To select poly-wood benches. All ayes. Motion carried 8-0

E. Discussion and possible action on Circulation Goals and Policies for the Multi-modal Circulation Element of the Town Center Plan

Due to the late hour, this item was deferred to the June Committee meeting.

F. Discussion and possible action on the Expansion of the Town Center boundaries

Planning Manager Balmer provided a brief presentation on the issue of expanding the Town Center boundaries. The task before the Committee will be to decide if the existing Town Center boundaries should be maintained or if the area should be expanded, and if so, where should the new boundaries be. There is a minimal area where expansion would be possible, which is the area located between Queen Creek Marketplace west to Hawes Road. The current General Plan Land Use Map was illustrated, which included a white line delineating the Town Center area. Mr. Balmer also provided background information on possible major General Plan Amendment applications and the draft General Plan Amendment schedule. The annual deadline for filing this application is June 15.

Mr. Balmer informed the group that the Town's Redevelopment Plan and Town Center plan will be merged into one document.

Mr. Balmer stated that Victoria Parcels 5&9 were not included in the Town Center area because the original plan included previously approved patio homes; the eastern edge of Town Center is envisioned to be of a general plan.

Mr. Balmer requested the Committee think about the issue of whether or not to expand the Town Center before the June Committee meeting. He added

that the annual major General Plan Amendment applications may provide additional discussion at that time.

G. Plus/Delta Review of the Meeting

The Committee noted the meeting ran over the allotted time today, and requested that even though the agenda was aggressive, they'd like to adhere to the schedule.

Ms. Cott reiterated that she will follow up on additional information regarding benches and traffic signals. In addition, she will forward Wayne's power point presentation to the Committee. She stated she would like to finalize the multi-modal element at the next meeting, in order to be able to proceed to Land Use in the near future.

5. Announcements

The next meeting is Tuesday, June 23, 2009 at 7:30 a.m. in the San Tan Conference Room of the Development Services Building.

6. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn: Steve Ingram 2nd: Chris Webb

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Laura Moats, Community Development Assistant

Cynthia Buffington, Chairperson

Passed and approved this 23rd day of June, 2009.