



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

GPA-DSTV-2-22-2

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	August 2, 2022
Proposal	Amendment to the Desert Ridge Specific Plan to modify standards for Superblock 9, Development Parcel 9.CP.2 regarding uses permitted, accessory uses, maximum building height and floor area ratio
Location	Approximately 3,300 feet west of the southwest corner of Tatum Boulevard and the Loop 101 Freeway

VPC DISCUSSION:

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Anthony Grande, staff, provided an overview of the Desert Ridge Specific Plan, the parcel proposed to be amended, and the surrounding context. **Mr. Grande** described the Loop 101 employment corridor and the reason for amending the subject parcel. He described the changes proposed to the plan text, including changes to the uses permitted, accessory uses, maximum building height, and maximum floor area ratio. He further described the existing height limits on the Desert Ridge parcels south of the Loop 101 and finally discussed the next steps for the proposed plan amendment.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Dickson stated that the Desert Ridge Community Association is in support of the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Younger** stated that he agreed.

Committee Member Hankins asked about the elevation of the parcel and the adjacent freeway. **Mr. Grande** stated that the information could be provided at the next hearing. **Chair Bowser** stated that the grade of the freeway north of the site is only a few feet higher than the parcel.

Committee Member Nowell asked about the definition of floor area ratio. **Mr. Grande** provided an explanation of the calculation of floor area ratio. **Chair Bowser** asked for clarification on whether it includes the full development site. **Mr. Grande** stated that the calculation includes the full development site and underground parking is excluded from the calculation.

Mr. Nowell asked about the inclusion of art galleries and museums in the permitted use list and the reason for including the word “private” in the use description. **Mr. Grande** stated that inclusion of those uses would allow flexibility for an employer on the site to provide amenities for employees. **Joshua Bednarek**, staff, added that the inclusion of the word “private” may not be necessary in the definition, but it is often how it is written in the zoning ordinance.

Chair Bowser stated that the height and floor area ratio could be increased beyond what is being proposed, adding that he believes attracting an office use at the subject parcel would be a great addition and adding flexibility in the standards is desirable. **Mr. Nowell** asked about the visibility of a taller building at this location from the closest residences. **Chair Bowser** stated that a stepback approach, with heights increasing further from the residential areas, would be preferred.

Mr. Dickson stated that the committee has approved height increases on other Desert Ridge parcels and that increasing the limit at the subject parcel is a good idea.

Ms. Hankins asked about transportation improvements that would be required with a development at this location. **Chair Bowser** replied that Mayo Boulevard will need to be extended for this development and a transportation analysis will need to be conducted by the developer, further stating that Mayo Boulevard will eventually need to be extended to pass over the freeway. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that a future developer at this location would be required to submit a traffic analysis and recommendations for infrastructure improvements would be addressed then.

Chair Bowser asked for clarification on the next step in the process. **Mr. Grande** replied that it would return to the committee in September for a public hearing and vote.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

STAFF COMMENTS:

None.