Chair Webb called the Study Session to order at 5:00 pm. The Commission and city staff discussed the agenda items scheduled for the hearing. It was determined that agenda items #2, 3, and 5 would be heard. Agenda item #4 (SPORTS AUTHORITY) was proposed for consent. It was discussed in study session that Commissioner Barger had declared a conflict of interest on Item #2 and would be replaced by Commissioner Maza for this item only.
MINUTES OF THE
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION
OCTOBER 8, 2013

TEMPE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT OFFICES
BOARD ROOM
500 WEST GUADALUPE ROAD
TEMPE, AZ 85283
6:00 PM (5:00 Study Session)

Commissioners Present:
Dennis Webb, Chair
Paul Kent, Vice Chair
Angie Thornton
Trevor Barger
Peggy Tinsley
Linda Spears
Ron Collett
Dave Maza (for item #2)

Commissioners Absent:
Dan Killoren

City Staff Present:
Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director
Steve Abrahamson, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner
Nancy Ryan, Project Management Coordinator

Chair Webb called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., which included the introduction of the Commission and City staff. It had been determined in the Study Session that the minutes for September 10, 2013 could be approved as drafted, and Item No. 4 could be placed on the Consent Agenda should no one from the public wish the case to be heard.

1. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 9/10/13 & 9/24/13 (9/24 MINUTES POSTPONED)

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Kent, the Commission with a vote of 7-0 approved the minutes from the September 10, 2013 meeting.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Request for a Preliminary Subdivision Plat for SPORTS AUTHORITY (PL130309), located at 1525 West Elliot Road. The applicant is TPP JV Maricopa LLC.

STAFF REPORT: DRCr_SportsAuthority_100813
On a motion by Commissioner Collett and seconded by Commissioner Spears, the Commission approved the Consent Agenda with a vote of 7-0 as proposed in the following staff report:

REGULAR AGENDA

2. Request for a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Planned Area Development and Development Plan Review consisting of a new 24-unit, 3-4 story townhome development for CLARENDON TOWNHOMES (PL130215), located at 425 West 6th Street. The applicant is Irene Clary, Symi Development, LLC.

STAFF REPORT: DRCr_ClarendonTownhomes_100813

Commissioner Barger recused himself from this case and Commissioner Maza replaced him at the dais.

This case was presented by Diana Kaminski and represented by Manjula Vaz, Gammage & Burnham.

Commissioner Spears questioned staff as to what alley improvements are required for this project.

Ms. Kaminski indicated that any time a case proposes to use the alley as a main entrance, paving, curb and gutter and drainage requirements need to be met. There will also be undergrounding of power lines in this area as well. The property owner is required to maintain the alley as it becomes part of their private drive.

Commissioner Maza and Ms. Kaminski discuss possible future development in neighboring properties, of which Ms. Kaminski determined single family most likely with the possibility of multi-family units.

Manjula Vaz, Gammage & Burnham, introduced the applicant, Irene Clary.

Ms. Clary made a presentation which included focused on the site plan, building elevations and landscape plan.

Commissioner Collett expressed concern regarding the tandem parking and lack of visitor parking and feels it will turn into rentals.

Ms. Clary indicated that they have provided visitor parking and have more visitor parking than is required. She also indicated that the price point is geared toward owner occupancy.

Commissioner Kent asked about refuse collection.

Ms. Clary indicated that for the people that front on 6th Street, trash collection will be on 6th and the units on the south bank will have refuse pickup from the alley.

Commissioner Kent also asked for clarification as to parking and the covered carports that are shown.

Ms. Clary referenced an elevation to show the covered carports/decks.

Chair Webb asked for public comment, seeing no one from the audience who wished to speak, he then closed the public input portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Collett indicated that it was a very nice project but too much in too little of space.

Commissioner Maza stated that he feels it’s a fantastic project.

Commissioner Tinsley indicated that she feels it’s a very nice project.
Commissioner Thornton thanked the applicant and stated that she thinks it's a wonderful project.

Chair Webb stated that he thinks it's a great project.

On a motion by Commissioner Kent and seconded by Commissioner Tinsley, the Commission with a vote of 6-1 (Commissioner Collett dissented), recommended approval of the Planned Area Development, Zoning Map Amendment and General Plan Amendment and approved the Development Plan Review as recommended in the staff report.

3. Request for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review consisting of two new 4-story multi-family buildings, totaling 358 units and approximately 672,000 sf. of building area for **LPC SOUTHBANK (PL130265)**, located at 1190 East Vista Del Lago Drive. The applicant is Snell & Wilmer LLP.

**STAFF REPORT:** [DRCr_LPCSouthbank_100813](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zbjy1f8ukv5ajpn/sNK-KclZID?n=144603333)

(Unable to transcribe due to recording issues)

This case was presented by Ryan Levesque and represented by Nick Woods, Snell & Wilmer.

City staff, Ryan Levesque, provided a brief overview of the project scope and identifies a recommendation of approval by staff for the PAD, but a continuance request to further address the design issues with the project.

The applicant represented by Nick Wood, provided an overview of the project and an introduction to Lincoln Property Company, the developer for the apartment project. Also represented was Womack & Hampton Architects, who designed the project.

The Commission and the applicant provided discussion on the project, regarding the design of the project, how the project related to the original develop proposal, and whether the project was compatible with the city’s vision for the town lake area.

Mr. Wood explained that their client was not ready to continue the request and advised the Commission take action on the request for either approval or denial. The applicant had expressed concern with a potential modification of hearing schedule proposed with City Council.

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and a second by Commissioner Barger, the Commission with a vote of 6-1 (Commissioner Barger dissented), recommended denial of the Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and denied the Development Plan Review.

5. **Introduction and first public hearing for a Major General Plan Amendment for GENERAL PLAN 2040 (PL130352).** The applicant is the City of Tempe. The second and final public hearing with the Development Review Commission is scheduled for October 22, 2013.

**STAFF REPORT:** [DRCr_GeneralPlan2040_100813](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zbjy1f8ukv5ajpn/sNK-KclZID?n=144603333)

(Unable to fully transcribe due to recording issues)

This case was presented by Nancy Ryan who explained the General Plan process and what the Plan envisions.
Public Comments

Chair Webb opened up the public commentary portion of the session.

A City of Tempe resident called attention to Fig. 2 of the projected Land Use Density Map to indicate concern of proposed split density designation of one part med/high density and one part high density. The high density designation would affect the Jentilly and Hudson Manor neighborhoods by increasing area traffic and allowing view obstructing buildings.

A 15 year City of Tempe resident commented on her concern of the General Plan not addressing the issue of climate change.

A City of Tempe resident asked the commission if the General Plan 2040 followed the United Nations Agenda 21 guidelines, to which Nancy Ryan replied that all current and past Tempe General Plans follow AZ State guidelines.

A City of Tempe resident expressed concern of projected population increase as a result of General Plan 2040 citing density and city resource availability as serious issues.

A City of Tempe resident raised concern of General Plan 2040 lacking sense of community.

A City of Tempe resident expressed concerns of congestion the General Plan could bring, as well as concern over where funds to implement the Plan will come from.

A City of Tempe resident shared ideas that the General Plan 2040 is too specific and not general enough.

A City of Tempe Resident expressed concerns over density and that bike friendliness is not in fact friendly to the elderly.

A City of Tempe resident shared that he interprets the General Plan promotion of public transit use as government infringement on his freedom to choose his method of transportation.

Chair Webb closed the Public Comment section and invited other commissioners to comment.

Commissioner Collett commented that he believes that the General Plan 2040 should be used as a guide, and be implemented as reality sees fit.

6. **Announcements**- No announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

Prepared by: Steve Nagy, Administrative Assistant II
Reviewed by: Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner

Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner
For further information on the above agenda items, contact Community Development, Planning Division (480) 350-8331. Cases may not be heard in the order listed. The City of Tempe endeavors to make all public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities. With 48 hours advance notice, special assistance is available at public meetings for sight and/or hearing-impaired persons. Please call 350-8331 (voice) or 350-8400 (TDD) to request an accommodation to participate in a public meeting.
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