MINUTES OF THE  
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION  
September 9, 2014  

Harry E. Mitchell Government Center  
Tempe City Hall - City Council Chambers  
31 E. 5th Street, Tempe, AZ  85281  
6:00 PM

Commission Present:  
Dennis Webb, Chair  
Paul Kent, Vice Chair  
Peggy Tinsley  
Ron Collett  
Linda Spears  
Angie Thornton  
David Lyon

Commission Absent:  
Dan Killoren, alt.  
Jerry Langston, alt.  
Trevor Barger

City Staff Present:  
Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director  
Steve Abrahamson, Planning and Zoning Coordinator  
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner  
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner  
Steve Nagy, Administrative Asst. II

Chairman Webb called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m., introducing the Commission and City staff. It had been determined in the Study Session that the minutes from the 08/12/2014 Development Review Commission meeting and item #3 could be placed on the consent agenda. Item #2 would be heard.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES:
   08/25/2014

   3. Request for a Development Plan Review consisting of a furniture retail store for ASHLEY FURNITURE HOMESTORE (PL140130) located at 8515 South Emerald Drive. The applicant is Michael Scarbrough, 3K1 Consulting Services.

Chairman Webb asked if there were any members of the audience who wished to speak on the items being considered on the consent agenda. On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Collett, the Commission approved the Study Session and Regular Meeting minutes from August 25, 2014 with a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Lyon abstained as he was not present at that hearing. Commissioner Tinsley then moved to approve item #3, which was seconded by Commissioner Collet, and with a vote of 7-0, the motion passed.

REGULAR AGENDA

2. Request for Development Plan Review consisting of new paint colors for HILLEL JEWISH STUDENT CENTER
(PL140241), located at 1012 South Mill Avenue. The applicant is Jennifer Jalowiec, Hillel Jewish Student Center.

Karen Stovall presented the case by reviewing the site, the zoning, and then presented photographs of the current building paint. Ms. Stovall continued by explaining to the Commission that the applicant was unaware they were required to go through a Development Plan Review process prior to a re-paint. Ms. Stovall read through the conditions and stated that staff recommended approval with conditions, including a requirement for a more neutral color on the screen wall.

Chair Webb then called up the applicant, Debbie Yunker Kail, Tempe.

Ms. Debbie Yunker Kail presented by explaining that she was unaware of the DPR requirement for a repaint. She continued by explaining the role of the center, and the idea behind their choice of colors. She also explained how the bright colors have been beneficial to the center. Ms. Yunker Kail concluded her presentation with providing examples of other brightly colored businesses throughout Tempe.

The Commission discussed the color choices with the applicant, and how she saw the center fitting into the community.

Commissioner Thornton asked Staff if the City of Tempe had designated paint colors for signage, Diana Kaminski responded that there were no City designated colors for signs, some commercial centers had sign packages with approved colors and designs, but this site is not a part of a larger center with a sign package.

Chair Webb then opened the meeting to public comment.

1. Chris Woodward, Tempe, spoke in support of the current color scheme as the contractor that performed the work. Mr. Woodward also described how the yellow wall would look slightly toned down once their new sign was installed.

   The commission asked if the yellow was ASU gold, which Mr. Woodward responded that it was two shades lighter.

2. Deeann Jo Griebel, Tempe, spoke in support of the bright colors, expressing that she thinks the Mill Ave area can come across as visually dull.

With no one else from the public wishing to speak on the case, Chair Webb closed the hearing to public comment and called the applicant back up to respond to the comments.

Ms. Yunker Kail expressed appreciation for the supportive comments and reemphasized the role of the center.

The Commission then discussed the repaint colors amongst themselves. Commissioner Collett supported the request and felt the colors were appropriate for a college town and for the area. Vice Chair Kent was not in favor of the yellow from a design aspect, the screen wall would be better with a neutral color, relying on signage for additional visibility. Commissioner Spears acknowledged there are areas in downtown that have color, but the yellow did not blend in with the location and building design; she expressed concern that the justification for the colors were needed to attract attention could be used by any property owner, but this is not a design consideration. Chairman Webb stated that the use of color as an attraction getting device was intended more for the purpose of signage, and not by use of the screen wall. The color of the wall is not going to drive the success of the organization, which will succeed on its own merits. Commissioner Tinsley noted that colors were a personal preference, and although she did not like the yellow, she supported the request based on the public input received. Commissioner Lyon understood the intent of the requested design, but felt the application of the colors did not meet the design objectives. Looking at the logo, the yellow was a smaller accent, but the building design uses the yellow in a very prominent area that is not an
accent. Several suggestions were given as alternatives. Commissioner Thornton appreciated the applicant and members of the public who spoke, but felt the yellow was too bright for the proposed location and application.

Commissioner Spears moved to approve the case with staff recommendation of a neutral paint color to replace the yellow. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Thornton and the motion passed with a vote of 5-2, with Commissioners Collett and Tinsley in the dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.
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