
MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION February 24, 2015

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
Linda Spears
Ron Collett
Trevor Barger
Jerry Langston, alt.

Commission Absent:

Dan Killoren, alt.
David Lyon, alt.
Angie Thornton

City Staff Present:

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director
Larry Tom, Principal Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
Steve Nagy, Administrative Assistant II

Chair Webb called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., introducing the Commission and City staff. It had been determined in the Study Session that the minutes, with one correction, from the 02/10/2015 Development Review Commission meeting could be placed on the consent agenda. Item #3 would be heard and item #2 had been removed from the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 02/10/2015

Commissioner Tinsley moved to approve the Study Session and Regular Meeting Minutes, with one correction, from the February 10, 2015 meetings. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Collett, and passed with a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Barger abstained from the vote on account of not present at that Hearing.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

2. Requests for a Development Plan Review consisting of two new apartment buildings containing 19 units, one Use Permit to allow tandem parking, and one Use Permit Standard to increase the maximum building height from 30' to 32' for **5TH AND HARDY APARTMENTS (PL140327)**, located at 1000 West 5TH Street. The applicant is Anthony Miachika, Pacific Rim Property Investments Ltd.

Karen Stovall presented the case by reviewing the location, request details, site plan, and building materials.

Vice Chair Kent asked why no neighborhood meeting had been held. Ms. Stovall stated that the type of request did not require a neighborhood meeting to be held, however, other methods of notification had been carried out to advertise the case.

Anthony Miachika and Tor Barstad approached the podium as the applicants. Mr. Miachika explained his background and the reason he wanted to build in this location. He added that as with his other development, he did not intend to target students as his clientele.

Commissioner Langston asked what their typical rental rates would be, Mr. Miachika replied they would be in the \$1,500 range.

Commissioner Spears asked how tandem parking would be enforced. Mr. Miachika replied that he found that tandem

parking use never needed to be enforced and that it typically worked itself out. The tandem parking in this development was also limited to the 2-bedroom units.

Vice Chair Kent asked about the type of environments Mr. Miachika's other developments were located. Mr. Miachika replied that 90% of his developments were in urban environments.

Commissioner Barger asked about the elevation details. Mr. Barstad replied that the intention was to create a big building look with using various pieces.

Chair Webb asked about a material samples board. The applicant replied that the color chips were submitted, and that the stucco finish and corrugated metal to be used were very standard. Commissioner Barger replied that the combination of materials used was very unusual, and then asked how the corrugated metal would be attached to the building. The applicant replied they would use galvanized bolts and apply sealant to prevent rusting.

Chair Webb then asked where would people park if the available spaces were full. The applicant replied people could use guest spots provided, alley spots, or where everyone else in the area parks. He added that he typically did not see overflow parking along the streets.

Commissioner Spears again clarified the building materials. Mr. Barstad replied that the materials were chosen to complement each other and adhere to a high-end, modern look.

Commissioner Tinsley asked the applicant how many people he expected to live in the units. The applicant replied he pictures a family or a pair of people splitting rent to occupy a unit. He repeated that he was not looking to attract students.

Vice Chair Kent asked about the amenity building on site. The applicant explained it would include a bathroom and small workout area.

Commissioner Barger asked if the alley trash containers would serve all the units, which the applicant confirmed. Commissioner Barger also asked for clarification on the landscaping, which the applicant provided.

Chair Webb asked what material the access road would be made of. The applicant replied it would be made up of asphalt. Chair Webb asked if he would consider pavers, which the applicant did not see how this would benefit the design. He added that the parking lot near the north property line would be colored concrete.

Commissioner Spears asked if the trash receptacles would be enough for the site. The applicant replied he would defer to city requirements.

Vice Chair Kent asked what material would be used around the pool, which the applicant had not decided upon yet. Vice Chair Kent asked if the access road to the site would be discernable from the main city road. The applicant replied that they used the city design standard for the main driveway.

Commissioner Barger discussed further design elements about the project, and the applicant expanded upon their design intentions.

Chair Webb asked about roof access, which the applicant also explained.

Commissioner Spears asked the applicant if they would consider a design without tandem parking. The applicant replied they would not be able to get the project to fit without the tandem parking.

Commissioner Barger asked staff when the zoning for this site was designated. Staff replied the zoning had been in place since at least 1976, when the recently demolished single-family home had been constructed.

With no other questions, Chair Webb opened the hearing to public comment.

1. Martha Rader, Tempe, expressed appreciation over the cleanup of the site. She also expressed concern over perimeter walls, balconies, and lack of management office on site.

Vice Chair Kent asked Ms. Rader about the typical profile of one of her tenants. She replied she usually rents to graduate students. Vice Chair Kent asked if Ms. Rader had witnessed any fraternities in the area, to which she replied she had not yet.

With no other comments from the public, Chair Webb closed the hearing to comment from the public.

The applicant came back up to the podium and addressed to concern over the balconies and perimeter wall. He also added that he lives in the area and effectively oversees the management of over 200 homes in the area through his company.

With no other questions from the applicant, the Commission discussed the case.

Commissioner Spears expressed that she was not a fan of tandem parking, and that the project is too big for the site. She also had a hard time envisioning articulation of elevations.

Commissioner Barger also expressed that he appreciated a development being proposed for the site. He also sees parking as an issue in Tempe, and tandem parking a challenge, but that it was hard to provide everything high-end renters seek. He also struggled to envision the design, but overall, would be in support of it.

Commissioner Langston expressed that he liked the colors and the design, but wasn't thrilled about the tandem parking.

Vice Chair Kent also expressed that he had a hard time envisioning the design, especially with the drawings and color samples provided. He does not like the tandem parking, but is ok with the density of the project.

Commissioner Collett expressed that the Commission needs to be realistic as to what fits in an urban setting. He also expressed that he believes this project works for such a setting and enough materials were submitted by the applicant to determine such.

Chair Webb pointed out that this site will likely see a high-density project, but the presentation given by the applicant was not great. He would like to see better articulation, more details, and better site plans.

Chair Webb then called the applicant back up to the podium and expressed the Commission's issues with not having any over flow parking. He also asked the applicant if he would be willing to address the tandem parking issue. Mr. Miachika asked for clarification on addressing the tandem parking issue. Chair Webb clarified that they would like to see less of it. The applicant replied that only 8 out of 47 spots were tandem parking, but he would look into reducing this further. Commissioner Barger replied that providing alternative to tandem parking should suffice in addressing the issue.

The Commission, Staff, and Applicant discussed a potential date to continue the project to. Ms. Stovall recommended that 4 weeks would suffice.

Commissioner Tinsley moved to continue the case to the March 24, 2015 Development Review Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Spears, and the motion passed 7-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Prepared by: Steve Nagy, Administrative Assistant II
Reviewed by: Larry Tom, Principal Planner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'LT', written over a horizontal line.

Larry Tom, Principal Planner