

## MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION OCTOBER 9, 2012

Harry E. Mitchell Government Center  
Tempe City Hall - City Council Chambers  
31 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Tempe, AZ 85281  
6:00 PM (5:30 Study Session)

### Commission Present:

Mike DiDomenico, Chair  
Dennis Webb, Vice Chair  
Peggy Tinsley  
Linda Spears  
Angie Thornton  
Ron Collett  
Jim Delton

### Commission Absent:

Dave Maza  
Paul Kent  
Dan Killoren

### City Staff Present:

Lisa Collins, Interim Community Development Director  
Steve Abrahamson, Planning & Zoning Coordinator  
Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner

Chair DiDomenico called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., which included the introduction of the Commission and City staff.

### **1. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 9/11/12 & 9/25/12**

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Spears, the Commission with a vote of 6-0 approved the minutes of September 11, 2012. Chair DiDomenico approved the minutes for the portion of the meeting he attended.

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Spears, the commission with a vote of 6-0 approved the minutes of September 25, 2012 with one minor change. On the final page, the final vote should read 6-1 (Commissioner Kent dissented).

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

2. Request for a Zoning Map Amendment from Agricultural District to General Industrial District and MU-3, Mixed-Use Medium-High Density District, a Planned Area Development Overlay to establish standards and reduce the required parking, a Use Permit to allow tandem parking, and Development Plan Review consisting of a new 3-story, 590 unit, multi-family development for **SOUTHWEST TEMPE REZONE (PL120261)**, located at 9010 South Priest Drive. The applicant is Huellmantel & Affiliates.

STAFF REPORT: [DRCr SWTempeRezone 100912](#)

The case was presented by Ryan Levesque and represented by Huellmantel & Affiliates.

Mr. Levesque made a presentation which included a brief history of this site and a review of the zoning map amendment, planned area development overlay, use permit and development plan review. Mr. Levesque stated staff has received public input concerning the increased traffic, potential industrial access to Priest Drive and access along Warner Road. Staff has also received questions regarding the PAD Zoning. Fire and Police service impact for this area was also questioned. Emergency service calls could be provided by Tempe, Chandler or Phoenix .

Commissioner Collett asked for clarification on the land being used for this project.

Mr. Levesque pointed out the land being used on a location map. The City of Tempe parcel will not be part of the project.

Commissioner Delton – Asked about the proposed industrial zoning for either development/billboard.

Mr. Levesque stated the request tonight is to change the zoning district. The applicant then has the ability to ask City Council to enter into a development agreement for an off-premise freeway sign at that location.

Mr. Huellmantel addressed the Commission. Mr. Huellmantel displayed a photograph of the land set to be rezoned. The Mark-Taylor Community is in for a development plan review. Mark-Taylor has been building in the community for approximately 30 years. Awards have been presented for some of the communities built in Tempe. Mark-Taylor Communities provide luxurious, high-end multi-family units. There has been discussion about the Crown Farms. The Crown Farms land is zoned for agricultural. If offices are proposed for this area there will be another hearing for rezoning. The General Industrial District would become eligible for a billboard only with Council approval. The applicant is requesting a general rezoning, and a development plan review for a site plan, landscape plan and elevations.

Mr. Huellmantel addressed the issue regarding emergency services. The Fire Departments in Chandler, Phoenix and Tempe are all part of a mutual response system. A general dispatch is used to notify the nearest vehicle. Often times near boundaries of a City, a fire department from another city will respond. If there is an urgent Police matter, other local Police Departments are also available.

Mr. Huellmantel stated they would not be requesting a proposal for an industrial road from Priest Drive with the exceptions of the Agave Center. There have been discussions with the Agave Center. The attempts have been unsuccessful to convince the owners of the center to have access to Harl Avenue (for the Mark-Taylor development). This would provide an additional access point to Warner Road.

Commissioner Delton clarified if the access road proposed on Harl was for the industrial site or Mark-Taylor?

Mr. Huellmantel indicated they were not asking for Harl Avenue to be extended, they wanted to extend Ranch Road past the canal to the new development. Since they do not have the authority to do so they have approached the owners of the land. The requests to extend the road have been unsuccessful.

Chair DiDomenico opened the hearing to public input.

Joe Salvatore, Tempe stated he is against the rezoning of this property. He is also against the concept of the apartments being built at this location. The 2030 General Plan was developed and adopted in 2003. A lot has changed since 2003. Rental units are becoming popular since fewer people are able to buy houses due to the economy. The Warner Corridor is nice and it should be protected.

Diane Salvatore, Tempe agrees with Mr. Salvatore. She is against the rezoning of this property. Things have changed in the past ten years. She believes the population is going to increase in this area. Traffic is going to be horrendous.

Commissioner Tinsley asked Ms. Salvatore what she thought would be an appropriate use for this property.

Ms. Salvatore stated she would much rather see single-family homes in this area.

Eric Emmert, President of the Sierra Tempe #4 Homeowners Association stated the homeowners association is located at Priest Drive and Ray Road. He stated the Mark-Taylor team did a good job reaching out to the residents and business in the area. He stated they had a neighborhood meeting a few weeks ago. If this proposal meets the density for the General Plan the quality of a Mark-Taylor development is something the residents would like to see. He cannot speak for all of the homes in the Sierra Tempe #4 neighborhood. He would like to see western access from the development to Harl Avenue for quick access to Warner Road to get on the freeway. He would ask for acceleration and deceleration turning lanes for eastern access to the development. Priest Drive can get bottled up and this development would add to the traffic. He also asked the applicant if he would consider transitioning the single-family detached homes from the east to the Agave Center and consider easing the transition. Mr. Emmert complimented the City Staff.

Sharon Kausal, Tempe is opposed to the rezoning of this project. She is concerned about the quality of the schools and the impact of the additional traffic in the area. The amount of property left in Tempe is minimal. She feels this land should be used for a better project. She does not believe a high density project serves Tempe very well. She would like to challenge the developer to come up with a better use of this property. A multi-family development may impact the property value of the single family homes. She would like the single family homes to be protected.

David Ember, President of the Tempe Village Homeowners Association stated Tempe Village is the latest development in the area. Tempe Village consists of 120 homes in a gated community located at Caroline Lane and Priest Drive. Woodside Homes was the developer of Tempe Village, unfortunately they are now out of business. At the time Tempe Village was developed Priest Drive was supposed to be widened and a traffic signal was supposed to be installed at Caroline Lane and Priest Drive. Tempe Village would like to address the potential installation of a traffic signal at Caroline Lane and Priest Drive. Children are bussed to a nearby school because it is too dangerous to walk across Priest Drive. Mr. Ember previously lived in a Mark-Taylor development and stated it was well developed. Mark-Taylor has a good reputation.

Commissioner Thornton asked Mr. Ember about the traffic light at Caroline Lane being part of his neighborhood development.

Mr. Ember stated Woodside Homes was supposed to pay for the traffic signal.

Chair DiDomenico stated he did not remember the traffic signal being part of the development.

Ms. Collins stated she could research the condition, but did not recall a requirement for Woodside Homes to install an off-site traffic signal.

Mr. Ember stated he would really like a traffic signal installed at Caroline Lane. Any development on this property would increase the traffic.

Chair DiDomenico indicated the new development would have the main ingress and egress on Greentree Drive. Chair DiDomenico asked Mr. Ember if a traffic signal at Greentree Drive would alleviate his issues with traffic.

Mr. Ember stated it would not. He would like to see the main entrance on Caroline if this development is approved.

Commissioner Webb stated Woodside Homes has not gone out of business, there are several new developments in Arizona.

Commissioner Delton asked if there was any specific reason the new development selected Greentree Drive for the main entrance/exit instead of Caroline Lane.

Mr. Huellmantel stated they felt this would cause the least impact in traffic. This location was selected after discussion with the City. They would be willing to pay for a traffic signal if it was beneficial to the development. City staff informed Mr. Huellmantel a traffic signal would only be beneficial for a short period of the day.

Commissioner Thornton asked staff if there were any rules or regulations regarding traffic lights near the vicinity of schools.

Mr. Levesque stated part of the determination for installing a traffic signal would include a warrant analysis. There are several factors to consider. The Traffic Engineering staff has noted the applicant has not requested a warrant analysis, but one could be considered.

Greg Laing, Tempe has been in commercial retail business for 30 years. Mark-Taylor Communities help market sales in the area. Mark-Taylor Communities usually bring in younger professionals. The communities are gated and the quality of the communities are tremendous. An increase in the population in this area would help further the success of the local businesses.

Anne Cadillo, Tempe is a resident of Sierra Tempe 1, 2 & 3. She has been living in south Tempe for one year. She chose to live in Tempe for the overall quality of life. She is a young professional and owns a home in Tempe. She is opposed to this development. She appreciates what the last speaker had to say. She has three areas she would like to address. She believes the increase in traffic is unrealistic. The impact of the local schools is a concern. There is also concern related to the home values. A three story development does not fit in with the character of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Thornton stated she has been doing some research and stated the issue with the schools is very important to her. The CFO of the Kyrene School District is aware of the project and feel there is room in the school district for the additional students. The Tempe Union High School District indicated this would increase the number of students at Mountain Point High School. Mountain Point also has room for additional students.

Chair DiDomenico indicated the developer would probably know what kind of impact the development would have on the local schools.

Amy Ahrens Dorf, Tempe asked about statistical data relating to traffic accidents at a certain density levels. Would the additional numbers with an apartment complex reach the density threshold? The issues with Police and Fire have been addressed regarding responding to calls. Are we above or below standard practices for Police and Fire personnel? What impact would the additional residents do to those numbers? Are we capable to responding to the additional calls?

Chair DiDomenico indicated that more cars does not necessarily mean there are going to be more accidents. There are other factors that need to be considered.

Tony Crump is a resident of Chandler. He owns a restaurant on the north east corner of Warner Road and Priest Drive called Forefathers. This is a few blocks away from the proposed development. From his perspective a business owner the development would be beneficial.

Chiara Elie, Tempe lives in a Mark-Taylor Community. She likes the quality of the property. She is single and does not want to purchase a home. Living in a nice high quality apartment community works best for her. She thinks a Mark-Taylor Community in that area would be great with the access to surrounding amenities.

Melissa Drake, Tempe has lived in a Mark-Taylor Community for the past seven years. She and her husband like the quality of the community and have had some amazing neighbors over the years. She would strongly consider moving to this location if it is developed due to the proximity of the freeway, nearby restaurants and amenities. She strongly supports this development.

Tim Noble, is a resident of Sierra Tempe. He has spoken with several neighbors and states no one in his neighborhood is in favor of this project. Mr. Noble stated he has to go to Phoenix or Chandler to do his shopping. There are no grocery stores near his neighborhood. He would like to see commercial development in this area. Something along the lines of a shopping center, grocery store or restaurants would be ideal for this area. Mr. Noble noted Warner Road is only two lanes wide in each direction. The traffic on Warner Road near the freeway backs up to Priest Drive sometimes. Ray Road and Priest Drive also get backed up as a corridor to the freeway.

Ray Delmotte, Tempe is opposed to the project. Tempe is land locked. The little amount of land that is left should not be used for apartment complexes. It would be good to have land for long term planning in the future. The traffic on Priest Drive is also a concern. Adding another 2,000 people in this 1/3 to 1/2 of a square mile is going to cause more congestion.

Michael Holtman, resident of Sierra Tempe is opposed to the development as it is currently planned. He does not understand how the development would only increase the traffic by 11 percent. He is a commuter, bicyclist and pedestrian in the area and it is ungodly dangerous. He was unaware of the neighborhood meeting held to discuss the project. He asked the Commission for a continuance on this case. He feels that since Tempe is land locked something better should be developed at this location. He is concerned about traffic safety, property value and the local schools.

Dave Hurrmann, Tempe is opposed to the high density populated area. Mr. Hurrmann is a retired fireman from Chicago. The high density area increases response time, personnel and equipment used in an emergency. He is concerned with the safety impact on the community as a whole. Mutual aid from other cities for Police and Fire Department assistance increases the time of arrival.

Chris Donahue is a resident of Sierra Tempe. Mr. Donahue is concerned about the traffic as many others have expressed. There is a large area of land across from Sierra Tempe that is undeveloped in the City of Chandler. If Tempe and Chandler do not coordinate their development efforts this whole area may be developed in a very poor fashion.

Chair DiDomenico indicated the large piece of undeveloped land in Chandler is owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. At some point in time it will most likely be a low density development, more of a religious facility.

Mike Myrick, Tempe resident for over 34 years is in support of this project. Mr. Myrick is a commercial real estate broker. He is not involved with this transaction. He owns commercial real estate within a one mile radius of this site. He is in favor of more households to support the amenities in the area. He does not see traffic as an issue. As a former first responder he pointed out that the City of Phoenix has a fire station at Warner Road and 48<sup>th</sup> Street which is about a mile away. Chandler also has a fire station about a mile and a half away on Kyrene and Chandler Boulevard. Tempe has a fire station at Elliot Road and McClintock Drive. Between the three stations there is adequate coverage. Tempe is considering updates to the General Plan. Mr. Myrick feels this is a wonderful project. He has a little concern about the density.

Chair DiDomenico closed the hearing to public input.

Chair DiDomenico stated that several citizens spoke regarding their neighborhood and the growth in the City of Tempe. The City is currently seeking community volunteers to be a part of the 2040 General Plan. By state statute the city is required to create a General Plan that maps out the future growth the citizens of the city would like to see. This process will go through May 2013 with monthly meetings. A consensus will go before the voters to become the 2040 General Plan. Applications are currently available for those interested in serving on the committee.

Mr. Huellmantel returned to address concerns.

Mark-Taylor has been a developer in the area for roughly 30 years. Mark-Taylor builds high end multi-family apartments. If this project is approved it would take six to nine months to get through the construction document phase. The construction would start immediately after. The construction phase would take approximately one year. The issues with the local schools have already been covered. Schools generally need students, it is expected that busses would come into the neighborhood to pick the students up. According to the demographics for the Mark-Taylor Communities, roughly about eight percent of the population would be children and three percent would be students.

Chair DiDomenico asked about how many residents would be living in the community.

Mr. Huellmantel stated there would probably be about 1,000 residents in the community. The ratio used is 1.8 per unit. Regarding the notice provisions they have gone well beyond what is required. Letters have gone out and several neighborhood meetings have been held.

Mr. Levesque stated the Zoning and Development Code requires notification to property owners within 300' radius of the project site area. In addition a vicinity notification is sent to registered neighborhood associations and homeowner associations within a 600' radius. Representatives listed on the Neighborhood Services contact list are notified. Posting of the site is also done 15 days prior to the hearing. The sign lists the future City Council Meeting dates as well as the Development Review Commission and neighborhood meeting dates. The Neighborhood Services staff also forwards public hearing agendas for the Hearing Officer, Board of Adjustment and Development Review Commission to the neighborhood association and home owner association representatives on the distribution list. The applicant is responsible to hold a neighborhood meeting. The applicant also authorizes staff to send out the notification postcards for the public hearings.

Chair DiDomenico indicated citizens sometimes feel a 300' radius notification may not be enough notice. The City Council and City Manager's office could be contacted by citizens if they feel the radius for the notification of projects should be expanded.

Mr. Huellmantel stated they have been working with the neighborhood association and will continue working with the Agave Center for a solution to find another access point. The plans for the project would place smaller buildings near the outside of the community. This would make the project appear to be less dense. The plans include less than 20 units per acre. The demographics of other Mark-Taylor Communities are the best to use. The community located at College and Baseline earns about \$112,000 per household. The property for the proposed development is zoned as agricultural. The property is taxed at roughly \$30,000 per year. If this project is built the same land will be taxed at about \$600,000 per year. From the tax perspective the value is significant. It is hard to estimate the impact on the taxes for the single family homes.

Mr. Huellmantel stated he is confident this would be a good project for the area. If the area was developed as retail or an office space there would still be an increase in traffic. There is plenty of empty office space available in the area, retail space is also available nearby. A traffic analysis has been done. Traffic Engineers with the City of Tempe have reviewed the traffic studies. The findings in general have been a traffic light would cause more problems. The developer would be willing to participate in paying for a traffic signal that is in reason. The developer would be willing to include a traffic signal near the entrance of the community if the City felt it would help solve the problem with the increased traffic.

Mr. Basha, Consultant Traffic Engineer prepared a traffic impact study for this project. It was submitted to the City of Tempe and a few revisions were made. The study was approved by the Traffic Engineers with the City of Tempe. Currently there are approximately 24,000 cars per day travelling on Priest Drive. This property would generate slightly less than 4,000 vehicles per day. That represents about 16 percent. Some of the traffic would go north of Caroline Lane and some of the traffic would go south of Caroline Lane. There would be a slightly lower percentage during the morning and a slightly higher percentage during the evening.

Commissioner Tinsley asked Mr. Basha to explain the letter scores being used for Priest Drive.

Mr. Basha stated transportation systems are rated on a scale from A to F. It's called level of service, A is low delay, F is high delay. Generally speaking public agencies prefer the level of service to be C and D. If you have A and B, you have too much asphalt compared to the amount of cars. E and F would represent too many cars for the asphalt. The Priest Drive and Warner Road intersection was analyzed for the proposed development as well as the Priest Drive and Ray Road intersection. The intersection at Priest Drive & Caroline Lane was also analyzed. The intersection at Priest Drive and Greentree Drive was analyzed both with and without the development. The level of service ranking changed very little with the proposed development. That is because most of the traffic exiting this development will exit via right turn and access Ray Road to the I-10. When the traffic returns home in the evening most of the traffic will use the I-10 interchange with Warner Road, and make a right turn into the site. Left turns on Priest Drive are more difficult than right turns. Multi-family residents have a peak hour that may be dispersed throughout the morning and evening.

Commissioner Tinsley asked when the traffic survey was done.

Mr. Basha stated the traffic counts were done during the week of May 10, 2012. It was done during the general elementary and high school year.

Commissioner Tinsley questioned going out of the way by making right turns.

Mr. Basha stated the travelled distance may be longer, but it would take a shorter amount of time.

Commissioner Tinsley asked if this was supported in his industry by studies over time.

Mr. Basha indicated it was supported by the traffic counts at this property. The cars were counted at various intersections in this area. Traffic counts were obtained for 24 hours along with turning counts. The mid-day time period was the highest volume time at Greentree Drive and Caroline Lane. The traffic volumes were dominated by right turns.

Chair DiDomenico asked about the number of trips in and out of the development given the design as proposed with the existing conditions on the street. Would the extra 4,000 vehicles on the road be more likely to cause more accidents or more traffic problems?

Mr. Basha stated collisions are rare events, even though they certainly do happen. Traffic Engineers do everything they can to prevent accidents. Traffic Engineers cannot predict where accidents will occur. Generally speaking, additional density does not create additional collisions. Collisions are a function of driver behavior, signals, and the number of lanes.

Commissioner Delton asked about the issue regarding a new traffic signal. Apparently it is not warranted based on the studies.

Mr. Basha stated the need for traffic signals was not analyzed at the entrances. The City of Tempe Traffic Engineers indicated a new traffic signal was not necessary. A traffic signal analysis was warranted for Sierra Tempe at the intersection of Stacey Lane and Priest Drive, and Lisa Lane and Priest Drive. The analysis was completed in 2008 and 2010. Both streets warranted traffic signals but the City of Tempe conclusion was the signals would cause more problems than they would alleviate.

Commissioner Delton asked about a traffic signal that would only change if someone is at the light. For example the traffic signals used near fire stations.

Mr. Basha stated if there were to be a signal anywhere along Priest Drive between Warner Road and Ray Road the signal would change as necessary for vehicles on the side street. During the peak time periods the signal might be beneficial for a few hours. The remainder of the day the signal would be a detriment. It would increase congestion rather than decrease congestion. Greentree Drive is too close to Warner Road to install a traffic signal.

Commissioner Delton stated he was confused why the City would choose to ignore studies that would warrant a traffic signal.

Mr. Basha stated the National Guidelines published by the United States Department of Transportation for signal analysis specifically say if a signal is warranted by the analysis a signal might be appropriate. It is subject to engineering judgment, local knowledge, and adjacent traffic control and traffic patterns. The warrants are basically used in reverse. If a warrant analysis indicates a signal should not be installed, then you should not install a signal. If a signal satisfies the warrants then it might be appropriate. A variety of access locations were analyzed for this project. The access locations selected seemed to work best for this project.

Commissioner Delton asked about an increase in traffic on Priest Drive in the future. Would there come a time that a traffic signal on Priest Drive would be appropriate for the people on the east side of Caroline Lane?

Mr. Basha stated they analyzed the proposed development with existing traffic volumes and with traffic volumes that might appear in the year 2020. An annual increase of traffic of two percent was used. That is much greater than Priest Drive has experienced in the past ten years. The access location selected for the project is far enough south that it would be outside the direct influence if a traffic signal is installed at Caroline Lane in the future. A signal at a T intersection is much more efficient than a signal at a full intersection.

Mr. Levesque stated if the Commission feels that it is necessary to do the warrant analysis, the City can condition the applicant to do that study. The Traffic Engineer can review it to determine if a signal at this location is warranted. The Traffic Engineer has not requested that at this time.

Mr. Huellmantel stated they have no objection to the condition of analyzing the intersection.

Chair DiDomenico asked how long the process would take.

Mr. Basha stated it would take two days.

Mr. Levesque indicated the City would need up to two weeks.

Commissioner Collett stated he has lived near Warner Road for thirty-three years. When he first moved there he was on the south side of Warner Road near McClintock Drive and Warner Road was two lanes. There was not a whole lot out there. About twenty-two years ago he moved one mile west between Rural Road and Kyrene Road on the north side of Warner Road. Warner Road is now four lanes. There is a lot more out there now. He compared the development of this project with the changes he has experienced over the past years. Something is eventually going to be developed in this area and there is going to be an increase in traffic. As long as he has lived near Warner Road there has not been additional traffic lights installed and he doesn't believe they are necessary. People are able to navigate the stretch. He indicated he did not see why the traffic light is such a big issue. His belief is the area is better off without a traffic light.

Commissioner Delton asked if there was any critically to the zoning change of the parcel on the west side of the canal that is not being developed at this time.

Mr. Huellmantel indicated it just seemed like a good time to address the zoning on the west side of the canal. It could be removed from the recommendation. It seems unlikely that the parcel of land would ever be agricultural in nature. It may become industrial. It is not critical to the Mark-Taylor Community.

Commissioner Spears asked staff what the General Plan 2030 shows as recommended use on the parcel proposed as the Mark-Taylor Community.



Mr. Levesque indicated the General Plan projected land use for the Mark-Taylor property as mixed-use. The General Plan projected residential density as medium-high which is up to 25 dwelling per acre. The applicant has requested a zoning designation that would allow up to 25 dwelling per acre but the proposed density is 19.7 dwellings per acre.

Commissioner Tinsley addressed Mr. Huellmantel about the concern of this development being built and remaining empty.

Mr. Huellmantel indicated Mark-Taylor Communities valley wide are 95 percent occupied. Good sites are selected, and the communities are managed well. Mark-Taylor Communities have a good reputation.

Chair DiDomenico closed the presentations.

Commissioner Spears indicated she would like staff to discuss proposed stipulation #32 and specifically address the DPR relates to the Mark-Taylor parcel. She would like to make sure stipulation #32 includes the Crown Farms.

Mr. Levesque indicated the current proposed stipulation presented by the applicant, "The land contained in the PAD shall remain in its current condition, be built in conformance to the DPR approved by the Commission or Council or return to the Development Review Commission for a review and approval of any modification to the DPR. Mr. Levesque stated he would add, "This includes the Mark-Taylor and Crown Farms property."

Mr. Huellmantel stated he would accept that modification.

Mr. Levesque indicated the site plan does not show the deceleration lane turning in to this property. Would it be possible to add that condition so the applicant would not have to come back for reconsideration?

Commissioner Collett stated it is preferable that the deceleration lane be there. He would rather see it in the proposal.

Mr. Huellmantel indicated it is in the traffic report and would be happy to add that as a stipulation as well.

Chair DiDomenico would like to add condition #33 regarding the deceleration lane. Stipulation #32 that deals with tying it to the DPR ties it to the boundaries of the PAD overlay.

Mr. Levesque read stipulation #33 into the record, "The project shall provide a right turn deceleration lane entering the project as determined by the traffic study."

Mr. Huellmantel agreed to stipulation #32 and #33.

Chair DiDomenico asked the Commission if they would have a differing vote for any of the items included in this project.

Vice Chair Webb indicated he would vote differently on the Development Plan Review.

Vice Chair Webb stated he is pretty familiar with this area. As much as he likes Mark-Taylor he believes this property should be zoned as single family. Tempe has missed out on single family developments in the last 20 years. Houses today are being built at a much higher quality. Single family homes would provide a higher degree of ownership.

Chair DiDomenico asked Vice Chair Webb how he gets over the 2030 General Plan the voters have placed before the Commission to uphold that seem to indicate they do not want single family on that parcel.

Vice Chair Webb indicated when 2030 was approved business were doing better and more houses were being built.

Chair DiDomenico indicated in the next go around there may be a major shift.

Commissioner Thornton stated that as a long time South Tempe resident, she was originally opposed to another apartment complex being built at the Fiddlesticks property in south Tempe. She, along with others, did not feel that they were notified and the project came as a complete surprise. This is something that needs to be addressed to the City Council. The General Plan approved by voters needs to be taken into consideration. Commissioner Thornton stated she toured a Mark-Taylor Community today. It is not just an apartment complex, it is a community. The tax revenue portion needs to be looked at when the Commission is making a decision of this magnitude. Commissioner Thornton stated she is in favor of this project.

Commissioner Delton indicated when he started reviewing this packet he thought this property would be ideal for single family homes. He wonders why this was not a suitable parcel for single family homes in the General Plan. The corridor along Warner Road is primarily single family homes. He stated he is torn about which way to vote.

Commissioner Spears stated she chaired General Plan 2030. The decision to make this land a mixed-use parcel was decided upon after looking at the available land in the city and what was appropriate for single family. It was decided because of the proximity to the freeway and the Emerald Center development the likelihood of getting quality single family homes on this property was not going to happen. Developers would look at other places that are family friendly. This is a high industrial commercial area.

Commissioner Tinsley indicated one of the things they have learned over the past few years is that home ownership isn't for everyone. There may need to be some apartment places. There are people that don't want to own a home or their circumstances may not allow them to qualify for a home. Since this location is at the end of the Warner area approaching the freeway it is less likely to be high-end single family. A high-end rental community may be a pretty good use of the land. A lot of neighbors are not happy with this at all. She was thinking about approving the zoning map amendment and continuing some of the other items. Commissioner Tinsley is going to support the project.

Chair DiDomenico indicated he would like some additional study of the traffic light issue.

Commissioner Collett feels the study would be a waste of time and money. He stated the City would not put a traffic signal in.

Mr. Huellmantel stated a study will be done and provided to staff for Council review.

Commissioner Tinsley made a motion to approve the zoning. No second, motion failed.

On a motion by Commissioner Collett and seconded by Commissioner Spears, the Commission with a vote of 5-2 (Vice Chair Webb and Commissioner Delton dissenting) approved PL120261 with added conditions #32 and #33.

The introduction and first public hearing for City Council will be October 18, 2012. The second and final hearing is November 1, 2012.

### **3. ANNOUNCEMENTS –**

Chair DiDomenico announced that the City is preparing to work on the General Plan 2040, if anyone is interested in being involved in the Community Working Group, they should contact the City Clerk's Office at 480-350-8241.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Prepared by: Julie Stennerson, Executive Assistant  
Reviewed by: Lisa Collins, Interim Director Community Development Department

---

Lisa Collins, Interim Director, Community Development Department