
MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION April 28, 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
Trevor Barger
Angie Thornton
David Lyon, alt
Dan Killoren, alt.

Commission Absent:

Jerry Langston, alt

City Staff Present:

Larry Tom, Principal Planner
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Steve Nagy, Administrative Assistant II
Sarah Adame, 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, from the 03/10/2015 Development Review Commission meeting, would be moved to the following hearing, and the minutes from 03/24/2015 hearing would be on the consent agenda. Item #3 would be heard.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Study Session minutes: 03/24/2015
2. Regular meeting minutes: 03/24/2015

Commissioner Tinsley moved to approve the Study Session and Regular meeting minutes from 03/24/2015 Development Review Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Barger and passed 6 – 0 with Commissioner Killoren abstaining on account of absence from that hearing.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

3. Request for a Development Plan Review for building elevations, site plan and landscape plan, and a Use Permit Standard for an increase in building height from 30 to 33 feet. The project consists of 15 single family attached townhomes for **THE BLOCK ON ROOSEVELT (PL140336)**, located at 233 South Roosevelt Street. The applicant is Scott Garvin of Intent Development Advisors.

Diana Kaminski presented the case by reviewing the location, type of project, request details, and site plans.

Commissioner Barger asked for clarification of roof height measurements which Ms. Kaminski clarified.

Chair Webb asked about staff recommendation concerning density and colors. Ms. Kaminski clarified that applicant decided to move forward without addressing staff concerns regarding these recommendations.

With no other questions of staff, Chair Webb called the applicant up.

Ben Patton, Phoenix, presented the project saying that it was inspired by the volume of the new homes coming into

the area. He added that the project was in compliance with the zoning and that they agreed with all the conditions of approval.

Scott Garvin, Mesa, continued the presentation by addressing the questions regarding height the commission asked staff. He then also presented the influence behind the design which was based on feedback for the type of style the project was designed in. he also added that water retention has been placed underground to provide more open space. He addressed the lack of amenities on site because of the proximity to the downtown city amenities that Mill Ave offered. Mr. Garvin also expressed that he was open to making adjustments recommended by staff in regards to material used and landscaping and sought to integrate project into neighborhood.

Vice Chair Kent asked about the entry parlor on ground floor of the units. Mr. Garvin explained the parlor were to be used as entry areas and could also be used as living and/or office space, and not designed to use as a bedroom.

Commissioner Spears asked, how the entry parlor would be finished. Mr. Garvin replied walls would be CMU and Gypsum with polish concrete or synthetic floors.

Vice Chair Kent asked about HVAC access and the applicant replied access would be through each unit via hatch. Vice Chair Kent also asked about gutter range drainage and the applicant explained the design.

Vice Chair Kent also asked about the parking plan for the project. Mr. Garvin replied that each unit has a true two car garage and they added as many guest spots as possible leaving them with one more spot than required.

Chair Webb asked, how the applicant knew the parking provided would be sufficient. Mr. Garvin replied that it was designed according to what they understood the current parking would need to be. Chair Webb then asked if the applicant considered breaking up the building to add parking and other amenities. Mr. Garvin replied they had considered it but in the end it was not financially viable. Finally, Chair Webb asked, why all floor plans were the same. Mr. Garvin replied it was more economical for the small project.

Commissioner Thornton asked for approximant unit price. The applicant replied the units would be priced from the mid to upper 300's.

Commissioner Killoren asked about the orientation of the properties, and Mr. Garvin replied they intended to take advantage of the current views in the orientation presented.

Commissioner Barger asked if the unit yards would be maintained by the HOA. Mr. Garvin replied that they would be, as established in the CCRs. Chair Webb suggested stipulating that the HOA be responsible for watering vegetation and home owners responsible for maintenance. Mr. Garvin agreed to the suggestion.

Commissioner Barger then asked about the driveway and front door access to the units on the east and west end. Mr. Garvin explained that they were designed that way in order to maintain an open space feel, and that he would be willing to revisit the detail to explore better options. Commissioner Barger then asked if the applicant would be willing to explore other building materials to better match surrounding structures, which the applicant agreed to be open to.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the boundary walls could be built to match the height of the property next to it, which appeared to be 8 feet. Mr. Garvin confirmed this could be done.

With no other questions of the applicant, Chair Webb opened the Hearing to public comment.

1. Justine Yates, Tempe, expressed concern over amount of parking on the site and an increase in traffic to the area.
2. Shoshanna Starzynski, Tempe, expressed interest in seeing more landscaping, energy efficiency, and maintaining high quality on the project.

3. William Connelly, Tempe, expressed concern over parking on the site.
4. Phillip Yates, Tempe, expressed concern over increase in traffic and structure not fitting in with surrounding area.
5. Michael Rothenberg, Tempe, expressed concern over parking on the site, and units being rented out to students.
6. Dale Douglas, Tempe, expressed concern over the project setting a standard for the area, resulting in a lack of character.
7. Eduarde Yates, Tempe, expressed interest in seeing more trees along site to provide more shade.

Chair Webb then read public speaker cards from people not wishing to speak on the case from the following people:

1. Justine Yates
2. Joseph Murria
3. Barbara Mular

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 address the concerns.

Mr. Patton came back up to the podium and explained that the project was in compliance with zoning and General Plan, but they were also constrained by lot size and shape. He believed the comments were reasonable, but applied more to older units that were designed for rental use. He also expressed that he would be willing to explore cut-thru traffic prevention options.

Chair Webb addressed the parking again, and the applicant reiterated that they provided 2 garage spots per unit as well as 4 guest parking spots, which was the best they could do considering the size and shape of lot.

Vice Chair Kent asked what materials the driveway would be made out of. The applicant replied asphalt. Vice Chair Kent then asked where a gate to prevent cut-thru traffic would be located. Diana Kaminski interjected that fire and solid waste need to be consulted before the conversation continued.

Commissioner Spears asked about bike parking. Mr. Patton pointed out the location and number of bike parking spots on site, including in parking lot as well as in individual units.

Commissioner Barger asked the applicant would be willing to reorient the north side of the drive way in order to fit more parking spots. The applicant confirmed he would be willing to explore different options.

With no other questions for the applicant, the Commission then discussed the project amongst themselves.

Commissioner Spears expressed that she did not like the design project and because it lacked open space and amenities provided by other condos typically provide. She also did not find off-site amenity use as being practical.

Commissioner Barger expressed that he likes the efforts put forth to enlarge garages to accommodate parking and storage for the units. He also likes the efforts made to create a residential look for the project. He was concerned with the finish of the two ends of the project to accomplish a residential feel, but appreciated the landscaping and colors working to fit in the area. Commissioner Barger noted that he would be willing to support the project with added stipulations.

Vice Chair Kent expressed that he was ok with the design though he thought it to be too monolithic. He added that he would like to see the site developed, but perhaps with a development that looked different than this particular project.

Commissioner Tinsley expressed that she appreciates the concerns and the applicant's willingness to address the concerns. She also expressed that she believed a continuance may give the applicant more time to explore options to add parking spaces and perhaps decreasing the size of the project by one unit.

Commissioner Thornton expressed that she thought the project was too dense for the site, and would like to see more amenities and characteristics added.

Commissioner Killoren expressed that he was supportive of the project, and that the density was within the requirements. He highlighted the challenge faced by developing an area near a historic area, but overall saw it as the type of project the city intended for that area.

Chair Webb expressed that he believed a continuance would be a good idea, and asked if 2 weeks would suffice. The applicant agreed it would. Ms. Kaminski replied that a 4 week continuance would be more realistic for staff to review changes, which was also fine with the applicant.

Commissioner Tinsley moved to continue the case to the May 26, 2015 Development Review Commission Hearing, which was seconded by Commissioner Thornton and the motion, passed with a vote of 7-0.

With no other announcements, the meeting was adjourned 7:45 p.m.

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



Larry Tom, Principal Planner