
MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION June 23, 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
Angie Thornton
Trevor Barger
Peggy Tinsley
Linda Spears

Commission Absent:

David Lyon, alt
Dan Killoren, alt
Jerry Langston, alt

City Staff Present:

Ryan Levesque, Dep. Com. Dev. Director
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
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 Study Session and Regular Meeting minutes for 06/9/2015, and Lindstrom – Nucci House would be on the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Study Session minutes: 06/09/2015
2. Regular meeting minutes: 06/09/2015

Commissioner Barger moved to approve 06/09/2015 meeting minutes.
Commissioner Tinsley seconded the motion to approve 06/09/2015 meeting minutes.

Motion approved 6-0

Chair Webb announced that there are only 6 Commissioner Members in attendance today.

5. Request for a Zoning Map Amendment for a Historic Overlay designation for the **LINDSTROM - NUCCI HOUSE (PL150074)**, located at 1220 S Maple Avenue. The applicant is Joseph Nucci.

Chair Webb announced that Commission had agreed during Study Session to have Lindstrom – Nucci House on the Consent Agenda.

There were no objections.

Commissioner Tinsley moved to approve on the Consent Agenda the Historic Overlay of PL150074 Lindstrom – Nucci House.

Commissioner Thornton seconded the motion.

Motion approved 6-0

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

8. Requests for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review consisting of a new mixed-use development containing 273 apartment units, 4,500 square feet of retail space, and 4,600 square feet of live-work space within a five-story, 69'-6" high building for **SOUTHBANK LOT 1 (PL150102)**, located at 1200 East Rio Salado Parkway. The applicant is Huellmantel & Affiliates.

Staff member, Karen Stovall, presented Southbank Lot 1 and its location. The property is currently zoned MU4PAD and within the Pier 202 planned area development overlay. Original PAD was approved 2007 with a master plan consisting of 9 lots with maximum building heights ranging from 187 feet up to 310 feet approved land uses including commercial hotel and residential totaling 27 acres. The approved PAD established development standards for 5 of the 9 lots, including the subject's site. In 2007 Lot 3 received approval for a 17 story senior living facility for development in 2012 and now the applicant is requesting to amend the PAD to modify the development standards for density lot coverage, landscape area, building height, building setbacks and vehicle parking.

The second request for Southbank Lot 6 is for approval of a development plan review for site plan building elevation and a landscape plan. This will be a 5 story 69 ½ foot high building and designed with all vehicle parking spaces within a below grade and at grade parking structure. The development standards would be modified to allow 273 dwelling units with a density 88 units per acre, 1,130 square feet of office space within four live work units that front on to Pier Drive. There would 4500 square feet of retail area at the Northeast corner of the building. The requested standards would result in a development with a higher residential density, reduced square footage with office and retail space and no restaurant or lounge space. Also, the building height would decrease by 117 feet, all building setbacks would be reduced to ground level and all open space would be slightly reduced. The design of the building is contemporary with flat roofs, parapets and painted metal balcony railings. The building is finished rough face stucco and galvanized metal bead deck that run in a vertical direction. The stucco colors include off white and shades of grey and ground face masonry is used for the screen walls. Staff recommends approval of this PAD amendment and DPR subject to the conditions:

- o Increase west setback from 9 feet to 15 feet to allow room for full canopy tree growth along Newberry Lane and better screening of the mechanical equipment along the west side of the building.
- o Replacement of trees along Newberry Lane and Vista de Lago Drive with trees that comply with the Streetscape theme approved for the entire PAD.
- o Redesign of the ground floor frontage along the east elevation so that it commercial with living areas are either behind or above the commercial space.
- o Reduction in the amount of stucco on building elevations.
- o Applicant would need to work with staff to increase the amount of glass, steel or decorative veneer.

Vice Chair Kent asked Ms. Stovall to review who owns the Plats 1 through 9.

Mr. Levesque advised that the City currently owns Lot 2, 4, 9a&b, 8 and 7. Private ownership is Lot 6, 5, 1, and previously approved Lot 3.

Chair Webb addressed condition number 18 regarding the amount of stucco on the building being reduced. He wants to know what that is really going to look like.

Ms. Stovall replied that the goal of that condition would be to reduce the stucco and use a decorative material or add more windows, such as on the east elevation where the live/work units would be located. This would increase the store frontage area. She advised that applicant and staff would need to discuss to reach an agreement on this.

Mr. Levesque commented that some of the visioning on this project comes from the previous concept plan of Pier 202 that called for more natural materials of the surrounding areas such as lake features like glass, stone, or masonry type that would be complementary to that area.

Chair Webb stated that he is confused and wonders if what will ultimately be built would be different than what is presented tonight.

Ms. Stovall replied per the condition that it would be up to staff and applicant to work through the plan of the project. She advised that the Commission can ask the applicant to come back after elevations are revised for approval.

Commissioner Tinsley asked if this has been discussed with the applicant.

Ms. Stovall explained that this was included in the site plan review comments and they have been made aware of this possibility through many discussions. The applicant has addressed some of the comments that staff have made. Ms. Stovall expressed the documents brought to DRC tonight are the applicants attempts to address staff's concerns and have not been resolved.

Commissioner Barger wants to know when staff will know when this has been achieved.

Ms. Stovall stated that staff won't know until they work on it together with the applicant.

Chair Web was concerned about the project plans are not complete and have not been worked on. The plans have been on the agenda for about 9 weeks already.

Mr. Levesque explained that staff did have the report ready with post conditions two meetings ago, but the applicant requested to continue the project to work on some of the materials and proposals requested for the recommendation of approval. The applicant is more concerned about the recommendation rather than the stipulations. However, the applicant will be presenting his proposed conditions in response in tonight's hearing.

Chair Webb calls for the applicant – Charles Huellmantel

Mr. Huellmantel is representing the applicant, JLB and Kevin Mantel. Mr. Huellmantel's presentation included a power point slide presentation of the project. He stated that he has tried to work with staff but was unable to do so. He provided the Commission with a list of proposed redlines. Mr. Huellmantel stated that the condition discussed earlier regarding stucco was not understood to be what was explained tonight. He states that he can work in the stipulation to add in more glass on the live/work side of the project.

Mr. Huellmantel proceeded to review his list of exhibits.

- Number 3 stipulation should change the date that this project goes to council.
- Number 10 and number 11 are related to parking in the live/work section of the project, requesting to be removed.
- Under the DPR there has been modifications made to the date of number 1.
- Number 18 was asked to be removed but now is asking to be modified and suggested to limit that condition to the live/work units along the store front.
- Number 29 addresses the landscape and the applicants are happy and willing to care for the plants along the property line
- Number 7 has staff asking for 15 foot but applicant asked for the proposed to be 9 feet.
 - Mr. Huellmantel states that if there is a need for more shade then the applicant is asking to move the building forward and come back with a landscape plan.

Mr. Huellmantel states that they worked with staff and made lots of changes to achieve a goal.

Vice Chair Kent asked where the parking in the live/work section is.

Mr. Huellmantel stated there are many options for parking. There will be spaces available including a large amount of street parking and separately marked spaces for the units.

Vice Chair Kent asked if there is a HOA to take care of the common areas.

Mr. Huellmantel advised that the owner is responsible for what they own and stated that he is not responsible for what the City owns.

Vice Chair Kent asked if all the roads are private or City owned.

Mr. Levesque advised that the street configuration is currently public right-of-way but there is CC&R language that talks about the control and maintenance of those right-of-way improvements are to be handled.

Vice Chair Kent asked what the applicants are required to maintain if it's on their own property or follow the CC&R states?

Ms. Stovall said that the stipulation was to address the landscaping but staff is fine with the change.

Commissioner Barger proposed an amendment to either increase the setback or plant a tree appropriate to the size that remains there.

Mr. Huellmantel stated that applicant is happy to modify the tree.

Chair Webb asked what is going inside the apartments.

Mr. Huellmantel advised the finishes will be "condo finishes" which include real wood floors, real wood cabinets, significant granite, and designed to not have the appeal of a condo or apartment.

Chair Webb asked what will the rents would be.

Kevin Rantsel, Scottsdale, aiming at \$2.00 per square foot for rent.

Commissioner Tinsley asked who the target residences are.

Mr. Huellmantel advised that the people who are looking for apartments are almost anyone of any age and employment but not targeting students. JLB will have in-house management.

No public comments.

Chair Webb called for discussion from the Commission.

Commissioner Tinsley is concerned that the Commission does not know what they are voting on for this project. She is inclined to offer the applicant another continuance. She thinks it's an excellent product. She asked Mr. Huellmantel what he can do to make the staff happy and the Commission happy without another continuance.

Mr. Huellmantel advised that they don't want another continuance. He stated that this is a challenging case and not the normal way he has worked with staff before. He stated that they are nervous going back to staff because they feel it's an awkward situation. He stated that if the main issue is adding more glass or windows to the live/work units over the store front then please ask them (the applicant) to work more with staff regarding that issue and it can be resolved.

Commissioner Spears expressed that having the setbacks reduced on both sides is the same thing that has been done in the past by getting density through width and lot coverage and not height. She is also concerned about moving the west line to have more interior open space. She doesn't care about interior open space but cares how it looks to the rest of the project.

She thinks they are selling themselves short by not trying to do the original vision for this property and she is not comfortable and knows that council expects quality development in terms of the original vision. Commissioner Spears is not supportive of the project.

Commissioner Barger is struggling with the original vision part. He likes that there is a lot of glass on the north and understands the lack of glass on the south. He likes the idea of more glass above the store front and that the trees are too large for the setbacks. He doesn't see an activated walkable space program. Commissioner Barger likes the project for the site.

Chair Webb expressed the comparison between this project and the Pier 202. He does like this project but his concern is that the project is wider than taller. He will support this project.

Vice Chair Kent expressed that he does like the look of the project and is attractive and somewhat active with the live/work. His view is that this piece of land is incredibly important to the city. He expressed that this project does fulfill the 2040 density and mixed use 2040. He is in support of the project.

Commissioner Thornton expressed that it is unfair to keep comparing everything in this area to the Pier 202 design when that project is (not?) going to happen. She thinks that this is a beautiful project and likes the addition of glass on the bottom.

Commissioner Tinsley motions to move the conditions of approval that the applicant brought with the following changes:

- o Applicant removed condition number 18 and will have the amount of stucco used on the building elevations at the live/work areas shall be reduced.
- o Applicant will work with staff to increase the amount of glass in the live/work area.
- o Final elevations to be approved by DRC.
- o One condition in the PAD number 7, applicant will keep the setback as amended at 9 feet but alternate trees shall be planted. Size appropriate trees will be provided there.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the motion is allowing removal of conditions number 10 and number 11.

Commissioner Tinsley confirmed.

Chair Webb called the applicant up to confirm that they are ok with the changes.

Mr. Huellmantel asked the Commission to clarify that the applicant is coming back to DRC to approve the elevation of the store front windows and also to clarify that the applicant next them in Lot 5 is present and stated that he would like to be involved in the process of what those live/work units would be.

Commissioner Tinsley stated that the Commission does not have a problem with that.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the Commission is okay with the type of plants that is presented by the applicant or does the Commission need to change it.

Commissioner Barger expressed that he is fine with the mediums and landscaped areas around the property but it seem odd to have the property responsible for larger landscape areas or mediums of those adjacent to the property.

Commission agreed.

Commissioner Barger seconded the motion to approve.

Motion approved 5-1 with Commissioner Spears in the opposition.

9. Requests for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review consisting of a new mixed-use development containing 272 apartment units and 5,071 square feet of retail space within a six-story, 84'-5" high building for **SOUTHBANK LOT 6 (PL140463)**, located at 1190 East Vista del Lago Drive. The applicant is Huellmantel & Affiliates.

Staff member, Karen Stovall, presents Southbank Lot 6. This property is a MU-4 PAD and is within the Pier 202 PAD. The applicant is requesting to amend the existing development standard for Lot 6 to modify the density lot coverage, landscape area, building height, setbacks and vehicle parking. Second request is a DPR approval for site plan elevations and landscape plan. The existing PAD for standards for this site allow up to 302 building units, 15000 square feet of retail, 5000 square feet of restaurant or lounge, 4 levels of parking, with a total 572900 square feet of building area and a maximum height of over 291 feet. The proposed development includes a 6 story, 84 ½ foot high building design with all vehicle parking spaces with a below grade and at grade structure. Development standards would be modified to allow 272 dwelling units, 5071 square feet of retail area along Vista de Lago Drive. The building result would be less than 200 feet of what is currently approved. The density is decreased, setbacks are reduced, there is a reduction in retail space and no restaurant or lounge space is provided. The floor plan shows a 1500 square foot future restaurant in the north east corner of the building. The east setback would be reduced from 90 feet to 15 feet which would eliminate a common garden area that was previously approved. This area was originally designed to be a pedestrian corridor between the lots and adjacent to the lake. The project would have design and construction track b which borders the property west property line. The original design of tract b included a water feature, cascading water fountains, and stairs that step down to a multi-use path along the lake. The applicant has proposed a Chinese Pistache, State Palms, artificial turf, a shallow water feature and pedestal for future art work neither the plans or narrative explain where the art work would come from. The building is designed with patios for residential units. The building is similar to the building in Lot 1 with same colors. The general plan does identify this property as being within the Rio Salado growth area which is to evolve this park into urban or hub.

Staff is recommending denial of the PAD amendment and DPR based on the analysis and approval criteria for both applications. The objective of the growth of the general plan is to attract distinct development by the lake by promoting high quality of architecture and landscape design, encourage vertical and mixed use in order to maximize land uses within the urban core and integrate art into area planning, promote accessibility and discourage exclusive environments. The proposed project does not fulfill these goals. The development standards requested by the PAD amendment do not take location upon text of this important site into consideration. The building materials are stucco with metal railing and metal panel and these are not of superior quality. The project design is not appropriate to the site or surroundings. It is a large mass that covers the majority of the lot and there are very few breaks provided. The design does not activate a pedestrian level either interior or along the lake. Ms. Stovall stated a list of conditions if the Commission does vote to approve this project. *to be listed at end of notes

Commissioner Barger asked questions from the conditions of approval. Why are we asking for the applicant to building 15 stories?

Ms. Stovall stated that building 15 stories would allow the same level of residential density that is currently proposed but with greater commercial area on the ground floor. It would encourage a different building design preferred along the lake.

Commissioner Barger asked about condition number 9 regarding the request to increase from 15 feet to 50 feet. Is this increase to have more pedestrian walking area?

Ms. Stovall responded yes, and then showed a comparison from what was approved from Pier 202 to what is currently being proposed on the overhead of the landscape concept. The original width was 90 feet.

Chair Webb asked why this project doesn't fit the 2040 plan.

Ms. Stovall replied that the 2040 plan envisions the growth as a higher density, urban core with more vertical mix use within a single building.

Chair Webb indicates that the General Plan 2040 does not specify a minimum building height.

Ms. Stovall replies that the original Pier 202 PAD does establish a height.

Chair Webb expresses that this project cannot be compared to the Pier 202 as it will not be built. Therefore this project does work with the 2040. The 2040 plan is a zoning plan and a plan for the future. All the elements of this project are contained in the 2040 plan.

Ms. Stovall states that this project has a small nonresidential component. The 2040 does encourage more mix use within a building. This project has a great reduction in the nonresidential component.

Commissioner Barger asked if the previous PAD is tied to this master plan or is it just a set of rules that go along with it.

Ms. Stovall explained the previous PAD has design and landscape concepts for the entire Pier 202 PAD.

Commissioner Barger asked if there is a master plan for location of the commercial uses in this PAD.

Ms. Stovall advised that on the current exhibits presented tonight shows the commercial uses locations.

Commissioner Barger is challenged to active retail space without street presents. He likes the idea of retail walkability streets down there but how is that going to be created. He stated that live work is not perfect but allows for transition. He would like to figure out how to not have dead retail space out there waiting.

Ms. Stovall expressed that this request does not include live/work adjacent to traffic as it is all residential along the west side of that building.

Vice Chair Kent asked how tall the buildings are.

Ms. Stovall explained that one tower is 8 stories condos and the second tower is 21 stories both with retail below.

Chair Webb called up the applicant.

Charles Huellmantel presented Southbank Lot 6. He stated that the applicant does not agree with the staffs stipulations.

Mr. Huellmantel handed out his stipulations to the Commission. He and the applicant are proposing a design with white and horizontal lines in the structure of 7 stories. They are aiming for a boutique-like hotel feel. The design has a lot of zigzag for a unique building frontage for those people who don't live in the building and provide great views for those who do. There is a large area in the center for a pool. Mr. Huellmantel states that in his packet is a letter from a hotel developer in the parcel behind this project. The developer is excited to build but is concerned with having access to Rio Salado for the traffic. Mr. Huellmantel states that the developer is excited that they are not building something tall.

The applicant has designed great balconies and terraces for these special apartments.

Mr. Huellmantel reviews the stipulations:

- Request to change the date of when this goes to council

- Conditions number 6 and number 7 are requested to be removed, as they are asking for a 15 story building that is not economically feasible.
- Condition number 6 addresses the commercial space. The applicant has provided retail space along the back of the building so people can see it. The applicant is proactive in providing the build out for commercial space such as the grease traps, etc.... The applicant feels that for the first couple of years there won't be any retail there, so for now they would like to make it residential so it can be activated by people and after 5 years be able to change it commercial space.
- Condition number 9 is an item requested to be removed.
- Conditions number 11 and number 12 cover that there will be vehicle space for vehicles and space along the streets.
- DPR conditions number 1, number 2, and number 3 are preventing the Applicant from building the project that is being proposed. The request to have those conditions removed.
- Condition number 4 is requested to be modified to what is being proposed.
- Condition number 5 states the applicant is interested in building out something very beautiful.
- Condition number 18 is requested to be removed.
- Landscaping
 - Condition number 27 and number 30 are requested to be removed.
 - Number 27 is a request to be approved. The current landscape plan is agreeable to plant any trees that the commission requests. Number 30 agrees to put in artificial turf or grass.

Mr. Huellmantel stated that this design is specific to this site and is willing to further discuss and modify the retail portion to this plan. They understood the colors and context to be wrong and have tried to design context that is more fitting to this location. Mr. Huellmantel showed a comparison of this proposed project to the Waterfront project that is currently on the lake. He compared the similar material uses.

Vice Chair Kent asked who owns track B.

Mr. Huellmantel replied that it is owned jointly by Lots 5 and 6.

Vice Chair Kent stated that one of the conditions that they want to remove talks about who cares for the common area.

Mr. Huellmantel explains that there is an Association and ultimately the City decides.

Vice Chair Kent wants to know why they should remove the condition.

Mr. Huellmantel expresses that he thinks the City wants there to be condos there in the future and that's why there are CC&Rs. If that's the case then the applicant is fine with those conditions.

Ms. Stovall agreed it's for common area.

Mr. Huellmantel is okay with putting that condition back in.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the finishes inside Southbank Lot 6 the same as Southbank Lot 1.

Mr. Huellmantel stated they are different but are better quality.

Commissioner Spears referred to condition number 6, regarding the commercial space, regarding if it will be active in 5 years at 40000 square feet if it is built up. What if it's not built?

Mr. Huellmantel explained if they are the only project out there then it doesn't make sense to create that commercial space.

Commissioner Spears confirmed that Mr. Huellmantel is indicating if less than 40000 square feet is built then they are not required to create that commercial space.

Mr. Huellmantel said that they are open to alternatives.

Commissioner Barger asked about condition number 27. Who is required to landscape the edge of the property and the water?

Mr. Huellmantel said that it's the City that maintains the area north of the sidewalk and the lake. He also stated that Flood Control may be asking the City to remove the trees along the bank. This is a detail issue that will need to be worked out and that City of Tempe can't do anything. They need the Flood Control district to do it.

Commissioner Barger confirmed that from the condition number 27 is to not landscape the area between the area and the lake.

Commissioner Barger asked staff, regarding building height, how do these building compare in height to the State Farm buildings.

Mr. Levesque stated that State Farm ranges from 10 stories to 17 stories in height.

Commissioner Barger asked if the intent was to landscape the property line to the lake or was there any other intent?

Ms. Stovall explained the intent was to landscape the area and possibly have more ground cover.

Mr. Huellmantel does not object to coming back with a separate landscape plan for that.

Chair Webb opened up discussion to the public.

Mr. Ron Fransway, Scottsdale, spoke about his concern of appreciation of the quality of this site and his potential neighbor of Lot 1 and Lot 6. He cares deeply about what this area is and will become. He stated that this project is the next logical decision in relationship to State Farm. Mr. Fransway is concerned that the commission is forgetting that this is the lake front and the only lake front. This area needs a program. It needs all ground floors to be mix use. He doesn't want to see the area just turn into all apartments.

Commissioner Barger asked Mr. Fransway in his opinion, how does retail get activated in this setting.

Mr. Fransway admitted that in his opinion it's about timing and believes the economy drives the timing. He stated that if there are breaks in the ground floor between retail space and residential space it destroys the urban 101 street pedestrian friendly traffic.

Closed to public comment

Commissioner Spears stated that she appreciates the design but her concern is that the Commission is approving another apartment project that has a questionable commercial component that may never be built and if not, will to just have apartments on the town lake.

Commissioner Barger stated that he agrees with Commissioner Spears on the look. It's a good looking structure on the town lake and like that it has a lot of balconies on the north and vertical accents to it. He is not disappointed that it is not 15 stories. He likes the density that is meaning to activate the sight. He would love for an all ground retail floor setting. However, he

doesn't know how to active such spaces. He hopes that with other development that this becomes dense and with great walking environment.

Vice Chair Kent really likes the design. He understand that staff has recommended denial but he can see that the Commission is now looking at something that is worthy of something. He is hoping that there is a way that to get everyone working on this together to building something that is good.

Chair Webb stated that he is not sure that the condo market is upon us yet. He likes that the retail space can be converted to condo and vice versa. Chair Webb said this is a beautiful project.

Commissioner Tinsley asked if we (Commission) want to wait another 10 more years to build. She stated that she recognizes that they (Commission) have people who have a better sense of the market than she and say that this is something that could be built and can work. Commissioner Tinsley expressed that this is a good looking building that is not 15 stories. She will support this project with modification

Commissioner Thornton expressed that she thinks that this is beautiful project and understands the concern about all apartments on the town lake and she doesn't want that. She likes the height that it is. She supports the project.

Commissioner Tinsley motions PAD15004 for approval with the following changes:

- o Number 6 remove the words "in five years if" and replace with the words "when in five years".
- o DPR condition number 2 was delete by him and reinstating submit an application for review of CCRs for the common areas etc..
- o Condition number 27 submit a separate landscape DRP application for an enhance landscape treatment on the North side of the property in conjunction with Flood Control district.
- o Plant material must include trees and grass/ground cover pursuant to Flood Control district guidelines.
- o Condition number 25 is back in for grass. (Used to be condition number 30)

Commissioner Barger seconds motion

Motion is approved PL140463 with the stipulations so stated, 4-2, with Vice Chair Kent and Commissioner Spears in the opposition.

1. Request for a Zoning Map Amendment from R-2 to R1-PAD, a Planned Area Development to establish development standards and a Development Plan Review for a seven unit townhome development for **FIFTH STREET WEST 10 (PL140081)**, located at 1214 W 5TH Street. The applicant is Tom Goscicki.

Staff member, Diana Kaminski, presented Fifth Street West 10. This is a property that includes two existing duplexes on the north side of 5th St. between Priest and Beck. It's a multifamily development. It's a repurposes redevelopment of the site to include 7 attached townhome products with a zoning amendment from R2 to R1 PAD. They would be single family planned area developments. The applicant is requesting a zoning amendment to planned area development, and the design for the landscape site plan and elevations of the buildings. This is the same developer that did the same project west on 5th Street and another project on 4th Street.

Applicant, Tom Goscicki, stated that he did the development on 1300 5th Street and also had a development approved on 4th Street. He is creating a single family type of environment. The development has a lot of landscape and front porch areas for people to gather. There is a lot of parking. Mr. Goscicki used the overhead to display his site plan that was approved. It shows a large part of the project is open space. It also shows a lot of elevations. The project has 3 buildings not just one building. There are 3 units that will have their driveways deeded to them. Those will have 4 parking spaces to each of them. There are 3 additional visitor parking spaces. The living is on the second floor and the kitchen and 2 bedroom areas are on the third floor. The roofs are black metal standing seamed roof. There will siding that is a composite cement board siding that will be

painted. The patio walls that people will sit on that will have a precast concrete top there will be a brick or block. Then, there is a lot glazing with a store front look. There will be horizontal lines in the stucco and synthetic colored finishes on the stucco.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the round circles on the drawing are trees.

Mr. Goscicki replied yes, they are trees. The trees are in various trees and sizes.

Vice Chair Kent asked where do residences take their dogs.

Mr. Goscicki explained by using the drawings that there are walkable landscaped areas.

Vice Chair Kent pointed out on the landscape plans it doesn't look like there are green areas.

Mr. Goscicki explained that there are areas but is willing alter the landscaping plans.

Vice Chair Kent asked for more information on the landscape plan regarding the shapes and descriptions.

Mr. Goscicki expressed that on the landscape plan is an area where he proposed a turf area in the four corners.

Vice Chair Kent expressed that it doesn't look like turf area.

Mr. Goscicki explained that Vice Chair Kent is correct that it doesn't look like it but it is what he proposed originally.

Mr. Goscicki agreed that he can work with staff on his landscape plan.

Vice Chair Kent asked how someone would get to the parking spaces from the street.

Mr. Goscicki explained that the entrance is thru the alley. There is no vehicle access from the fifth street. Everyone would have to enter from the North/South alley and swing to the East/West alley.

Commissioner Spears, regarding the landscape plan, asked for confirmation on the type of bushes there are.

Mr. Goscicki expressed there are trees on the street sides.

Commissioner Barger loves the tree cover. He asked about the architecture. He likes the movement in the roof line, the materials, heavy canopies, of the 5th Street elevations and asked if he could include that on this project.

Mr. Goscicki explained that several parts of the project that are glazing areas are to give a store front appearance of the same of the 5th Street project.

There are a lot of corner window sets up. They are not set up in this presentation. From a drawing, Mr. Goscicki was able to show where the windows would be placed.

Commissioner Barger asked if the fire wall is made from white colored stucco.

Mr. Goscicki replied yes and below is metal screen lines and between is all siding. There is siding wrapped all around the building.

Commissioner Thornton asked if there are examples of the materials.

Mr. Goscicki gave the example of the material to the commission to review.

Open to public comment.

Mr. Bill Butler, Tempe, is a neighbor across the alley of this project. Generally speaking, Mr. Butler supports this project due to the recent sales of \$300,000.00 of the residence on 4th Street. Mr. Butler claims that he took a survey of 180 addresses in the neighborhood and there were 2 people that lived in the area that owned property the rest were rental landlords. Mr. Butler is concerned about a parking problem due to the design of the structure of the project.

Mr. Dave Swanson, Tempe, stated that he owns property around this proposed project. His concern is regarding garbage collection. He would like to know how the garbage collection is going to work. He is also concerned about visibility by traffic in the alley. Otherwise he is in favor of the project.

Mr. Gosicke explains that the City wants the dark cans in the alley.

Ms. Kaminski stated when refuse reviewed this project, they indicated that 90 gallon container were fine to be rolled back by residence with access off 5th Street. The recycle cans go out to the street and rolled out by the residence.

The Commission reviewed the process of rolling out the cans on site plan and on the overhead.

Vice Chair Kent asked the applicant if the residence will have space in the garage to store the garbage cans.

Mr. Gosicke replied yes, there is room by design in the garage. There is a 4 foot section set apart for the cans.

Commissioner Webb asked about the visibility for traffic in the alley.

Mr. Gosicke explains that he can't control the driver's visibility in the existing alley way. It is up to the driver to decide that.

Vice Chair Kent asked about the doors where a person can enter directly into a bedroom.

Mr. Gosicke advised that it was vision he had that if someone who lived in the bedroom would have a nice porch set up and sit up out there from their bedroom. He explained it was not his intention that someone would use this room with the door as a rental space. He further explains that originally it was designed as a window but then thought it would be nicer if it was a door.

Commissioner Thornton asked about pricing of the units.

Mr. Gosicke advised that at his other project those homes sold at \$205.00 - \$230.00 per square foot. He is guessing that he would get that by the end 2016 or a little more.

Commissioner Thornton asked what kind of amenities would be in these homes.

Mr. Gosicke advised that he uses tile, hardwood flooring, and very minimal carpeting. He uses 1 piece counter tops.

Discussion from the Commission

Commissioner Thornton expressed that she likes the project but it's not appealing. She doesn't agree that the design of the structure would last and that it looks trendy. She doesn't like the design of the project. She expressed that maybe it's the colors.

Vice Chair Kent expressed that he thinks the rendering that were received were not very good. He likes the plans that were given. He thinks it's a good use of space, looks like the site is not packed with units which are rare to see. He thinks its good project.

Commissioner Spears expressed that she likes the project and likes activating the alleys.

Chair Webb expressed that he thinks a brilliant use of an open court yard, street use, building setback, separate driveways, and parking. Good job.

Commissioner Barger likes the site plan and the similarities to the project on 5th Street. He loves the landscape plan with or without the turf and tree cover. He struggles with the architecture itself. He likes the design of the roofs, simple block massing with the rest of the forms darker lower level. He is concerned with the fire walls in between each unit.

Commissioner Tinsley thinks it's a nice project and it's from someone who has a proven track record. She thinks that he has done good work in the past and expects him to continue to do good work.

Commissioner Tinsley motions to approve PL140081 with the following addition to landscape condition number 8 which would be sub "d" that turf would be added in for central landscape quadrants as discussed.

Commissioner Spears seconds motion to approve PL 140081 with said stipulations.

Motion approved 4-2 with Commissioner Barger and Commissioner Thornton in the opposition.

Elections of Chair and Vice Chair for the Commission

Commissioner Thornton nominates Vice Chair Paul Kent for Chair.

Commissioner Tinsley seconded the nomination of Vice Chair Kent for Chair.

Nomination approved and passed 6-0

Commissioner Thornton nominates Trevor Barger for Vice Chair.

Commissioner Tinsley seconded the nomination of Commissioner Trevor Barger for Vice Chair

Nomination approved and passed 6-0

With no other announcements, the meeting was adjourned 8:55 p.m.

Prepared by: Sarah Adame, Administrative Assistant II

Reviewed by: Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director



Ryan Levesque