



---

**Minutes of the  
Development Review Commission  
July 28, 2015**

---

Minutes of the regular hearing of the Development Review Commission, of the City of Tempe, which was held at the Council Chambers, 31 East Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona.

**Present:**

Paul Kent – Chair  
Trevor Barger- Vice Chair  
Angela Thornton - Commissioner  
Thomas Brown- Commissioner  
Linda Spears - Commissioner  
David Lyon- Commissioner  
Andrew Johnson- Commissioner

**City Staff Present:**

Ryan Levesque, Dep. Comm. Dev. Director  
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner  
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner  
Sarah Adame, Comm. Dev. Admin Assistant II

**Absent:**

Margaret Tinsley- Alt. Commissioner  
Dan Killoren- Alt. Commissioner  
Gerald Langston- Alt. Commissioner

**Guest Present: NONE**

**Number of Interested Citizens Present: 0**

Hearing convened at 6:35 p.m. and was called to order by Paul Kent.

-----

Consideration of Meeting Minutes: 07/14/2015 Study Session  
07/14/2015 Regular Meeting

**MOTION:** Commissioner Thornton

**SECOND:** Commissioner Spears

**DECISION:** Approved 6-0 with Vice Chair Barger abstaining.

---

Consent Agenda: None

---

**THE BOARD DISCUSSED THE FOLLOWING CASE(S):**

1. Request for a Development Plan Review consisting of a new commercial development for **RURAL AND MINTON BUILDING (PL150015)**, located at 4715 South Rural Road. The applicant is Jason Rieke of Bar Napkin Productions

Staff, Diana Kaminski introduced the case.

This project is a redevelopment of a commercial site with a new 8,050 square foot multi-tenant commercial building.

Including:

- Breakfast restaurant with a drive through on the south end of the building

- A lunch and dinner fast services sit down restaurant at the north end of the building

- Two middle suites with undetermined tenants.

Development Plan Review includes site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan.

Applicant, Jason Rieke of Bar Napkin Productions.

Mr. Rieke was asked questions regarding project from the Commission

- Rooftops – materials and heights

- Street Tree – Pine trees, Olive trees, Acacia Aneura, replacements and heights

- Drive through and Parking configurations

- Signage intent of location on building

Public Comments: None

Discussion & Questions from Commission Members

Vice Chair Barger expressed that he likes the development in the area. He would like to add a stipulation to have tree pallet match the character of the area removing the Acacia Aneura and adding pines trees.

Commissioner Lyon expressed that he likes the suggestion of adding a pedestrian connection at the Northside of the stack.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Barger made a motion to approve PL150015, Rural and Minton Building with the additional stipulation with a pedestrian connection that would connect Rural Road to the buildings near the north entry drive. The second stipulation is to remove the Acacia Aneura trees and replacing them with Olive trees or the Aleppo Pine trees and replacing some of the trees on site with Aleppo Pine trees to make more in character with the surrounding area.

Commissioner Spears seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed.

Vote 7 – 0

**DECISION:** The Development Review Commission approved Rural and Minton Building PL150015 Development Plan Review including site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan with stipulations.

---

2. Request for a General Plan Projected Land Use Map Amendment from Residential to Mixed-Use, a General Plan Projected Density Map Amendment from High Density-Urban Core (more than 65 du/ac) to High Density (up to 65 du/ac), a Zoning Map Amendment from R-4 TOD to MU-4 TOD, a Planned Area Development Overlay, and a Development Plan Review for a new five-story mixed-use development containing 260 dwelling units and 1,800 square feet of commercial space for **UNIVERSITY VILLAGE 2.0 (PL150026)**, located at 920 South Terrace Road. The applicant is Manjula Vaz, Gammage & Burnham, P.L.C.

Staff, Karen Stovall introduced the case.

This project is located on the north side of Terrace Rd about 500 feet east of Rural Rd. and the main Arizona State University Campus. It is near the light rail and surrounded on the southeast and southwest by multifamily developments.

Development Plan Review including site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan.

Applicant, Manjula Vaz, Gammage & Burnham, P.L.C, representing Legacy Partners

Presented team introductions with areas of discussion

- Tim O'Brian, Legacy Partners
- Ben Cassidy, KTG Y Group, Inc. -Architect Firm
- Mark Bryers, Design Element - Landscape
- Don Cardea, Simtech - Traffic
- Rob Lane, Gammage & Burnham, P.L.C.

Explained developments in the surrounding area of the site and determination of the height

Redevelopment of student housing

Reviewed the requests of the project

Discussed development proposed overview

- Landscape
  - Landscape coverage, Street trees, Ground floor plan
- Building Setbacks
- Onsite Vehicle Parking
- Bike Parking
- Amenities
  - Courtyard
  - Community Pool
  - Fitness Center
  - Clubhouse
  - Volleyball Court
- Design Perspective
- Building Elevation
- Typical Unit Plans
- Traffic Impact & Parking Study

Questions from Commission Members

- General Plan density and mixed use comparison amendment request
- Leed Certified development – Manjula Vaz
- Street Tree discussion and variations

Mark Bryers , Design Element – Landscape discussion

- Street tree – open to work with staff to move trees
- Water conservation
- Turf & Decomposed Granite – useable

Ben Cassidy, K T G Y Group, Inc. – Architect Firm  
Materials & Color uses  
Viewed Samples  
Building Elevations and Design Perspectives plans with discussion  
Individually metered units  
Sunlight exposure

Public Comments: None

Discussion from Commission Members

Vice Chair Barger expressed that he appreciates this project and that it's a great way to renovate the area and add more people. He likes the change to the mixed use to allow the density to add mixed use elements to the building to allow the General Plan to work as in intended. He doesn't mind the orange color but prefers red accents. He will be approving the project as proposed.

Commissioner Lyon expressed that he thinks this project is wonderful, striking and beautiful. He likes the color choice and the contemporary pallet is bold and beautiful. He wishes the density was a little stronger and there were taller elements. He shares the concern regarding the shading from the afternoon sun.

Commissioner Thornton agrees with Vice Chair Barger and likes the color orange but it's called "Forceful Orange". She thinks that this is perfect for the area.

Commissioner Johnson expressed that he appreciated the project and likes the activation along Terrace Rd. and the increase in the density of the project. He likes the trees shown in the design. He is in support of the project.

Commissioner Spears has concerns with the General Plan amendment. She would like to have more open space on the Terrace side of the building. She would also like to see some elevation changes. She is undecided on this project.

Commissioner Brown expressed that he would approve this project and would like to suggest a stipulation for the increase of number of trees; up to 50 percent. However, per city staff, the trees have to be a minimum of 1 per 30 feet and this plan does not comply they would have to add that.

Chair Kent expressed that he does not like the color. He does think that the project is good but the site is challenged and would like to put the open space in the front but the building but realizes that it faces south. It's going to be a great space for student housing.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Barger made a motion to recommend approval for PL150026 University Village 2.0, with a stipulation to work with staff to add additional street trees along the Terrace frontage.

Commissioner Thornton seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed.

Vote 6-1 with Commissioner Spears in the opposition

---

**DECISION:** The Development Review Commission has recommended for approval the **UNIVERSITY VILLAGE 2.0 (PL150026)** General Plan Projected Land Use Map Amendment from Residential to Mixed-Use, a General Plan Projected Density Map Amendment from High Density-Urban Core (more than 65 du/ac) to High Density (up to 65 du/ac), a Zoning Map Amendment from R-4 TOD to MU-4 TOD, a Planned Area Development Overlay, and a Development Plan Review including site plan, building elevations, and landscape plan with stipulations.

---

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm.

Prepared by: Sarah Adame  
Reviewed by: Ryan Levesque



---

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Development Director

RL/sa