

**Minutes of the  
Development Review Commission  
August 11, 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: 1**

Hearing convened at 6:07 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 Spears  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Thornton  
**DECISION:** Approved 7-0

---

**Consent Agenda: 3 items**

1. Request for a Development Plan Review consisting of a new retail store for **MATTRESS FIRM AT EMERALD CENTER (PL150266)**, located at 8502 South Emerald Drive. The applicant is Victor Kollasch, Balmer Architectural Group.
2. Request for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plat for **THE MOTLEY (PL140078)**, located at 1221 East Apache Boulevard. The applicant is Wood, Patel & Associates, Inc.
3. Request for a Code Text Amendment for **MEDICAL MARIJUANA (PL150267)**, consisting of changes within the Code that regulate the location and operation requirements for dispensaries and cultivation facilities in Tempe. The applicant is Bryan McLaren, Zoned Properties, Inc.

**ITEM HAS BEEN PULLED AND WILL BE CONTINUED TO THE AUGUST 25<sup>TH</sup> 2015 AGENDA**

**MOTION: Commissioner Spears**  
**SECOND: Vice Chair Barger**

**DECISION: Approved 7-0, motion passed.**

---

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

4. Request for a Development Plan Review and Preliminary Subdivision Plat for a new single family subdivision consisting of 94 dwelling units for **RHYTHM (PL130327)**, located at 9330 South Priest Drive. The applicant is Chris Jones of Anderson Baron.

Staff, Diana Kaminski introduced the case.

RHYTHM (PL130327) is a new residential development which spans across the borders of Tempe into Chandler. The Tempe portion of the project is comprised of 94 single-family detached units on 19 gross acres with a projected density of 5 du/ac. The City of Chandler portion of the project is planned for 281 units comprised of a mix of four residential housing types (condominium, villas, lofts and casitas). The entire 51.52 acre development has 375 residences. The site was part of a prior Planned Area Development for MU-4, which required a Zoning Amendment to R1-PAD in 2014. The Development Review Commission heard this request on June 9, 2015; the case was continued to provide more time to address design details.

Applicant, Andy Baron of Anderson Baron representing Mattamy Homes

Review project and items that were asked to be reviewed and changed from their previous hearing on June 9, 2015.

Vicinity map was provided with the locations of the project for the City of Tempe and the City of Chandler

Review of the Site Plan

Mr. Baron presented different product lines between the cities

Chandler has four product lines:

- Casita Unit – 12 units, single family detached unit and individual for sale lots
- Villa unit – detached alley unit that have garages that live off the rear and front doors that live off the street
- Loft unit – 35'x58' lot size, 3 stories
- Condo unit – 5 unit condo buildings each with garages that lead into the unit itself and stairs that go up to the unit

Tempe has one product line:

- Casita Unit – single family detached unit and individual for sale lots

Character and Theming

Central Amenity Plan

Seventeen different amenities, pool, fitness facility, many shaded spaces, different types of fire place areas, gathering spaces, etc.

Entry Wall and Gate Plan

Scales of height

Wall details: elevations, landscaping, materials, and colors

Review of questions from last hearing:

The distances coming into the site

They have been working with the city traffic department for stacking. There is proper stacking distance, proper turn around, and the monumentation that is articulating on the streets creating a sense of arrival.

Perimeter walls

Scale of monumentation

The wall is 7 foot tall and has the Arizona tile on it and the gates are 6 foot high. The proportions are much more at scale with this elevation. This is the northern entrance of the Tempe portion.

Wall character – unchanged from last meeting. Creating a vehicular community not armored and fenced and there is a public trail on site that must be acknowledged

There will be potted plants to help create some visual separation

Additional wall treatments with transparent fencing

Architect, Chris Texter, KTG Architecture & Planning

Presentation: Creating Urban/Contemporary feel

Addressed in detail description of all four product lines, six floor plans, two elevations, and nine color schemes for both cities.

Eaves on houses – introduced larger over hangs in front of house and on the side of the house they remain the same size due to fire code limitations

HERS ratings – Mattamy Homes has not completed yet but is attempting to get the lowest available

Homes will be Energy Star Certified – Based on Mattamy's interior design

Discussion on Pre-plotting to avoid building same design homes next to each other - limitations

HOA will be provided

Commissioner Spears asked the applicant to explain how the street is going to look like, as the proposed streets scene, if every buyer comes in and wants plan #4?

Mr. Texter stated that they are open to making conditions where there is a restriction for a certain number of homes that can occur in a row or restrict the type of elevation that occurs in a row and restrict the color scheme. They don't have any issues with pre-plotting.

Commissioner Spears expressed that the applicant did not state that in the write up and they only wrote "it is not required". The applicant has additional floor plans and she now understands now that the applicant is going to agree to a stipulation on pre-plotting.

Staff, Kaminski, responded that the draft CC&R's state that the adjacent lots with the same house models shall not be painted the same paint schemes.

Commissioner Spears stated that it is just not about the paint schemes.

Applicant agrees to a condition for pre-plotting based on elevations not being the same next to each other.

Commissioner Spears asked about increasing the eaves on the houses. She asked the applicant why they didn't address that request.

Applicant said that they introduced larger overhangs where it is at pedestrian level such as the front of the homes. He stated that they were hesitant on the size as the homes get closer and closer together. There are home in certain areas that can fit the larger over hangs.

Chair Kent also stated that on the applicant's write up it stated that the eaves are at 12 inches.

Applicant stated that information is not completely accurate. Applicant continued to show the Commission where in all the plans that they were able to fit the larger eaves.

Commissioner Spears asked about the HERs rating on all houses.

Applicant responded that all products are currently under development and cannot be identified at this time. However, they do desire the lowest rating as possible for the sale price.

Chair Kent asked for a range or a rough number.

Applicant responded that he didn't have that information.

Vice Chair Barger asked design questions regarding the eaves on plan 2.2. He wanted to know if the changes to the plan are fire related issues or could have matching eaves.

Applicant replied yes, that is a good opportunity to do the 2 foot element with the eaves there.

Vice Chair Barger has the same concern for the eave on plan 3a and plan 4.

Applicant replied yes, it's a possibility and he is open to making these changes.

Commissioner Brown asked if there will be a HOA

Applicant replied yes there will be one HOA

Commissioner Brown asked why there are larger density in Chandler and smaller density in Tempe

Applicant replied that the site with the higher density project would be adjacent to the car dealer and Tempe is more functional for the smaller density. A function of land use, access, and number of access point available from an access standpoint from Orchid and on to Priest and has the ability to have a frontage on Orchid and to have a larger number of units to be able to come out in two locations was also the reasoning.

Commissioner Brown asked if there will be a difference in the taxation.

Applicant replied that he can answer that question but it's an interesting question.

Commissioner Brown asked if the applicant knew that the two areas are in the same school district.

Applicant replied yes.

Applicant Jose Castillo with Mattamy Homes stated that the tax should be relatively straight across the board because it's based off the selling price of the homes. The prices of the homes will be the same in Tempe.

Commissioner Brown asked the applicant what is the price range?

Applicant replied the casitas will be starting in the low \$300,000.00 but they haven't started setting the prices yet. The Condos will be the least expensive in Chandler, which will be in the low \$200,000.00 and then you mix in the Villas that come next which are a step up and the lofts are a step up from the Villas so the price range is from the low \$200,000.00 to the low \$300,000.00.

Mr. Baron and Mr. Texter

Addressed items that were asked by the Commission in a previous hearing:

Presented Street Scene Plan View

Addition of sidewalk for fire access

Dealership distance is 100 feet – no interference with new addition of public trail

Wall returns

Access to refuse

Sidewalks and entry ways

Multiuse Trail Plan

Driveways/Parking

No building over the gas line but can apply some grading

Grading

Landscape - Oaks, Elms, and Vitex (Chastetree) trees

Construction will be completed in two phases

Chair Kent expressed that there were questions from the last hearing regarding the gates in the backyards; would they duck tail together and would they be organized or would they be at different levels.

Applicant replied yes, they are on the side and began to explain that there are some clean shifts that occur on the wall geometries that respond to the architecture that happens to the side of the building along with having the utility box on the side of the houses. The elements create articulation on the street scene.

Commissioner Brown stated that the property line to the building is 5 feet and then asked if there are masonry common walls centered on the property line and will that be Dooley block the pilaster type?

Applicant replied the walls between the lots will be pilaster type which is the 4 inch block.

Commissioner Brown asked if there will be the standard Tempe recycling barrel sizes? He is concerned that the area is tight at the property line. He went on to express that he thinks the building forms and colors are quite nice for the building and you get a lot of building for a small lot. The Commission is concerned about the 18 feet for the parking spaces; he thinks people will have their cars on the sidewalk from time to time. He stated that the 5 foot is very tight and is not sure how to solve that. He is concerned that some people will leave their trash barrel on the driveway from time to time and thinks that it's too much of a hassle to get it back passed the air conditioner.

Applicant stated that there will be CC&Rs that will control people leaving trash cans out. The driveways themselves are 18 feet clear to the sidewalks and that is standard.

Commissioner Brown asked if there are any places in Tempe where the sidewalks are this close.

Staff, Diana Kaminski, stated that this was discussed early on in design and determined the setbacks thru the PAD process last year. There wasn't much flexibility in changing the foot prints of the buildings but can enforce parking over the sidewalk thru the CC&Rs but the 18 foot depth is the standard depth for a parking space.

Chair Kent asked if there is on street parking.

Applicant replied yes.

Chair Kent asked what is at the end of the street of Jeanine Drive and the Canal.

Applicant replied that it would be a masonry wall.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the only connection in this development to the multiuse path is along the Knox Rd. alignment or is there a connection along the gas line easement on the north side of the development?

Applicant responded, that if somebody wanted go that way they could but the plans show a fence coming across the northern boundary so they did plan a wall. The amenities that are within that easement itself would benefit the community itself. The public trail was intended to allow folks from the greater Tempe public to access the regional facilities. The access is fenced off from the north end to prevent liability of the public to the residential community.

Commissioner Johnson stated that through the reading of the plan it states to allow as many types of accesses as possible to this type of regional trails along the canals. While looking at the development plan, Commissioner Johnson inquired about the residents from the community would have a long walk around the block to get to those trails.

Applicant suggested that it is possible to have a thru fence or something that could have a gate.

Chair Kent asked the applicant if they could build across that gas line.

Applicant explained that it's a government entity that is federally regulated and stated that there isn't a whole lot they can build on it. They can do some grading on top of it.

Chair Kent replied he meant in regards to the fence that they are going to put at the northern boundary.

Applicant stated they can put a fence in the area but not on top of the gas pipe line. They have to span that distance which makes it fairly limited. The north side of the project is open but the plans currently show that as a masonry wall. There is not a pathway that continues in that direction because it is a retention basin for them.

Commissioner Lyon asked if on the site plan it shows some trees planted in front of a block wall at the end of the access road way leading off to the west at the end of path way and on the plan shown on the overhead there aren't any trees planted is the site plan erroneous?

Applicant explained that it is a small planting space and there is some landscape area there and will probably squeeze some cluster trees in there.

Commissioner Brown asked whether Ash trees were being used.

Applicant said that they are not Ash trees. They are Oak, Elm, and Vitex that are on the trail corridor.

Vice Chair Barger asked to clarify about the walls on all boundaries, are those all the perimeter walls shown.

Applicant replied they have several different wall conditions.

Community Wall

Westside (Tempe side) and Northside are Dooley walls

Chair Kent questioned #10 and sited the applicant's response that all products are currently under development and standard options can't be identified at this time. He asked if the applicant is going with that answer today.

Applicant said yes and that owner is just starting building documents.

Chair Kent questioned #11 regarding their HERS ratings and being energy efficient.

Applicant stated that they do know that they are going to be energy star certified.

Chair Kent reviewed question #18 and asked if this one about the entry on the floor plan were eliminated.

Applicant stated that the plan was revised significantly and now homes have their own entry and identified living rooms.

Chair Kent reviewed question #20 regarding plot plans for each house. He confirmed that the applicant did show them this from the 6 different model homes.

Chair Kent stated that the plot plan is very diverse and confirmed with applicant is not adverse about having a stipulation about requiring diversity.

Applicant replied yes and as long as the stipulation implies that no exact two same floor plans and elevations be built next to each other and across the street. Yes that is very standard.

Commissioner Spears asked what if the stipulation is greater than that.

Applicant stated that he understands and that it is a possibility but he thinks that they need to understand the likely hood of that occurring and that due to product diversity and price ranges that are quiet substantial from initial plan single story up to the largest two story that all provides enough measure often times in communities. Applicant believes that a stipulation like this creates handcuffs preventing the creation of a successful and viable community.

Commissioner Spears asked how the Applicant will prevent a home buyer from purchasing the home next door to another home that looks the same.

Applicant replied that when a home buyer picks their house they get to pick their lots.

Commissioner Spears asked how this project will be built; all at once?

Applicant replied it will be phased built at a time in 2 phases.

Vice Chair Barger suggested a stipulation of no same plan elevation or color adjacent or directly across the street and no more than 30% of any individual plan in the subdivision/street.

Public Comments: NONE

Discussion from Commission Members

Vice Chair Barger expressed that he appreciates the applicant's willingness to work with the Commission with a nice set of documents that address all their requests. He would like to come up with a stipulation for the plotting conditions. He agrees with the discussion regarding the elevation changes to the front to accommodate the roof eve requests. He liked the community wall along the canal since it's more of a public space in Tempe. He thinks it's a really nice project and appreciate that the developer is going to work across city boundaries and provide a really great neighborhood.

Chair Kent expressed that he appreciates all the sample boards. He appreciates the letter with questions and answers to all the Commission's request from the prior hearing. He is a little disappointed in some of the responses but then the actual response from the applicant was better. He would like to see the applicant work on the detail of where the end of Jeanine runs into the canal because it seems to be a dead end. He agrees with the style of community wall on the canal. He thinks it looks like a good project.

Commissioner Brown expressed that he would like to know the energy star ratings.  
Staff, Diana Kaminski explained how the energy star ratings are counted.

Commissioner Brown expressed that he thinks that the interior design was well addressed based on what the market place would be. He thinks the variety of model types and elevations are nice and would like to craft a stipulation on the color, model, and optional separation to street scape so that it doesn't have repetition.

Commissioner Johnson expressed that he appreciates the efforts to bring in more diversity to the elevation of the units. He is little disappointed that there is only one access to the regional trail. He feels at least two more access points should be provided. He agrees with the community wall along the regional trail. He was disappointed that the HERs ratings were not provided as requested.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Barger motioned for approval of Rhythm (PL130327) with the following additional stipulations:

- Amendment to stipulation #2: limit the plotting to no same plan, elevation or color scheme adjacent or directly across the street and no individual plan maybe more than thirty percent of the street.
- The wall along the canal shall be a community wall
- To the plan 2.b, 3.a, and 4a. additional eve with two foot depth in the front elevation that does not encumber fire code
- A landscape buffer be added between Jeanine and the canal community wall
- Provide a restricted access to the regional canal trail on the north end of the parcel

Commissioner Spears seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Approved 7-0

**DECISION:** Request for a Development Plan Review and Preliminary Subdivision Plat for a new single family subdivision consisting of 94 dwelling units for **RHYTHM (PL130327)**, located at 9330 South Priest Drive was approved with additional stipulations.

---

5. Request for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review for a new 14-story mixed-use development containing 384 dwelling units and 3,838 square feet of commercial space for **1000 EAST APACHE (PL150208)**, located at 1000 East Apache Boulevard. The applicant is Nick Wood, Snell & Wilmer, LLP.

Staff, Karen Stovall introduced the case

The development is designed to serve the needs of university students. The proposal includes a 14-story (plus rooftop amenity deck) mixed-use development containing 384 dwelling units, 3,838 square feet of commercial space, and restaurant space.

Chair Kent asked how tall is 922 (Place)?

Ms. Stovall replied that it's 116 feet

Chair Kent asked how tall is 1000 East Apache.

Ms. Stovall replied it is 172 feet

Applicant, Nick Wood, Snell & Wilmer, LLP

Presentation provided the following:

- Location and surrounding business

- Reviewed concerns from each Commissioner regarding

  - Traffic and Parking vs. the number of student living here

  - Amended council approval

  - Improved original design

- Original Site Plan

  - Reviewed all old issues

- New Site Plan

  - Outdoor dining

  - Sidewalk detached

  - Landscape along streets

  - Garage

  - Traffic flow is better

  - New bike racks

  - Drop off area/Circulation Networks

  - Project designed to become condos in the future

  - Reduction in parking

Architects, Joe Herzog and Justine Trexler

- Provide overview of elevations

  - Views of south elevation lower level

    - Windows – open and close curtain wall system, maintenance of window shelves

    - Walls are inward creating an inviting feel

    - Corten Steel – orange color

  - Views of north elevation

    - Glass wraps around the corners of the building

  - Parking garage – embedded into the building

  - Views of east elevation – see lower mass towards Apache and the taller mass is midblock and towards the rear of the site

  - Views of west elevation – mostly screened by the 922 project

- Materials of construction of building

  - Massing is pulled back

Vice Chair Barger confirmed with the applicant that the Corten Steel rusts into the color orange then stops rusting, he also asked about the colors of the masonry and other materials on the specific areas of the project according to the plans.



Commissioner Thornton asked how the window outside shelves would be kept cleaned.  
Applicant responded with advising that there are devices that could be put on the shelves that would eliminate birds and that there are several other options.

Commissioner Lyon asked if applicant is going to express tension ties or tension cables.  
Applicant replied that those would be filled.

#### Building Sections

- Creating Courtyards - four in total as they cascade up the building
  - Study rooms
  - Small theater
  - Lounge
  - Pool
  - Palm trees
  - Fitness room
  - Hanging garden
  - Perforated metal screen that wraps around the courtyards, 8 feet tall

Vice Chair Barger asked, on the 15<sup>th</sup> floor at the perimeter, there is no way for students from hanging over or around edges.

Applicant replied no.

Commissioner Lyon asked for a very brief explanation on the hanging garden.  
Applicant responded this is a conceptual plan and that the thought was underneath the canopy there would be an infrastructure for hanging different things such as hammocks and potted plants, etc. on a small scale.

- Creating egress for the interior units
  - Natural convection and passing air movement that would move through the building
- Street Section of the lower level
  - Residential vs. Retail
- Landscape Plan – desert variety
  - Palo Verdes, trees

Chair Kent asked if there is an alternative for the Palo Verdes since the ones at 922 are out grown and untrimmed.  
Staff, Karen Stovall replied that stipulation number #30 was added because the Palo Verde that was shown on the landscape plan did not specify that they were single trunk and it does not appear that the Palo Verdes on 922 were single trunk. They look like they had branches chopped off over the past few years. If the stipulation is single trunk and staked properly they won't have that same appearance and that is why that condition is added.

Chair Kent asked again is this the right tree for this location?

Ms. Stovall replied, I believe this tree can work in this location if it's single trunk and staked properly.

#### Site Circulation – Vertical Corridors, two locations of entrances

- Pedestrian and bicycles
- Retail at the street level
- Parking
- Dedicated service zone for fire and refuse

Vice Chair Barger asked is it ideal to describe the motion or replacement on the two different site plans shown. In regards to the bicycle parking on the west side has increased the bike parking underneath the building is a little different than the layout presented that they have.

Applicant responded yes that there is stipulation that requires them to use the Tempe standard detail which has a slightly greater distance between each hoop. The changes shown are with the stipulation. The applicant is trying to get more bicycle parking but the city requires a wider space between the parking spaces.

Staff, Karen Stovall explained that what was discussed is that the plan actually shows a rack in the center of the designated bike space which is the rectangles on the plan. Instead they would have a bike rack with 24 inches for a bike space, 6 inches of clearance and another 24 inches for a bike space and then a bike rack. If they had followed what we discussed prior to the hearing it would actually reduce the number of bike racks and have 2 bike share a single rack. Ms. Stovall advised that they had not discussed adding bike spaces along the west property line, yet.

It was noted that the General Contractor will attend Cultural sensitivity training course with the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community

– General Contractor will attend

Commissioner Thornton requested that the applicant have a least one person designated to take this course and be on site and is responsible for this part of the project.

Applicant responded that they will have their general contractor attend the training and that they are ok with adding this to their list of conditions.

#### Traffic Engineer, Dawn Cartier

Student housing studies relying on studies for reduction of parking spacing

Commissioner Lyon asked if the applicant has any way of demonstrating that reducing parking is appropriate.

Ms. Cartier stated that there are several studies on student housing concepts. She referenced to a study out of Michigan stating a ratio of parking of anywhere from .18 up to .6 which would be spaces per bed. In this case we are providing .5 ratio so they fit well within the range even to the upper end of that range and that has become the industry's new guide.

#### Developer, Matt Booma

Security provided with a manager on site 24/7

Security guards during the first four weeks of each semester on Thursdays and Fridays

Zero Tolerance Policy

Chair Kent asked to have the applicant confirm that there is no access to extension of the concrete out from the windows. No one is allowed out there except the people cleaning it.

Applicant replied that the windows are operational and they have limiters on them. There will be a strict policy against going out on the extended concrete of the windows. The person would have to dismantle the entire window in order to get out there.

Commissioner Brown asked the applicant if they will be involved in the good neighbor policy with ASU.

Applicant responded yes.

#### Questions from Commission Members

Commissioner Brown asked what the measurement of the property setback is.

Applicant responded it is 6 feet.

Commissioner Brown asked what happens in 3 years from now if the landowner wants to build a similar tower that close to the property line.

Applicant responded that fire code would litigate that and by being in the space first the development has the advantage in choice of building and then its market driven for how close the building would be.

Commissioner Brown asked about the 2 gates going out; are there easements because there aren't gates now?

Applicant responded that the gate on the western portion of the site is egress path then he pointed out that there is a gate on the drawing that should be deleted and there is a gate that was requested by the fire department.

Commissioner Brown asked about the trash pickup on the east; if the large bins that are indoors, are they pulled out hydraulically.

Applicant responded yes. The staff at the building would pull those bins out.

Commissioner Brown asked if the height of the building is negotiable.

Ms. Stovall stated that the previous PAD overlay had this building height, it's on the table but the applicant is not requesting a decrease in building height.

Commissioner Brown says that the building is very tall and would like to know if it's negotiable.

Ms. Stovall stated that the applicant is requesting a PAD amendment but not to decrease the height.

Commissioner Lyon asked how the Corten meets the ground. Does it meet DG or concrete, what is right at the base of the Corten.

Applicant replied that it is a detail that they haven't resolved yet. Ideally, there would be a little landscape.

Commissioner Lyon asked if the window system is like the store front system.

Applicant replied that it would be from the same supplier. At this height, it's more of a curtain wall system. It would have the same frame and paint.

Commissioner Thornton asked if people will be paying for parking spots and how much.

Applicant replied yes. The charge would be what is similar to the market for other buildings.

Commissioner Thornton asked how much will rent be.

Applicant replied what is similar to the market.

Commissioner Thornton asked where the metal mesh is going to be.

Applicant replied it is going to be on the perimeter of the courtyard levels.

Chair Kent inquired about the potential of a big screen TV.

Ms. Stovall advised the Commission that if there was a television installed in the courtyards that an administrative DPR would be required. She requested that a condition be added to limit how much the windows open.

Vice Chair Barger asked about having more landscaping on the north side of the building. He also asked why the Commission didn't receive landscape plans for the upper level courtyards and how are they supposed to approve them.

Applicant replied that there are several doors there but does see some opportunities for additional landscaping.

Ms. Stovall answered that an administrative DPR be processed for the roof top deck landscaping.

#### Public Comments:

Matthew Salenger, Tempe, stated that he has met with the development team. He does like the height of the project and believes that the project met every requirement for student housing. Mr. Salenger does support this project.

#### Discussion from Commission Members

Commissioner Spears expressed that she does like the changes to the design of this project and she likes the pedestrian aspect.

Commissioner Brown expressed that he likes the project but does not like the height.

Vice Chair Barger likes the design of the building. It has a fun aspect on the ground level. He doesn't have any concerns about the height and is not worried about the access for Tempe Fire and Police departments. He likes the answers he heard from management and the level of "neighborhoodness". He will support the project.

Chair Kent expressed that he likes the new design. He is willing to trade any comments about height for the work that has been done on the ground level. He thinks this is a great project. The project could have been built lower and not have all the amenities but he thinks the investment will pay off in the long run with regards to this design.

Commissioner Lyon expressed that he liked the project too. It is an attractive building. He has a few minor concerns, such as the windows, window shelves, landscape terraces for level five and level eleven were a little puzzling with the eight foot mesh trim. He knows that it will all get figured out. He would like to commend the applicant and architect for the presentation. He is in favor of the project.

Commissioner Thornton expressed that she likes the project as well.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Barger motioned to approved 1000 East Apache PL150208 with the following additional stipulations:

- Stipulations 6 & 7 added to read "Work with staff to address the cleaning and pigeons on shelves in and around the building." "Process a staff-level Development Plan Review for the landscape on the upper-level landscape gardens."
- Stipulation #9 modified to include, " or an alternative bike parking detail"
- Adding a stipulation that a member of the general contacting team will attend the Salt River Project Maricopa Indian Community Cultural Sensitivity training course
- Adding a stipulation to create window opening limiters to limit objects that can be thrown from the building or residents using the window shelves
- Adding a stipulation to working with staff on an additional landscape plan to the northern elevation of the project

Commissioner Thornton seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** Approved 6-1 with Commissioner Brown in the opposition.

**DECISION:** Request for an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay and a Development Plan Review for a new 14-story mixed-use development containing 384 dwelling units and 3,838 square feet of commercial space for **1000 EAST APACHE (PL150208)**, located at 1000 East Apache Boulevard was approved with additional stipulations.

---

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Prepared by: Sarah Adame  
Reviewed by: Ryan Levesque



---

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Community Director, Planning