



Minutes
Development Review Commission
STUDY SESSION
May 10, 2022

**Minutes of the study session of the Development Review Commission, of the City of Tempe, was held in Council Chambers
31 East Fifth Street, Tempe, Arizona**

Present:

Chair Michael DiDomenico
Vice Chair Steven Bauer
Commissioner Scott Summers
Commissioner Don Cassano
Commissioner Philip Amorosi
Commissioner Barbara Lloyd
Commissioner Michelle Schwartz

City Staff Present:

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director, Community Development
Maria Laughner, Economic Development Director
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner
Steve Abrahamson, Principal Planner
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
Obenia Kingsby II, Planner II
Ty Templeton, Planning Technician
Joanna Barry, Administrative Assistant II

Absent:

Alt Commissioner Linda Spears
Alt Commissioner Rhiannon Corbett
Alt Commissioner Charles Redman

Chair DiDomenico began the Study Session at 5:19 p.m.

Review of April 12, 2022 Minutes

Item #1 - Study Session Minutes
Item #2 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Review of May 10, 2022 Regular Meeting Agenda

Item #3 – TEMPE CLARK PARK (PL220042) – On Consent

Chair DiDomenico asked if there was a way to save the existing recreational center building instead of tearing it down. He stated that two or three years ago the City showed that location to a local non-profit group to use and it was a good fit. The problem was that there was so much programming going on in the two buildings that they just could not co-exist. However, unless there is something wrong with the building, it seems a shame to tear it down. Ms. Stovall advised that it would need to be left up to the applicant to explain the overall programming for the park.

Commissioner Amorosi advised that he was part of the original planning for this, and he thought the neighbors wanted to keep the community garden where it was, however in this plan it is all the way on the north side of the lot. He asked what had changed since then. Ms. Stovall advised that would also probably be best left up to the applicant to respond to as staff was not involved in the programming of the park. Chair DiDomenico requested that if the applicant arrives prior to the end of the Study Session that they be asked about these items.

Commissioner Summers noted that the plans show for a standard seam metal roof and since these are expensive, he wanted to know if long-term maintenance is part of the application.

Prior to the end of the Study Session, Mr. Brandon Sobiech, Dig Studio, was able to provide some answers to the Commissioners' questions: Regarding the recreation center, Mr. Sobiech, advised that during the master plan phase it was determined that there were accessibility issues and capacity issues in terms of plumbing if they were to expand it. There were also control issues and they felt everything should be located in one hub instead of separate areas. Regarding the roof, they have not noticed any issues with the product thus far but are open to comments and suggestions from the Commission. The location of the garden was also part of the master plan effort. They noticed that the pool had never been completely demolished, and the garden seemed to take over that space. Due to existing plumbing and other factors, they decided to keep the pool in its original location. Chair DiDomenico asked that Mr. Sobiech work with the City to see if they can repurpose the recreation center building and make it a part of the public park.

- Item #4 – TEMPE FIRE STATION NO. 2 (PL220095) – On Consent
- Item #5 – DOGTOPIA OF TEMPE (PL220011) – On Consent
- Item #6 – EDWARDS RESIDENCE (PL220040) – On Consent
- Item #7 – RAMADA INN REZONING (PL220055) – To Be Heard

Project Updates by Staff (City Council Action Items): NONE

Review of past and future applications with staff: Ms. Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner, gave the Commission an overview of items on the May 24, 2022 DRC agenda.

Tempe Tomorrow: General Plan 2050: The Commission to select two commissioners to represent the Commission on the Technical Advisory Group.

After discussion, it was determined that the names of those interested would be put forward to the Planning staff and would then be voted on. Both Commissioner Lloyd and Commissioner Amorosi expressed interest, however since Commissioner Amorosi's term is almost up staff will need to check if he is eligible. Commissioner Schwartz advised that she is travelling a lot and Ms. Dasgupta advised that there will be remote meetings. Chair DiDomenico also requested that staff reach out to the alternate members to see if they are interested.

PRESENTATION: Hayden Flour Mill Redevelopment – Presentation of project concept and input from Commission

Ms. Maria Laughner, Economic Development Director, introduced the project team to the Commission.

Mr. Lorenzo Perez, Venue Projects, shared images and went over several other reuse projects they have done that are similar to this project. For the Hayden Flower Mill, they envision a commercial mixed-use campus that will be a gateway icon to downtown Tempe. The existing silos are the stars of the project, and any new structures will be subordinate or secondary in scale and placement. They believe that proactive community outreach will help get support from stakeholders in the community. Mr. Perez then went over the site plan, illustrating the location of items and amenities. They will be working closely with Tempe Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). He stated that everyone seems to be enthusiastic about this project. They hope to get the flour mill on the National Historic Register, which will provide them with tax credits. There is a lot of old equipment that is currently in the flour mill, and they want to salvage it and reuse it creatively by replacing what they can without inhibiting its ability to be used or inhabited.

Chair DiDomenico asked about the general timing and Mr. Perez advised that right now it is pretty fluid, and they have all agreed not to commit to anything as there is a lot of outreach they are doing. Their best guess at this date is a three-to-five-year timeframe.

Commissioner Amorosi asked if the new buildings they are envisioning would be brick to simulate what is there, or glass so that you can see through to the old structures. etc. Mr. Perez stated there has been strong public opinion against using glass. Personally, he would like to integrate some masonry, adobe, and plasters in addition to some glazing.

Commissioner Cassano asked if there were other entities that they had to deal with, such as SHPO. Mr. Perez advised that there were, and they included SHPO, the National Park Service, and the four southern tribes.

Vice Chair Bauer stated that he appreciates that they are respecting the history of these iconic buildings.

Chair DiDomenico asked if there was still enough there structurally of the silos so that they can be more than just window dressing. Mr. Perez stated at this time they are basically just storage containers. Sundt Corporation provided a structural analysis, and they are solid and basically cast concrete tubes that are conical at the bottom. He recently learned that there is a basement underneath that captured a lot of the grain. The grain elevator seems to have habitable space. There are areas on the ground floor that could be used for food and beverage, a bar, restaurant, etc.

Commissioner Sumners stated he appreciates the focus on the light touch.

Announcements: NONE

The Study Session adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Prepared by: Joanna Barry, Administrative Assistant II
Reviewed by: Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner

