

# PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

---

## MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION NOVEMBER 12, 2013

Harry E. Mitchell Government Center  
Tempe City Hall - City Council Chambers  
31 E. 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Tempe, AZ 85281  
6:00 PM

Commission Present:

Dennis Webb, Chair  
Paul Kent, Vice Chair  
Trevor Barger  
Ron Collett  
Linda Spears  
Angie Thornton  
Peggy Tinsley

Commission Absent:

Dan Killoren  
Dave Maza

City Staff Present:

Dave Nakagawara, Community Development Director  
Steve Abrahamson, Planning & Zoning Coordinator  
Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner  
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner  
Julie Stenner, Executive Assistant

Chair Webb called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., which included the introduction of the Commission and City staff. It had been determined in the Study Session that the minutes for October 22, 2013 could be approved as drafted, and Item No. 3 could be placed on the Consent Agenda should no one from the public wish the case to be heard.

**1. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 10/22/13**

On a motion by Vice Chair Kent and seconded by Commissioner Tinsley, the Commission with a vote of 7-0 approved the minutes of the October 22, 2013 meeting.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

3. On a motion by Commissioner Barger and seconded by Commissioner Tinsley, the Commission with a vote of 7-0 approved the Preliminary Subdivision Plat for **SAN SONOMA (PL120261)**, located at 9010 South Priest Drive. The applicant is JMA Engineering Corporation.

STAFF REPORT: [DRCr\\_SanSonoma\\_111213](#)

---

**REGULAR AGENDA**

2. Request for a Development Plan Review consisting of a repaint and landscape modification for **CAMPUS POINTE APARTMENTS (PL130283)** located at 1115 East Lemon Street. The applicant is Gould Evans.

**THIS CASE WAS CONTINUED FROM THE OCTOBER 22, 2013 MEETING**

STAFF REPORT: [DRCr\\_CampusPoint\\_111213](#)

This case was presented by Diana Kaminski and represented by Nick Wood from the law firm of Snell and Wilmer. The site is located on the east side of Terrace Road, north of Apache Boulevard and south of Lemon Street. The property has two different zoning classifications. This is an existing apartment community. The property was purchased this last summer and the new owner is proposing upgrades to the property. This is a phased project to update the interior and exterior of the building. The new owner is present tonight for a request to update the paint colors on the exterior of the building. The design justification was tied into the landscape plan. Landscape improvements have been incorporated into the Development Plan Review for consideration with the paint modification. The proposed building colors are similar to those approved for another project in the area. Staff is recommending approval of the requested modification elevations and will be reviewing the landscape plan separately when the applicant makes a final submittal.

Nick Wood gave an overview of the history on this site. The property was built in 1970. The original owner wanted more density and made changes to the property without obtaining the proper permits. The property owner was told to put the property back to the original floor plan. A subsequent owner also made changes to the property without permits. The property has not been maintained over the years and was in really poor condition. The Police Department has had a high number of incident calls for this property. The property also had several Fire Code violations. This site was an attraction for homeless people, drug dealers, roaches and rats. The property had a detrimental effect on the community.

The property owner buys troubled slum properties and converts them into high end quality projects. The owner has been working on the interior improvements and would like to change the exterior of the building as well as the reputation of the property. Rebranding the building would create energy and excitement with bright, vibrant paint colors. Surrounding buildings in the area are painted with similar colors. Tempe is all about art, excitement and innovation. The proposed colors are compatible with the surroundings.

Crystal Sheppard, Architect compared the proposed colors to the colors approved at 1010 East Lemon Street. The proposed building colors were compared in context of the proposed trees and plants to be used in the landscape plan. The proposed trees included Sonoran Desert Museum Palo Verde, Sisoo, Chinese Red Pistache and Caesalpinia Cacalaco trees that pick up the vibrant green and bright red of the building paint palette. The base paint proposed for the building would be grey. The vibrant colors would be accent colors. The entry of the building would be red to draw attention as a focal point. The large walls on the end of the property would be painted green to match the accented green on the balconies. If the Commission does not agree to the large walls being painted green, grey may also be an option for the paint color to reduce the amount of the green being used.

Commissioner Spears thanked Ms. Sheppard for providing the landscape plans.

Vice Chair Kent stated he saw green painted on the wall of the property when he drove by. He asked if the color was a sample of the paint being proposed.

Ms. Sheppard stated the green color is a sample of the paint being proposed. A color analysis was done before a paint color suggestion was presented to the property owner. It is important to select paint color in the natural daylight it will be viewed in.

Vice Chair Kent stated it looks like the detail of the color changes on the corrugated metal railings.

Ms. Sheppard stated the color change would take advantage of the assets the property has. This would vary the pattern across the elevation. The proposed colors are dynamic and energetic and would refresh the building.

Chair Webb asked what percentage of the building would be painted green if the large walls were painted green as well as the accents.

Ms. Sheppard stated the green would be painted on approximately 40%-50% of the building.

Chair Webb asked Ms. Sheppard if she knew what percentage of green is being used for 1010 East Lemon Street.

Ms. Sheppard stated she did not know the percentage of green being used at 1010 East Lemon. The property has a variety of accent colors.

Commissioner Barger stated he loves the vibrancy of the building as well as the proposed landscape plans. He asked what the time frame would be between painting the building and the completing the landscape.

Ms. Sheppard stated the landscape plan would be started as soon as it is approved by Ms. Kaminski.

There was no public comment.

Vice Chair Kent asked staff if the colors referenced in the neighborhood were approved.

Ms. Kaminski stated all of the paint colors were not approved. Not everyone goes through the approval process before painting their building.

Chair Webb stated it may be a little misleading to say the proposed colors go with the colors of the community.

Ms. Kaminski stated those colors are all in the environment, but they have not all gone through a planning entitlement process.

Commissioner Spears asked if the colors for the Cabana were approved.

Ms. Kaminski believed the colors for the Cabana on McClintock Drive and Don Carlos were approved after the fact. The art work was added later.

Vice Chair Kent asked if the Cabana on Mill Avenue and Baseline Road went through the same process.

Mr. Abrahamson stated the paint colors for the Cabana on Mill Avenue and Baseline Road was approved by Staff.

Commissioner Tinsley stated she like the project.

Commissioner Barger believes the project will do a lot to activate the area. The colors are contemporary colors that are seen all throughout the valley. He likes the combination of citrus colors. The colors are a nice accent in the middle of the student core. He feels this is a great proposal, especially with the accents of proposed landscape around the outside areas of the building.

Vice Chair Kent asked Commissioner Barger and Commissioner Tinsley if they are referring to greener of the two proposals.

Commissioner Barger and Commissioner Tinsley stated they were referring to the greener of the two proposals.

Vice Chair Kent stated people have the right to do what they want to do. He is not totally in favor of the greener

proposal. He prefers the proposal with the grey on the large walls at the end. He applauds the property owner for remodeling but feels the green would look better in small doses.

Chair Webb stated 1010 East Lemon was a unique project. The green was a great accent piece and the project fit that corner. He feels painting 40% of this particular building green as an accent color is too much. He could go along with the grey/green version.

Commissioner Spears stated artwork would be painted on one of the walls. The wall would not be green; it would have a mural of some sort.

Commissioner Collett stated the mural may have a lot of green in it. He feels the proposal contains too much green.

Commissioner Thornton wanted to than thank everyone for coming back tonight and for the great presentation. She stated she likes the green.

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Thornton, the Commission with a vote of 4-3 (Chair Webb, Vice Chair Kent, and Commissioner Collett opposed) approved this Development Plan Review for **CAMPUS POINT APARTMENTS (PL130283)** in the green on green version as recommended in the staff report subject to the conditions of approval.

- 
4. Request for a Development Plan Review consisting of a building modification for **ASH PROPERTY RESURRECTION (PL110362)**, located at 959 South Ash Avenue. The applicant is James Hann Design.

STAFF REPORT: [DRCr\\_AshPropertyResurrection\\_111213](#)

This case was presented by Ryan Levesque and represented by James Hann, James Hann Design. The request for Ash Property Resurrection consists of a building material change. The original change included a modification of the Hardie vertical plank and horizontal shiplap siding material to stucco, for a portion of Unit D and the east (alley) elevation for Units B, C, D, and E. Staff has received a few public comments and letters of non-support regarding the request of the material change. The applicant is now asking the Commission for approval of an alternate material that was part of the original material palette, which is the vertical batten board siding. This siding would provide the same vertical elements that would exist on the buildings in the front. There would be a combination of vertical batten board as well as the horizontal lap siding material. Staff is in support of the material change as proposed.

James Hann stated they are looking for a revision to the existing exterior materials. The intent on this project was to create some individuality to each of the units. Once they had the material in hand it wasn't as nice as they thought it would be. The owner intended to upgrade the material quality. Initially this change was proposed with the use of stucco. The building was originally stucco and it seemed to be in good context with fitting everything else in. Stucco is energy efficient and the rear of the project is basically an alley area. This project is not in the nicest part of town. A tremendous amount of graffiti was put on the storage pod that was stored at this site for approximately two months. Stucco was considered on the alley side strictly for a maintenance standpoint. Stucco is relatively easy to paint over and clean up. Hardy plank is challenging to maintain. It is unfortunate that stucco has a reputation for being a cheap material. Due to the resistance against stucco they are now proposing board and batten along with the Hardie plank material.

Commissioner Barger stated he would have been opposed to the stucco and would have tried to come up with an alternative solution. He believes the board and batten version gives the vertical accent that is desired. The material is a good alternative to the site.

---

On a motion by Commissioner Collett and seconded by Commissioner Spears, the Commission with a vote of 7-0 approved this Development Plan Review for **ASH PROPERTY RESURRECTION (PL110362)**, as recommended by staff with the modified conditions of approval.

5. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – No announcements.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 p.m.

Prepared by: Julie Stennerson, Executive Assistant

Reviewed by: Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner



---

Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner