



Minutes of the Development Review Commission March 27, 2018

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

Present:

Chair Linda Spears
Vice Chair David Lyon
Commissioner Thomas Brown
Commissioner Philip Amorosi
Commissioner Andrew Johnson
Commissioner Michael DiDomenico
Alternate Commissioner Nicholas Labadie

Absent:

Commissioner Scott Sumners
Alternate Commissioner Angela Thornton
Alternate Commissioner Barbara Lloyd

City Staff Present:

Chad Weaver, Community Development Director
Ryan Levesque, Comm. Dev. Deputy Director - Planning
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner
Cynthia Jarrad, Administrative Assistant

Hearing convened at 6:00 pm. and was called to order by Chair Linda Spears.

Consideration of Meeting Minutes:

The following Agenda items #1 and #2 were considered together.

- 1) Study Session Minutes, March 13, 2018
- 2) Regular Meeting Minutes, March 13, 2018
MOTION: Motion made by Vice Chair Lyon to approve Study Session and Regular Meeting Minutes for March 13, 2018. Seconded by Commissioner Amorosi.
VOTE: Motion passes, 4-0, with Commissioners Johnson, DiDomenico, and Labadie in abstention

Consent Agenda:

The following item was considered on Consent Agenda.:

- 3) Request a Development Plan Review for 2,835 square-feet of additions to two existing commercial buildings for **RURAL & BROADWAY COMMERCIAL**, located at 737 East Broadway Road. The applicant is Jammonstudios. (PL180007)
MOTION: Motion made by Commissioner DiDomenico to approve **PL18007**. Seconded by Commissioner Johnson.
VOTE: Motion passes, 7-0.

- 4) Request an appeal of the February 6, 2018 Hearing Officer's decision to approve two use permits to allow entertainment (indoor) and a bar (Series 6) for **5th ST PREPARED FOOD MARKET & BAR**, located at 24 West 5th Street. The appellant is Mark Davis on behalf of the Hayden Square Condominiums. **(PL180006)**

Chair Spears reminded the Commission that this is a Quasi-Judicial item, and the Commission will be evaluating the case based on the five criteria for a Use Permit only, per the Zoning and Development Code (ZDC).

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner, gave a presentation. He stated that 5TH St Prepared Food Market & Bar intends to operate on the northeast corner South Maple Ave and W 5th St in the CC, City Center District, and within the TOD, Transportation Overlay District.

- On February 6, 2018 the Hearing Officer heard and approved a Use Permit to allow entertainment (indoor) and a bar (Series 6).
- The site consists of a 18,552 s.f. lot with a building area of 12,008 s.f.. The total indoor floor area, consisting of two floors, is approximately 11,419 s.f. The outdoor bar area and patio totals approximately 3,403 s.f. The uses require 19 parking spaces while 29 are provided.
- The restaurant hours of operation are proposed from 6am to 2am, daily; and the bar hours of operation are proposed from 10am to 2am, weekdays, and 8am to 2am, weekends.
- Prior to the original hearing, staff received inquiries from two property owners at Hayden Square Condominiums, one of which was the appellant, Mr. Davis. At the hearing two members of the neighborhood spoke in support of the use permit requests; however, one did have concern about the potential noise since his patio faces the venue. Mr. Davis and Michael Mueller, provided their letter in opposition to the Hearing Officer and spoke in opposition.
- On February 16, 2018, an appeal to the Hearing Officer's decision was submitted by appellant, Mark. A. Davis on the following grounds:
- The hearing officer stated on record that he did not read their complete letter and therefore their concerns as the direct neighbor were not incorporated into the decision.
- The applicant attended the homeowner's association meeting on February 7th and refused to address the specific issues addressed in the letter.
- On record, while answering the Hearing Officer's question about the use of the proposed 2nd story north double doors, the applicant mischaracterized the doors as the "Emergency Exits" wherein the site plan clearly defines the doors at Main Entrance.
- To date, staff has received phone calls from two Hayden Square Condominium HOA Board Members. Both expressed concern potential noise concerns with patrons entering/existing second floor using the proposed exterior stairs on NEC of the building. A concern was also expressed in regard to the outdoor speakers, but both believe that the building itself will shield noise away from the condos.
- A decision by the Commission to approve either appeal will have the effect of overturning the Hearing Officer's decision; thus, denying the use permits. A decision to deny either appeal will have the effect of upholding the Hearing Officer's decision; thus, maintaining approval of the use permits.

PRESENTATION BY APPELLANT:

Mr. Mark Davis, the appellant, gave a presentation. He stated there may have been a miscommunication, but he understood that the Hayden Square Homeowner's Association (HOA) is the body that filed the appeal, he only administered it. He asked the Chair to acknowledge that the appellant was Hayden Square HOA, so that they could present, and she declined to do so. He stated that he wished to make it clear that he is here on behalf of the Hayden Square Homeowner's Association. Mr. Davis went on to state that there are five issues they have with the Hearing Officer's decision to approve the Use Permit. All of the five are tied to the fact that the active area of the proposed project is in too close proximity to the condo owners. The proposed changes of utilizing the second floor as a nightclub rather than office space is an intensification of use. Their building is built inexpensively with stucco, two-by-fours and single pane glass, and therefore they hear everything outdoors

at Hayden Square. The concerned citizens living here would like conditions added so their HOA has a good commercial use next to their good residential use. They would like to limit the entertainment use hours during the week only, not on the weekend, the main concern being noise later into the night. They would like to see no outside speakers, similar to "The Cabin" establishment which is also nearby. The Cabin removed their outside speakers after complaints and a letter to the City was filed. They would like to see the applicant provide outside security when patrons are exiting the bar so as to ensure orderly conduct, reduce the possibility of vandalism or unruly behavior. They would also request that trash be held within the building and disposed of in the morning, to further reduce the noise that is generated at a 2am closing time. Lastly, the second-floor main entrance double doors that have a 6- to 8-foot wide opening should be moved to the east side of the building from the north. They had hoped to avoid having to file an appeal, but the applicant would not meet with them and talk about creative solutions to the existing problems, therefore they decided to file.

Commissioner DiDomenico inquired if Mr. Davis was both a homeowner and a board member. Mr. Davis responded he owned a unit there which he rents out, and he is also a board member and the treasurer of the HOA.

Vice Chair Lyon asked Mr. Davis if he had any brief comments on the City's five criteria for Use Permits. Mr. Davis responded that number one, regarding vehicular traffic, they do not have an issue with. They actually benefit from increased vehicular traffic because they own part of the parking garage below, so more parking revenue is good. Number two, regarding nuisance arising from emission odor, dust, gas, vibration. Yes, this is a problem, as the thumping of the beats will only be intensified. This issue with noise bleeds into criteria three through five as well, as noise and surrounding issues with another bar would definitely downgrade the property values of Hayden Square. He stated that the preponderance of units there are now owned, not rented.

Commissioner Brown asked of Mr. Davis regarding the five requests he spoke of and outlined in the letter he wrote and signed on March 15, 2018, if those items were agreed to, would he give the project the thumbs up? Mr. Davis responded that was correct.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Michael Mueller stated that he is the Vice President of Hayden Square and a resident of Hayden Square as well. He has lived there and served on the board as president for 12 years, and been on the board for about 25 years. He stated that the Chair has stated he cannot speak on behalf of the HOA, but they did all vote on the letter that was submitted by Mr. Davis, and they believed they were appealing as the HOA. Although each resident has a little bit different view, he fields many ongoing complaints. Personally, his main complaint is the double doors on the north side, and the staircase on the north side. He stated Officer Ryan Conway with Tempe Police Department, upon review of the original blueprints, wrote a letter saying this stair well would not be acceptable. Mr. Mueller had reached out to the owner/developer, asking if the stair well could be relocated, that would mean a world of difference to the community. He stated that is his major concern.

Mr. Bryce Buchanan stated that he is also a resident and owner, and he has worked together with 20 owners in the building in addition to enhancing properties, he is a real estate agent. He believes arts and entertainment are inevitably coming to this area, and he is in favor of what is happening. "The Cabin" establishment has set a bad precedent in regard to noise levels, but he believes this proposed project will be a great amenity for this vacant building. The building is a concrete structure, and noise does not travel on the interior. Given the changes that have been proposed for the patio sound, he thinks it could be something great.

Mr. Charlie Rockwell stated that he lives about 30 yards away from the proposed project, and has since 1990. He highly recommends this project, as everyone who lives in this area knows they live in an entertainment district. "The Cabin" is only about 15 feet from about half of the Hayden Square condos, and residents in the area are already used to hearing music at night. He knows the developer, who has other businesses in Tempe, and those businesses have always followed regulations. The building being vacant is detrimental as well, as people park there for a few minutes to get a cup of coffee at Starbucks and when they come back their car has been towed. He watches this happen all day. Having a tenant in the building would be great, he thinks it is a beautiful project and hopes that the Commission will approve it.

Mr. Anthony Rice stated he rents in this area, and he is aware the surroundings are loud. He agrees that the board of this HOA has come up with some good solutions that may help the two entities to coexist a bit better. He agrees that weekday evenings should be quieter than weekends.

Mr. Van O'Steen stated that he believes people have been misled by the name of this establishment. It makes you think that it is actually a restaurant, but it is not, it is a nightclub and bar. He believes that integrity is important, and this proposal has lacked integrity, as many thought this would be a quiet location for food and drinks as opposed to a place with amplification and late hours.

Mr. Frank Moore stated he has lived across the street from this development for quite some time, and has two young sons who live there as well. He agrees that there is confusion over the name of the proposed project. With concern about the noise, he looked up the noise ordinance and spoke to the City's Code Compliance department. The conditional use permit for this establishment would not override the noise ordinance. Is no one measuring the noise levels? He agrees that the double doors make a big difference, and believes the conditions suggested by the HOA are good ideas. He is concerned about too much noise, especially during the week.

Mr. Conor Favre stated that he is with the 5th Street Prepared Food company, and he wanted to make clear that it will be a restaurant, serving high end organic foods that should fit the community. It is not just a nightclub. Commissioner Brown inquired what types of food would be served, Mr. Favre responded that is still in development, but most probably will be burgers, salads, sandwiches, etc.

Mr. Shawn Erickson stated he was also speaking on behalf of the company, and he has worked for this owner/developer for several years. He attested that the owner is very caring about dealing with neighbors, and has an impeccable record of doing so with other projects, such as Shady Park. He stated they did reach out to be a liaison to the HOA group.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

Mr. Charles Huellmantel stated that once an appeal is filed, the process needs to continue, but there have been some changes made to the design in response to the neighbor's concerns. This proposed project will be in a former telecommunications building, and therefore there are 16-inch thick block walls. He acknowledged that the original plan was for offices on the second floor, but the owner has changed his mind about that over time. He pointed out that the west side of the project faces the neighborhood in question. The original use permit allowed for the patio on the west side, but they have since moved it to the east side. They have moved the 2nd floor main entrance double doors to the east side, and have met with police and building services, etc. The stair well is also being moved, and it will be monitored. As to limiting hours of trash collection, they should not be the only business in the area that has to do this, and they also need to be compliant with the Health Department and City schedules for trash pickup. They are willing to work with Staff on this, but it would apply to all surrounding buildings as well, because trash pickup is on a certain schedule in a certain area. As to limiting outdoor speakers, the second floor does not have outdoor speakers, the bottom floor does, but again, that is now at the east end and speakers are pointing down, not out. It is not right to hold this applicant to regulations that are not consistent with the surrounding similar businesses. As to providing professional security as patrons leave, City of Tempe Police Officer Conway states that is not allowable, as outdoors is the City police department's jurisdiction. The applicant is happy to work with police on this issue, but it is not the owner's purview to take care of this aspect.

Chair Spears asked for clarification that currently, condition #6 states that "entertainment shall take place inside only." That would mean there would be no live entertainment outside. Also, condition #3 states "use permits will be reviewed after six months." Does the applicant agree that this is the case? Mr. Huellmantel stated that was correct.

Commissioner DiDomenico asked if his understanding was correct, that the hours of operation proposed by the applicant and the hours preferred by the neighbors are not really very far off from one another. Mr. Huellmantel agreed, but stated weekend hours should stay the same as everyone else in the area. They are not willing to limit their hours when the

entertainment takes place on the inside, so it should not affect people outside. Commissioner DiDomenico stated he was thinking more of the noise as patrons come and go, not so much the noise inside.

Commissioner Johnson asked about the neighbor's trash pickup request, he did not think that had been answered. Mr. Huellmantel stated that is difficult to answer without knowing specific answers as to whether trash can be stored in a building for several hours, which would be a Health Department question, and when the City picks up trash in that area, etc. They are willing to work with staff on this question, and the owner definitely wants to be in compliance, but that is not a question that can be answered currently.

Commissioner Brown stated that he believes emptying trash at 2:00 am is a very noisy operation, and he thinks it would be reasonable for the trash to be held for a few hours to coincide with morning hours. The City picking up the dumpster is not the issue. He does not think that because other bars in the area empty trash and contribute to noise levels in the wee hours, is a reason to do it here, and he believes using the time the City picks up the trash as an excuse is a bit disingenuous. Just because other bars are noisemakers does not mean this one needs to be as well. Mr. Huellmantel disagreed and stated that the times are relevant, not an excuse. He did not mean to imply that they believe they should be allowed to make noise just because others do. He and Commissioner Brown continued to speak about what was "on the table" this evening for a vote, as the outside speakers are on the first floor only, and that is not a part of this appeal, only the second floor is.

Chair Spears interjected that the Commission can only take into consideration the five criteria for Use Permits, as she stated before. This is quasi-judicial, and frankly that is why the applicant could not address the neighbor's concerns at the neighborhood meeting or after that.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Labadie stated he believes this project easily meets the criteria for a Use Permit. This is in downtown, city center, Mill Avenue area. He hears the neighbor's concerns, but this is appropriate for the site. What better building could this use be in, with almost no windows and incredibly thick walls. The neighbors live in this area, and it is part of what they accept when they choose to live there. Many of the concessions have been made, and the neighbors and applicant are not too far off from one another. He also raised the concern that he does not think it is possible to limit hours of operation for this business beyond what other businesses are limited to in this area, and that no one can say with certainty that the Health Department would allow a business to hold onto trash overnight. Therefore, he does not feel that either of these items could be conditioned without certainty.

Commissioner DiDomenico stated the Commission is also unable to add more conditions of approval, as this is an appeal. He has heard what concessions have been made for the neighbors, and he agrees they are voting utilizing only the five criteria.

MOTION: Motion made by Vice Chair Lyon to deny the Appeal of the Hearing Officer's decision for **PL180006 - 5th ST PREPARED FOOD MARKET & BAR**. Seconded by Commissioner Labadie.

VOTE: Motion passes, 7-0.

- 5) Request a Zoning Map Amendment from R-4 TOD (Multi-Family Residential General, Transportation Overlay District) to MU-4 (Mixed-Use, High Density) and a Planned Area Development Overlay on approximately 1.59 acres; an Amended Planned Area Development Overlay on approximately 4.31 acres; and a Development Plan Review for a new 5.9 acre, three- and four-story, mixed-use development to include 259 dwelling units and commercial uses for **METRO 101**, located at 2177 East Apache Boulevard. The applicant is Huellmantel & Affiliates. **(PL170300)**

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Ms. Karen Stovall, Senior Planner, gave a presentation on the project. These requests are for the properties located at the southwest corner of the Loop 101 Freeway and Apache. Phase I of Metro 101, which is adjacent to Apache, is currently zoned MU-4 PAD TOD. This phase received zoning and design approval in January 2017 for a mixed-use project within three buildings. Phase II, which is adjacent to Wildermuth, is currently zoned R-4 TOD.

She shared the site plan and stated:

- The proposal includes three requests:
 - A Zoning Map Amendment for the 1.59 acres of Phase II from R-4 TOD to MU-4.
 - An Amended Planned Area Development Overlay on the entire 5.9-acre site to establish development standards for density, building height, lot coverage, landscape area, setbacks, and parking ratios.
 - Development Plan Review for three new buildings as well as exterior modifications to the three previously approved buildings.
- The requests would result in a total of 259 dwelling units within 6 buildings, at a density of 44 du/ac.
- The three previously approved buildings on Phase I would remain.
- In Phase I, the applicant proposes the addition of 2 two-story carriage buildings, labeled Buildings 5 and 6 on this plan, containing a total of 6 units. One building is located adjacent to the west property line, and one is located in the center of the project.
- In Phase II, the applicant requests the addition of one three-story building, containing 54 units.
- She stated that staff is proposing a condition of approval as follows:
 - On Buildings 2, 4, and 6, our recommendation includes a condition to require steel awnings instead of fabric awnings where they are shown on the south and west elevations. The intent is to use an awning material that will better withstand the intense heat of the summer sun and require less frequent replacement.
- She shared Building 4, 5 and 6 elevations and additional conditions of approval proposed by staff as follows:
 - Another condition requires the addition of steel awnings above windows on the first floor of Building 4 and second floor of Building 6 where they are not currently provided. The intent here is to require that dwelling unit windows on the south and west elevations have exterior solar controls to reduce heat gain. On the south elevation of Building 4, this would create a window treatment consistent with the upper-level windows, as they all face the public street.
 - The next set of conditions pertain to the carriage Buildings 5 and 6, requiring a 3' high ground face CMU base. This will create a consistent design theme among the six buildings and protect the base of these buildings from damage, since they will have vehicles maneuvering directly adjacent to those walls.
 - The last unique condition is to require that rooftop drain pipes are internally piped. This is a standard condition for all new development; however, we agree that drain pipes internal to the courtyard created in the center of Buildings 1, 2, and 3, and not visible from the perimeter of the project or parking areas, may be external. The applicant is proposing external drains on the carriage Buildings 5 and 6.
- Staff is recommending approval of all three requests, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report and with the modification discussed at the study session. This is a modification to DPR condition #13, which should read: "On Building 2, fabric awnings shown on the second, third, and fourth floors of the south and west elevations shall be replaced with steel awnings."

Vice Chair Lyon asked Ms. Stovall to clarify the "loss" of the fifth floor of Building 1, the addition of Buildings 5 and 6, and adding an additional three units. Ms. Stovall stated the original plan under Phase 1 had a fifth floor containing 3 units on Building 1, and Buildings 5 and 6 were not planned. At the administrative level, it was approved to remove that floor. The applicant is now requesting to add six units total with the addition of Buildings 5 and 6. This change was owner-driven as a construction cost saving effort, not requested by the City.

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Mr. Charles Huellmantel stated this is an unusual case on a tough site. It sits at Apache and the Loop 101, and it is the first of Tempe's workforce housing projects. Between the approval of Phase 1 and now, there has also been land added to the

site, as the neighbor behind them, which had been a recycling center, has sold the property to this developer. Therefore there are now additional buildings added to the site. Being a workforce housing project, it is a cost-driven product. They have worked with staff for many months coming up with solutions, and currently they agree with staff on about 98% of the conditions. There are a few items on which there is still disagreement: the developer does not want to add metal awnings nor change fabric to metal in the areas specified; they do not wish to provide internal roof drains; and they wish to provide less ground face concrete masonry units (CMU) on Buildings 5 and 6.

Commissioner DiDomenico inquired what is the applicant's position on interior drains. Mr. Huellmantel replied that they can be very problematic, and they would like to have them integrated into the exterior of the building.

Commissioner Johnson inquired, in regard to Building 6, stipulation #15 and #16, is the number of windows actually 4, and they would be required to have steel awnings? That did not seem to him that it would be a significant cost. Mr. Huellmantel stated that was correct, but went on to say on the overall project, it is a much more significant number, it is actually a total of 40 locations where they are asking to remove the steel awnings and replace them with canvas. They wish to be required to use steel awnings only on the units facing Apache and Price, as they understand the need for a more expensive and estimated design at the street front, but to use canvas awnings on the remaining windows in the project. That alone will save the project approximately \$200,000.

Chair Spears asked staff if there was information about heat generated from metal awnings, especially in a courtyard area. Ms. Stovall stated that staff has not done research on the impact of heat, but none of the conditions in the report require metal awnings in a courtyard area, they are all fully exposed on either the south or west elevations. The suggestion of metal awnings is driven by the desire for durability.

Commissioner Brown asked if the applicant knew the life span of canvas awnings. When Mr. Huellmantel responded they last about 10 years, Commissioner Brown asked if they would then be replaced, and Mr. Huellmantel stated they would be. Also, the windows are insulated glass and these will be individually metered units.

Vice Chair Lyon asked if there were elevations of Buildings 5 and 6. Mr. Huellmantel replied that they did not have those, but they are essentially the same design.

Commissioner DiDomenico stated that in his experience, canvas awnings do not hold up and they need to be cleaned frequently, which voids the warranty. The association would need to take care of these awnings, and that does not always happen as it should. He believes that having no awnings on the interior buildings would be better than canvas. He also agreed that interior drains can be problematic from time to time, and wondered why staff is encouraging drainage inside. He feels that if it is not seen by the public anyway, it can be on the exterior.

Chair Spears added that she likes the look of exterior drains as well. They can have an industrial, modern look.

Vice Chair Lyon stated that since elevations of Buildings 5 and 6 are absent tonight, his worry is that they may be sub-par. He is unsure of whether these carriage buildings are a good way to add units. Mr. Huellmantel responded that it is true the best-looking buildings are at the street front. However, the Council directive was to put in as much workforce housing as possible, at the most affordable rate. Those buildings/units are not designed to be the best, that is why they are in the back, and it is frankly about doing what they needed to do to control costs.

Chair Spears inquired if workforce housing rental rates are about 75% of the standard rate and Mr. Huellmantel replied that they were.

Commissioner Brown asked if the project would be rent-controlled. Mr. Huellmantel replied that rents will be regulated as part of the stipulation that is in the packet tonight. They have not entered into that agreement with the City yet, but they are continuing to work with staff and the City Attorney on that.

Commissioner Brown agreed that external drain pipes can be a great feature, but on this project he is concerned about where they are situated right between garage doors. This will become a maintenance issue, as they will be hit by cars, etc.

Commissioner Labadie asked about Buildings 5 and 6, are they one-bedroom or what? Mr. Huellmantel stated they are 2-bedroom units. Commissioner Labadie stated he likes the carriage house concept, and these units have a garage as well, he believes having the additional building space is a better choice than having additional parking lot space.

Commissioner Amorosi stated he wished to commend the developer for creating workforce housing, with the many restrictions that come along with it. Construction costs are skyrocketing, and trailer parks in Tempe are "going away." He believes this will be a good project, even with the "less attractive" units. He believes the market is there for these to easily sell, and he also believes the canvas awnings would be a very acceptable choice.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the applicant could again clarify with which stipulations they disagree. Mr. Huellmantel stated they are in disagreement with conditions DPR 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18. Commissioner Johnson then stated that he also believes there will be a market for Buildings 5 and 6, and he believes conditions 13, 14, 15 16 should be left as is, not removed. He is unsure about the drains (DPR condition 22), and thinks internal drains should be fine if they are done properly.

Commissioner Labadie asked for clarification that the applicant wanted conditions 13 through 16 eliminated completely. Mr. Huellmantel replied that was correct.

Ms. Dasgupta clarified for the Commission that DPR condition #13 is referring to the metal awnings that are not in the interior courtyard but on the South and West elevations as proposed by the applicant for Phase 1 and approved with the Phase 1 project. The applicant is now seeking to remove those awnings. Mr. Huellmantel agreed that was true, they had agreed to those before, and quite frankly the price of steel has increased dramatically since the initial phase.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Vice Chair Lyon stated that he feels this is a good project and he will support it.

Commissioner DiDomenico stated he would like to see DPR condition #22 removed to let the roof drainage systems be designed external to the buildings. Wherever there are awnings, he would like to see them metal, and he does not mind losing fabric awnings anywhere else on the project.

Chair Spears stated she would rather see no awnings than fabric ones. She thinks it gives it a much more modern look, and since there are insulated windows, she does not think they serve a great purpose. She is also concerned with heat issues related to all those metal awnings.

MOTION: Motion made by Commissioner DiDomenico to approve **PL170300 - METRO 101** with conditions of approval as proposed in the packet, with the amendment as read by staff for (DPR 180034) condition #13; removal of DPR condition #22; and amendment of DPR condition #18 to change the words "four elevations" to "three elevations". Motion seconded by Vice Chair Lyon.

VOTE: Motion passes, 7-0.

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Commissioner DiDomenico stated there was recently a first-year music festival called the "Innings Festival" downtown, and it was fantastic and well-run. He encourages everyone to attend next year so that it can continue and grow.

Chair Spears stated that she would like it on record that the Commission had discussed at Study Session this evening the issue of their personal email addresses being published by the City for use by what is essentially a lobbying group. Members of the Commission have mixed feelings, some do not really care, and some have strong feelings against it. If the City is going to do share their email addresses, the Commission requests that the City issue to Commission members City email addresses so they are not bombarded by requests from other lobbying groups who would request that information.

Commissioner DiDomenico stated he agrees, and it is particularly problematic for those Commissioners who have their work email on file with the City Clerk's office, as this would now mean their business and professional lives may also be intertwined with Commission related business.

Commissioner Amorosi agreed with Chair Spears.

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Ms. Dasgupta reviewed the agenda for the April 10, 2018 Development Review Commission meeting. There are currently four items on the agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:01 pm.

Prepared by: Cynthia Jarrad



Reviewed by:
Suparna Dasgupta
Principal Planner, Community Development Planning