



Minutes of the Development Review Commission May 22, 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 Scott Sumners
Commissioner Michael DiDomenico
Commissioner Andrew Johnson

Absent:

Alternate Commissioner Barbara Lloyd
Alternate Commissioner Nicholas Labadie
Alternate Commissioner Angela Thornton

City Staff Present:

Chad Weaver, Community Development Director
Ryan Levesque, Comm. Dev. Deputy Director - Planning
Ambika Adhikari, Principal Planner
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner
Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner
Hunter Hansen, Project Management Coordinator
Robbie Aaron, Planner II
Cynthia Jarrad, Administrative Assistant

Hearing convened at 6:03 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, April 24, 2018
- 2) Regular Meeting Minutes, April 24, 2018

MOTION: Motion made by Commissioner DiDomenico to approve Study Session and Regular Meeting Minutes for April 24, 2018. Seconded by Commissioner Amorosi.

VOTE: Motion passes, 7-0

- 4) Request a Planned Area Development Overlay; a Use Permit to allow vehicle sales (indoor) in GID zoning district; and a Development Plan Review for a new 3-story, 252,335 square-foot industrial building for **PRECISION FLEET SERVICES**, located at 360 South Smith Road. The applicant is Cawley Architects. **(PL180002)**

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner, gave a presentation. He stated, regarding location and zoning, that:

- Precision Fleet Services is a licensed car dealer that operates a dealership on three parcels using the common address of 1941 E. 3rd Street, located in the GID, General Industrial District. The project site consists of 3 non-subdivided parcels east of South Perry Lane, south of East 3rd Street, and west of South Smith Rd.

- The current dealership with its offices, buildings, and other improvements, sits primarily on two of the smaller parcels fronting South Perry Lane. A small portion of the active dealership utilizes the larger parcel to the east for access and for a portion of the building improvements, except for the pavement and fencing. The larger parcel is the site of the new development and is currently used as overflow parking for vehicles from the existing facility.

He went on to explain the applicant is requesting the following entitlements:

- On August 8, 2017, the Development Review Commission approved a use permit and development plan review for an earlier design of tonight's request. The previous design consisted of 161,168 square feet of ground and lower-level warehouse/garage, and 13,106 square feet of above-ground two-story office.
- The project's new design is now a 266,485 square foot industrial building consisting of 14,150 square feet of two-story office, and 252,335 square feet of three-story warehouse/garage.
- The applicant is requesting a Planned Area Development Overlay to increase the maximum building height from 35 feet to 55 feet to maximize the presentation, storage and effective sales of their vehicle inventory.
 - The height of the office section parapet is primarily 33'-10" tall with exception of the main entrance tower section which sits at 38'-10" tall.
 - The height of the warehouse/garage section parapet is primarily 46'-4" tall with the exceptions of the stairwell/elevator towers which stand at 52'-10" tall, and the upper-level ramp and screen along the north elevation, which stands at 54'-4" tall.
- A new use permit is required for the new design because of the additional floor area of the proposed vehicle sales use, as well as a new Development Plan Review.
- The dealership is considered a traditional car lot but offers online sales as well as wholesale sales to other dealers. Inventory is typically obtained through trade-ins, wholesale purchases from other dealers and auctions. The dealership will operate from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on weekdays and from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on Saturdays. It employs some office staff, mechanics, service people, sales people, and administrative staff. Currently, approximately 30 individuals work at Precision and that is expected to increase by 50% with this expansion.

Regarding the site plan:

- The building will be positioned lengthwise along East 3rd Street and setback 25 ft. from 3rd Street and Smith Road. The office portion and main entrance will be located along Smith, while the warehouse area will primarily front 3rd Street. New driveways are provided on the west end of the 3rd Street frontage and the south end of the Smith Road frontage. Surface parking is setback 25 ft. from the streets and provided along the south and west of the building. A rolling vehicle gate will be provided at the 3rd Street driveway and the refuse enclosures will be located south of the warehouse/garage.

Regarding elevations and floor plans:

- The primary building material consists of tilt-up concrete panels.
 - Architectural interest is primarily provided along the perimeter of the office section along Smith, where four tones of gray are applied to the façade.
 - Horizontal and vertical reveal patterns will be created within the concrete tilt panels to allow for color variation; vertical bands will be provided to reduce the horizontal length and provide undulation along the parapet.
 - Large clear windows are provided at the two-story main entrance and adorned with yellow metal awnings.

- Windows are provided along the perimeter of the office section on the first and second floors. Clerestory windows are provided throughout the perimeter of the garage/warehouse to offer natural daylight into the building. The perimeter of the warehouse/garage has emergency exits about every tilt-up panel, and roll-up doors are evenly distributed on the south elevation with one provided on the west. All doors along the perimeter of the warehouse/garage are to be painted to match their respective background primary color.
- An extension of the parapet is provided on the north elevation to screen the enclosed ramp leading to the open-air third level of the warehouse/garage. This portion of the extended parapet will be adorned with an architectural screening feature consisting of perforated metal with a minimum of 1" openings, painted to match the primary accent color of the building.

Regarding the landscape plan:

- Approximately 31,161 square feet of landscape area will be provided, equating to a coverage of 19.8%. Twenty-one trees will be installed along the street frontage in addition to the nine existing street trees.
- The landscape vegetation consists of three species of trees and eight ground cover.
 - The tree palette consists of Desert Museum Palo Verde, Sisso, and Swan Hill.
 - The ground cover palette consists of Mexican Bird of Paradise, Orange Jubilee, Red Yucca, Desert Spoon, Baha Ruellia, Gold Mount Lantana, Trailing Rosemary, and Blue Elf Aloe.
 - All landscape surfaces will be covered with half-inch Madison Gold decomposed granite, two inches deep, and accented with three by three by three-foot granite boulders along the landscaped frontage areas.

Mr. Jimenez then explained that:

- A neighborhood meeting is required and was held on April 11, 2018 from 6 to 7pm at Precision Fleet Services' existing facility, located at 1941 East 3rd Street.
- The meeting was held as a group presentation with a Q&A segment at the end.
- One person who owns two properties immediately south of the proposed site attended the meeting. He expressed his opposition to the proposed height and indicated that he may seek a legal protest to the project.
- To date, the only public input activity has been inquiries by the person in opposition and his legal counsel regarding the legal protest process.

Mr. Jimenez concluded by stating that, for further processing, the applicant will need approval for a Subdivision Plat to combine the parcels adjacent to the west and to move the western lot line of the new development. Also, as indicated in the Staff Report, staff believes that this application meets all of the approval criteria for the PAD, Use Permit, and Development Plan Review, and supports this request subject to the conditions provided in the report.

PRESENTATION BY APPLICANT:

Mr. David Fulk with Cawley Architects, Inc., the Project Director, and Mr. Chris Finn, the owner, then spoke briefly. Mr. Finn stated they have been in business since 2008, and they are looking forward to developing this entire property, not just the east side of the site. As mentioned, this will be an enclosed structure for vehicle sales. There will be rooftop parking, and the sales and corporate offices will be attached as well. He stated that the applicant is working to develop this project while also remaining a good neighbor, as their existing business has been operating just to the north and west of this site for many years. With this latest design, they have re-positioned the building further to the north, and toward Smith Road, to ensure more open space, distance between buildings and adequate circulation. The request for the variance in height is due to the garage and the height of the showroom space. The parapet is at 46 feet, 4 inches, which is only about six feet higher than

what is currently entitled. They have been cognizant of colors and pedestrian ways, landscaping, etc, in their design and have worked hard toward an appropriate and fitting building for this site.

Commissioner Amorosi inquired if photovoltaic cells could be incorporated as the building is constructed, so it is ready for solar. Mr. Fulk responded that he would have to confer with the owner on this, it is not being planned now, but he believes the conduit and wiring necessary could be added in the future without major issues.

Commissioner DiDomenico inquired if the showroom will be an air-conditioned space and Mr. Fulk responded that it will be evaporative cooled, not air-conditioned. They do not desire being a huge energy consumer, but they are also trying to work with an appropriate level of cooling.

Commissioner Brown inquired about the 24 feet between the ground floor and the second floor, and wondered why it was so high. Mr. Fulk responded that this was so the showroom does not have a garage feel, as well as for staff in the offices on the second floor to be able to see down into this area and into the garage.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. David Leyvas of Tempe stated that he owns the building directly south of this project, and that he is authorized to speak on behalf of the four parcels that are to the south of this proposed project. He and the others he represents are hoping to avoid a legal protest by coming to the hearing this evening, hoping to work out some issues. He commended the developer for a nice project, on a property that has been vacant for quite some time. Firstly, the brochure that went to the neighboring properties states the building will be 89,000 square feet, when in fact it will be over 250,000 square feet. This is misleading. Second is an issue with the height of this building. It is much higher than those of the surrounding area, and is higher than is allowed in General Industrial District zoning. Lastly, he is told there will consistently be 700 to 800 cars at this location, and there are already four or five different car dealerships in the area, with no accommodation for off-loading the vehicles from transports. Currently, most of the dealerships use the public streets. That is a big increase to be off-loaded onto public streets.

Commissioner Amorosi inquired of Mr. Leyvas what is the nature of his business. Mr. Leyvas responded that it is partially a door and trim business, and partially a vehicle service center. The other businesses there are an environmental clean-up business, Rango Honey, and to the east is an air-conditioning supply facility.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

Mr. David Fulk stated that the confusion over the number of square feet was not an attempt to mislead. The ground floor (footprint) is 89,000 square feet, but the total area of the building is closer to 250,000 square feet. Regarding the height, the construction documents will show 46 feet, 4 inches, matching the parapet height. Mr. Chris Finn stated that currently there are typically around 400 cars on the lot, and the off-loading occurs on 3rd Street. With this proposal, the number of cars will approximately double. The off-loading takes about 20-30 minutes and has not been a problem in the seven years at this location.

Commissioner Brown stated the applicant had mentioned they did not want it to feel like a parking garage. Do individuals test-drive cars there? Mr. Finn responded they do, they test-drive on the streets. Commissioner Brown stated that having the first floor four- to six-feet lower should not impact the garage "feel" that they are trying to avoid. Mr. Finn responded that was a matter of opinion, in his experience a 24- or 26-foot clear showroom looks great, and the lower heights do not look as appealing. Also, the lower you make the height, the more you limit potential for a warehousing use, if this building were to be sold in the future.

Vice-Chair Lyon inquired what the advantage of a closed building is, as opposed to an open garage. Mr. Finn replied that first and foremost was simply shopping for a new car in the summer, on an open lot. Cars stored inside are 30 to 40 degrees cooler, they stay cleaner, and it is a nicer presentation. Customers are able to touch door handles without burning their hands.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Summers stated he believes this building, at this height, is suitable in this zoning. He likes the project and knows revenue from auto sales is significant. He is happy to support.

Vice Chair Lyon agreed with Commissioner Summers, he believes the height is not a problem, it is consistent with the use. He believes it is a good business model as well. He wishes the northeast corner was a little more of a presentation, but that is not enough of a quibble to oppose the project. He will vote in favor.

Commissioner Brown stated he was surprised to hear off-loading onto the street was not a problem. He likes that the parking is behind the building, and he does not see why off-loading cannot take place in the applicant's own parking lot.

Chair Spears stated that she actually drives through this area and she has never noticed the off-loading. She believes it is common practice, and one sees it around car dealerships. She reminded Commissioner Brown that the Commission has approved other car dealerships.

Commissioner Brown then asked staff if every business is allowed to unload their lumber and their product on the street daily or weekly. Mr. Jimenez responded that this question would be better answered by Transportation, as far as what is allowed on a certain street type, time of day when merchandise is loaded, etc. He reminded the Commission that the site does have an actual use permit for this use already entitled.

Commissioner Johnson stated he appreciates the height and likes the idea that the applicant is trying to ensure the opportunity for reuse of this building in the future. As an example, this is not the case with the many parking garages in our community. He does not see many other future uses of parking garages. He will vote in favor.

Chair Spears added that she also appreciates the reuse aspect.

MOTION: Motion made by Vice Chair Lyon to approve **PL180002**. Motion seconded by Commissioner Summers.
VOTE: Motion passes, 6-1, with Commissioner Brown in the dissent.

- 5) Request a recommendation of design guidelines, placemaking principles, and character area maps for **CHARACTER AREA 3 PLAN** dated May 2018, which is generally bounded by the Loop 202, McClintock Drive, Broadway Road, and Priest Drive. The applicant is the City of Tempe. (**PL180134**)

PRESENTATION BY STAFF:

Mr. Hunter Hansen, Project Management Coordinator, gave a presentation. He thanked the members of the public that have been involved with the 2-year planning process for this Character Area. In early 2016, under Council direction, work began on the plan, coinciding with the conclusion of the Alameda and Apache Character Area Plans. This area is very different than those, currently with more than 34,000 people and 11,000 households. By 2040, city-wide, 83,000 new residents are expected, as well as 47,000 new jobs. Not all of that, of course, is projected within this planning area, but the lion's share of the growth will happen along the lake, in the downtown area, and throughout the Novus district. The area plan has undergone an exhaustive public outreach campaign, including workshops, social media engagement, door hangers, meet-ups in restaurants and businesses, with the same information being available electronically as well. This plan advances the goals of the General Plan 2040, which calls out the development of Character Areas. He spoke about the scope of work within the Plan, and that it deals with design guidelines and placemaking principles, as opposed to laws. The key consideration for any Character Area Plan is connection to place. Placemaking in communities is tied to art and a sense of pride, as well as a sense of belonging. Therefore, it is much more than good design, it is rooted in a meaningful connection that people make to the places they inhabit. The effort here is to tie people to the place, and to the people that came before them, to create quality spaces which contribute to human health, happiness, and well-being. He then went on to describe some of the principles and guidelines in each of the four areas: Northwest Neighborhoods, Downtown Tempe, Rio

Salado/Town Lake, and Novus Innovation Corridor. Residents of the northwest neighborhoods have been met with extensively, residents there see huge growth coming to downtown and to ASU, and they want some assurance that transitions are managed well, and that neighborhood in-fill projects fit the character, feeling, and setting of the neighborhoods. If this Plan is successful, it will do that. Regarding the downtown area, there has been a focus on maintaining a pedestrian realm, the importance of public art, shaded walkways, types of buildings and building materials, etc. Regarding Tempe Town Lake, the focus has been that it needs to function as a whole, rather than as individual parts. Utilization of open space, programming the water's edge, and activating and utilizing these spaces in a meaningful way will help create a seamless destination. Regarding the Novus Innovation Corridor section of the Plan, it is an ASU-led program, and therefore distinct jurisdictional boundaries need to be respected. The focus here has been to ensure that connectivity to and through that entire area will be managed and planned, to ensure success. He concluded by reviewing how the document actually works and what, in general, is contained within it. He then reviewed next steps. The public comment period closed on April 30, 2018. The Plan will go before City Council on June 7, 2018. Once the Council Resolution takes place, the document will be finalized and will be available online as well as distributed to the relevant Boards and Commissions. He introduced Principal Planner Ambika Adhikari, to speak briefly about the Urban Core Master Plan (UCMP) and how it relates to this Character Area Plan.

Mr. Ambika Adhikari, Principal Planner, spoke briefly. He added that there had been three additional comments received this afternoon, and one person is here to speak this evening, so there are four additional comments, which he wished to address. Character Area 3 and the UCMP have roughly the same boundaries. At this point, the Character Area planning has been completed, and the UCMP is approximately halfway completed. The two plans are closely connected, as they have the same boundaries and many similarities. However, the emphasis is different. The Character Area plan is more granular in terms of the core, such as materials, colors and connectivity to the buildings in the area. The UCMP goes beyond that, in that it will look into intensities and possible densities, and affordable housing. The UCMP also includes the Transportation Overlay District (TOD), and is more regimented, whereas the Character Area Plan is much more advisory. Between the two plans, details will be worked out as to where the growth can occur, and how the connections will take place between the neighborhoods and large-scale development. He emphasized that in regard to the Character Area Plan, over the past five months, the vast majority of the comments from residential leadership have been addressed, with adjustments and additions to the document. Staff has done their utmost to meet the needs/desires of the neighborhood leaders in an exhaustive effort.

Commissioner Johnson inquired about the Rio Salado/Beach Park Master Plan, which the Commission heard about in a previous Study Session. He asked how these plans have been integrated. Mr. Adhikari responded that there are other plans involved as well, such as a transportation plan and a street plan, and many of these are connected. The Rio Salado/Beach Park Master plan is very specific for a specific area, such as where plants will be planted, what amenities will be added, etc. The UCMP is more of a high-level perspective in terms of where densities can go and how the connections can occur. Staff involved in each of these plans are working together and coordinating these details.

Commissioner Amorosi commented that in previous Character Area plans, residential and commercial aspects are mixed, but in this large area, the huge entities such as Beach Park, Downtown, and ASU could easily overwhelm what is happening at the neighborhood level. Can an area of separation be done? Mr. Adhikari responded that this was a good observation, that even the Apache corridor was mixed. However, because the borders were defined by City Council, and there are only eight Character Areas in the City, some areas must be lumped together. The neighborhoods here are predominantly single family, and are well preserved. The historical aspects of this entire area have been respected in the planning phases, and continue to connect the areas, with one area influencing another. Within this Character Area plan, there are some general principles that are area-wide, creating common landscaping, building materials, and so forth. The Joint Review Committee, comprised of representatives of ASU and of the City, will be looking further into the cohesion of ASU projects and City projects. Ms. Dasgupta added that staff has been diligent in evaluating all of the aspects of planning in each of the four sub-categories, including circulation and traffic, which inevitably affects the neighborhoods, each part of the plan undergoes a comprehensive review.

Commissioner Amorosi commented that the information in the document that refers to historic properties should be clearer, so there is no question as to properties that are part of the National Registry, State Registry, etc. Mr. Adhikari responded there was a legend that defined that, but it could be improved upon, and staff would do so.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ms. Deborah Zajac of Tempe stated she does not live in this Character Area, but has attended the meetings to get a feel for the process. Her concern is that with all the different plans, each containing guidelines, such as Urban Core, ASU, TOD, etc, that neighborhoods will become a lower priority. For example, when the General Plan 2040 had just been approved, within a few months there were already developers coming before the Development Review Commission requesting, and having approved, densities that were two or three times that which had been planned. Just because it is written, does not mean it will be adhered to, and that is her main concern.

Ms. Darlene Justus of Tempe stated she also does not live in this area, but lives north of the lake and has been a resident for 50 years. She is very interested in historic preservation and designation of Tempe's historic neighborhoods. The Maple Ash area and the area surrounding it has some of Tempe's most historic homes. She was the cofounder and still serves on the board of the Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation, but she speaks today as a private citizen. She is concerned about protecting the Maple Ash neighborhood, and believes there has not been enough documentation of this neighborhood and all that it has accomplished, its public art, etc. She agrees the other areas of downtown are overpowering, and that the City has done a good job of planning, but these neighborhoods are trying to maintain, and she hopes the Commission will respect that, asking staff to "go back and finish the job" in regard to these neighborhoods.

Mr. Philip Yates, president of the Riverside Neighborhood Association, then spoke. He feels this plan will give permission for developers to build more projects that the neighborhood does not want, and it will be easier for developments to be pushed through the DRC and City Council. Grouping residential with non-residential areas will allow further expansion by ASU and other large-scale developers to creep into the residential area. The Character Area 3 document gives very little history of the area, and should mention by name some of the pioneers of the area. He hopes for a design that fits the historical characteristics of downtown Tempe.

Mr. Trevor Barger stated that he lives in this area, and complimented Mr. Hansen on a job well done, presenting a comprehensive summary of the area, as well as educating people along the way. It has been an incredible effort, and no doubt exciting and challenging. He is concerned that some of the core of the neighborhoods could be overlooked, as small "mom and pop" restaurants and the like are dwarfed as large development comes in. He realizes it is a challenge to keep these distinct pieces unique, and he is also concerned that with the UCMP, ASU's master plan, etc, many conflicts could arise between those documents and this one. He also would like to see the neighborhoods separate from the three cores, and would like to see the different plans come together to finish the downtown area cohesively.

Ms. Karyn Gitlis, Chair of the Maple Ash Neighborhood Association and immediate past president of the Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation, and currently an officer, spoke next. She stated there have been many revisions, additions, and improvements to this plan over the course of the last three drafts, making it a better plan. The neighborhood section was incomplete upon the first draft, and it is becoming better and better, but it is not yet finished. Of the fourteen neighborhoods included in this plan, five are in need of planning attention, and have been for many years. This is not new information, and she feels the City is rushing to finish this plan, yes it has been two years, but it is in reality four plans in one. She feels the neighborhood piece has not been properly or comprehensively addressed. She asked the Commission to please send this incomplete plan back to the drawing board.

Ms. Catherine Mancini of Tempe stated that she lives in this area, and although she recognizes the amazing work done on this plan, she would like to ensure that the name "Greater Maple Ash" is incorporated in this historic document. She stated this is the name they have given themselves to preserve their existence in some small way, despite the rapid changes outside of their control. She thinks the verbiage "neighborhood tapestry" within the document is very generic and there needs to be much more specific documentation of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Justin Stewart, current Chair of the Mitchell Park Neighborhood Association spoke next. He thanked City staff for their incredible effort and also thanked the neighborhood representatives for their participation in all the city-sponsored meet-ups and neighborhood meetings throughout the past two years. He stated he would also like to see the term "Greater Maple Ash" inserted back into the document, to add some extra protection to this fragile geographic area. Ms. Gittis did a great job of documenting over 20 years of effort and work, helping Mr. Hansen craft one or two pages describing the Greater Maple Ash area. He wants this to be a thorough and detailed document, so it can help guide development and protect neighborhoods in the future.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

Mr. Adhikari responded to the comments by saying that all of what has been mentioned has been discussed over a long period of time, actually 3.5 years in total, with the last 6 months being revisions. This plan has not been rushed, as has been mentioned by some of the speakers. Almost everything that the neighbors have asked for has been addressed, and he reminded everyone that this is an advisory plan only, not regulatory, so it does not dictate densities, etc. Having the plan in place will actually make it easier for the communities to ask for the design characteristics and design quality they so well deserve. With regards to the term "Greater Maple Ash," there are about 16 neighborhoods within the Character Area 3 boundaries. The Maple Ash, Wilson Art & Garden, and Mitchell Park neighborhoods have the highest concentration of the important characteristics of the area: the historical, the flood irrigation, the proximity to ASU. So staff extracted the area with the highest concentration of these characteristics and named it that, which is Maple Ash. A minor term like "neighborhood tapestry" is not imperative to the document and can be removed. Staff has tried to accommodate all of the neighborhood's requests, and would like to hear thoughts from the Commission.

Commissioner Brown stated that this document contains guidelines only, correct? Mr. Adhikari affirmed that was correct. Commissioner Brown continued that it takes none of the neighborhood protections away? Mr. Adhikari responded that they are just advisory guidelines, and should help and protect the neighborhood. They do not take protections away. Commissioner Brown stated he thinks the neighborhoods just want recognition, which would be accomplished with a page or two added detailing some of the nearby neighborhoods. No one wants to see the neighborhoods go away, or for them to be replaced by concrete towers. He wondered if staff could take another month or so to add these pages.

Chair Spears added that she was going to ask the same question. This is the first time there has been opposition to a Character Area, and she agrees with the neighbors that they got short shrift. She feels there was more time devoted to residential in other Character Area Plans. This is a small area, but the concentration is there. What can be done to preserve single-family homes? There is much history here, and we should be preserving character.

Vice Chair Lyon added that he feels that staff did an excellent job of documenting quantifiable things, but the intangibles he is not so sure about. People are fiercely devoted to this area, and perhaps the document could provide some more detail about why these neighborhoods are unique and why residents are so fiercely devoted. Perhaps a page or two to convey "oh, there is something really special here, maybe we should pay attention."

Mr. Chad Weaver asked the Commission to be very specific about what is desired and what they are requesting. He reminded the Commission that the UCMP will be giving these neighborhoods the protection they need. The neighborhoods cannot just be "lopped off" from the other three areas – Downtown, ASU, and Rio Salado/Town Lake, the area needs to be planned for as a whole. The second issue, the nomenclature "Greater Maple Ash," he is opposed to because of mapping and logistics, and if those three neighborhoods really want or need to be re-named as Greater Maple Ash, they can go through that process. However, for purposes of this document, it does not make sense to do so, as it does not reflect the area. He reminded the Commission that Tempe has a very robust system for recognition of and involvement with its neighborhoods, and that is already in place. He also reminded them that if any changes are requested to be made to the document, they need to be made quickly, because of upcoming dates for completion. And finally, again, this plan deals with design standards, not with affordable housing, densities, etc. Those things are addressed in the UCMP.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Johnson stated that he has lived in this downtown area for 20 years. He believes this is an integrated area, and it should all be in one Character Area plan, which is representative of all the areas, including neighborhoods, ASU, downtown, and Rio Salado/Town Lake. The City listens to these neighborhood voices, they have a long history of activism, those voices have been heard. He would like to see this document in place quickly, so that it is available for guidance, materials, landscaping, etc. This should be done without any further delays. If there is direction to add additional information to the Plan, it should be within a defined timeframe.

Commissioner Amorosi directed to Mr. Weaver that he has heard the word "Greater" was taken out, but he also knows that two to four pages concerning important elements of these neighborhoods were eliminated, and the neighbors would like to see these re-inserted. Mr. Weaver responded that if one looks at page 23 of the document, that is the page to which they are referring. All of those elements are still there, it has just been re-titled. He has directed staff over the last six months to "beef up" the unique features of the neighborhoods, to call it out and be specific. This document reflects that. He reminded the Commission that they need to be very specific in what changes they would like to see for this document.

Commissioner DiDomenico stated that he agrees with Commissioner Johnson. He stated that he has read the documentation received, and has listened to the neighbors this evening. He believes this document could be word-smithed to death, and meanwhile, development continues without the benefit of this document being in place. Perhaps the document could be a little better, but the Commission has wanted these guidelines for quite some time, as have developers. This should go forward, it will be a living document, and can be edited in the future. If there is a quick and easy "fix" for now, then maybe do that, but if there is not, then let it go on to Council as-is.

Chair Spears added that she trusts Staff to add a page or two back in, if it comes to that. She addressed the neighbors, saying if they want to be known as "Greater Maple Ash," they can undergo that process.

Vice Chair Lyon agreed that the major core areas within the Plan should not be separated, they do affect one another. If you separate them, you in essence say they do not affect one another, which is the opposite of what is true. He asked if one page can be added, which would give an out-of-town visitor the "flavor" of these neighborhoods, with some historical landmarks, etc, which would help them realize the neighborhood is worth visiting. He believes it deserves the addition of this one page, and he believes overall that it is a great piece of work.

Commissioner Sumners stated that he also agrees with recent comments. This document will be adopted in the very near future, and will live for a long time. This Commission deals with planning and zoning and other issues all the time, and it gets complicated, even with just considering maps. There is the City map, the General Plan, not to mention power districts, school districts and so on, and to add a new layer that has no standing or formal approval process does not make sense to him. If we do this once, where do we stop? This is why he is against adding a new name (Greater Maple Ash), that has no formal standing. His other concern is that the more time spent on this document, while important, is less time spent on something "with teeth." He is happy with the document and will support it.

Commissioner Amorosi stated that he appreciated the Herculean effort on staff's part, it is excellent work. He inquired about page 32, regarding assessment reports. Are these wish lists, or are there actual reports with certain time frames that are being created? Mr. Hansen responded this refers to, as an example, a Building Condition Assessment Report (BCAR), which is done when the city acquires a new property. This report outlines the building condition and intervention needed, if any.

MOTION: Motion made by Commissioner Brown to approve **PL180134**, with the addition of a one-page flavor piece, completed within 2 weeks. Motion seconded by Commissioner Amorosi.

VOTE: Motion passes, 6-1, with Commissioner Sumners in the dissent

COMMISSION ANNOUNCEMENTS: None.

STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Ms. Dasgupta reviewed the agenda for the June 12, 2018 Development Review Commission meeting. There are currently five items on the agenda.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:02 pm.

Prepared by: Cynthia Jarrad

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Suparna Dasgupta', written in a cursive style.

Reviewed by:
Suparna Dasgupta
Principal Planner, Community Development Planning