



Minutes of the Development Review Commission Study Session December 11, 2018

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

Present:

Vice Chair Michael DiDomenico
Commissioner Don Cassano
Commissioner Thomas Brown
Commissioner Scott Sumners
Commissioner Philip Amorosi
Alt Commissioner Michelle Schwartz

City Staff Present:

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Director, Community Development
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner
Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner
Karen Stovall, Senior Planner
Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner
Robbie Aaron, Planner II
Dalton Guerra, Planner I
Christopher Ray, Administrative Assistant I

Absent:

Chair David Lyon
Commissioner Andrew Johnson
Alt Commissioner Barbara Lloyd
Alt Commissioner Angela Thornton

Vice Chair Michael DiDomenico began the Study Session at 5:15 p.m.

Review of November 27, 2018 Regular Meeting Agenda

1. Development Review Commission – Study Session and Regular Meeting – October 23, 2018

Review of Development Review Commission Agenda:

Vice Chair DiDomenico asked the Commission whether to put Item #2: 1100 E Apache Housing on the Consent Agenda. He asked if any more public input has been received on Item #3 Raising Canes. The Commission decided to put on Consent agenda.

Mr. Lee Jimenez, Senior Planner, stated there has been no further public comment.

Commissioner Amorosi asked if the applicant agreed to the new bus bay pullout that was requested by staff. Mr. Jimenez stated that that was a comment made by transportation and has been added as a condition of approval, to which they did not disagree with. Commissioner Amorosi also inquired about whether the parapet shown will be sufficient to cover the equipment on the top of the building. Mr. Jimenez stated that they had compromised raising the

parapet a foot to further enhance the screening it provide, however, there will also be mechanical screening in place to screen the equipment. Commissioner Brown voiced concern whether the parapet and screening were significant, so Vice Chair DiDomenico decided it was a case best heard. Ms. Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner, clarified that it was a code that the equipment must be fully screened, regardless of its appearance on the plan.

Vice Chair DiDomencio asked if there have been any further public comments on Item #4 Lofts on 8th. Ms. Dasgupta stated there has been no further public comment aside from Mr. Chuck Buss requesting access to the file online. The Commission discussed briefly about previous comments that had been made regarding Lofts on 8th.

Vice Chair DiDomenico reviewed Item #5 Tolman Residence. Commissioner Amorosi inquired about the power that the DRC has over the development of this project. Mr. Dalton Guerra, Planner I, explained that this application is just regarding the use permit, and not any design standards.

Presentation: Tempe/Mesa Streetcar Feasibility Study:

Mr. Tony Belleau, Tempe Streetcar, gave a brief presentation of the feasibility study done for the Tempe Streetcar project. He introduced the context of the presentation that will be given and described what the feasibility study encompasses. Mr. Darren Lozano, Valley Metro, continued the presentation and explained why they are doing this study, showed the study area, overviewed the project timelines, and presented other projects that are related to Tempe Streetcar.

Presentation: The Grand at Papago Park Center -- Phase 4: Building C and Parking Structure P1B:

Mr. Buck Yee, Davis, introduced himself and Richard Drinkwater, Davis, to present that Grand at Papago building C and parking garage PB-1. Mr. Yee gave a brief overview of what the design of these buildings are and explained the design theory of them. Mr. Drinkwater overviewed the elevations of the buildings and explained why designs were chosen for this new development. Commissioner Amorosi inquired about the blue tinted glass on the main building and asked whether they considered including it in the parking structure as well. Mr. Drinkwater responded that the current design elements were carried over from the original parking structure and they didn't want to introduce a new design element for the sake of consistency. Commissioner Amorosi stated he would have liked to see more of a relationship of design with the office building and garage. Commissioner Brown asked if there was another parcel of land in the SRP development that is slated for a future office building, to break up the height of the tall building currently proposed. Mr. Yee stated that it will either be an office or hotel development; the use has not been defined. Commissioner Brown inquired about whether the building being represented in the renderings is the one currently in development. Mr. Yee stated it is not, and the one currently under development is farther back near the 202. Commissioner Brown then asked staff whether we will see a future PAD for this project. Ms. Dasgupta responded the reason this was brought to the study session was to get feedback on design elements of the project, so it could be addressed before it is brought to the commission at a later date as a DPR. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked what the pros and cons were to place the parking garages instead of the office buildings on the street frontage. He expressed concern over the excessive placement of garages on the street frontage, stating it could create a negative design element. Mr. Yee stated the garages were placed on the Washington Street frontage because of the sharp grade that exists in the property, and stated it made more sense to put the first floor of the parking garage nestled up to the retaining wall and the offices on the more level ground in the back. He also stated that the first architect for the project chose this design, and they continue with it for the sake of consistency. In addition to this, Mr. Yee stated that SRP wants to have the Grand Canal be a focal point of this development and this design makes the most sense to accomplish that goal. Vice Chair DiDomenico added that this design is much more attractive for the occupants of the building, and much less for residents who drive past these developments every day. Commissioner Sumners stated a site Plan would be extremely helpful to provide comments. Ms. Dasgupta stated that she could provide the Commission with a site plan, acknowledging it is still in the works, and they could provide feedback directly to Ms. Karen Stovall, Senior Planner. Vice Chair DiDomencio asked what the timing on this project was and when we would see it again. Ms. Stovall explained they will come back tentatively end of January or beginning of February. Commissioner Amorosi asked whether they could add some interesting lightning effects to offset the monotony created by designing it like the existing

parking garage. Mr. Yee stated that building illumination is part of their scope, and they could look into animating the structure to make it more appealing to light rail riders and pedestrians driving by. Commissioner Schwartz stated it might also be helpful to see the public art component near the streetscape. Commissioner Brown stated he would like to see a continuance of landscape onto the empty plot of land also to create some continuity of design. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked if the new parking structure will be standalone or connected. Mr. Yee said that there will be a passthrough to connect the two garages.

Project Update by Staff (City Council Action Items):

Mr. Ryan Levesque, Dept. Director Planning, gave a brief overview of recent City Council Items. He stated that Eastline Village was granted a PAD extension for one year, 100 Mill and Hayden House got approved as well. Mr. Levesque stated there was an added condition for 100 Mill to add additional screening elements to the structure on the east side of the building. Vice Chair DiDomenico asked whether this development will call for the demolition of the non-historic portion of the current building. Mr. Levesque responded that there is a process for achieving this sensitively that will be utilized, and there are ongoing efforts for improvement of the Hayden House. He added that there is a future hotel portion that will be constructed as well. Commissioner Brown stated he would like to see the future hotel portion of Hayden House come through the DRC. Mr. Levesque stated the first hearing for ASU NOVUS happened, and there were some additional comments from the Council asking for notification when neighborhood meetings are required for these developments. Commissioner Amorosi asked why the TEMPE STUDENT HOUSING project didn't go to the City Council. Mr. Levesque stated because there was only a use permit standard and development plan review and there was no requirement to go to City Council.

The Study Session adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Prepared by: Christopher Ray



Reviewed by: Suparna Dasgupta
Suparna Dasgupta, Principal Planner