

MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMISSION SEPTEMBER 27, 2011

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

Commission Present:

Mike DiDomenico, Chair
Dennis Webb, Vice Chair
Tom Oteri
Peggy Tinsley
Paul Kent
Kolby Granville
Nick Miner

Commissioner Absent:

Monica Attridge
Mario Torregrossa
Jim Delton

City Staff Present:

Lisa Collins, Deputy Director Community Development
Steve Abrahamson, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Ryan Levesque, Senior Planner

Chair DiDomenico called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., which included the introduction of the Commission and City staff. It had been determined at Study Session that Item No. 2 would be heard.

1. **CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: 8/23/11 & 9/13/11**

Approval of minutes postponed to the October 11th meeting.

-
2. Request for **DISCOVERY BUSINESS CAMPUS (PL110130)** (Tempe Campus SPV LLC, property owner; Gammage & Burnham, applicant) consisting of one (1) two-story office/industrial building totaling 35 feet in height, one (1) four-story office building totaling 79 feet in height, one (1) five-story office building totaling 91 feet and 9 inches in height, one (1) six-story office building totaling 100 feet and 11 inches in height, one (1) eight-story office building totaling 132 feet and 3 inches in height, two (2) six-story hotels each totaling 80 feet in height with a combined total of 400 guest rooms, three (3) one-story restaurant/retail shop pads each totaling 30 feet in height, one (1) three level parking structure totaling 27 feet in height and multiple at-grade parking courtyards containing a combined total of 7,600 parking spaces, and eleven (11) existing industrial buildings totaling approximately 1,000,000 square feet of building area. The proposal has a total gross floor building area of approximately 2,580,000 square feet. The site is approximately 135.62 net acres in size and is located at 2100 East Elliot Road, on 135.62 net acres, located at 2100 East Elliot Road in the GID, General Industrial District. The request includes the following:

PAD11007 (ORDINANCE NO. 2011.47) – Planned Area Development Overlay modifying the general development standards for an increase in the maximum allowed building heights from 35 feet for Site #1 to 80'-0", for Site #2 to 80'-0", for Site #3 to 132'-0", and for Site #4 to 91'-9".

ZUP11063 – Use Permit request to allow Hotel uses on Site #1 and Site #2.

ZUP11064 – Use Permit request to allow general Retail/Restaurant uses on Site #5.

DPR11122 – Development Plan Review including site plan, building elevations and landscape.

STAFF REPORT: [DRCr_DiscoveryBusinessCampus_092711.pdf](#)

This case was presented by Ryan Levesque and represented by Manjula Vaz, Gammage and Burnham (applicant) and Mike Edwards, Davis Architecture.

Ryan Levesque made a brief presentation on the basic requests of this case. Ms. Vaz addressed the Commission and gave a brief history on the site and the intended schedule for the renovation of the existing buildings and future development. She also included a brief presentation on the site plan and layout of the proposed buildings and their uses. She indicated that there is no immediate plan for the hotels and those will be presented to the Commission at a future date but the type of hotels will be business-oriented, such as Holiday Inn Express or Marriott Courtyard, which will cater to people coming to the campus for training, etc.

Mike Edwards gave a presentation in regards to the proposed landscaping and phasing of the site.

Chair DiDomenico questioned Ms. Vaz regarding the SRP substation and who it will service. He also questioned the total square footage of office and if that includes what is currently onsite or is this additional new development and how many workers may be present on the site when completed and occupied.

Ms. Vaz indicated that it currently serves Freescale and that it could serve other on site users. She also indicated that the total square footage of office is all inclusive and they estimate approximately 4000-6000 people.

Commissioner Oteri asked when the first building and subdivision were constructed.

Mr. Edwards stated that he believed the first building was constructed in the early 80's and construction of the subdivision began in 1994.

Chair DiDomenico opened the hearing for public input.

A total of nine residents addressed the Commission, two in support, two strongly opposed to the development and five spoke with concerns relating to height, location of retail, noise, traffic and pedestrian access from the site to the neighborhood. Four citizens requested their comments be read into the record, and those also centered on height, traffic and pedestrian traffic.

Chair DiDomenico circulated a three page petition (approximately 36 names) to the Commission that shows support of the development.

Chair DiDomenico closed the hearing to public input.

Ms. Vaz returned to the podium to address the concerns brought forth by the neighborhood. She also confirmed that the petition that the Commission received is signed by residents of the adjacent neighborhood, Oasis at Anozira.

Ms. Vaz and Mr. Edwards used renderings with proposed landscaping to indicate height and views from the neighborhood looking onto the site.

Ms. Vaz addressed the concern over the possibility of a drive thru type of restaurant being placed on site. She stated that the reason for the Use Permit is to allow retail on the site and that the retail/restaurant is being placed on a separate pad. Mr. Edwards indicated that there may not necessarily be one user in the 9000 s.f. pad. There may be one restaurant and several smaller shops.

Chair DiDomenico questioned the applicant as to the placement of the retail. Mr. Edwards indicated that the intention was to place the height away from the residential subdivision and that they view the retail as an amenity to the neighborhood and access from Country Club was another consideration.

Chair DiDomenico questioned the wall access and whether it is viewed as a positive or a negative for the neighbors in order to access the retail.

Ms. Vaz indicated that the applicant has no position on this access and is happy to do whatever the neighbors want. It is her understanding that some neighbors wished it to remain while others wanted it closed.

Chair DiDomenico questioned the pros and cons of building an 8' wall.

Mr. Edwards indicated that the 8' wall would be along their contiguous property line from the wall access area to the north border. It is currently a 6' wall and it is being determined whether or not 2' can be added to it or if it will need to be completely taken down and rebuilt. He also stated that they felt it better to increase the wall height rather than build an additional 8 wall, as that would create a "no man's" land and could cause security issues.

Dawn Cartier of CivTech spoke to concerns regarding traffic. She stated that the traffic study is based on square footage of the buildings and their uses.

Chair DiDomenico questioned Ms. Cartier if the study can tell how many people will be coming and going from the site.

Ms. Cartier indicated that it could be done but was not done with this study.

Commissioner Miner asked Ms. Cartier what trip generation was calculated for the retail/restaurant component of this application.

Ms. Cartier indicated that they increased the square footage from what is provided on the plan so there numbers are going to be higher. The study shows approximately 1770 daily trips to the retail site.

Commissioner Webb asked if the study shows the effect on southbound 101 traffic from this site.

Ms. Cartier indicated that the findings show no impact to the existing street network that can't be mitigated and make it acceptable or it isn't already acceptable and there is no service impact to the intersection overall.

Chair DiDomenico asked if a traffic signal needs to be installed at Country Club Way.

Ms. Cartier indicated that during phase I everything will remain about the same but sometime between phase II and build out, a signal will be necessary.

Commissioner Kent questioned as to what rating the intersection of the 101 and Elliot has currently and what it is expected to be at build out.

Ms. Cartier indicated that it is currently a C and is expected to continue to service at a C level. Commissioners Kent and Tinsley both suggested possible relocation and/or reorientation of the retail.

Ms. Vaz and Mr. Edwards indicated that these layouts and designs will work best to keep parking near the buildings where necessary and feel retail will better succeed if placed closer to Elliot.

Commissioner Granville questioned staff as to why the property does not revert back after the time designated in the staff report.

Ms. Collins indicated that any reversion requires a public hearing process, automatic reversions are not legal.

Chair DiDomenico asked if someone from the City of Tempe Traffic Engineering staff could comment on the traffic study.

Cathy Hollow, City of Tempe Traffic Engineer, indicated she had concerns in regards to the intersection at the 101 and Elliot and will need further analysis to confirm the needed placement of a signal at Country Club Way.

Commissioner Webb asked Ms. Hollow to clarify her concerns.

Ms. Hollow indicated that there are currently issues at this intersection; however, the issue is currently confined to approximately 30 minutes in the evening. This additional traffic may cause that time to increase to about 45 minutes, which in an urban area she considers to be acceptable.

Ms. Collins commented that there is a condition that states final approval of the traffic study by the traffic engineer has to be received prior to building permits being issued.

Chair DiDomenico reminded the audience that the Commission is making a recommendation only and that final approval will be done at the City Council level.

Commissioner Miner stated that he understood the concerns of the neighbors and commended the developer for taking the time to work with the neighborhood and put together a very well thought out site plan but that this is a great opportunity for Tempe and supports the case.

Commissioner Tinsley agreed with Commissioner Miner's comments.

Commissioner Webb stated that he also understood the neighbor's concerns but also is in support of the case.

Commissioner Kent stated that although there are issues to work out, he is in support of the case.

Commissioner Granville indicated that although he felt this is a great project, he cannot support the case due to this much density in South Tempe.

Commissioner Oteri commended developer for the placement of the large buildings away from the subdivision and would have liked to have seen the relocation of the retail but supports the case.

Chair DiDomenico stated he believes it's a well-designed project and is the type of development to be expected at a site near the freeway and the City of Tempe is fortunate to have this property being developed.

On a motion by Commissioner Tinsley and seconded by Commissioner Miner, the Commission with a vote of 6-1 (Commissioner Granville opposed) recommended approval of this Amended Planned Area Development Overlay, Development Plan Review and Use Permits as recommended in the staff report.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair DiDomenico announced the next meeting is scheduled for October 11th and there are two cases on the agenda at this time.

The hearing adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Prepared by: Lisa Novia, Administrative Assistant II
Reviewed by: Lisa Collins, Deputy Director Community Development Department



Lisa Collins, Deputy Director Community Development Department

APPROVED