



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary PHO-1-21— Z-57-06-7

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	October 19, 2021
<b>Planning Hearing Officer Hearing Date</b>	October 20, 2021
<b>Request</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Request to modify stipulation number 1 regarding development to the site plan, building elevations and conceptual landscape plan date stamped August 15, 2006.</li><li>2) Request to delete stipulation numbers 1.a, 2, 3, 4, and 9 regarding a master architecture theme, pedestrian circulation plan, enhanced landscape features, and right-of-way triangle.</li><li>3) Technical corrections to stipulation numbers 5, 7, 8, and 10.</li></ol>
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 300 feet north of the northwest corner of 91st Avenue and Lower Buckeye Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Denial.
<b>VPC Vote</b>	5-2 Motion passes; with members Barquin, Cartwright, Perez, Rush and Cardenas in favor; Danzeisen and Joel Sanou in dissent.

### **VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATION:**

*One member of the public registered to speak on this item. Two other members of the public were allowed to speak on this item during the meeting.*

**Enrique Bojórquez**, staff, introduced himself and provided a presentation on this case noting the location of the site, existing zoning, and proposed use. The requested modifications to the case stipulations for PHO-1-21--Z-57-06-7 were presented and the new proposed site plan, landscape plan and building elevations were shown. He then invited the applicant to provide a brief presentation to the committee.

**William Allison**, with Withey Morris PLC, introduced himself as the applicant and discussed the location of the site, surrounding uses, and existing site conditions. He discussed the history of the commercial corner and other commercial uses that exist in

the area. The requested stipulation modifications were explained, and the new proposed landscape plan and building elevations were shown. He concluded the presentation by stating that less traffic would be generated by the townhome community proposed when compared to a commercial use and requested approval of this application.

**Lisa Perez** would like to know what street improvements are going to be provided and stated that several community members who are connected to the meeting wish to speak on this item.

**Beth Cartwright** stated that there are no sidewalks in that portion of the area now and asked if this project will construct sidewalks along the adjacent public streets.

**Mr. Allison** responded that sidewalks and a multi-use trail will be constructed as part of this development.

*Committee member Barquin joined the meeting at 6:20pm, bringing the quorum to 8 members.*

**Abby Dunter**, member of the public, introduced herself and stated that she represents the Farmington Community Association. She lives in the area and most residents oppose the changes to the stipulations as it will increase density in the area. The original zoning stipulations were intended to allow commercial uses which are needed in the area. This proposed use will strain the resources in the area like streets, schools, commercial uses at this crowded intersection. She supports maintaining the existing zoning stipulations on the site.

**Chairman Cardenas** allowed two other members of the public to speak during the meeting.

**Kristine Morris**, member of the public, introduced herself and stated that she is the Superintendent of the Union Elementary School District. She values the safety of students, including the transportation of these students. She worries about the ability for school buses to enter and exit the site. This development will likely generate new students which public schools must plan to accommodate, unlike Charter Schools.

**Andre Serrette**, member of the public, had questions about the applicant's traffic-related comments.

**Ms. Perez** stated that this is a terrible intersection that needs street improvements and commercial services. The adjacent Charter School did not receive notification of this case, and discussed development patterns in the area, plus traffic-related issues. She has questions on street-related improvements. Multifamily uses are taking over commercially-zoned properties, adding to the lack of grocery stores and services in the area. There is a housing need across the city, but there is also a need for commercial uses in this community. She asked staff to clarify the boundary of the current application and if the Street Transportation Department has provided any comments.

**Mr. Bojórquez** responded that the requested stipulation modifications would only apply to the properties which are part of this application. He added that other city

departments are notified of PHO applications, but comments from these departments are typically provided directly to the PHO staff.

**Ms. Perez** added that there are too many unknown questions and there needs to be a discussion on improvements in the area.

**Ms. Cartwright** discussed traffic issues, including during morning rush hour, when traffic is backed up. She should be affected by increased traffic and feels that commercial traffic is generated during other hours of the day.

**Mr. Allison** stated that portions of the adjacent streets would be dedicated and improved as part of this projects.

**Dan Rush** asked for clarification on who prepared the traffic report for this case. **Mr. Allison** discussed the traffic engineer who prepared the report and added that this compared the uses allowed there today versus what is proposed with this project.

**Kevin Danzeisen** appreciates the comments from the community and understands the frustration to get commercial uses to come to this community also from the perspective of landowners. Roads are widened when vacant land develops. He knows that retail is needed but would support this request due to street improvements that would be made.

**Ms. Perez** feels that piece-meal street improvements are not appropriate and has concerns about that. She understands Mr. Danzeisen's comments but feels that this project needs more thought. She is not in favor of this development.

**Mr. Rush** asked if there is a difference between the street improvements that a commercial or residential use would have to make on this site.

**Ms. Perez** feels that these improvements would better improve the streets if the site develops as commercial due to a larger area being improved. We should be planning for commercial development here.

**Mr. Rush** wonders why commercial development does not come into this corner.

**Dafra Joel Sanou** feels that this might be due to misinformation about income data in this part of town. Traffic is already bad in this area.

**Ms. Perez** stated that in 2013, this area was not being developed. Now, people are flocking to this area. Housing is needed, but we also need commercial uses, hospitals, grocery stores and other services. We are doing a disservice by approving other projects in this community.

**Mr. Rush** asked why commercially-zoned properties are not being developed.

**Mr. Danzeisen** stated that he talked to retailers and tried very hard to bring them to the Village. He feels that the problem is that limited potential for growth in the Estrella Village.

**Mr. Rush** is torn on this case as he is not too concerned with traffic issues raised since this is expected of new development. But why are retail uses not coming to this Village.

**Mr. Danzeisen** stated that selling land for residential use does not generate more profit necessarily but feels that the studies of the retail industry are showing them something about this area. The nearby Walmart does serve as a grocery store.

**Ms. Perez** stated that the committee should fight to keep commercially-zoned land available for future commercial developments.

**Mr. Rush** stated that he does not see this project as an obstacle for disrupting the quality of life here.

**Ms. Perez** asked if the case could be continued to a future hearing date.

**Mr. Bojórquez** responded that the committee could vote to continue the case, but the decision to bring the case back would be up to the Planning Hearing Officer's discretion. The applicant could also voluntarily ask the committee to continue the case.

**Mr. Allison** responded that he would prefer a decision other than a continuance on the case this evening.

**Mr. Sanou** was hoping for a continuance on the case.

**MOTION:**

**Ms. Perez** motioned to deny case PHO-1-21--Z-57-06-8. **Ms. Cartwright** seconded the motion to deny.

**VOTE:**

**5-2**, motion passed; Members Barquin, Cartwright, Perez, Rush and Cardenas in favor; Danzeisen and Joel Sanou in dissent.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

None.