



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-36-19-6

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	September 17, 2019
Request From	C-O (17.72 acres)
Request To	PUD (17.72 acres)
Proposed Use	Planned Unit Development to allow a mixed-use development.
Location	Northwest corner of 44th Street and Camelback Road

VPC DISCUSSION:

*32 cards were submitted in favor, not wishing to speak.
2 cards were submitted in favor, wishing to speak.
88 cards were submitted in opposition, not wishing to speak.
17 cards were submitted in opposition, wishing to speak.
7 cards were submitted noting no position on the item, not wishing to speak.
4 cards were submitted noting no position on the item, wishing to speak.*

Mr. Darrin Orndorff declared a conflict of interest and recused himself from the item and left the committee table, bringing the quorum to 15 members.

At this point in the meeting Mr. Blake McKee arrived bringing the quorum to 16 members.

Mr. Ed Bull, Burch & Cracchiolo, representing the applicant, provided an overview of the request. He expressed that the development would include a mixed-use project which contained a combination of retail, commercial uses, health recreation facility and self-service storage facility. He provided an overview of outreach done and showcased a 3-D model of what the current entitlements would permit versus the request before the committee. He noted that 88 percent of the site was 36-feet or less in height while the remainder 8.5 percent is over 56 feet. He provided an overview of the area and context to the site and why the applicant was requesting a PUD zoning.

Ms. Crawford asked if Land Use Areas (LUAs) are fixed from modification. **Mr. Bull** noted that LUAs are subject to modification by 25 percent but cannot intrude into other Sub-Zones. He noted that the applicant would be requesting the LUA B be restricted from modification.

Ms. Linda Bair asked for clarification regarding LUA A and asked if the traffic study considered evening and peak hours for night time uses. **Mr. Bull** noted that only landscaping and parking canopies were permitted in LUA A. **Ms. Dawn Cartier**, traffic engineer, noted that the peak hours the traffic study pertained to was 7 AM to 9 PM and 4 PM to 6PM. **Ms. Bair** asked if a banquet facility is proposed as part of the hotel. **Mr. Bull** noted that the banquet hall would be limited to hotel site. **Mr. Bull** noted that the banquet hall would hold approximately 150 to 175 seats.

Mr. Blake McKee noted that he did not believe self-storage was the best use for the site. He noted that office building should be located on the western portion of the site instead. **Mr. Bull** noted that the applicant was attempting to reduce impacts adjacent to single-family homes and further noted that there were guidelines the restricted windows along the northern and western property lines.

Ms. Andrea Hardy echoed Mr. McKee's comments noting that the self-service storage use was underwhelming. She asked the applicant to address the changes that they made to the PUD in the last eight months. **Mr. Bull** noted that there have been many meetings with neighbors which resulted in the sub-zones and LUA's. He indicated that there were still concerns regarding the height in the community.

Ms. Linda Bair asked Mr. Bull to explain the difference between cocktail lounge versus brew pub. **Mr. Bull** explained that a cocktail lounge was an area where food may be served and where there may or may not be a bar. He noted that a brew pub included a microbrewery.

Mr. O'Malley asked is the Suns facility would be private and secured. **Mr. Bull** noted that there would be two gates to enter the facility and that the facility was for players, coaches and trainers and not open to the public.

Mr. Abbott asked what fiscal impacts the project would have and what business owners surrounding the area thought of the project. **Mr. Bull** noted the project would generate approximately 1,700 permanent jobs and generate 2.6 million dollars in sales tax. He indicated that comments received from the surrounding businesses included support while other have remained neutral.

Chairman Swart asked that the applicant make the economic study available for the committee. He opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Shannon Johnson, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that many meetings were had with neighbors by the applicant.
- Declared her opposition to 75-foot tall buildings
- Noted that she did not receive sketches of how the views would be blocked.
- Noted that the site should be limited to 56-feet

- Noted that she was not opposed to the uses but rather the height.

Dr. Marvin Borsand, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Provided a PowerPoint presentation and noted that he had been in the community since 1987.
- Expressed that the corner was iconic with views of Camelback Mountain.
- Noted that he did not oppose the development but rather opposed the height.

Ms. Jennifer Steen, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that she did not want to look at building along 44th Street, she would rather have the views of the mountain preserved.
- Raised concern about noise and roof deck activities.
- Indicated support for mixed use but was skeptical about the development and the impact of intensity on surrounding uses.
- Noted opposition to the height.

Mr. Wally Graham, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that he was disappointed that the developers did not consider the main opposition which was the height.
- Asked that the height be lowered to 56-feet.

Ms. Katherine Cecala, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Opposed to 75-foot height
- Concerned about traffic
- Noted that the development did not fit the character of the area.

Michael Book, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted support for mixed use.
- Raised concerns about height and blocking of views.

Mr. George Buckler, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that the percentage of allocated height demonstrated by Mr. Bull was not represented accurately.
- Noted that he was concerned with traffic.
- Wanted access to speed and traffic studies related to the project.

Mr. Mike Epstein, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Concerned with parking.
- Noted that every business should support their own use.

Mr. Richard Ross, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Concerned with parking.
- Concerned with blocking of views.
- Concerned with footprint of buildings looking into surrounding homes.

- Noted that there was no need for storage but rather a need for office.

Mr. Jack Leonard, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Expressed concerns with blocking of views.
- Noted that the building should be stepped back from the street.
- Noted that mountain views would be lost.

Ms. Ruth, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that she lived in the area since 1969.
- Noted the development would have a negative impact on the community.
- Noted concern with blocking of views and added traffic.

Mr. McGuire, in opposition, made the following comments:

- Noted that the development could be designed better.
- Noted that that tall buildings were unfriendly to the area.
- Noted that traffic would greatly increase at the intersection.

Mr. Ed Bull noted that a mixed-use infill project came with varied issues. He noted that the team was trying to address as many issues as possible. He noted that the site needed 75-feet to be able to build the quality type of development envisioned for the hotel and AA-Class office. He noted that the taller buildings were concentrated at the intersection. He noted that 56-foot tall buildings were currently permitted on the site and would block views.