



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-TA-8-23-Y

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	June 5, 2023
<b>Request</b>	Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Zambrano** shared the parking reductions proposed and displayed an image of a typical multifamily development with a lot of parking. Mr. Zambrano shared the current and proposed parking requirement for multifamily development City-wide, affordable multifamily development City-wide, multifamily development in the Infill Development District, market-rate multifamily development in the Walkable Urban (WU) Code, and affordable multifamily development in the WU Code. Mr. Zambrano displayed an example for each type of multifamily development of a 300-unit complex, having only 1- or 2-bedroom units, and shared what the difference in the parking requirement would be. Mr. Zambrano then discussed passenger loading zones, a new requirement proposed only for sites zoned WU Code. Mr. Zambrano concluded with the timeline for the text amendment.

**Mr. Soronson** asked if there are parking reductions proposed adjacent to transit. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that transit would be covered under the Infill Development District and the Walkable Urban Code.

**Chair Popovic** asked what the current parking requirement is for multifamily. **Mr. Zambrano** displayed the current requirement verbatim from the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance.

**Roy Wise** asked about the intent of this text amendment. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that current parking requirements are resulting in overparking. **Mr. Wise** stated that he believes the text amendment is trying to force more people to use transit.

**Ms. Balderrama** asked how the proposed parking requirement was calculated. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Traffic Services Division conducted a study that showed the actual parking demand is less than what the current parking requirements are. Mr. Zambrano added that part of the intent behind the text amendment is trying to encourage more transit use and acknowledging that not everyone may own a private vehicle and may rely on other modes of transportation.

**Ms. Sepic** asked if the proposed parking ratio would apply to four-bedroom units as well. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, noting that the previous requirement was two parking spaces per three or more-bedroom unit.

**Chair Popovic** asked where the distance to a light rail station in the Walkable Urban Code is measured from. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it is measured from the lot line.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-8-23-Y

### INFORMATION ONLY

**Date of VPC Meeting**

June 5, 2023

**Request**

Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

No quorum.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

No quorum.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-8-23-Y INFORMATION ONLY

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 12, 2023  
**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

### VPC DISCUSSION:

*Committee Member Rouse left during this item bringing quorum to eight.*

### Staff Presentation:

**Mrs. Sanchez Luna** provided an overview of the proposed text amendment. Mrs. Sanchez Luna noted that the proposed text amendment would allow for a reduction in parking for multifamily and affordable multifamily citywide. Ms. Sanchez Luna summarized other parking reductions. Mrs. Sanchez Luna presented examples of the proposed parking reductions. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by noting the proposed hearing dates for the text amendment.

### Questions from the Committee:

**Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked if ADA parking would still be required. **Ms. Gomes** confirmed. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked prompted this text amendment. **Ms. Gomes** noted that the text amendment has been in response to legislative and affordability movements. Ms. Gomes noted that the city analyzed affordability and that is why there were standards for infill development, the walkable urban code, and city wide. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** noted that it would allow for more units because of the reduction in parking. **Ms. Gomes** noted that residents in affordable housing have less vehicles and that more units would drive down rental costs. Ms. Gomes noted that these would be minimum parking standards. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** noted that Phoenix doesn't have an efficient public transportation system to support the parking reduction. Mr. Nasser-Taylor added that existing multifamily developments do not have enough parking. Mr. Nasser-Taylor asked if a study was conducted before presenting the new parking ratios. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the city utilized ITE data that focuses on traffic counts in order to create the proposal. **Ms. Perrera** asked what year the data was collected. **Ms. Gomes** stated that that information could be provided at a later date.

**Ms. Perrera** noted that the parking reduction made sense in infill development if amenities are in a walkable distance. Ms. Perrera noted that a citywide reduction was

not feasible. Ms. Perrera added that Laveen did not have sufficient public transit. Ms. Perrera noted that there should be a reduction in commercial parking rather than multifamily parking. Ms. Perrera added that she had concerns on data utilized.

**Ms. Rouse** voiced her agreement and stated that parking would spill onto the street.

**Ms. Rubio-Raffin** agreed that the city doesn't have the public transit infrastructure to support the reduction. Ms. Rubio-Raffin noted that the City of Tempe has an efficient public transit system. Ms. Rubio-Raffin added that the reduction could reduce the number of cars.

**Ms. Jensen** stated that more public transportation infrastructure would be required before a reduction could occur. Ms. Jensen asked how much overflow parking occurs in walkable urban code areas. **Ms. Gomes** noted that the department has been working to gather the data.

**Mr. Chiarelli** noted that apartments could start charging for parking which would affect housing affordability. Mr. Chiarelli asked what would make a housing project affordable. Mr. Chiarelli added that people that live in affordable housing still have vehicles.

**Francisco Barraza** noted that a reduction in vehicles per household would not be attainable. Mr. Barraza stated that downtown development discourages parking, but other parts of the city cannot accommodate the reduction. Mr. Barraza added that the proposed text amendment would benefit developers rather than individuals.

**Chair Abegg** stated that she hasn't seen a decrease in vehicles with less parking availability. Chair Abegg asked if existing projects could revise their site plan to reduce the parking. Chair Abegg asked about the outreach and noted that in-person meetings are less accessible for the community.

**Vice Chair Hurd** noted that she has seen multifamily projects with excessive parking but would discourage filling empty parking lots with more housing. Vice Chair Hurd noted that the data utilized needed to be evaluated. **Chair Abegg** noted that the reduction made sense in some overlay areas but not the entire city.

**Ms. Gomes** noted that staff has heard similar comments from northern villages. Ms. Gomes noted that if the text amendment is adopted, all current developments could utilize the parking reduction. Ms. Gomes noted that existing projects would have to be evaluated on a case by case basis. Ms. Gomes noted that information only items for text amendment allow the community to voice their initial concerns prior to recommendation. Ms. Gomes added that the information is available online and recommended the committee to promote any input. **Chair Abegg** noted that the in-person meetings are not accessible to the entire community. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the text amendments have been a respond to City Council requests and legislative movements. **Chair Abegg** reiterated that a virtual meeting would increase community input and accessibility. **Ms. Gomes** stated that not all facilities have the technical

capabilities to host hybrid meetings.

**Mr. Chiarelli** noted that South Mountain has not have quorum in several months. Mr. Chiarelli added that this prevents community input. Mr. Chiarelli asked what the city has done to ensure an active committee. **Chair Abegg** encouraged Committee Member Chiarelli to contact the City Council. **Ms. Gomes** voiced her agreement and confirmed that the City Council is addressing the issue.

**Public Comment:**

**Mr. Hertel** stated that ADA parking spaces will be utilized by non-ADA vehicles. Mr. Hertel added that an efficient public transportation system is required prior to a parking reduction. Mr. Hertel asked for the purpose behind the text amendment and if any data was collected to support the reduction in Laveen. Mr. Hertel added that this would result in modifications to existing approved site plans. Mr. Hertel voiced his opposition to the text amendment.

**Committee Discussion:**

None.

**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting**                      June 12, 2023

**Request**    Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a presentation regarding the proposed text amendment to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing. He described the proposed citywide parking requirements for multifamily development and affordable multifamily development and further described the proposed parking requirements for the Infill Development District and in the Walkable Urban Code.

**Committee Member Sherman** stated that the pick-up/drop-off areas should be encouraged to be on-street to reduce the number of driveways.

**Committee Member Olivas** expressed concern about the proposal, citing an example of an affordable housing development with a low parking requirement where there is an issue with cars parking on the street.

**Committee Member Dana Johnson** asked for clarification regarding the on-street parking allowance in the infill district and expressed concern about the proposal from an equity perspective. **Mr. Grande** provided clarification that on-street parking would no longer count toward parking requirements in the infill district.

**Committee Member Uss** stated that parking is a barrier to providing affordable housing and that this proposal would open up more parcels for affordable housing development.

**Committee Member Martinez** agreed with the example raised by Ms. Olivas, noting that traffic situation around the development is problematic due to the reduced parking requirements.

**Committee Member Gaughan** stated that it is important to get families into housing units and that providing parking makes the units more expensive.

**Committee Member Martinez** noted that low-income people still own cars. **Ms. Uss** replied that the vehicle ownership rate is lower for low-income people.

**Vice Chair O'Grady** stated that it would be helpful to tour affordable developments with minimal parking, such as the Native American Connections buildings.

**Committee Member Rachel Frazier Johnson** asked that staff provide examples of affordable developments with lower parking requirements for the next meeting.

**Chair Gonzales** asked for clarification on how the proposal would affect the Downtown Code. **Mr. Grande** clarified that it would not change any requirements of the Downtown Code.

**Committee Member Sonoskey** asked about maximum parking requirements. **Mr. Grande** replied that there were only parking maximums in the Downtown Code, and this proposal would not change that.

**Committee Member Olivas** asked about congestion on narrow streets with street parking. **Mr. Grande** replied that the Street Transportation Department reviews any on-street parking to verify the street width is sufficient to handle the parked cars and the flow of traffic.



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting**                      June 6, 2023  
**Request**                                      Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

*No member of the public registered to speak on this item.*

**STAFF PRESENTATION:**

**John Roanhorse**, staff, provided a presentation the proposed text amendment to reduce parking, the scope, requirements and adjustments for multifamily development. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the current parking requirements, the proposal and the comparative reduction calculations for affordable housing, infill development, Walkable Urban Code areas and other site adjustments. Mr. Roanhorse displayed the changes that will include passenger loading zones pull up/drop off spaces for streetscapes. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the time frame for review for the at Villages, Planning Commission and City Council.

**QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE:**

**Ms. Schmieder** asked about the text amendment as a method of clarifying information and parking reduction is a significant change and why this being considered as a text amendment. Mr. Roanhorse responded that the text amendment is a method that allow the City to adjust an existing requirement. Ms. Schmieder stated that changing the parking requirements has big implications for neighborhoods and new development. **Mr. Roanhorse** responded that a text amendment is changes to the text of the requirement.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None.

**STAFF RESPONSE:**

None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

None.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-8-23-Y INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	June 6, 2023
<b>Request</b>	Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing

### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a presentation regarding the proposed text amendment to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing. He described the proposed citywide parking requirements for multifamily development and affordable multifamily development and further described the proposed parking requirements for the Infill Development District and in the Walkable Urban Code.

**Committee Member Hankins** asked about the impetus behind this proposal. **Mr. Grande** replied that there was interest from the city and stakeholders in reducing barriers to providing housing.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** asked if the proposal makes the assumption that people residing in affordable housing have lower vehicle usage. **Mr. Grande** replied that he didn't have any studies available on the question but will try to provide more information at the next meeting.

**Committee Member Santoro** asked if there were studies done that show apartment buildings with vacant parking spaces. **Mr. Grande** replied that he would follow up with more information at the next meeting.

**Chair Bowser** stated that multifamily housing has different users than single-family, which could impact the need for parking, adding that he would like to see a requirement for proximity to transit as part of the proposal.

**Committee Member Kollar** stated that parking in many apartment complexes can be very difficult and that he'd like to see studies showing the feasibility of the proposal.

**Committee Member Younger** asked if this amendment would only affect new construction. **Mr. Grande** replied that it was for new construction.

**Committee Member Israel** asked about the AMI levels included in the definition of affordable housing. **Mr. Grande** replied that there will be more information by the next meeting when there is proposed text.

**Committee Member Reynolds** stated that low-income families may have multiple people working and needing parking spaces, which could be an issue.

**Committee Member Nowell** stated that the proposal could increase demand on commercial parking lots nearby, potentially leading to issues in the future.

**Committee Member Younger** asked what the purpose of the proposal was. **Mr. Grande** replied that it would eliminate a barrier to providing additional housing.

**Chair Bowser** stated that there is a general need to reduce parking requirements across the city because the city is generally overparked, adding that he would like to see some studies to show the need for this specific proposal.

**Committee Member Kollar** stated that the 1.25 spaces per unit for multifamily housing seems low.

**Committee Member Israel** asked for clarification on the proposed citywide requirements for multifamily housing compared to proposed requirements related to transit-oriented areas in the central part of Phoenix. **Mr. Grande** provided clarification.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-8-23-Y INFORMATION ONLY

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 13, 2023  
**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

### VPC DISCUSSION:

**Mr. Zambrano** shared the parking reductions proposed and displayed an image of a typical multifamily development with a lot of parking. Mr. Zambrano shared the current and proposed parking requirement for multifamily development City-wide, affordable multifamily development City-wide, multifamily development in the Infill Development District, market-rate multifamily development in the Walkable Urban (WU) Code, and affordable multifamily development in the WU Code. Mr. Zambrano displayed an example for each type of multifamily development of a 300-unit complex, having only 1- or 2-bedroom units, and shared what the difference in the parking requirement would be. Mr. Zambrano then discussed passenger loading zones, a new requirement proposed only for sites zoned WU Code. Mr. Zambrano concluded with the timeline for the text amendment.

**Mr. Virgil** stated that developers will try to fit more homes in a development by removing parking spaces. Mr. Virgil stated that there is never enough parking for visitors. Mr. Virgil stated that the City wants to push people out of their cars.

**Mr. Sommacampagna** asked about removing on-street parking in the Infill Development District. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Street Transportation Department has had issues with adding bike lanes in certain areas because developments are counting the on-street parking towards their minimum required parking spaces.

**Mr. Virgil** stated that the City does not want people to own cars.

**Mr. Zambrano** stated that part of the intent of the text amendment is trying to support multi-modal transportation.

**Chair Lawrence** stated that this would be a great idea if everything was within walking distance of the light rail.

**Mr. Virgil** stated that he would rather have too much parking than not enough. Mr. Virgil asked if handicap parking would be reduced as well. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that ADA parking requirements would still be the same. **Mr. Virgil** asked if the ideas for the text amendments are coming from California. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that they are trying to address a number of issues, including the housing shortage and affordability.

**Vice Chair Perreira** asked Mr. Zambrano could share his opinion on the text amendment. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that based on information he has heard, the current Phoenix Zoning Ordinance parking requirement requires more parking than what the actual market demand is for parking.

**Mr. Virgil** reiterated that he would rather have more parking than not enough.

**Chair Lawrence** stated that he would have to disagree with the parking requirement supplying more than the actual parking demand. Chair Lawrence asked if Mr. Zambrano has ever lived in apartment complex in Phoenix. **Mr. Zambrano** responded he has lived in apartment complex only in Tempe. **Chair Lawrence** asked if there was plenty of parking when coming home at 9:00 PM. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that he had a reserved parking space. **Chair Lawrence** stated that when the parking ratio is 0.5 spaces per dwelling unit, there are not enough reserved spaces for each unit. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the 0.5 spaces per unit ratio is only for the Walkable Urban Code, which is typically along the light rail corridor. **Chair Lawrence** stated that he is okay with the proposal along the light rail, but that other apartment complexes he has been to have had parking issues. Chair Lawrence added that he has never driven into an apartment complex before that has had many empty parking spots or an empty space nearby the unit, which is under the current parking requirements.

**Mr. Virgil** stated that there is an apartment complex on Union Hills Drive and 35th Avenue where off-street parking is impossible to find in the complex and people park in the street, noting that their parking is under the current requirements.



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting**                      June 13, 2023  
**Location**                                      Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:**

No quorum.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

Committee member Ashley Hare left during the previous item, thus losing quorum.



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 14, 2023  
**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

No quorum.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

No quorum.





**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting**                      June 8, 2023

**Request**    Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

No quorum.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

No quorum.



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 8, 2023  
**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

**Staff Presentation:**

**Mr. Zambrano** shared the parking reductions proposed and displayed an image of a typical multifamily development with a lot of parking. Mr. Zambrano shared the current and proposed parking requirement for multifamily development City-wide, affordable multifamily development City-wide, multifamily development in the Infill Development District, market-rate multifamily development in the Walkable Urban (WU) Code, and affordable multifamily development in the WU Code. Mr. Zambrano displayed an example for each type of multifamily development of a 300-unit complex, having only 1- or 2-bedroom units, and shared what the difference in the parking requirement would be. Mr. Zambrano then discussed passenger loading zones, a new requirement proposed only for sites zoned WU Code. Mr. Zambrano concluded with the timeline for the text amendment.

**Discussion:**

None.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-8-23-Y

### INFORMATION ONLY

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 20, 2023

**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

#### VPC DISCUSSION:

##### Staff Presentation:

**Mrs. Sanchez Luna** provided an overview of the proposed text amendment. Mrs. Sanchez Luna noted that the proposed text amendment would allow for a reduction in parking for multifamily and affordable multifamily citywide. Ms. Sanchez Luna summarized other parking reductions. Mrs. Sanchez Luna presented examples of the proposed parking reductions. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by noting the proposed hearing dates for the text amendment.

##### Questions from the Committee:

**Mr. Sanou** and **Ms. Wallace** voiced their disagreement.

**Chair Perez** stated that the text amendment came from movement at the legislative level. Chair Perez voiced her disagreement on the proposed text amendment and provided an example on 67th Avenue and Broadway Road that would be able to reduce parking with the proposed text amendment. Chair Perez noted that all current projects could revise their site plan to reduce the number of parking.

**Angelica Terrazas** voiced her disagreement and stated that the reduction in parking would make living in the city inconvenient, negatively affecting the population.

**Chair Perez** stated that Estrella did not have the infrastructure nor amenities to support the reduction. Chair Perez added that the reduction could work in certain areas of the city, but not the entire city nor Estrella.

**Dan Rush** stated multifamily development did not have enough parking. **Chair Perez** stated that if parking is unavailable, it could allow for alternative forms of transportation.

**Ms. Wallace** stated that Estrella did not have the public transportation infrastructure or street infrastructure to support the reduction. Ms. Wallace stated that the population

needed vehicles and parking spaces. Ms. Wallace reiterated her disagreement and opposition to the text amendment. **Chair Perez** noted that families have numerous vehicles that overcrowd garages and driveways. **Ms. Wallace** stated that parking garages could help reduce on street parking and overcrowded driveways.

**Ms. Terrazas** stated that single-family residences don't always have families that require one vehicle. Ms. Terrazas noted that numerous people share one house, requiring additional vehicles. Ms. Terrazas voiced her disagreement and added that the reduction was unpractical.

**Ms. Wallace** noted that a reduction in parking is only feasible to certain social groups who can afford the reduction.

**Chair Perez** asked staff about the input that they have received in the northern villages. **Ms. Escolar** noted that they have heard similar concerns and were opposed to the text amendment.

**Ms. Terrazas** asked for information regarding commercial parking reduction. Ms. Terrazas noted that a reduction in commercial parking would also have negative effects on the village. **Ms. Escolar** stated that the proposed text amendment would not reduce commercial parking.

#### **Public Comment:**

**Ms. Groff** stated that the proposed text amendment does not affect the parking maximum. Ms. Groff stated that the idea would be to allow the market demand to determine the number of parking. Ms. Groff noted that this could lead to shared parking between developments and parking adjusted to the market.

#### **Committee Discussion:**

**Ms. Wallace** stated that the reduction would allow for zero parking. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** responded that the zero required parking would only be in the Walkable Urban Code and affordable housing projects.

**Ms. Groff** added that the lack of parking could reduce rental rates. **Mr. Sanou** disagreed.

**Chair Perez** noted that there could be additional revenue if there were rented parking garages. **Ms. Wallace** stated that the parking garages should be free in certain areas.

**Ms. Wallace** voiced her opposition for the proposed text amendment.

**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting**                      June 12, 2023

**Request**    Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

**Mr. Klimek** shared the parking reductions proposed and displayed an image of a typical multifamily development with a lot of parking. He shared the current and proposed parking requirement for multifamily development City-wide, affordable multifamily development City-wide, multifamily development in the Infill Development District, market-rate multifamily development in the Walkable Urban (WU) Code, and affordable multifamily development in the WU Code. He displayed an example for each type of multifamily development of a 300-unit complex, having only 1- or 2-bedroom units, and shared what the difference in the parking requirement would be. He then discussed passenger loading zones, a new requirement proposed only for sites zoned WU Code and concluded with the timeline for the text amendment.

**COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS**

Committee Members Adams, Alauria, O’Hara and Vice Chair Fogelson expressed concern over the proposed parking reduction.

**Committee Members O’Hara** asked if 1.25 spaces per unit is a standard that comes from a national study or if it focuses on cities such as Phoenix. **Mr. Klimek** responded that the ITE study is national and shows 1.23 spaces per unit for suburban development and 1.2 spaces per unit for urban development. He added that the proposal also equates to 1 space per resident dwelling plus 0.25 guest spaces.

**Committee Member Molfetta** stated that the zoning district prescribes the number of dwelling units permitted on a site so less parking means more units can be constructed.

**Committee Member Freeman** stated that this provides greater flexibility, that the parking supply should be specific to the context, and that the current standard is high. He asked if this will limit the amount of parking that can be provided. **Mr. Klimek** responded that this reduces the number of spaces that are required but does not limit the amount of parking that can be provided.

**Committee Members O'Hara** asked Chair Jaramillo how the proposal was received by the Planning Commission. **Chair Jaramillo** responded that the proposal was well received, will support affordable housing, and he then cited cul-de-sac in Tempe as an example of an innovative community that would not be permitted in Phoenix.

**Committee Members O'Hara** stated that cul-de-sac is at a good location with plenty of students, good access to transit and ASU, and a responsible owner. He expressed concern that not all owners are responsible, and this could be used to create less desirable housing products. **Committee Members Krentz** stated he was involved in the cul-de-sac project and that half the residents are not affiliated with ASU.

**Committee Member Sommacampagna** asked if the parking reductions in the Infill Development District would be allowed by-right and if there were any parking reductions permitted in the area that require a use permit. **Mr. Klimek** responded that the parking reductions are by-right in the Infill Development Area and responded that he wasn't sure about the use permit areas.

**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**  
**Z-TA-8-23-Y**  
**INFORMATION ONLY**

**Date of VPC Meeting** June 26, 2023  
**Request** Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

Meeting was canceled due to lack of quorum.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

Meeting was canceled due to lack of quorum.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-TA-8-23-Y

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	June 27, 2023
<b>Request</b>	Amend Chapters 2, 6, 7 and 13 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing.

#### **VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:**

*Two members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

#### STAFF PRESENTATION

**Samuel Rogers**, staff, provided a presentation regarding the proposed text amendment to reduce parking requirements for multifamily and affordable housing. He described the proposed citywide parking requirements for multifamily development and affordable multifamily development and further described the proposed parking requirements for the Infill Development District and in the Walkable Urban Code.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

**Committee Member Adams** asked how the parking reductions were determined. **Mr. Rogers** stated that he was not aware of how the reductions were determined, but he would provide the staff report.

**Committee Member Keyser** stated that surveys have shown that people want mass transit, but he expects innovation in autonomous vehicles, electric vehicles, or smart car technology to impact how people interact with cars. Committee Member Keyser stated that Phoenix could become walkable someday, but the City needs to implement linear cores. Committee Member Keyser stated that he is shy on this text amendment until we know the future automobile market trends.

**Committee Member Solorio** stated that parking minimums have been eliminated across the country in cities like Buffalo, Seattle, and Portland and in the City of Mesa's downtown form-based code. Committee Member Solorio explained that parking will be determined by the financier based on the product type, so luxury apartments will still provide parking and developments that serve specialty populations such as veterans,



the elderly, or individuals with severe mental illnesses will be able to provide less parking and thus more units.

**Committee Member Fitzgerald** encouraged everyone to read the text amendments very carefully and stated that there is no outreach to the people in neighborhoods.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

**John Hathaway** stated that there is a law of unintended consequences that is always present and stated that the increase in luxury apartments being built in Phoenix has caused the City to be ranked number one in the county for increasing housing rates at 32 percent. Mr. Hathaway stated that he understands the need for affordable housing, but there will be consequences and explained that places like Portland, Southern California, or Manhattan are not the same as Phoenix because car ownership is much higher in Phoenix.

**Jackie Rich** stated that she would like to see the research that supports the parking reduction and stated that the proposed text amendment would reduce parking requirements for luxury units to what is currently required for a studio unit. Ms. Rich stated that luxury unit residents will likely want amenities like electric vehicle charging rather than fewer parking spaces and explained people will not walk because the City of Phoenix is seeing around 100 days with temperatures over 100 degrees Fahrenheit and because Phoenix is ranked number six in most pedestrian fatalities. Ms. Rich stated that while some residents in affordable housing developments may not drive, some residents may have a medical condition that make it difficult to walk and those residents need easily accessible parking and explained more public transit needs to be available before this text amendments moves forward.

#### **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION**

None.