



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-25-20-4

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 1, 2021
<b>Request From</b>	R-3 RI (Multifamily Residence District, Residential Infill District), R-5 RI (Multifamily Residence District, Residential Infill District), C-O (Commercial Office – Restricted Commercial District), C-O/G-O (Commercial Office – Restricted Commercial District / General Office), C-2 SP (Intermediate Commercial District, Special Permit), C-2 HR (Intermediate Commercial District, High-Rise District), C-2 HR (Approved C-2 HR SP) (Intermediate Commercial District, High-Rise District, Approved Intermediate Commercial District, High-Rise District, Special Permit), C-2 HR SP (Intermediate Commercial District, High-Rise District, Special Permit), C-2 HGT/WVR (Intermediate Commercial District, Height Waiver), and P-1 (Passenger Automobile Parking, Limited)
<b>Request To</b>	PUD (Planned Unit Development)
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Phoenix Children's Hospital PUD to allow for a medical campus
<b>Location</b>	Southwest corner of the SR-51 Freeway and Thomas Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approve, per staff recommendation
<b>VPC Vote</b>	12-0

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

*No speaker cards were received on this item.*

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Klimek**, staff, introduced the request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) on the Phoenix Children's Hospital Campus. The request will consolidate 10+ zoning districts into a single PUD that includes enhanced development and design requirements, integrates entitlements from previously approved zoning cases, and provides standards that focus on pedestrian connectivity, shade, and perimeter treatments including setbacks. These requirements contained in the

PUD include: a pedestrian circulation plan to unify the campus as it continues to develop, detached sidewalks with all new development that will be shaded to 75 percent by vegetation, new private pathways that will be shaded to 75 percent by vegetation, new surface parking lots that will be shaded to 25 percent by vegetation, and height restrictions to limit the greatest intensity to along Thomas Road and the S.R. 51. He concluded by stating that staff is recommending approval subject to 11 stipulations including: technical corrections, shaded bus pads, a traffic impact statement, ADA compliance for all streets, and standard stipulations pertaining to Aviation and Archaeology.

#### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

**Taylor Earl**, of Earl and Curley, introduced himself as representing Phoenix Children's Hospital. He provided an overview of Phoenix Children's Hospital, its mission, and its many accolades. The current campus is governed by multiple individual zoning cases with different zoning districts and a variety of stipulations pertaining to each and this fragmentation makes it difficult to develop a cohesive campus. The PUD zoning tool was not available at the time of previous zoning entitlement or else it would have been used because it is the ideal zoning district for a campus such as Phoenix Children's Hospital. The PUD will simplify the zoning on the site, allow for easier master planning, and articulates design standards beyond that prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance

#### QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**Procaccini** noted that Children's Way is misspelled on all aerial photographs in the narrative and that Virginia Avenue is incorrectly identified as Virginia Street. He added that he is hopeful the applicant will take extra care in developing the most southwesterly parcel because it is surrounded by residential uses.

**Jewett** and **George** asked staff for an update on the Bus Rapid Transit and if it is still planned for Thomas Road. **Klimek** responded that Thomas Road was not selected as part of the foundational network of the BRT system but that, to his knowledge, it may still be a later extension. The foundational network will be 35th Avenue and Van Buren into downtown.

**Jewett** noted that the bus routes along Thomas Road have high ridership and frequent routes; he asked why the presentations and the PUD do not more directly address how the campus will be designed with consideration toward this transit corridor, which may still receive BRT in the future. He also noted that the campus is a large superblock and that all discussion in the presentations and the PUD are focused on internal connectivity rather than connectivity with the surrounding neighborhoods to, for example, provide a direct connection through the campus to the businesses along Thomas Road.

- Regarding transit orientation, **Earl** responded that many employees are medical professionals who travel from throughout the region, so bus service is not always practical and that many patients and visitors travel to

the hospital in emergencies or tend not to use bus service for other reasons.

- Regarding through-routes for pedestrians, **Earl** responded that campus security is an important element for any pediatric hospital and that open access is not consistent with the safe environment that Phoenix Children's Hospital has created and wishes to expand.

**Vice Chair Bryck** note that the campus is near the Oak Street Bikeway which is currently in development and that it is also near the Grand Canal which was recently improved through the Grand Canalscape project. He further noted that the pedestrian and bicycle connections under the S.R. 51 on Thomas Road appears uncomfortable. He asked that the applicant explore these topics as they consider the expansion of the campus. **Earl** responded that they met with several active transportation planners from the City of Phoenix, so they are aware of the nearby bicycle projects and have included bike racks as requested by staff. He added that they recognize the S.R. 51 crossing is not ideal and have met with the city on potential solutions which may also need ADOT involvement.

**Wagner** stated that Phoenix Children's Hospital is a tremendous asset. She stated that the PUD discussed signage for both decoration and branding which may be appropriate along Thomas Road but expressed that lighted signage and branding along the south and west boundaries should be limited in its height and intensity when facing the neighborhoods. **Earl** responded that the campus has its signs regulated through a Comprehensive Sign Plan which includes provisions that the tower be decorative and that these lessen outward from the main tower. He added that the campus is well respected in the area for their attention to security and on their sensitivity to the neighborhood.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

#### APPLICANT RESPONSE

None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE.

#### **MOTION**

**Procaccini** moved to approve per the staff recommendation. **Wagner** seconded the motion.

#### **DISCUSSION**

None.

#### **VOTE**

**12-0-0;** motion passed with Benjamin, Coates, George, Jewett, Mahrle, Matthews, Procaccini, Rodriguez, Searles, Wagner, Vice Chair Bryck, and Chair Kleinman in support; none in dissent; and none in abstention.

### **STAFF COMMENTS**

**Member Procaccini** noted during the discussion that all exhibits contained in the Development Narrative include the following two discrepancies:

- “Children’s Way” is misspelled “Childerns Way”
- “Virginia Avenue” is incorrectly identified as “Virginia Street”

Staff has received the comment and concurs with the suggestions that both errors have merit and, if desired, can be corrected without creating issues within the PUD.