



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-59-18-8

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 13, 2018
<b>Request From</b>	R1-14 BAOD (0.82 acres)
<b>Request To</b>	C-1 BAOD (0.82 acres)
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Commercial
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 615 feet north of the northwest corner of 25th Street and Baseline Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval
<b>VPC Vote</b>	11-3 (Ealim, Smith, and Vera, dissented) (Brennan abstained)

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

**Elyse DiMartino** provided an overview of the rezoning request including General Plan Land Use maps, zoning maps, aerial photographs, General Plan principles, and the proposed site plan. Ms. DiMartino explained that the subject site is an extension of the commercial site directly to the south. She noted that the site to the south had been rezoned to commercial in 2005, while the subject site remained residential. She explained that the northern portion of the site was depicted as a retention area and the southern portion of the site was to be used for parking. She further explained that the parcels would develop as one commercial center. Ms. DiMartino clarified that the conceptual site plan includes a pedestrian pathway providing access to an amenities area on the adjacent parcel to the east. This parcel was rezoned in case no. Z-10-18-8 and was stipulated to the provision of open space and amenities including a multi-use trail, equestrian corral area, shaded benches, and bicycle parking areas. Ms. DiMartino noted that the VPC had heard this zoning case back in May of this year.

**Mr. Steve Bienstock, representative with Beus Gilbert,** presented background on the request. He explained that the subject site would be part of a larger commercial development that would include the parcel to the south.

**Ms. Marcia Busching** suggested adding a stipulation requiring a pedestrian pathway from the site to the canal. **Ms. DiMartino** clarified that staff had stipulated that the development provide access to the canal amenities adjacent to the subject site. **Ms. Busching** stated she wanted a separate stipulation that would provide direct access to the canal.

**Mr. Greg Brownell** asked if the owner to the south was the same as the subject site. **Mr. Bienstock** confirmed both sites have the same owner.

**Mr. Patrick Brennan** asked if the site had the same owner as the property to the east. **Mr. Ken Skinner, representing the developer**, stated that these sites have separate owners but will likely function as one fluid commercial site.

**Ms. Sara Christopherson** asked if the displayed plan was a site plan for the development. **Ms. DiMartino** clarified that the site plan displayed is for the area of the rezoning. She further explained that this site is part of a larger development.

**Mr. Bienstock** confirmed. He noted that the rezoning site will have parking and retention that will be used for the overall, larger commercial site to the south.

**Ms. Christopherson** asked if the subject site and the lot to the south will be combined. **Mr. Skinner** confirmed the lots would be combined to one lot.

**Mr. Brennan** stated he had received an email about a historic building on, or adjacent to, the development. **Mr. Skinner** stated that he was not aware of any historic buildings. He explained that the single-family home that was previously located on the subject site was demolished.

**Mr. Joseph Larios** asked the applicant to consider having public art elements along the canal. Additionally, he encouraged the applicant to reach out to local artists in the South Mountain Village.

**Mr. Perry Ealim** asked the applicants where their offices were located and what kind of work they have done in the South Mountain community. **Mr. Skinner and Mr. Bienstock** explained that they were located outside of the Village. **Mr. Ealim** expressed frustration that many of the developers and applicants looking to build in South Mountain are not doing anything positive for the community. **Mr. Bienstock** explained that this rezoning will allow the larger development to progress, which will ultimately provide goods, services, and jobs for the community.

**Ms. Muriel Smith** asked the Committee to focus on the current request, whether or not the zoning is appropriate.

**Ms. Tamala Daniels** asked what types of businesses the developer would be marketing to. She stated that she did not want to see more drive-through restaurants or dollar stores. She explained the community's need for more services and sit down restaurants.

**Mr. Stephen Glueck** reiterated Ms. Daniels' concerns about having more fast food restaurants.

**Mr. Skinner** stated that the subject site and the larger site to the south combined, is only about 5 acres. He explained they are looking at having a sit down restaurant, fitness center, and/or retail in the overall development; however, the subject site would be used for parking and retention.

**MOTION**

Ms. Kay Shepard made a motion to recommend approval of the request. **Ms. Sara Christopherson** seconded the motion.

**Mr. Patrick Brennan** requested a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor to add the following stipulation:

- The developer shall provide a pedestrian pathway to the canal.

**Ms. Kay Shepard** did not accept the friendly amendment.

**VOTE**

**11-3 (Ealim, Smith, and Vera, dissented) (Brennan abstained)** Motion to recommend approval of the request passes.

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

None.