



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**

**PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8)**

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	July 8, 2024
<b>Date of Planning Hearing Officer Hearing</b>	July 17, 2024
<b>Request</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Request to modify Stipulation No. 1 regarding general conformance with the site plan date stamped March 17, 2022, and elevations date stamped July 11, 2022.</li><li>2) Request to modify Stipulation No. 3 regarding maximum building height.</li><li>3) Request to modify Stipulation No. 5 regarding EV Ready garages and charging stations.</li><li>4) Request to modify Stipulation No. 14 regarding the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces.</li></ol>
<b>Location</b>	Northeast corner of 39th Avenue and Vineyard Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approved
<b>VPC Vote</b>	6-0

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

*One member of the public registered to speak on this item, in favor.*

**Staff Presentation:**

**Nayeli Sanchez Luna**, staff, displayed the location of the subject site and noted the acreage of the proposal. Mrs. Sanchez Luna summarized the original rezoning request noting the original proposal for multifamily development. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the staff presentation by summarizing the proposed single-family development and added the proposed modifications proposed in the Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) application.

### **Applicant Presentation:**

**Ashley Marsh**, representing the applicant with Gammage & Burnham PLC, began the presentation by summarizing the original proposal that rezoned the property to R-2 to allow 110 built-to-rent units. Ms. Marsh stated that the current proposal would modify the site plan to allow 64 single-family detached homes which was a 42 percent reduction in density. Ms. Marsh noted the recreational lawn located on the north portion of the site that was added based on community feedback. Ms. Marsh added that all the homes would have two car garages in addition to a shared driveway. Ms. Marsh noted that the proposal was updated to include fencing for more protection. Ms. Marsh displayed the new proposed color palette and elevations and noted the enhanced accent materials when adjacent to a public street. Ms. Marsh concluded her presentation by summarizing the proposed modifications requested through the PHO process and noted that they were no longer requesting to delete any stipulations.

### **Questions From the Committee:**

**Jennifer Rouse** stated that she appreciated the fencing and recreational lawn but noted that the lawn should be centrally located. Ms. Rouse added that she appreciated the changes to the parking and garages because there have been ongoing issues in other similar subdivisions. Ms. Rouse voiced her support for the single-family detached product and hoped to hear from the community that was going to be directly impacted. Ms. Rouse asked if there were any plans for 39th Avenue. **Ms. Marsh** stated that all off-site improvements, including 39th Avenue, would have to be completed before the first home was built. **Ms. Rouse** added that the intersection on Vineyard Road was dangerous, and it was an accident waiting to happen. **Carlos Ortega** voiced his agreement. **Ms. Marsh** recognized the ongoing issue on Vineyard Road but noted that the original rezoning case had a stipulation that would require the developer to work with the Street Transportation Department regarding Vineyard Road.

**Francisco Barraza** noted that he liked the new proposal and liked having more than one accessway into the proposed development. Mr. Barraza stated that the landscaping was appropriate and appreciated that the landscape stipulation was not removed. Mr. Barraza added that he hoped that the applicant and developer continue to work with the Street Transportation Department regarding 39th Avenue and Vineyard Road.

**Mr. Ortega** stated that the new proposal was an improvement compared to the one presented last month. Mr. Ortega added that he would like to have the option for EV capabilities in the garages. Mr. Ortega stated that some of the driveways should be 22 feet long to accommodate larger vehicles. **Rebecca Perrera** agreed with the concerns regarding vehicles spilling onto the sidewalk. **Ms. Marsh** understood that the concern but noted that the driveways were not located along the street, but rather on the rear side of the buildings. Ms. Marsh added that only six houses would have driveways adjacent to the street. **Mr. Ortega** asked if the sidewalks would be located on the perimeter of the development. **Ms. Marsh** confirmed. **Mr. Ortega** added that more amenities should be placed on the northern recreational lawn. **Ms. Marsh** noted that the

recreational lawn was primarily for retention purposes.

**Ms. Perrera** shared her concerns regarding the 18-foot driveways and garages. Ms. Perrera noted that it would be best if they could accommodate the 22-foot standard length. Ms. Perrera appreciated the time and dedication that the applicant demonstrated and for keeping the original landscape stipulations.

**Patrick Nasser-Taylor** asked why the product had changed from a multifamily development to a single-family product. **Ms. Marsh** noted that the new developer does not build build-to-rent or multifamily products. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** noted it was odd for a multifamily proposal to change to single-family. Mr. Nasser-Taylor asked if all the houses would be a minimum of three bedrooms. **Ms. Marsh** confirmed.

#### **Public Comment:**

**Phil Hertel** stated that they have seen four proposals for this site and that the project has improved. Mr. Hertel added that the Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development (LCRD) did not have an opportunity to provide an official recommendation, but the applicant did present to the group. Mr. Hertel noted that all the garages were located on the rear, so the LCRD did not have an issue with the reduction in garage and driveway sizes. Mr. Hertel stated that his only concern was the neighborhood located along the north and west side of the proposed site. Mr. Hertel added that the neighborhood has experience a lot of crime and requested the proposed development be gated. Mr. Hertel noted that the applicant has denied the request to gate the single-family subdivision. **Ms. Marsh** thanked Mr. Hertel and the LCRD for their input. Ms. Marsh stated that a wall was provided to add extra security, but since this is an infill project, the street will remain public. Ms. Marsh reiterated that they modified the proposal to accommodate fencing along certain areas.

#### **Committee Discussion:**

**Mr. Ortega** stated that he had concerns with high-speed driving on Vineyard Road. **Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd** asked if a stipulation could be added to include speedbumps on Vineyard Road. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** stated that speedbumps are only allowed on certain roads, dependent on the street classification. **Ms. Marsh** clarified that there was already an existing stipulation to work with the Street Transportation Department regarding Vineyard Road. **Mr. Ortega** noted that the development adjacent to the site added speedbumps on Vineyard Road. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** noted that a stipulation could be added, but that the Street Transportation Department had to review and approve it. **Vice Chair Hurd** suggested contacting the Street Transportation Department after this case to voice their concerns regarding Vineyard Road. **Ms. Marsh** reiterated the existing stipulation and agreed to work with the Street Transportation Department regarding concerns on Vineyard Road.

**Motion:**

**Rebecca Perrera** motioned to recommend approval of PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8).

**Patrick Nasser-Taylor** seconded the motion.

**Vote:**

**6-0**, motion to recommend approval of PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8) passed with Committee Members Barraza, Nasser-Taylor, Ortega, Perrera, Rouse, and Hurd in favor.

**Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:**

None.



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**

**PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8)**

**Date of VPC Meeting** May 13, 2024

**Date of Planning Hearing** May 15, 2024  
**Officer Hearing Request**

- 1) Request to modify Stipulation No. 1 regarding general conformance with the site plan date stamped March 17, 2022, and elevations date stamped July 11, 2022.
- 2) Request to delete Stipulation No. 2 regarding garage door embellishments.
- 3) Request to delete Stipulation No. 3 regarding maximum building height.
- 4) Request to delete Stipulation No. 5 regarding EV Ready garages and charging stations.
- 5) Request to modify Stipulation No. 6 regarding tree caliper size within the required landscape setback.
- 6) Request to modify Stipulation No. 7.a regarding minimum tree caliper size between back of curb and sidewalk.
- 7) Request to modify Stipulation No. 14 regarding the minimum number of bicycle parking spaces.

**VPC Recommendation** Continued

**VPC Vote** 7-0

**VPC DISCUSSION:**

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

**Staff Presentation:**

**Nayeli Sanchez Luna**, staff, displayed the location of the subject site and noted the acreage of the proposal. Mrs. Sanchez Luna summarized the original rezoning request noting the original proposal for multifamily development. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the staff presentation by summarizing the proposed single-family development and added the proposed modifications and deletions proposed by the Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) application.

**Applicant Presentation:**

**Alex Caraveo**, representing the applicant with CVL Consultants, began the

presentation by summarizing the proposed changes to the site. Mr. Caraveo displayed the proposed single-family residential site plan and noted the enhanced open space and centrally located amenity area. Mr. Caraveo added that the proposed development would significantly reduce the density in the area. Mr. Caraveo stated that the purpose of the PHO application is to remove any stipulations that were no longer necessary for a single-family residential development with lower density. Mr. Caraveo summarized each stipulation modification and deletion request. Mr. Caraveo noted that the garage embellishments and EV Ready charging stations were no longer necessary because this was a single-family development. Mr. Caraveo concluded the applicant presentation by reiterating that the proposed development will have a lower density and will be compatible with the surrounding land uses.

### **Questions From the Committee:**

**Francisco Barraza** asked for clarification regarding access into the subject site. **Mr. Caraveo** noted the entrance on Vineyard Road. **Mr. Barraza** asked if each house would have a garage. **Mr. Caraveo** confirmed.

**JoAnne Jensen** stated that the reduced density had nothing to do with the request to reduce the landscaping requirements nor the height limitations. Ms. Jensen asked for more reasoning behind the stipulation modifications and deletions. **Mr. Caraveo** noted that the modifications and deletions were necessary for the proposed single-family development and the configuration of the site. **Ms. Jensen** recalled that the original rezoning case and stated that she would like to keep the height limitations. **Mr. Caraveo** stated that they were looking for relief to allow for the single-family residential development. **Ms. Jensen** asked if the proposal would provide EV capabilities such as wiring in the garages. **Mr. Caraveo** noted that EV capabilities would not be available. **Ms. Jensen** added that EV capabilities have been required in all rezoning cases within Laveen and strongly suggested including wiring in the proposed garages. **Mr. Caraveo** noted that they were trying to limit the cost of development to increase affordability. **Ms. Jensen** voiced her concerns regarding the proposed reduction to the tree caliper size. Ms. Jensen stated that the applicant should not rely on a lower density proposal to justify the reduction in landscaping. Ms. Jensen noted that shading was still necessary.

**Jennifer Rouse** asked for the dimensions of the proposed lots. **Mr. Caraveo** clarified that the lots would be 55 feet by 55 feet. **Ms. Rouse** asked if the garage doors would have lighting. **Mr. Caraveo** confirmed. **Ms. Rouse** voiced her concerns regarding the shared driveways as it could cause a hostile environment. Ms. Rouse asked how wide the shared driveways would be and how the established HOA would enforce lighting. Ms. Rouse added that there is a large unsheltered population and noted that lighting would be very important for this development. Ms. Rouse voiced her support for a lower density but was hesitant on the proposed design. **Mr. Caraveo** noted that the driveway would be 18 feet long and each lot would have a two-car garage. **Ms. Rouse** asked what would happen if there were one car per household. Ms. Rouse noted that the neighborhood would depend on additional parking.

**Rebecca Perrera** stated that she liked the original proposal. Ms. Perrera asked if the lower density project would be built for rent. **Mr. Caraveo** stated that the lots would be for sale.

**Mr. Caraveo** addressed Ms. Rouse's question by stating that additional parking would be available on the accessway.

**Chair Linda Abegg** asked if there was a requirement to add additional parking on the accessway. **Troy Hill**, with the applicant's team, noted that they would be required to provide two parking spaces per lot. Mr. Hill noted the two-car garage and the driveway. **Ms. Perrera** noted that she was having a hard time visualizing the parking situation. **Mr. Hill** added that they were providing more parking than what was required.

**Ms. Jensen** stated that she counted 55 additional parking spots on the public accessway and asked for confirmation. **Mr. Caraveo** confirmed. **Mr. Hill** noted that he realized that this type of housing product is not for everyone.

**Chair Abegg** added that a stipulation could be added to keep lots 24, 25, 26, 57, 59, and 60 should be limited to one story. Chair Abegg noted that there should be wiring provided for EV vehicles in the garages. **Mr. Hill** noted that this is something that is not offered. **Chair Abegg** stated that shading should stay at 75% and that there could be a small reduction in the landscaping requirements, but not 100% 1-inch caliper trees. Chair Abegg added that 22-foot garage setbacks must be required to accommodate larger vehicles.

**Carlos Ortega** stated that the proposal was incomplete and that it seemed that they would worry about the concerns later. Mr. Ortega noted that the previous applicant spent hours with the community to address all the concerns. Mr. Ortega voiced his support for 22-foot-long garage and driveways. Mr. Ortega voiced his concerns regarding shared driveways. Mr. Ortega recognized that the applicant was proposing a development with lower density, but it seemed that they were not thinking about the buyer. Mr. Ortega asked for the open space percentage. **Chair Abegg** noted that there was 18% of open space. **Mr. Ortega** noted that there needed to be more amenities in the development.

### **Public Comment:**

**Phil Hertel** stated that the proposed PHO request was not presented at the Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development (LCRD) meeting. Mr. Hertel noted that there were a lot of concerns regarding the proposal. Mr. Hertel added that elevations needed to be presented and that a 22-foot garage and driveway needed to be provided. Mr. Hertel noted that the landscaping setbacks should not be modified. Mr. Hertel requested the case be continued so that the applicant could address the committee's concerns and attend an LCRD meeting.

**Dan Penton** noted that the previous applicant worked to address concerns regarding

traffic. Mr. Penton added the applicant did not seem to care nor address the traffic concerns found in the original rezoning request. Mr. Penton stated that the previous proposal should have been used as a template and that there needed to be 22-feet of driveway. Mr. Penton cited a previous rezoning case that had a stipulation that would offer EV wiring to future homebuyers.

### **Committee Discussion:**

**Chair Abegg** noted that garage door embellishments and 22-foot garage setbacks were common in the Laveen community. Chair Abegg asked if the applicant was open to a continuance. Chair Abegg added that some of the possible stipulations included, enhanced garage doors, height limitations for specific units, wiring for EV, 1-inch and 2-inch caliper size trees, 22-foot-long garage setbacks, and parking.

**Mr. Hill** stated that he would prefer to address the issues tonight. Mr. Hill added that he could not speak on the 22-foot-long garage setbacks.

**Ms. Perrera** added that the original multifamily development was more thought out.

**Ms. Jensen** stated that regardless of housing, it should be a place to live comfortably. Ms. Jensen added that the proposal does not look like a comfortable place to live.

**Mr. Hill** asked if a shared driveway would be something that the committee would support. **Ms. Jensen** voiced her disagreement on a shared driveway. **Mr. Hill** added that the proposal was proposed to lower utility and construction cost, which would result in saving to buyers.

**Chair Abegg** noted that there had been numerous proposals for this site.

**Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd** stated that the stipulations were not added because the previous project was multifamily, they were added because they were standard in Laveen.

**Mr. Ortega** asked what happened to the previous developer. **Mr. Hill** noted that the developer fell through.

**Chair Abegg** appreciated the lower density but added that there were items that needed to be addressed. Chair Abegg asked if the applicant was willing to return to next month's meeting. **Mr. Hill and Mr. Caraveo** confirmed.

**Vice Chair Hurd** noted that these items were important to the committee and the community.

**Mr. Ortega** asked if the proposal would be gated. **Mr. Hill** noted that the proposal would not be gated. **Chair Abegg** added that a private accessway could help enforce street parking. **Mr. Ortega** reiterated the concerns with the proposal. **Chair Abegg** asked if



anyone had a motion.

**Motion:**

**Jennifer Rouse** motioned to continue PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8) to a future meeting.  
**Francisco Barraza** seconded the motion.

**Vote:**

**7-0**, motion to continue PHO-1-24--Z-19-22-7(8) to a future meeting passed with Committee Members Barraza, Jensen, Ortega, Perrera, Rouse, Hurd and Abegg in favor.

**Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:**

None.