ATTACHMENT C

Laveen
VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
GPA-LV-1-24-8
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	May 13, 2024
Request From	Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre and Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned
Request To	Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre, Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre, and Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned
Proposal	A minor general plan amendment for single family residential attached and detached uses and golf course
Location	Southeast corner of 59th Avenue and Southern Avenue

VPC DISCUSSION:

Item No.3 (GPA-LV-1-24-8) and Item No. 4 (Z-25-24-8) were heard together.
Nine members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Applicant Presentation:

Alex Hayes, representing the applicant with Withey Morris Baugh, began the presentation by displaying the location and acreage of the site. Mr. Hayes summarized the history of the site, noting the decline of the golf course. Mr. Hayes added that the golf course was recently purchased and that the new owns were willing to revitalize the site. Mr. Hayes summarized the public outreach conducted including numerous meetings with the community, surveys, and engagement with stakeholders. Mr. Hayes displayed the proposed development and noted the different types of single-family housing and proposed golf course. Mr. Hayes added that each residential development would be gated in order to ensure safety throughout the community. Mr. Hayes concluded the presentation by listing the permitted uses, added that multifamily and condos would be prohibited, and noting that the PUD would have a phasing plan for the golf course.

Questions From the Committee:

Francisco Barraza voiced his support for revitalizing the golf course.

JoAnne Jensen stated that she her surprise regarding the contingency amount the HOAs and the residents. Ms. Jensen asked how the applicant was able to get the consensus of the majority of the residents. **Mr. Hayes** stated that it took a lot of time and listening. Mr. Hayes added that the original proposal consisted of solely single-

family residential houses, but that proposal was not supported by the community. Mr. Hayes noted the numerous meetings that were held and stated that the community agreed to the compromise of a golf course and single-family residential. **Ms. Jensen** added that she hoped that the golf course would be built as promised by the applicant.

Jennifer Rouse agreed with JoAnne Jensen. Ms. Rouse stated that she was worried that the houses would be built but the golf course would never be restored. Ms. Rouse noted the distrust and hesitation from the community and added that she looked forward to hearing from the community and their concerns. Ms. Rouse added that the community and the committee would be following the proposal closely.

Carlos Ortega asked about the golf course affordability. **Mr. Hayes** noted that surrounding residents would be able to attend the golf course for free three times a year and receive a 10% discount. **Mr. Ortega** asked if the HOA fees of the surrounding residents would increase with the development of the golf course. **Mr. Hayes** stated that each proposed development within the PUD would have its own HOA to support the cost of the golf course. **Mr. Ortega** asked if the golf course would have a private section. **Mr. Hayes** stated that that hasn't been part of the discussion.

Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd noted the importance of protecting the community and stated that the applicant seemed to have done its due diligence. Vice Chair Hurd added that if the community supported the proposal, then the committee would support it as well.

Chair Linda Abegg agreed with the stated comments and added that she wanted to add language to ensure that the development of the golf course would be required. Chair Abegg listed possible stipulations including general conformance to a site plan for the proposed golf course.

Public Comment:

Karen Adams stated that the proposed development was the only viable solution. Ms. Adams added that she did not want the HOA fees to increase, nor did she agree to apartments. Ms. Adams noted that she would like the golf course to be built prior to any housing. Ms. Adams summarized events held by the previous golf course and voiced her support for revitalizing the community amenity.

Warren Foster noted that there were already too many houses and rental properties in the area. Mr. Foster stated that the single-family development located on 51st Avenue and Southern Avenue had turned into primarily rental properties. Mr. Foster asked how many years it would take for the development to be completed and that he did not want residents having to deal with noise and dust from construction. Mr. Foster asked if the development was going to allow apartments. **Mr. Hayes** indicated that multifamily and condos were prohibited.

Denise Suchy stated that the applicant glossed over the required vote required by the

HOAs. Ms. Suchy noted that the applicant has not done extensive outreach to the surrounding communities. Ms. Suchy added that there was a lawsuit against the previous golf course owners for not maintaining the land. Ms. Suchy stated that the proposal did not have enough parking for the proposed golf course.

Kim Brunner voiced his support for the proposal. Mr. Brunner noted that it was the best opportunity that has been presented in over 20 years and appreciated that a portion of the site was going to remain golf course. Mr. Brunner noted that the community has been very informed and that this would be the first development where the developers invited the community to work together on creating the proposal.

Cheryl Watnier noted that the applicant has worked with the residents within the Cottonfields development. Ms. Watnier noted that the applicant hosted neighborhood meetings and asked residents to attend to voice their concerns. Ms. Watnier added that the applicant has made compromise after compromise and that they sent out surveys to further gather comments. Ms. Watnier disagreed with Denise Suchy's comments regarding the lack of communication.

Jon Kimoto voiced his support for the proposed development. Mr. Kimoto noted the success of the golf course 20 to 30 ago. Mr. Kimoto added that it was in the community's hand to ensure success and that the applicant has worked with the community by reducing the number of units. Mr. Kimoto supported the proposal.

Patrice Herring stated that she was opposed to the proposed development. Ms. Herring voiced her distrust for the applicant and noted that she bought her residence for the open space that is provided by the existing golf course area. Ms. Herring mentioned the HOA vote and noted that the vote is not valid because the meeting didn't have all board members. Ms. Herring added that the applicant would sell the property as soon as they rezone the site. Ms. Herring stated that the applicant has hired a third party to contact all residents of the HOA to sign for the vote. Ms. Herring noted that she has been contacted numerous times. Ms. Herring added that the applicant must return to the HOA for a valid vote.

Melanie Hagen voiced her support for the proposal. Ms. Hagen noted that during the first public meeting, she was completely against the proposal; however, the applicant has since listened to the community and modified the proposal. Ms. Hagen noted that they golf course would be revitalized, and the gated communities will increase security. Ms. Hagen stated that the applicant has hired a third party to verify the HOA vote and it was individuals who did not participate or attend the public meetings who were opposed to the project.

Phil Hertel, representing the Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development (LCRD), noted that they applicant had previously presented at one of the meetings. Mr. Hertel added that people might have been misinformed regarding the HOA vote. Mr. Hertel noted that the Laveen VPC meeting had a lot of missing information presented at the LCRD meeting. Mr. Hertel requested the applicant to provide conceptual elevations and

site plans and reiterated that the proposal would be great for the community.

Chair Abegg informed the public that the HOA vote would not be discussed by the Laveen VPC. Chair Abegg added that she would like to add certain stipulations including general conformance to the golf course site plan, elevations, and site plan. Chair Abegg noted that she would like to see golf course language that would ensure that the golf course is built prior to any housing development.

Ms. Perrera requested more information on the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Ortega requested a stipulation that would require that a minimum of 75% of the individuals to own the residential property to prevent rental properties. Mr. Ortega noted that he would like to see strong CC&R conditions to help prevent rental properties. **Vice Chair Hurd** noted that she had lived in an HOA that had a condition where for the first year the property owner could not rent the house. Chair Hurd asked for more information on how the developer would maintain the land.

Applicant Response:

Alex Hayes noted that the consent forms required for the HOA vote were confirmed by the firm. Mr. Hayes stated that renters were unable to sign the consent form. Mr. Hayes noted that each HOA would have a property manager to ensure maintenance. Mr. Hayes added that the applicant's intent is not to sell the property and that multifamily was not proposed. Mr. Hayes noted that the golf course is intended to be completed by late next year and that they had no issues with language requiring general conformance to a site plan or elevations. Mr. Hayes stated that the narrative had detailed design guidelines that would guide elevations and that he agreed to language requiring the golf course to be completed prior to housing. Mr. Hayes added that if any of the surrounding residents had any complaints regarding weeds or trash to contact the property owners so it could be addressed.

Committee Discussion:

Ms. Jensen stated that the applicant should not overlook conditions in CC&Rs to limit the number of rental properties.

Mr. Ortega noted that he had owned a condo with similar CC&Rs.

Laveen
VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
GPA-LV-1-24-8

Date of VPC Meeting	August 12, 2024
Request From	Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre and Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned
Request To	Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre, Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre, and Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned
Proposal	A minor general plan amendment for single family residential attached and detached uses and golf course
Location	Southeast corner of 59th Avenue and Southern Avenue
VPC Recommendation	Approval
VPC Vote	7-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

Item No. 3 (GPA-LV-1-24-8) and Item No. 4 (Z-25-24-8) were heard together. Three members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Staff Presentation:

Nayeli Sanchez Luna, staff, presented an overview of GPA-LV-1-24-8 and Z-25-24-8. Mrs. Sanchez Luna discussed the location of the site, the requested zoning designation, and the surrounding land uses. Mrs. Sanchez Luna provided an overview of the proposed development including proposed uses for each development unit. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by summarizing the staff findings, correspondence, providing the staff recommendation and proposed stipulations.

Applicant Presentation:

Adam Baugh, representing the applicant with Withey Morris Baugh, provided an overview of the proposed cases. Mr. Baugh stated that he has been working with the neighborhood for over two years and that his team had finally achieved the number of signatures required to modify the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) of the adjacent subdivision, Cottonfields Community. Mr. Baugh added that the modifications to the CC&Rs would allow for the rezoning of the site and for the redevelopment of the golf course. Mr. Baugh noted that Stipulation No. 2 would require the golf course to be revitalize before single-family residences are occupied. Mr. Baugh displayed the proposed golf course holes and noted the renovations to the clubhouse and entrance monuments. Mr. Baugh added that multifamily and condos

are prohibited within the PUD. Mr. Baugh stated that all residential elevations must go through the public hearing process and that the PUD only allows 415 units. Mr. Baugh requested the committee to consider deleting Stipulation No. 11 which would require a 50 percent contribution to a future traffic signal on 59th Avenue and Vineyard Road. Mr. Baugh stated that the development located on the west side of 59th Avenue was not required to contribute to the traffic signal. Mr. Baugh noted that the proposed golf course and single-family development did not generate enough traffic to warrant a traffic signal and that other future development could assist with the cost. Mr. Baugh requested the committee to consider deleting Stipulation No. 1.n. which would require a pedestrian circulation exhibit to be added to the PUD narrative. Mr. Baugh added that the Cottonfields Community was opposed to pedestrians in their community and that each proposed development unit would be gated.

Questions From the Committee:

Chair Linda Abegg stated that she had spoken to the Street Transportation Department regarding the proposed deletions. Chair Abegg noted that the Street Transportation Department had stated that a traffic signal is required at every mile and half mile intersection, thus requiring a signal at the intersection of 59th Avenue and Vineyard Road. Chair Abegg added that the 50 percent contribution was consistent with the conditional approval of the Traffic Impact Study. Chair Abegg added that Stipulation No. 1.n. would ensure connectivity for different modes of mobility. Chair Abegg voiced her support in maintaining both stipulations.

Patrick Nasser-Taylor asked why the three-story multifamily project was removed from the proposal. **Mr. Baugh** noted that no one from the community supported the proposal for high density multifamily on this location. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** added that it was odd that the applicant did not push for multifamily but pushed on another multifamily project adjacent to the Loop 202 Freeway. **Mr. Baugh** stated that it was a different location and a different developer. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked if there was a possibility for Development Unit E, which would allow for a golf course, to be converted or reduced to allow for more single-family residential units. **Mr. Baugh** stated that more single-family units would not be supported by the community; furthermore, discussions with the Cottonfields community and CC&R have indicated that the boundaries are set. Mr. Baugh added that the density could be reduced but not increased. **Nr. Nasser-Taylor** asked for more information regarding Stipulation No. 2. **Mr. Baugh** provided an explanation. Mr. Baugh noted that the Certificate of Occupancy for single-family residential development would not be provided until the grading and drainage is completed and landscaping is completed. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked if the golf course had a developer. **Mr. Baugh** confirmed and noted that the property owner has also hired a management company for the golf course.

Carlos Ortega asked for clarification if the single-family attached units would be able to receive certificate of occupancy before the golf course was completed. **Chair Abegg** noted that she had reached out to staff, and they have confirmed that single-family attached is single-family residential and not multifamily. **Mr. Ortega** asked if the

existing residents would receive some sort of discount to utilize the golf course. Mr. Ortega asked if the existing homeowners association fees would increase for the Cottonfields community. **Mr. Baugh** noted that this development would cover all the costs of improvements and that the HOA fees for the adjacent Cottonfields community would not increase. Mr. Baugh added that the new development would have their own HOA and their own fees. Mr. Baugh added that there has been some discussion to allow for a free round of golf a few times a year and discounts for the golf course and restaurant. **Mr. Ortega** asked if there would be a possibility to allow for large events. **Mr. Baugh** added that the clubhouse could be used for events.

Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd asked if the clubhouse would be modified. **Mr. Baugh** clarified that only the exterior of the clubhouse would be remodeled.

Mr. Ortega voiced his concern regarding the single-family attached development. Mr. Ortega added that if it was possible to amend the PUD to convert the single-family attached to multifamily and receive certificate of occupancy prior to the golf course completion. **Mr. Baugh** stated that any modifications to the allowed uses or density would require a major amendment. Mr. Baugh added that a major amendment would be required to go through the entire public hearing process.

Mixen Rubio-Raffin noted that there was not a lot of information on why the original golf course was abandoned. Ms. Rubio-Raffin asked for more information. **Mr. Baugh** stated that he was unsure of the exact reason for the abandonment of the golf course. Mr. Baugh explained the history of the golf course noting the changes in holes and maintenance. Mr. Baugh noted the proposed number of holes and renovation of vegetation. **Ms. Rubio-Raffin** asked if the new HOAs created through the PUD process would work with the Cottonfields community. **Mr. Baugh** noted that they would work together regarding gates, entry monuments, and maintenance. **Ms. Rubio-Raffin** noted that there would be numerous single-family developments and added that existing connections were no longer available. **Mr. Baugh** stated that the existing Cottonfields community has voiced safety concerns regarding the area. Mr. Baugh added that the Cottonfields community has stated that they do not want penetration into their community. Mr. Baugh noted that they do not like people walking through their development and prefer them walking from Southern Avenue to Baseline Road using public sidewalks. **Ms. Rubio-Raffin** voiced her disappointment. Ms. Rubio-Raffin asked how they would entice people to go to the golf course if the existing community does not want outside individuals. Ms. Rubio-Raffin added that people would not be able to sample the golf course amenities. **Mr. Baugh** added that he has never seen a golf course open to the public.

Francisco Barraza voiced his support for pedestrian circulation. Mr. Barraza added that it would benefit the community. **Mr. Baugh** stated that he was willing to support pedestrian circulation within the proposed development units if it did not include the Cottonfields community. **Mr. Barraza** voiced his support for the traffic light on 59th Avenue and Vineyard Road. **Mr. Baugh** stated that he didn't disagree with the need, but that the contribution percentage was arbitrary, and that the adjacent multifamily

development was not required to contribute. Mr. Baugh added that he did not see the legal nexus but does recognize the policy requiring a traffic light. **Mr. Barraza** asked if an easement was going to be provided on Southern Avenue and 59th Avenue to allow access into the site. **Mr. Baugh** stated that an easement was not required.

JoAnne Jensen noted that the community has voiced concerns regarding the lack of police and fire services in the area. **Mr. Baugh** stated that he did not understand the concern. Mr. Baugh added that redeveloping the golf course and new residential development would increase safety and contribute to impact fees that cover fire and police services. **Ms. Jensen** asked about the existing golf course views. **Mr. Baugh** noted that if a resident had a golf course view, they would still have a view after the completion of the new residential developments. Mr. Baugh added that there might be situations where new paths might be added behind some existing houses, but views would not be obstructed. **Ms. Jensen** asked about water usage and conservation. **Mr. Baugh** added that there would be less turf and that landscaping would consist of native desert vegetation. Mr. Baugh noted that some lakes would be redesigned to fix design flaws that did not maximize water conservation. **Ms. Jensen** noted that some golf courses utilize gray water and asked if this golf course would utilize this type of water source. **Mr. Baugh** stated that gray water would not be utilized due to the agreement with SRP.

Jennifer Rouse voiced her concerns regarding the single-family development and asked if it would be a rental community. **Mr. Baugh** noted that this would not be a rental or multifamily community. **Ms. Rouse** voiced her support for the traffic light on 59th Avenue and Vineyard Road. Ms. Rouse noted that numerous commercial uses have been proposed as well as a community college that would contribute to the traffic in the area. **Mr. Baugh** stated that all those commercial uses would contribute to the traffic but were not required to contribute. Mr. Baugh reiterated that the percentage contribution was not proportional to the impact caused by their proposed development. **Ms. Rouse** added that she did not support pedestrian circulation within the development. Ms. Rouse noted that people paid to live here and did not want to see an increase in vandalism. Ms. Rouse voiced her support to delete the pedestrian circulation stipulation.

Vice Chair Hurd voiced her support for the traffic signal. Vice Chair Hurd thanked the applicant for everything they have done and for working with the community. Vice Chair Hurd thanked Chair Abegg for reviewing the language to ensure that the golf course is completed prior to the certificate of occupancy of the single-family development.

Chair Abegg voiced her support for the traffic signal. Chair Abegg noted that they had reached out to the Street Transportation Department regarding the applicant's request to delete the two stipulations. Chair Abegg indicated that traffic signals are constructed at the mile and half mile intersection. Chair Abegg clarified that 59th Avenue and Vineyard Road was at the half mile intersection, thus requiring a traffic signal. Chair Abegg noted that the Street Transportation Department had indicated that 50 percent

contribution was required as a conditional approval of the Traffic Impact Study provided for this proposal. Chair Abegg added that the Street Transportation Department has indicated that the multifamily to the south was stipulated to contribute to the design and construction for the signal on 59th Avenue and Southern Avenue. Chair Abegg stated that the department has indicated that a pedestrian circulation exhibit was required to ensure that the transportation network is comfortable for all modes and abilities. Chair Abegg stated that she saw both sides pertaining to the pedestrian circulation exhibit. Chair Abegg added that the PUD landscaping requirements would require 50 percent two-inch, 25 percent 1.5-inch and 25 percent one-inch caliper size trees. Chair Abegg stated that she would like to modify the landscape requirement to require 25 percent three-inch caliper trees. **Mr. Baugh** noted that the PUD already exceeded what was required by the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Baugh requested the landscape architect, Laura Cornell to provide a comment. **Laura Cornell**, on the applicant's team, stated that there was a misconception regarding caliper tree size. Ms. Cornell stated that the conditions at nurseries influence tree health. Ms. Cornell noted that the roots are greatly impacted due to growing in a box that will later be transported to a new location. Ms. Cornell stated that the roots found in three-inch caliper trees grow too close to the tree trunk, and when transplanted to the development site, these roots do not expand, causing the tree to either die or fall. Ms. Cornell added that native vegetation tends to grow naturally into a shrub shape, where tree branches reach the ground. Ms. Cornell stated that branches act as shade for the tree, but nurseries cut these branches forcing all the weight to be placed in one branch. Ms. Cornell added that it was better for trees to be planted in smaller calipers, so they can grow in their new environment and expand their roots. Ms. Cornell concluded her comment by adding that multi-trunk trees do not have a standards tree caliper size and that it varies species by species. **Chair Abegg** voiced her gratitude for Laura Cornell's explanation.

Public Comment:

Phil Hertel noted that he was planning on requesting three-inch caliper trees but will now remove his request based on Laura Cornell's information. Mr. Hertel asked if the golf course would be up and running before the certificate of occupancy for single-family homes. **Mr. Baugh** confirmed. **Mr. Hertel** noted that he supported this case because of all the work that went into it and supported the stipulation to require the golf course to be built.

Norma Nelson stated that she had purchased her home 20 years ago and paid a premium for the golf course views and security. Ms. Nelson added that her property had a scenic view of the golf course lake. Ms. Nelson said that she was opposed to pedestrian circulation because she did not want individuals in her backyard. Ms. Nelson added that people have been wandering the abandoned golf course and she no longer felt safe. Ms. Nelson noted that she was opposed to removing the lake because she had paid premium fees for a lake view. Ms. Nelson stated that the developer had no right to take away her privacy and her amenities. Ms. Nelson reiterated that pedestrian circulation connecting to the Cottonfields community made

her feel unsafe.

Kristi McCann voiced her concerns regarding the new development. Ms. McCann asked if the new development would help cover all the costs that Cottonfields had to pay. Ms. McCann added that the applicant presentation included new monuments and gate renderings. Ms. McCann asked who would pay the existing Cottonfields HOA for all the fees to redesign the gates and monuments. Ms. McCann added that the Cottonfields HOA had funded 360-degree cameras to be located for security and asked who would be refunding those fees. Ms. McCann stated that the existing Cottonfields HOA has also replenished vegetation in some areas and asked the new development refund all the money that they had invested. Ms. McCann voiced her support for the proposed traffic signal and added that this development would also contribute to traffic. Ms. McCann suggested adding a stipulation that would address these concerns and require the new HOAs to pay back all the improvements that would be removed.

Applicant Response:

Mr. Baugh thanked members of the public for their comments. Mr. Baugh noted that all proposed streets within the development would be private streets.

Chair Abegg noted that the issues between HOAs such as the fences, gates, and maintenance, are all private issues not related to the rezoning case. Chair Abegg requested the applicant to work with the existing Cottonfields HOA regarding these negotiations. **Mr. Baugh** agreed.

Mr. Baugh stated that the existing lake would not be modified. Mr. Baugh added that the lake configuration would not change, and that Norma Nelson would still have her scenic lake view. Mr. Baugh noted that a private path might be added but her views would not be obstructed. Mr. Baugh added that the property owner has the right to renovate their property.

Committee Discussion:

Chair Abegg stated that based on the discussion, the committee is in favor of keeping the traffic signal stipulation. Chair Abegg asked if the committee agreed to keep the pedestrian circulation stipulation. **Ms. Jensen** noted that the community has strongly voiced their opposition for pedestrian circulation with the existing Cottonfields community. Ms. Jensen added that it was proper etiquette for people to not cross golf course areas. **Mr. Baugh** added that they would support the stipulation if it required pedestrian circulation within their development but not connecting to the existing Cottonfields development. **Vice Chair Hurd** voiced the importance for connectivity. **Ms. Jensen** and **Ms. Rouse** voiced their support for the community concerns. **Chair Abegg** provided a modification to the stipulation that would require connectivity between the new development units and remove connectivity within the Cottonfields community. **Mr. Baugh** voiced his support.

Ms. Rubio-Raffin stated that the issues with vandalism might reduce with new development. Ms. Rubio-Raffin stated that she supported pedestrian connections because of the desert environment and the dangers of arterial streets. **Chair Abegg** noted that the modified stipulation language would require pedestrian circulation between the new development units and the exterior streets of the existing community. **Ms. Rubio-Raffin** added if someone lived closer to Southern Avenue, they would need those pedestrian connections if they wanted to walk to Baseline Road without having to go out to the arterial street.

Scott Rose, a member of the public, stated that if they knew pedestrian circulation would be required the Cottonfield community would have never signed to modify the existing CC&Rs.

Motion:
Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd motioned to recommend approval of GPA-LV-1-24-8 per the staff recommendation. **Jennifer Rouse** seconded the motion.

Vote:
7-1, motion to recommend approval of GPA-LV-1-24-8, per the staff recommendation passed with Committee Members Barraza, Jensen, Ortega, Rouse, Rubio-Raffin, Hurd, and Abegg in favor and Committee Member Nasser-Taylor in opposition.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

No comments.