



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

**Z-57-21-3**

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	April 4, 2022
<b>Request From</b>	RSC PCD and RSC PCD (Approved C-2 H-R DNS/WVR SP PCD)
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Mixed-use development
<b>Location</b>	Northwest corner of Tatum Boulevard and Cactus Road

### VPC DISCUSSION:

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

**Ed Bull**, representing the applicant with Burch & Cracchiolo, introduced himself and Jeff Moloznik, with RED Development, the applicant. Mr. Bull reviewed the 2021 rezoning approval for C-2 H-R DNS/WVR PCD and the construction status of Phase 1 and showed the proposed PUD boundaries which total approximately 80 gross acres. Mr. Bull added that this request does not propose to increase the height on the site from the current entitlement, nor does it add any new uses to the site on the use list and detailed their current outreach to date. Mr. Bull shared that the site is within the Paradise Valley Village Core and displayed a circulation plan which showed a bicycle path connecting to Tatum Boulevard and Cactus Road and showed the vehicle path being broken up by several small blocks across the site. Mr. Bull also displayed a landscape plan and renderings of the proposed Whole Foods, Streetlights multifamily development and the Harkins theater. Mr. Bull displayed a site plan showing the proposed three-acre community open space (named "Park at PV") which contains three restaurants with areas for outdoor seating and event space. Mr. Bull displayed a graphic of the proposed building heights and reiterated that the proposed height will not exceed the previously approved height entitlement granted in 2021. Mr. Bull detailed when they sent out notification letters and the various neighborhood meetings they have held or attended. Mr. Bull concluded the presentation by showing the next steps for the project and anticipated hearing dates.

### Questions from the Committee:

**Chair Gubser** asked why Phase 1 was not a part of the PUD and if that was due to it being under construction. Mr. Bull replied that the permits have been pulled for that site and it could not wait for the PUD approval. Chair Gubser added that it is a testament to the outreach they have done that there is no one in attendance in opposition.

**Alan Sparks** shared that it is an exciting proposal that has been on their radar for a long time and asked about public transit and if light rail was going to be constructed in this area. Mr. Bull replied that light rail will not be constructed, and about 2-3 years ago the City Council deleted that proposed extension off the map. Mr. Sparks replied that he was surprised to hear that.

**Diane Petersen** asked if the existing parking garage on site will remain or be reconfigured. Mr. Bull replied that the parking garage will stay, it will be enhanced in some manner to make it more attractive and there will be bicycle amenities added such as a bicycle fix it station in or around the parking garage.

**Toby Gerst** asked if the parking garage will be used for the residents or for the customers of the proposed grocery store or cinema. Mr. Bull replied that the Streetlight multifamily development will have their own parking garage within that development for residents and that the Whole Foods patrons will park in a surface parking lot to the east of the Whole Foods, and the existing parking garage will be available for other developments occurring on the site. Mr. Bull added that is unlikely that residents will use that garage as any new residential development will have their own structured parking attached to those developments for their residents. Mr. Moloznik added that the existing parking garage is intended for commercial users, and not for residents. Ms. Gerst thanked the applicant for their presentations to the various block watch groups, and that their presentations were excellent, candid, and clear and the neighborhood leaders were impressed with their presentation and their professionalism.

**Abram Bowman** asked what advantages there are to using a PUD zoning district verses a conventional zoning district. Mr. Bull replied that the benefits of a PUD are that they allow an applicant to work out specific standards for setbacks, pedestrian connections, and parking to facilitate a mixed-use environment. Mr. Bull added that due to subdividing the large site, conventional zoning is going to require artificial setbacks from interior lot lines and create lot coverage issues, and that conventional zoning would require a lot of variances and would not be the best for a mixed-use development in the Village Core. Mr. Bull added that on the use side, with conventional zoning you cannot limit uses but the use list on a PUD can be tailored. Mr. Bull concluded that a PUD is more specific as to what can and cannot be built on a site and that it is a zoning tool created about 10-15 years ago that can help achieve a mixed-use environment.

**Vice Chair Joe Leshner** shared that he is excited about the project and asked if the applicant is setting aside funding for traffic mitigation after the development is built, citing that with the increased density the anticipated traffic yields will increase up to three or four times and sometimes developments can have unanticipated consequences when it comes to the amount of increased traffic to an area. Mr. Bull replied that they had not planned to do so or considered it, they did provide a traffic analysis reviewed by city staff and that the streets are being maintained and were built to handle a large amount of traffic. Vice Chair Leshner replied that with applicants in the Kierland area, some developers are allocating funds for traffic mitigation post-development and that there might be a need for that. Mr. Bull replied that he would discuss with his client further about that suggestion and that they will take the time to consider it.

**Roy Wise** asked what safety enhancements are being proposed, citing that the circulation plan shows many vehicle paths on short blocks and there will be many pedestrian and vehicle interactions. Mr. Bull replied that the circulation plan is

illustrative, showing how people can navigate the site in all directions, but the developments on the site might develop as shown or some might shift the circulation plan based on land availability and how much of it is developed at a time. Mr. Bull added that safety is paramount and that they will have pavers provided where appropriate to highlight pedestrian crossings.

**Cynthia DiMassa** asked if the applicant is adding a bike path at the southeast corner of the site through the proposed greenspace, connecting to Cactus Road. Mr. Bull replied affirmatively, showing a site connectivity slide highlighting multimodal opportunities near the PV Mall, and one of the connections is the bicycle route which goes near the three-acre open space. Ms. DiMassa asked if the applicant is responsible for connecting the bike path through the greenspace adjacent to Cactus Road, sharing that the area is difficult to cycle in. Mr. Bull replied that the proposed bicycle path at the corner of Tatum and Cactus is a part of proposed circulation improvements that the applicant is proposing to make with this application. Ms. DiMassa asked if there will bicycle lanes added to the perimeter road. Mr. Bull replied that he does not know, the ring road is not necessarily bike friendly, but he defers to his design team as to whether it can be more bike friendly in the future.

**Regina Schmidt** asked if a trolley system had been considered to circulate the site. Mr. Bull replied that a trolley system is not something they had considered. Mr. Moloznik added that while it was not something they had considered, it is something they will investigate.

#### **Public Comment:**

**Marc Soronson** shared that he would be interested to know how climate planning will be integrated into this PUD and shared that architecture is priority, citing the Cityscape project as an example and he would like to know what the applicant is doing to provide a high level of architecture on the site.

#### **Applicant Response to Public Comment:**

**Ed Bull** replied that the exhibits shown for Phase 1 show a high level of architecture, the building's will not be monotonous, and the architectural quality will be to city standards as additional phases are under construction.