



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-19-23-5

Date of VPC Meeting	July 12, 2023
Request From	R1-6
Request To	R-3A
Proposal	Multifamily residential
Location	Approximately 500 feet south of the southeast corner of 75th Avenue and Camelback Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation.
VPC Vote	10-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

Committee Member Jennifer Fostino joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 11 members.

Staff Presentation:

Matteo Moric, staff, presented an overview of the rezoning case Z-19-23-5. Mr. Moric discussed the location of the site, the requested zoning designation, the surrounding land uses, and the General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mr. Moric displayed the site plan and elevations and concluded the presentation by summarizing the staff findings and identified the proposed stipulations.

Applicant Presentation:

Taylor Earl introduced himself as being with the law firm Earl and Curley on behalf of the developer DevCo Development. **Andrew Hunt** with DevCo Residential introduced himself and thanked the Committee and said they take great pride in engaging with bodies like the Village Planning Committee.

Mr. Earl stated they proposed stipulations and the development company's intent was to hold the project forever. Mr. Earl said there usually is lots of height in DevCo's past

projects, however, they got the message quickly meeting with community members who were engaged through the previous project proposed at the site that the height would not fly and decided to keep the project at 2-stories.

Mr. Earl described the context of the site and said it was next to the Grand Canal which would create a recreational opportunity for people to activate and make it safer by putting eyes on it. Mr. Earl noted there was commercial development to the north. Mr. Earl described the surrounding uses and felt commercial next to people causes concerns at times. Mr. Earl said he heard of traffic concerns on 75th Avenue and indicated there would be less traffic than if the project were to be built as a commercial.

Mr. Earl identified how the project compared to the previous one. Mr. Earl said the previous project was three stories with more units and the previous case was withdrawn before it went to City Council.

Mr. Earl explained that the previous proposal was at 120 units and this proposal would take it down to 112 units. Mr. Earl said they wanted to create a buffer to the south with a row of trees. Mr. Earl said the previous project got paused before a City Council vote and Mr. Earl wanted to have a conversation with the neighborhood leaders. Mr. Earl said the previous developer pulled out because they could not make it pencil. Mr. Earl stated with this project rent would be preserved at 60% of AMI, they'd include a detached sidewalk and powerlines would be undergrounded.

Mr. Earl provided a rendering of the proposal and explained how the architecture was consistent with the surrounding area and how it tied in with the southwest feel. Mr. Earl added that in terms of amenities they were hoping to make a nice livable community. Mr. Earl noted there would be a clubhouse, pool and ramada area, and a dog run and path which lead to the trail. They are hoping to activate the trail. Mr. Earl stated that they tried to rotate buildings so fewer windows would face south and added an associated stipulation with staff. Mr. Earl felt the proposed row of Eucalyptus trees would provide a nice buffer. Mr. Earl added that bike parking standards of Walkable Urban Code would be adopted here and electric vehicle infrastructure would be setup.

Mr. Earl noted they proposed using a red tile roof similar to the one in the neighborhood and would limit building height.

Mr. Earl explained some of the outreach efforts which started prior to filing the case by getting some of the community input from some of the community leaders. Mr. Earl added there was an open house for neighborhoods closest to the site, they completed a project website which was not required anymore, went door to door to talk with people, provided notices in both English and Spanish to prevent a language barrier. Mr. Earl showed the outreach area door to door and then showed the notification boundary of about 70 houses.

Mr. Earl emphasized maintenance was critical and DevCo plans to be the long-term owner. Mr. Earl showed that Phoenix was one of the least affordable metro areas for

housing. He showed the prices for rent based on a funding model for what the rates would be. He felt 112 units is one step in the right direction and talked about Phoenix Housing Plan and goals of creating more housing. Mr. Earl said the current parcel is not attractive and the current development team brought down the height and unit count which the other builder was not able to do.

Chris Demarest mentioned there was a single house on the whole property, and while he would hate to see it go, it was nice to see something new coming in on the site.

Mr. Earl replied that the property was vacant in 2017 and demolished in 2018.

Mr. Earl said 75th Avenue would be the project entrance. Mr. Earl noted concerns included traffic on 75th Avenue, the concept of multifamily generally, and the height. Mr. Earl said that when they went out to the community there was not harsh opposition and several people were generally happy with what was proposed.

Questions from Committee:

Chris Demarest asked if this was the same project presented as several months ago on the same property. **Mr. Earl** responded the developer and proposed project were different, and this developer has a lot of experience developing high-quality housing projects.

Ken Dubose asked if this was affordable housing, similar to what was proposed previously for the site. **Mr. Earl** said this project is preserving restrictions on rents to target those at 60% AMI, which is what the previous project proposed.

Mr. Al Battle asked which neighborhood leaders were contacted. **Mr. Earl** replied that they spoke with community member who had previously spoken to the City Council office, including homeowners to the south and west.

Sandra Oviedo asked if this was going to include commercial. **Mr. Earl** replied the project would be residential, commercial is unlikely at the site, and the General Plan designation is commercial which calls for multifamily residential.

Chair Derie clarified the General Plan designation was commercial and it was currently zoned for single family homes, but the applicant could ask for any zoning district.

Chris Demarest added the last project even included a little bit behind the veterinary office.

Jennifer Fostino said this was a good infill project, it buffers the residential, this appears to be a good project with amenities, and-asked who would install the EV infrastructure. **Mr. Earl** said they would install the infrastructure and wiring for at least 10 spaces.

Melissa Acevedo asked when the project would be completed. **Mr. Earl** estimated once they break ground the project would be completed within 3 years.

Melissa Acevedo asked if the numbers for rents would change in 3 years. **Mr. Earl** said that the rent numbers he showed were given to them but as the market value changes prices will change with it.

Joe Barba asked if this was a “C” Class property. **Mr. Earl** said he was not familiar with this type of classification.

Al Battle asked about the response from outreach. **Mr. Earl** said the feedback from the first group was generally positive. Mr. Earl indicated there were 8 people total who represented 5 households at the neighborhood meetings.

Warren Norgaard asked how much smaller the units would be from the previous proposal. **Mr. Earl** said the square footage was not pinned down, and since the height is reduced the buildings had larger footprints.

Mr. Earl added the intent is to park it under current parking requirements. He said that could potentially consider turning parking to open space. But something need to be thoughtful of meet code but they would have enough parking.

Sandra Oviedo asked if the project would be elderly friendly and school bus friendly. **Mr. Earl** said it absolutely would be elderly friendly, if school bus needed to come on site, the fire lane would have a turning radius for a school bus.

Sandra Oviedo asked about bike parking. **Mr. Earl** said they would provide bike parking as per Walkable Urban Code requirements.

Sandra Oviedo asked about lighting on the canal trail. **Mr. Earl** said since they did not own the canal they were not be able to put lights on it, but hopefully there would be lights there. Mr. Earl added that they could not bleed light into the neighboring property. Mr. Earl indicated they’d activate the site to the canal and it would provide visibility onto the canal.

Chris Demarest said they’d be building the Grand Canalscape on the north side.

Sandra Oviedo asked why the company chose this property and why Maryvale. **Andrew Hunt** explained they wanted to be a long-term community asset and they said they saw a large housing need in the area.

Saundra Cole asked what the interior of the clubhouse and units would be. **Mr. Earl** said the project would have LITHC funding and making it affordable but it would also be a quality project. Mr. Earl said he believed the proposed amenities showed this.

Chair Derie shared that he appreciated the eucalyptus trees along the south property line and asked if there would be a security gate onto the canal. **Mr. Earl** responded they will be providing access to the canal but were unsure if it will be for residents only or allow neighborhood access.

Zeke Valenzuela asked if they were in agreement with all stipulations. **Mr. Earl** replied affirmatively, adding that they reflect what they promised the neighbors.

Public Comments:

None.

Motion:

Ken DuBose made a motion to recommend approval of Z-19-23-5 per the staff recommendation. **Chris Demarest** seconded the motion.

Vote:

10-1, Motion to recommend approval of Z-19-23-5 per the staff recommendation passed, with Committee Members Acevedo, Barba, Battle, Cole, Demarest, DuBose, Fostino, Norgaard, Valenzuela, and Derie in favor; Committee Member Oviedo opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.