



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

PHO-2-21—Z-111-01-8(7)

Date of VPC Meeting October 11, 2021

Planning Hearing Officer October 20, 2021

Hearing Date

Request

- 1) Modification of Stipulation 1 regarding general conformance with the site plan date stamped April 10, 2002.
- 2) Review of site plans and elevations by the Planning Hearing Officer per Stipulation 2.
- 3) Deletion of Stipulation 9 regarding the completion of the Developer Project Information Form for the MAG Transportation Improvement Program.
- 4) Deletion of Stipulation 17 regarding 50 percent open space being high and dry.
- 5) Modification of Stipulation 22 regarding architectural character consistent with the Laveen Plan.
- 6) Deletion of Stipulation 24 regarding corporate colors and associated graphics as an accent feature.
- 7) Deletion of Stipulation 25 regarding pitched roofs on commercial buildings.
- 8) Deletion of Stipulation 27 regarding windows on any facade with a primary customer entrance.
- 9) Deletion of Stipulation 28 regarding landscaping of surface parking areas.
- 10) Modification of Stipulation 35 regarding maximum height of service station canopies or drive-through canopies.
- 11) Deletion of Stipulation 36 regarding canopy support pillar size and materials.
- 12) Modification of Stipulation 42 regarding a maximum of 312 lots.
- 13) Modification of Stipulation 43 regarding minimum lot widths.
- 14) Modification of Stipulation 45 regarding rural mail delivery and the use of gang mailboxes.
- 15) Modification of Stipulation 46 regarding roof treatment variety.
- 16) Modification of Stipulation 48 regarding general

conformance with the site plan dated April 5, 2002.

17) Modification of Stipulation 52 regarding a variety of at least six different types of roof treatments.

18) Modification of Stipulation 53 regarding materials that would minimize stucco and tile.

19) Modification of Stipulation 56 regarding substantial conformance with view fence pictures.

20) Technical corrections to Stipulations 10, 23, 33, and 38.

Location	Northwest corner of 75th Avenue and Baseline Road
VPC Recommendation	Denial
VPC Vote	8-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Sofia Mastikhina, staff, provided an overview of the request, including its location, zoning, surrounding land uses, and proposed stipulation modifications. She then presented the stipulated site plan and elevations, and the proposed site plan and elevations.

Cassandra Ayers, representative with Beus, Gilbert, McGroder PPLC, provided an overview of the request, explaining that it will replace the multifamily residences shown on the approved plan with single-family homes, and will also decrease the overall density on the site as the original plan would allow 374 units, while the new project proposes 173 units. She outlined the proposed open space areas, which exceed conventional zoning standards, and total 22 percent of the net lot area. She explained that there is also a development agreement that allows the property to use areas along the Laveen Conveyance Channel as part of the open space calculations. However, the 22 percent is exclusive of the channel areas. She then stated that the applicant could incorporate some of the design features that the committee's Vice Chair provided ahead of time. She proceeded to outline each stipulation modification request and asked for the committee's recommendation for approval.

Vice Chair Linda Abegg stated that she sent the applicant a list of design elements that the Village typically requests in these types of cases and asked if they had brought their architect or site design team to discuss incorporating these elements and corresponding stipulations. She explained she provides these ahead of the meeting so applicants can incorporate them into the design, yet the plans presented do not seem to have done so. She outlined the desired design features such as breaking up of building mass, mix of accent materials on street-facing facades, and variation in rooflines. **Chair Tonya Glass** asked that all these be included as stipulations since the applicant did not incorporate them into their elevations. **Vice Chair Abegg** agreed and further stated that not all of the requests to delete stipulations regarding commercial development to allow for market flexibility make sense. However, with a stipulation of general conformance to the site plan presented, a developer would need to go through the Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) public hearing process to update the site plan in order to develop commercial, which would allow for the committee to then assess commercial design stipulations. She then stated that the Village would like to stipulate to minimum 22-foot

driveways in the single-family portion of the development and that, although the applicant indicated they would not be able to accommodate, she feels that this is an important aspect that will help prevent blocking of sidewalks, so it will also be stipulated. She also stated that Laveen has not approved reduced width lots in recent single-family developments, and that they are not supportive of the reduction to 45-foot lot width. She added that another way to address the committee's concerns with lot width is to require minimum side yard setbacks to ensure homes have adequate separation between them.

Carlos Ortega expressed his concern with the vague nature of some of the applicant's requested stipulation modifications and stated that they should provide specific elevations of the single-family homes once they have them. He expressed his discomfort with approving vague plans, and that there are no guarantees for good design without elevations, unless the applicant were to request a Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezone.

Stephanie Hurd asked the applicant to consider revising their building design to look more like the developer's project named 23 North, which is much nicer. She asked who she would need to talk to ahead of the meetings to ensure applicants come to the meetings with a high-quality design. **Chair Glass** reiterated that the applicant had the opportunity to update their building design after meeting with the Vice Chair and receiving the committee's list of desired design elements, but they decided not to incorporate them. **Ayers** replied that they can take a look at the committee's requested stipulations, discuss them with the developer, and work with the committee on incorporating them.

Vice Chair Abegg asked if the applicant is willing to accept a continuance to be able to work with the committee on these matters, as the time frame between this meeting and the PHO hearing is very short. **Ayers** replied that they would prefer to take the committee's stipulations and continue moving through the hearing process.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Lewis Smith asked the applicant what the approximate price range of the townhome units will be. **Chuck Chisholm**, with the development team, replied that similar units in their 23 North development are being sold in the \$350,000 range. He added that he considers the Laveen location to be superior, and prices will likely affect that. **Smith** expressed concern with two-story buildings blocking view corridors along the west side of 75th Avenue, and with the impact of this development on the Laveen School District. He then asked if the new developer will be responsible for maintaining the drainage channel on the west side of 75th Avenue. **Chisholm** replied yes.

Phil Hertel expressed his concern with the applicant's assertion that the density will be reduced, because they are still maximizing the density in the commercial portion of the development. He also stated that 45-foot-wide lots absolutely should not be approved, setbacks should be added, and minimum 22-foot driveways should be incorporated to ensure consistency with other Laveen developments. He stated that many of the community's desired design features were not included and that a continuance should be granted to allow the applicant to work with the community on improving their design.

Daniel Penton expressed his concerns with the increased traffic generation along 75th Avenue and Baseline Road, insufficient guest parking in the townhome project, the

small single-family lots and driveway lengths, which will cause on-street parking and congestion, and the building design. He stated that the townhome design is very institutional and not unique to the Laveen character. He suggested the applicant modify them to be more consistent with a rural or modern farmhouse architectural style. He also expressed concern with the lack of single-family home elevations and stated that this case still has a lot of work ahead of it. **Ayers** explained that the single-family elevations were not required as part of this process, and that they will be presented later on in the process. She stated that the applicant is ready to move forward with the process with the additional design stipulations outlined by the committee.

Vice Chair Abegg stated that this case should not move forward without additional work with the community, but, understanding the PHO process, she would like to ensure that all of the committee's stipulations in the case of an approval are put on the public record.

1ST MOTION

Vice Chair Abegg made a motion to deny the case as filed, and approve with modifications and additional stipulations as follows:

- Approve modification to Stipulation No. 22 with the following additions:
 - That all elevations shall incorporate at minimum three of the following building materials: native stone, burnt adobe, textured brick, wood (when shaded by overhangs or deep recesses), slump block, ceramic tile (matte finish), stucco and exposed aggregate concrete, as approved by the Planning and Development Department with a minimum 25% non-stucco materials on street facing elevations.
 - All garage doors shall have decorative embellishments such as window panels, added materials surrounding the door, or trellises, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
- Deny requested deletion of Stipulation No. 28, which should remain unchanged, as additional trees should be encouraged.
- Deny requested modification of Stipulation No. 43, as lot width should not be reduced.
- Deny requested deletion to Stipulation No. 46, as roof overhangs should remain unchanged.
- Deny requested modification to Stipulation No. 53, approve with the modification that all street-facing elevations shall have a maximum of 75 percent of stucco or primary building material.
- Additional stipulation for minimum 22 percent open space.
- Additional stipulation for minimum 22-foot driveway depths.
- Additional stipulation for maximum one story homes on west side of 75th Avenue.
- Additional stipulation for minimum 5-foot side yard setbacks for single-family homes.
- Additional stipulation regarding multifamily portion of development:
- Reduction of building mass shall be achieved by using a combination of the following techniques:
 - a. Variation in the roofline and form;
 - b. Use of ground level arcades and covered areas, protected or recessed building entrances;
 - c. Vertical elements on or in front of expansive blank walls;

- d. Use of pronounced wall plane offsets and projections;
- e. Use of focal points and vertical accents;
- f. Inclusion of windows on elevations facing streets and pedestrian areas.

Carlos Ortega seconded the motion.

VOTE:

2-6: Motion fails with committee members Barraza and Buggs in favor, and committee members Glass, Abegg, Hurd, Knight, Ortega, and Rouse opposed.

2ND MOTION

Vice Chair Abegg made a motion to deny the case as filed and requested that it be continued to allow the applicant to work with the committee on updating the design.

Jennifer Rouse seconded the motion.

VOTE:

8-0: Motion passes with committee members Glass, Abegg, Barraza, Buggs, Hurd, Knight, Ortega, and Rouse in favor.