



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-SP-6-21-7

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	February 14, 2022
<b>Request From</b>	S-1 (Approved C-2)
<b>Request To</b>	C-2 SP
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Self-service storage warehouse and all underlying commercial uses
<b>Location</b>	Southeast corner of the Loop 202 freeway and Southern Avenue
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval with modifications
<b>VPC Vote</b>	5-4

#### **VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:**

**Sofia Mastikhina**, staff, provided an overview of the proposal, including locational context, current and surrounding land uses, and General Plan Land Use Map designation. She presented the proposed site plan and elevations and explained that the proposal is consistent with the land uses in the area, and that the site is appropriately located next to a major freeway for access. She stated staff's recommendation of approval and listed recommended stipulations. She noted that the developer intends to pursue a technical appeal to reduce the required Multi-Use Trail Easement (MUTE) along Southern Avenue to 25 feet and explained that the language contained in Stipulation No. 6 is crafted to allow the Planning and Development Department the flexibility to approve such a reduction through the technical appeal process.

**Alan Beaudoin**, representative with Norris Design, provided background information on the property, explaining the original rezoning case that encompasses the site and surrounding parcels south of Southern Avenue. He stated that the proposal is for a 585-unit self-storage warehouse, with a 1,500-square-foot office building. He presented the proposed site plan, noting the site's proximity to the freeway off-ramp, which restricted the ability to construct an access driveway directly on the site. Access will instead be provided from the adjacent parcels to the east of the project site. He then presented the proposed building elevations and stated that he had received feedback from the community regarding specific agrarian architectural features, which he plans to integrate into the elevations. He commented that they had also incorporated window glazing along the front elevation per staff's request, a feature that is also solidified through one of staff's recommended stipulations. An additional comment from the community had been to add a grain silo element to the front elevation, which his architectural team was

looking to incorporate. He stated that his team would like to continue working on the building elevations to incorporate the features the community wants as the case moves through the public hearing process. He then outlined the public outreach and hearing timeline.

**Carlos Ortega** asked how the applicant determined how many storage units are needed in the area, based on population. **Beaudoin** stated that it is determined through an analysis of the metropolitan area and is based on demand for storage, and a ration of population to square footage of storage unit. **Ortega** noted that there are two large multifamily housing projects adjacent to the property and asked if that is a factor in deciding to build this facility in anticipation of this housing. **Beaudoin** replied yes, that was factored into the project planning. **Ortega** then mentioned that there have been parking citation issues in this area and recommended the applicant plan for sufficient off-street parking.

**Vice Chair Linda Abegg** thanked the applicant for conducting early outreach to the community and stated that this is an appropriate location for a self-storage facility, as it is located between a freeway and multifamily zoning. She then noted that there are three buildings total on the site, yet the applicant only provided elevations for main storage building. She asked if the applicant would be agreeable to extending staff's general conformance stipulation to include the two remaining buildings to ensure that they also exhibit the stipulated architectural elements. **Beaudoin** replied yes.

**Chair Tonya Glass** thanked the applicant for conducting early outreach and encouraged him to incorporate the elements discussed into the building elevations as the case moves through the public hearing process. She then expressed her concern with lack of attendance at the applicant's required neighborhood meeting, noting that the required notification radius only includes vacant properties. She stated that when the city's required radius doesn't reach many property owners, applicants should take the initiative to expand the boundaries to encompass more properties for meaningful and genuine public engagement.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Phil Hertel** stated that the building elevations should resemble a barn and that adding a silo on the northwest corner of the main building is very important. He also asked that a sign plan be submitted for committee review. He then expressed his hesitation to allow this project to move forward until the architectural changes have been made and suggested that the case be continued so updated elevations can be presented to the Laveen Village Planning committee for approval.

**Dan Penton** expressed concern with the Southern Avenue building frontage and with the proposed vehicular circulation, as the access drive to the site will intersect with the drive-thru restaurant pads in the commercial development, potentially causing traffic issues. He then suggested that the building architecture be modernized to align with the vision of the South Mountain Technology Corridor along the Loop 202 freeway.

**Chair Glass** expressed concern with the fact that the architectural features that were recommended by the community during the applicant's early outreach were not incorporated into the building elevations that were presented tonight. She then asked if the applicant is willing to come back before the committee to present a sign plan for this

development. **Beaudoin** replied that he and his team are committed to updating the building elevations and create a sign plan prior to the Planning Commission hearing and to work with individual members of the Laveen Village Planning Committee on those updates prior to the next step in the public hearing process.

**Vice Chair Abegg** requested that the applicant provide updated materials to staff for distribution to the committee well in advance of the Planning Commission hearing on March 3, 2022. **Beaudoin** replied that they will try to get materials sent out by February 23, 2022, but that he will have to first consult with his team if this date is feasible.

**JoAnne Jensen** expressed concern with allowing this project to move along the public hearing process given that there are so many modifications that still need to be made. She stated that a continuance would be more appropriate.

**Vice Chair Abegg** explained that the committee can recommend a continuance, and if the applicant does not agree to it, it will be at the discretion of the Planning Commission to remand the case back to the Village Planning Committee. She stated that recommending approval with specific stipulations has typically garnered more meaningful attention from the Planning Commission as they may not always agree with a continuance, so the committee no longer has a say in any modifications to the stipulations.

**Beaudoin** stated that all the major issues with the site such as access, circulation, and shared right-of-way jurisdiction between the City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department and the Maricopa County Department of Transportation have all been resolved. He noted that the only remaining item in discussion is the north building elevation, and that he and his team are committed to incorporating the comments they received from the community prior to the next public hearing. He stated that they are also willing to have another community meeting prior to the Planning Commission hearing to present the updated elevations to the community, but that a continuance would not be ideal from their perspective, as they would lose a month in their development process.

**Vice Chair Abegg** expressed her concern with allowing the building elevations to move forward without further committee review, given the continued concerns, most of which had been brought up to the developer before tonight's meeting. She stated that she would not be comfortable with hinging tonight's recommendation on a promise that the elevations will be updated prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

**Stephanie Hurd** also expressed concern with allowing the elevations to move forward, especially because there have been many instances in which what is actually built on a site looks very different from what was presented to and approved by the committee.

**Vice Chair Abegg** proposed that Stipulation No. 1 be modified to require that the elevations be approved through the Planning Hearing Officer process, including committee approval, and that elevations include the following features:

- North elevation of storage building, and east elevations of office and smaller storage building shall contain windows,
- That there be a silo on the northwest corner of the storage building,
- All building elevations shall contain architectural embellishments and detailing such as textural changes, pilasters, offsets, recesses, variation in window size

- and location, and/or overhang canopies,
- A minimum of three distinct building materials shall be utilized on all building elevations.

## **MOTION**

**Vice Chair Abegg** made a motion to approve the request with modifications to Stipulation No. 1 to replace general conformance to the elevations with a requirement for the developer to return through the Planning Hearing Officer public hearing process for approval of updated elevations prior to preliminary site plan approval. **Carlos Ortega** seconded the motion.

## **VOTE**

**5-4**, Motion to approve with a modification, with Committee Members Glass, Abegg, Barraza, Ortega, and Perrera in favor, and Committee Members Buggs, Hurd, Jensen, and Rouse opposed.

## **STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

1. ~~The development shall be in general conformance with the building elevations date stamped January 24, 2022, with specific regard to the following, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.~~ **BUILDING ELEVATIONS SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING HEARING OFFICER THROUGH THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS FOR STIPULATION MODIFICATION PRIOR TO PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL, WITH SPECIFIC REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING BUILDING ELEMENTS. THIS IS A LEGISLATIVE REVIEW FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY. SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS MAY BE DETERMINED BY THE PLANNING HEARING OFFICER AND THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.**
  - a. ~~The north elevation~~ **OF BUILDING A, AND EAST ELEVATIONS OF BUILDINGS B AND C, AS DEPICTED ON THE SITE PLAN DATE STAMPED JANUARY 24, 2022,** shall incorporate windows ~~along the front façade.~~
  - B. THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF BUILDING A, AS DEPICTED ON THE SITE PLAN DATE STAMPED JANUARY 24, 2022, SHALL INCORPORATE A DECORATIVE SILO.**
  - C b.** All building elevations shall contain architectural embellishments and detailing such as textural changes, pilasters, offsets, recesses, variation in window size and location, and/or overhang canopies.
  - D e.** A minimum of three distinct building materials shall be utilized on all building elevations.
2. All uncovered surface parking lot areas for employees and customers shall be landscaped with minimum 2-inch caliper size large canopy drought tolerant shade trees. Landscaping shall be dispersed throughout the parking area and achieve 25 percent shade at maturity, as approved by Planning and Development Department.

3. Pedestrian walkways connecting the building to adjacent public sidewalks shall be shaded to a minimum of 75 percent using large canopy drought tolerant shade trees at maturity and/or architectural shade.
4. Where pedestrian walkways cross a vehicular path, the pathway shall be constructed of decorative pavers, stamped or colored concrete, or other pavement treatments that visually contrasts with parking and drive aisle surfaces, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Vehicular crossings shall be kept to a minimum.
5. A minimum of four bicycle parking spaces shall be provided through Inverted U and/or artistic racks located near the building entrance of each enclosed commercial building and installed per the requirements of Section 1307.H. of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Artistic racks shall adhere to the City of Phoenix Preferred Designs in Appendix K of the Comprehensive Bicycle Master Plan.
6. The developer shall dedicate a 30-foot-wide multi-use trail easement (MUTE) along the south side of Southern Avenue and construct a minimum 10-foot wide multi-use trail (MUT) within the easement, in accordance with the MAG supplemental detail indicated in Section 429 and as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Where conflicts or restrictions exist, the developer shall work with the Site Planning section on an alternate design through the technical appeal process.
7. The developer shall dedicate minimum 55 feet of right-of-way and construct/permit the south side of Southern Avenue as required by MCDOT and the Street Transportation Department.
8. The developer shall construct all streets within and adjacent to the development with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
9. If determined necessary by the Phoenix Archeology Office, the applicant shall conduct Phase I data testing and submit an archaeological survey report of the development area for review and approval by the City Archeologist prior to clearing and grubbing, landscape salvage, and/or grading approval.
10. If Phase I data testing is required, and if, upon review of the results from Phase I data testing, the City Archeologist, in consultation with a qualified archeologist, determines such data recovery excavations are necessary, the applicant shall conduct Phase II archeological data recovery excavations.
11. In the event archeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archeologist, and allow time for the Archeology Office to properly assess the materials.