



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-53-25-7

Date of VPC Meeting	August 12, 2025
Request From	R-5 SPVTABDO, C-1 SPVTABDO, C-3 SPVTABDO, and P-1 SPVTABDO
Request To	WU Code T5:6 SPVTABDO
Proposal	Mixed-use, multifamily residential
Location	Southeast corner of Central Avenue and Broadway Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with a modification
VPC Vote	12-0

Four members of the public registered to speak and did not indicate support or opposition. One member of the public donated their time to Fernando Ruis.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Samuel Rogers, staff, presented the request, the location of the subject site, the surrounding context, the General Plan Land Use Map designation, the site plan, the staff recommendation, the staff findings, and concluded by presenting the proposed stipulations.

Committee Member Coleman asked whether the City would retain ownership of the site. **Mr. Rogers** stated that he would defer to the applicant.

Committee Member Tamala Daniels asked whether Elias Valencia had reviewed the request. **Mr. Rogers** stated that he was unsure but would follow up and send the information to him.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Eric Prochnow, staff, introduced the item, provided background on the subject site, explained that the purpose of the rezoning is to prepare the site for a future Request for Proposals (RFP) for redevelopment, and stated that the development team would return to the Village Planning Committee once a specific proposal has been selected. Mr. Prochnow described the planning context, explained that the property is adjacent to the light rail, and supports broader City goals for transit-oriented development. Mr. Prochnow stated that the zoning request is for Walkable Urban Code (WU Code), presented desired

RFP elements, summarized the community outreach efforts and feedback, and stated that staff is requesting a recommendation of approval.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Committee Member Greg Brownell asked how the City would ensure that the proposed elements are implemented. **Mr. Prochnow** explained that a developer agreement would be executed as part of the process. Committee Member Brownell asked whether the developer selected through the RFP would follow the same zoning and entitlement process as other applicants. Mr. Prochnow explained the structure of the RFP process. Committee Member Brownell shared concern that once the property is sold, requirements may not be enforced, referencing a previous project where the developer did not comply with agreed-upon conditions.

Xandon Keating, staff, explained the difference between the RFP and rezoning processes, stated that the City will evaluate developer proposals, stated that public easements will be required and dedicated through the development process, and explained the timing of land title transfer to the selected developer.

Committee Member Petra Falcon expressed concern that the process was premature and that she did not want to lose key elements that had been promised to the community. **Chair Arthur Greathouse III** asked what the original planning vision for the site had been. **Committee Member T. Daniels** stated that community input over several years had emphasized the need for entrepreneurship incubation, trade schools, and STEM-focused development. **Committee Member George Brooks** questioned why the current plan did not follow the vision established through the (South Central Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Community Plan process.

Committee Member F. Daniels asked whether the project team had engaged with community members from the South Central TOD planning process. **Mr. Prochnow** stated that outreach had been conducted. **Mr. Rogers** displayed the South Central TOD Community Plan, stated the proposal is consistent with the land use map in the TOD plan, stated that the current proposal aligns with allowable uses in the Walkable Urban (WU) Code, and explained the WU Code would support a range of community-desired uses.

Committee Member Fred Daniels asked if members of the community are included on RFP panels. **Mr. Keating** confirmed that members of the community are included on RFP panels.

Committee Member Tamala Daniels emphasized that the most important component the community requested—an entrepreneur hub—was not included. **Committee Member Brooks** stated that the approach felt hypocritical and resembled past projects that had

failed to meet community expectations. **Chair Greathouse** asked members to focus on concrete suggestions.

Committee Member Brooks recommended returning to the community's original proposal. **Mr. Keating** responded that staff has met with groups recommended during the planning process and that his division was not part of the original TOD planning. Mr. Keating stated that the intent is to bring forward a proposal that reflects community priorities, explained that staff is still drafting the RFP, explained that important concepts can still be incorporated, and emphasized that zoning the site ahead of the RFP gives the City more control over outcomes. Committee Member Brooks recalled previous projects where promises were not kept.

Chair Greathouse asked whether it was possible to increase the amount of commercial space and target specific uses. **Mr. Keating** cautioned against limiting the uses too strictly, noting that over-prescription may affect viability, shared that prospective developers are already aware of the community's desires, and stated that the project team is listening.

Committee Member F. Daniels recommended involving the original South Central TOD Community Plan stakeholders. **Mr. Keating** stated that while he could not make firm commitments, staff does not want to exclude important ideas and wants to build something that reflects community needs.

Vice Chair Emma Viera reminded the Committee that the action under consideration is a rezoning request and asked whether the Committee supports rezoning the property into the Walkable Urban Code

Committee Member T. Daniels asked what zone would allow for the desired community uses. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the WU Code was the most flexible zoning option to accommodate a mix of uses. Committee Member T. Daniels asked whether Elias Valencia had been consulted. Mr. Rogers stated that Elias Valencia is no longer with the City of Phoenix, but stated he would follow up Mr. Valencia.

Committee Member Marchuck inquired about the lack of a stipulation for a landscape plan and asked whether one could be added. **Mr. Rogers** confirmed that a stipulation could be added requiring the applicant to return to the Committee for review and comment on the landscape plan. Committee Member Marchuck suggested mirroring the approach used in rezoning case Z-58-24-8. **Mr. Keating** stated that the applicant team is not opposed to requiring the landscape plan come back to the VPC for review.

Mr. Keating described the RFP scoring panel and clarified that it required unanimous approval. **Committee Member Brownell** stated that the panel was not a typical committee. **Committee Member Marchuck** asked whether community members within a

half-mile radius could be included on the panel. **Mr. Keating** stated that requiring specific members of the community to sit on the RFP panel could create more issues.

Committee Member Marchuck expressed concern about transparency and rules of order.

Committee Member Jackson asked whether the development would align with a specific place type. **Mr. Rogers** explained how the proposal aligns with the place type.

Committee Member Shephard asked whether churches and schools would be permitted. **Mr. Rogers** stated that those uses are generally allowed under the WU Code.

Committee Member Trent Marchuk inquired about the parking ratios for affordable housing under the proposed zoning and asked whether a development could potentially provide zero parking spaces. **Mr. Rogers** stated the development is required to provide 0.5 parking spaces per affordable housing unit and 0.75 parking spaces per market rate unit.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Carolyn Short asked for clarification on the percent of affordable units.

Jose Melero stated that he is a nearby resident and charter school employee, emphasized traffic safety, and asked that traffic impacts be seriously considered during development.

Fernando Ruis explained that he represents Project America, stated that his organization was faith-based and planned to develop a STEM-focused project, stated support for affordable housing but opposed the 50% affordability requirement, and suggested 30% instead. Mr. Ruis emphasized cultural preservation, including recognition of the Hohokam, and shared that their planned paseo that would connect with the proposed paseo for the proposal.

Israel Diaz explained that he is a resident and business owner on 2nd Street, advocated for preserving existing homes, encouraged walkability, and developing something iconic for South Phoenix. Israel stated a desire to avoid high-rise buildings and shared concerns about affordability and displacement.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Mr. Rogers explained that the rezoning stipulation requires a minimum of 30 percent of units be affordable, while the RFP will require 50 percent of units be affordable.

Mr. Keating explained that the 50 percent affordability requirement was Council direction and agreed with concerns about sensitivity on the east side, noting that building height would be limited to 30 feet along that edge.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Committee Member Marchuck asked why WU Code T5:6 zoning was proposed instead of WU Code T5:5. **Mr. Prochnow** stated that staff had recommended WU Code T5:6. **Mr. Rogers** explained that designated place type allows incentive heights up to 80 feet if 30 percent of units are provided as affordable housing and stated that the WU Code T5:6 allows for heights up to 80 feet.

Committee Member Brownell requested that staff send out information about the WU Code and how it relates to light rail development. **Mr. Rogers** confirmed he would provide additional information.

MOTION

Committee Member Trent Marchuk motioned to recommend approval of Z-53-25-7, per the staff recommendation, with a modification. **Committee Member Petra Falcon** seconded the motion.

VOTE

12-0, motion to recommend approval of Z-53-25-7, per the staff recommendation, with a modification passed with Committee Members Beehler, Brooks, Brownell, Coleman, F. Daniels, T. Daniels, Falcon, Jackson, Marchuck, Shepard, Viera, and Greathouse in favor.

VPC recommended stipulations:

1. The maximum building height shall not exceed 56 feet, except that the maximum building height may be increased to 80 feet, subject to a minimum of 30% of the dwelling units are provided as Affordable Housing, as approved by the Planning and Development Department and Housing Department.
2. The development shall contain a vertical mix of land uses such as residential and nonresidential uses, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. A minimum of 4,000 square feet of non-residential uses shall be provided along Central Avenue and shall not include lobby, exercise, reception areas or other similar uses intended for exclusive use by residents.
3. The development shall utilize the storefront, gallery, arcade, or forecourt frontages, or a combination thereof, per the requirements of Section 1305.B. along Central Avenue.

4. The ground floor of the building at the northwestern corner of the site shall be enhanced with angled or rounded building corners, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
5. The building height shall not exceed 30 feet within 35 feet of the east property line, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
6. ~~The site plan and elevations shall be presented for review and comment to the South Mountain Village Planning Committee prior to preliminary site plan approval.~~ **THE CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE PLAN, AND ELEVATIONS FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE SHALL BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING HEARING OFFICER THROUGH THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS, INCLUDING REVIEW BY THE SOUTH MOUNTAIN VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE, FOR STIPULATION MODIFICATION PRIOR TO PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN APPROVAL. THIS IS A LEGISLATIVE REVIEW FOR CONCEPTUAL PURPOSES ONLY. SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS WILL BE DETERMINED BY THE PLANNING HEARING OFFICER AND THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.**
7. The required paseo shall be provided, as described below and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. The required paseo shall be no closer than 200 feet from Central Avenue and 2nd Street.
 - b. The required paseo shall connect to the sidewalks along Broadway Road and Corona Avenue.
8. A minimum of two 1,000 square foot plazas shall be provided, as described below and as approved or modified by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. A minimum of one plaza shall be located along the required paseo
 - b. A minimum of one plaza shall be located at the northwest corner of the site.
 - c. The plazas shall contain a minimum of one artistic enhancement
9. Bicycle infrastructure shall be provided, as described below and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.

- a. A bicycle repair station (“fix-it station”) shall be provided and maintained near secure bicycle parking areas and separated from vehicular maneuvering areas, where applicable.
 - b. All required bicycle parking for multifamily use, per Section 1307.H.6.d of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, shall be secured parking.
 - c. Guest bicycle parking shall be provided at a minimum of 0.05 spaces per unit with a maximum of 50 spaces near entrances of buildings and installed per the requirements of Section 1307.H. of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance.
 - d. A minimum of 3 percent of the provided bicycle parking spaces shall include standard electrical receptacles for electric bicycle charging capabilities.
10. A minimum of 3 percent of the required parking spaces shall include EV-Capable infrastructure.
11. A minimum of four bioswales shall be implemented, per the Greater Phoenix Metro Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development Details for Alternative Stormwater Management, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development and/or Street Transportation departments.
12. Natural turf shall only be utilized for required retention areas (bottom of basin, and only allowed on slopes if required for slope stabilization) and functional turf areas located on properties for uses such as residential common areas, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
13. Prior to final site plan approval, documentation shall be provided that demonstrates a commitment to participate in the Water Efficiency Checkup program for a minimum of 10 years, or as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
14. A minimum 50 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated and constructed for the south side of Broadway Road.
15. The sidewalk along Broadway Road shall be a minimum of 8 feet in width and detached with a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip located between the sidewalk and back of curb, and planted to the following standards, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. Minimum 2-inch caliper, single-trunk, large canopy, shade trees planted 20 feet on center, or in equivalent groupings.

- b. Shrubs, accents and vegetative groundcovers with a maximum mature height of two feet evenly distributed throughout the landscape area to achieve a minimum of 75% live coverage.

Where utility conflicts exist, the developer shall work with the Planning and Development Department on alternative design solutions consistent with a pedestrian environment for installing the required plants.

- 16. The sidewalk along Corona Avenue and 2nd Street shall be a minimum of 5 feet in width and detached with a minimum 5-foot-wide landscape strip located between the sidewalk and back of curb, and planted with minimum 2-inch caliper, single-trunk, large canopy, shade trees planted 20 feet on center, or in equivalent groupings, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Where utility conflicts exist, the developer shall work with the Planning and Development Department on alternative design solutions consistent with a pedestrian environment for installing the required plants.
- 17. Prior to preliminary site review, a Traffic Impact Analysis shall be submitted to and accepted by the Street Transportation Department. All mitigation improvements shall be constructed and/or funded as identified in the accepted Traffic Impact Analysis.
- 18. Replace unused driveways with sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Also, replace any broken or out-of-grade curb, gutter, sidewalk, and curb ramps on all streets and upgrade all off-site improvements to be in compliance with current ADA guidelines.
- 19. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed 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.
- 20. The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of the Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.
- 21. The eastbound bus bay and pad on Broadway Road east of Central Avenue shall be retained.

22. If determined necessary by the Phoenix Archaeology 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 Archaeologist prior to clearing and grubbing, landscape salvage, and/or grading approval.
23. If Phase I data testing is required, and if, upon review of the results from the Phase I data testing, the City Archaeologist, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, determines such data recovery excavations are necessary, the applicant shall conduct Phase II archaeological data recovery excavations.
24. In the event archaeological 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 Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.
25. Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition 207 waiver of claims form. The waiver shall be recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder's Office and delivered to the City to be included in the rezoning application file for record. This stipulation shall not be applicable if the property is owned by the City of Phoenix.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.