



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-44-25-6

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 4, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	C-2 PCD
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposal</b>	PUD to allow mixed use multifamily residential, office and restaurant; and PCD removal
<b>Location</b>	Northeast corner of 24th Street and Arizona Biltmore Circle
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with additional stipulations
<b>VPC Vote</b>	13-5

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

*Committee Member Guevar joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 19 members, then left the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 18 members.*

*Sixteen members of the public registered to speak on this item, 11 in opposition, 5 in support. Thirteen members of the public registered in opposition, not wishing to speak.*

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a presentation summarizing the surrounding context, the proposed development, the standards in the proposed PUD narrative, and the staff recommendation, including the recommended stipulations.

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

**Nick Wood**, representing the applicant with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, provided a presentation summarizing the subject site, background of zoning requests in the area, including the previous request for this site, the proposed development and design elements, comparisons with the previous proposal, and that the applicant proposes to add two additional stipulations related to general conformance to the site plan and elevations.

**QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE**

**Committee Member Augusta** asked about parking and if it is sufficient for the mix of uses. **Mr. Wood** reviewed the parking requirements, noting the development will provide significantly more parking than is required by the Zoning Ordinance.

**Committee Member Guevar** asked for clarification on the square footage of the units. **Mr. Wood** stated that the Zoning Ordinance doesn't distinguish between condos and apartments, but the 1,500-square-foot minimum unit size will make condos more likely.

**Committee Member Todd** asked about the right of use for Arizona Biltmore Circle. **Mr. Wood** stated that Arizona Biltmore Circle is not a public street and is owned by the adjoining property owners, further noting that an easement allows for use of the street by residents.

**Committee Member Todd** asked for clarification that the rooftop amenities will only be located above the parking garage and if the building will rise to 8 stories. **Mr. Wood** stated that amenities will only be located above the garage and reviewed the drawings to indicate that the building is only 6 stories from the grade of any point on the property.

**Committee Member Todd** asked about how the building relates to the nearby owners at the southeast corner of the site. **Mr. Wood** stated that the two closest owners are not in opposition to this proposal.

**Committee Member Sharaby** asked if the development partners are in attendance at this meeting. **Mr. Wood** stated that they are not in attendance because of the issues they had at a previous public hearing. **Chair Fischbach** noted that it was his suggestion to the applicant.

**Committee Member Todd** asked about the retaining wall. **Mr. Wood** noted that it was necessary because of the slope of the property and water that runs north to south.

**Committee Member Siegal** asked about the proposed striping on Arizona Biltmore Circle. **Dawn Cartier** with CivTech reviewed the proposed striping, noting that it likely should have been done already based on the existing traffic volume. **Ms. Siegal** asked about pedestrian improvements. **Ms. Cartier** reviewed the pedestrian improvements related to the northbound right turn lane.

**Committee Member Williams** asked about the ground level view from one of the angles shown in the presentation and whether the mountain view would be maintained. **Mr. Wood** stated that the view in question would have the proposed building blocking the view from the street level at the southwest corner of the site.

**Committee Member Guevar** asked about the height of the existing structure. **Mr. Wodd** stated that he didn't have the exact height. **Mr. Guevar** asked about the alternative scenario if this rezoning is not approved and why they would build a medical office at this location under the current zoning, rather than a smaller R-3 multifamily

development. **Mr. Wood** stated that the economics would work out better for a medical office in that scenario and noted that at that density, the development would likely be apartments, rather than condos.

**Committee Member Augusta** asked if the street striping could be included as a stipulation. **Mr. Grande** noted that Stipulation No. 2 already included the striping since it is part of the Traffic Impact Analysis.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**Timothy La Sota** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, highlighting the long uninterrupted street frontage, the ground level elevations, and the fact that a setback is typically required for this height.

**Larry Cuculic** introduced himself as the President and CEO of Best Western and spoke in opposition to the proposal, referencing letters provided to the Committee from Best Western leadership in opposition to the proposal and highlighting issues with the scale of the proposal, including a loss of views from the Best Western office building.

**Ellen Best-Laimit** introduced herself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that the current view is preferred over the view that would be created by the proposed development.

**Gene Hechler** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that the proposed development doesn't fit with the neighborhood and that it will create traffic issues.

**Wes McKeage** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that a beautiful location will be destroyed by the proposed development, also noting that the traffic study was conducted on a Tuesday, which is when most of the Best Western employees are working from home.

**Rosemary Robinson** introduced herself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that it is possible for the developer to go down in height and the developer should listen to the community, adding that comparisons made to other developments are not valid because it is comparing a suburban context to an urban one.

**Richard Lund** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that the proposal will block existing views and cause a dangerous traffic situation on Arizona Biltmore Circle.

**Esther Battok** introduced herself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that the homes are very close to this development, and that the parcel needs to be redeveloped, but this proposal is too massive.

**Wayne Ziemer** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that the proposal is not compliant with the Phoenix General Plan, and that the developer could make it work with the existing C-2 district.

**Jerry Deutsch** introduced himself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating that he built a home in this neighborhood because of the openness, and the proposed development would change that and is a result of greed.

**Lynne Lagarde** introduced herself and spoke in opposition to the proposal, stating concerns about the scale of the building that is out of character with the neighborhood where there are no other buildings of this height nearby, also noting that this is not within a village core.

**Heather Barilla** introduced herself and spoke in support of the proposal, highlighting that the area is growing as an employment area and needs more housing.

**Kaylee Johannsen** introduced herself and spoke in support of the proposal, noting that the proposed development is respectful of the landscape.

**Patricia Hawkins** introduced herself and spoke in support of the proposal, stating that she was opposed to the original proposal, but believes this corner deserves something special.

**Orianna Picklesimer** introduced herself and spoke in support of the proposal, stating there is a need for housing in this area with a lot of employment.

**Taylor Schmidt** introduced himself and spoke in support of the proposal, stating that the Valley is growing and needs to go up in scale, adding that these projects provide good jobs.

#### APPLICANT RESPONSE

**Mr. Wood** stated that many of the opposition letters are duplicates and that Best Western originally was a partner in the previous proposal, which proposed similar heights even closer to the Best Western office, further noting distances of property owners from the proposed development and that views will not be blocked, and clarifying that the building will only be 6 stories from any portion on the lot.

**Committee Member Swart** asked for clarification if the traffic study was conducted on a Tuesday. **Ms. Cartier** replied with the traffic count requirements, noting that the traffic is very minimal compared to the capacity of the street.

**Committee Member Schmieder** asked what date the count was done. **Ms. Cartier** stated it was September 10, 2024.

**Vice Chair Paceley** stated Biltmore is a treasure, and JDM has done a fantastic job in the area, noting that the proposed development will be an asset to the area.

**MOTION:**

**Vice Chair Paceley** made a motion to recommend approval of Z-44-25-6, per the staff recommendation, with the following additional stipulations:

- That the development shall be in general conformance with the site plan date stamped October 10, 2025, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development Services Department.
- That the development shall be in general conformance with the elevations date stamped April 25, 2025, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development Services Department.

**Committee Member Grace** seconded the motion.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Committee Member Whitesell** thanked the public for making comments and stated that this plan doesn't meet parts of the General Plan, noting that the site is outside of the village core, that the design is not Biltmore-esque, that access is on a private street, and that we do protect scenic views.

**Committee Member Augusta** stated that this is a thoughtful development on a challenging site and is voting yes.

**Committee Member Beckerleg Thraen** stated concerns about compatibility and is voting no.

**Committee Member Eichelkraut** stated that cities are growing and changing and it is not reasonable to expect a view to be preserved, and is voting yes.

**Committee Member Grace** stated a concern about the leadership of the opposition having form letters sent to the Committee.

**Committee Member Langmade** stated this will be a good project that people will enjoy in the future and is voting yes.

**Committee Member Schmieder** stated concerns about the height and is voting no.

**Committee Member Sharaby** stated that the developers should not have been asked not to attend the meeting, but this is a good project, and he is voting yes.

**Committee Member Siegal** stated that change can be difficult, noting that new development that is initially opposed is often enjoyed later by residents.

**Committee Member Todd** stated he read all the letters and concerns, and he is voting yes.

**Chair Fischbach** provided an explanation for requesting the developers not attend the meeting, and stated he is voting yes.

**VOTE:**

**13-5;** motion to recommend approval of Z-44-25-6, per the staff recommendation, with additional stipulations, passed; Committee Members Abbott, Augusta, Baumer, Eichelkraut, Grace, Jurayeva, Langmade, Sharaby, Siegel, Swart, Todd, Paceley, and Fischbach in favor. Committee Members Beckerleg Thraen, McClelland, Schmieder, Whitesell, and Williams opposed.

**Recommended Stipulations:**

1. An updated Development Narrative for the 2400 Biltmore Residential PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with the Development Narrative date stamped October 10, 2025, as modified by the following stipulations:
  - a. Front cover: Revise the submittal date information to add the following: City Council adopted: [Add adoption date].
  - b. Page 12, D1: Development Standards, Row d: Add ", except as modified by the Building Height Step Plan shown in Exhibit 10."
  - c. Page 12, D1: Development Standards: Add a row with "g. Minimum Unit Size" in the left column and "1,500 square feet" in the right column.
  - d. Add an Exhibit 10 with the Building Height Step Plan date stamped October 23, 2025 attached to the staff report.
2. **THAT THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE IN GENERAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE SITE PLAN DATE STAMPED OCTOBER 10, 2025, AS APPROVED OR MODIFIED BY THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT.**
3. **THAT THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE IN GENERAL CONFORMANCE WITH THE ELEVATIONS DATE STAMPED APRIL 25, 2025, AS APPROVED OR MODIFIED BY THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT.**
2. All mitigation improvements shall be constructed and/or funded as identified in the accepted Traffic Impact Analysis dated July 17, 2025.
- 4.

3. Replace unused driveways with sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Also, replace any
5. 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.
4. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with paving,
6. 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.
5. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the
7. 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.
6. 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.

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

Staff recommends consolidating the two additional stipulations, revising the date of the site plan to match the latest version, and revising the language for clarity as follows: The development shall be in general conformance with the site plan date stamped October 20, 2025 and the elevations date stamped April 25, 2025, as modified by the following stipulations and approved by the Planning and Development Department.

# Camelback East

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-44-25-6

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	July 1, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	C-2 PCD
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposal</b>	PUD to allow mixed use multifamily residential, office and restaurant; and PCD removal
<b>Location</b>	Northeast corner of 24th Street and Arizona Biltmore Circle

#### VPC DISCUSSION:

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

#### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

**Nick Wood**, representing the applicant with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, provided a presentation summarizing the proposed site, surrounding context and streets, the proposed development and architectural details of the design, noting that the unit count is not as high as it could be because the average unit size is 2,000 square feet.

#### QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

None.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.