



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-39-19-4

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 26, 2019
<b>Request From</b>	C-2 HGT/WVR DNS/WVR TOD-1 and C-2 TOD-1
<b>Request To</b>	WU Code T5:5 UT
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Multifamily residential
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 400 feet east of the northeast corner of 7th Avenue and Camelback Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval per staff stipulations.
<b>VPC Vote</b>	10-1, motion passes with McCabe, Shore, Ammon, Becker, Ender, Farina, Jones, Keyser, Krietor, Solorio in favor with Williams opposed.

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

*Three speaker cards were submitted in favor, wishing to speak.*

*One speaker card was submitted in favor, not wishing to speak.*

*Four speaker cards were submitted in opposition, wishing to speak. Three of those speakers chose to donate their time to Mr. Rick Mountjoy.*

**Mr. Bednarek**, staff, presented an overview of the request including the background and analysis of the site. He displayed an aerial map and zoning map. He presented staff's findings and recommendation.

The applicant, **Jason Morris** with Withey Morris PLC, explained why the zoning is appropriate for this project and how it has mid-century modern architecture. He explained that they added new finishes, trees along the frontage, a pedestrian path and how they have worked with the neighborhood.

**Mr. Ender** asked if there was a street was behind the adjacent hotel and what the occupancy rates are for the area.

**Mr. Morris** responded that it is an alley and he will provide more information regarding occupancy rates.

**Mr. Jones** asked the applicant to describe the pedestrian walkway.

**Mr. Morris** responded that the walkway separates the pedestrian with landscaping treatment from cars.

**Mr. Ammon** asked about the alley from the south all the way to the north, the safety of people walking through the site, and commented that he wants to see more greenspace and safety-oriented design.

**Mr. Morris** responded that drivers will not be able to drive on the walkway, and if they abandoned the alley the site would be safer, but it would limit access for the residents. He continued that alley access is important because people don't want to walk on Camelback, and the more people who use the alley the safer it will be.

**Mr. Keyser** asked the applicant if they can spruce up the alley.

**Mr. Morris** responded that they will try their best to make it a nice alley.

**Mr. Rick Mountjoy** with the Medlock Historic District stated that traffic is his main concern. He stated that it is hard to head east and south from the project and wanted an enforceable commitment in the form of a stipulation that will prevent traffic from running through the Medlock neighborhood.

**Mr. Jones** stated that on another project an applicant committed to provide funding for a traffic study after 80% occupancy was reached at the project site.

**Mr. Solano** asked the speaker if height was a concern for the community.

**Mr. Mountjoy** responded that height is not a concern.

**Mr. Walter Crutchfield**, of Vintage Partners who developed the Arrive Hotel neighboring the site, stated that he supports the project. He shared that the project is thoughtful and is a transit-oriented development. He stated that they will maintain the alley with their new neighbors and that for a transit-oriented development to work, it needs to be given the chance to get built. He stated that he is hoping the residents use transit.

**Mr. Ammon** asked how they rectify a borderline design that is not mid-century modern.

**Mr. Crutchfield** stated that he believes the project compliments theirs, and that good development is desirable to them.

**Mr. Bruce Bilbrey** stated that he does not oppose the project and the existing use of the site has been a nuisance. He asked that the applicant keep them in mind and work with them regarding traffic impacts.

**Mr. Morris** stated that they have looked at trip generation and that they have received conflicting information about which streets want or do not want traffic chokers. He added that they cannot be stipulated to put in chokers as they cannot install them before they receive a building permit. He stated that they will stay involved with the community to help them work with the Streets Department for traffic mitigation measures.

**Mr. Ammon** asked what percentage of units are being offered at a reduced rate.

**Mr. Morris** responded that none are being offered at a reduced rate.

**Mr. Krietor** asked if the Village Planning Committee can stipulate a traffic study or traffic mitigation measures.

**Mr. Bednarek** responded that they cannot legally stipulate offsite improvements, and that the Streets Department is not taking money into escrow accounts anymore. He continued that any community can work with the City regarding traffic problems.

**Mr. Jones** asked what the process is for the Streets Department to do a traffic study.

**Mr. Bednarek** replied that if certain traffic thresholds are met, streets can be eligible for traffic mitigation measures.

**MOTION:**

Committee member Charles Jones motioned to approve the request per staff's stipulations. Committee member Jak Keyser seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**

10-1, motion passes with McCabe, Shore, Ammon, Becker, Ender, Farina, Jones, Keyser, Krietor, Solorio in favor with Williams opposed.

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

None.

**Stipulations**

1. A sidewalk shall be provided on-site from the apartment building to 7th Avenue and the sidewalk shall be a minimum of 5-feet in width, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
2. There shall be a maximum of 418 parking spaces provided on site.
3. The developer shall provide clearly defined, accessible pedestrian pathways that connect all building entrances and exits and at all vehicular entry and exit points. These pathways shall be constructed of decorative pavers, stamped or colored concrete, or other decorative pavement that visually contrasts with the adjacent

parking and drive aisles surfaces, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.

4. The development shall incorporate masonry elements into the primary exterior building materials and shall be reflective of the architectural style in the area, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
5. All building elevations shall contain architectural embellishments such as textural changes, pilasters, offsets, recesses, variation in window size and location, and/or other overhang canopies, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
6. All windows shall be shaded by architectural elements, awnings, canopies, etc., as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
7. The developer shall install traffic calming devices along the driveways of the property so that vehicles exercise caution prior to crossing the sidewalk when exiting and entering the property, as approved by the Planning and Development 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. A 30-foot-wide driveway shall be provided at the proposed location on Camelback Road, in accordance with C.O.P Standard Detail P-1255-1, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
10. A 10-foot-wide sidewalk easement shall be dedicated, on the north side of Camelback Road, for the length of the property, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
11. 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.