



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 22, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 23, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.

REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 2, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Denial
VPC Vote	9-5-3

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

STAFF PRESENTATION

Sarah Stockham provided a presentation on mobile home developments, the status, background and non-conforming conditions and text amendment changes. Ms. Stockham mentioned that existing mobile homes originally in the County were not built to City standards and had limitations for expansion. Ms. Stockham stated that mobile homes would be allowed to expand but still be required to meet standards and would still be subject to administrative review to be consistent with the text amendment.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE:

Ms. Eichelkraut asked about the administrative review and noted concern about safety and conditions of mobile home parks, displaced residents and the City's response. **Ms. Stockham** responded that increasing density would require an administrative review for compliance with site standards by the Zoning Administrator. Ms. Eichelkraut asked if site conditions would be taken into consideration for the review. Ms. Stockham mentioned that all conditions would be considered for safety and access.

Ms. Jurayeva ask if a two- or three-story development could be added to increase density. **Ms. Stockham** responded that it would depend on the standards of the zoning district they are in.

Ms. Schmieder asked if a mobile home could currently be added to a residential zoned district to increase density for a future expansion and what is the time frame to be considered non-conforming. **Ms. Stockham** responded that the date for a legal non-conforming addition is July,1 2023.

Mr. Grace asked about density on a site and if you can add other alternative home types on a site. **Ms. Stockham** responded that it would depend on the density and the space depending on the development type.

Ms. Schmieder asked about parking standards on a site. **Ms. Stockham** responded that parking requirements would have to follow underlying standards for the zoning district.

Ms. Nye stated that this amendment does not seem to address housing needs and only intends to respond to site requirements.

Mr. O'Malley stated that this amendment as presented is going to raise public concerns and he is not in support of the measure and this should have been brought to the Committee a couple of times to frame the problem and explore solutions and engage with other parties.

Mr. Sharaby stated that more information is needed for this text amendment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Neal Haddad with the Arcadia Osborn Neighborhood Association introduced himself and provided background on the text amendment and noted that cities are responding to legislative actions to eliminate local control of zoning. Mr. Haddad stated that there is a push because cities do not operate fast enough and the administrative review will be very important in the text amendment process in moving forward.

STAFF RESPONSE:

Ms. Stockham responded that the intent is to address displacement of residents and for the issue of timing that the Council wants to hear this matter before the summer break.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND VOTE:

Chair Swart stated that he agrees with Mr. Sharaby when it comes to text amendment introductions and movement and there are concerns because the details need to be vetted and there needs to be time for review. Chair Swart stated that amendments need time and members cannot support these measures if they have not studied the actions.

Ms. Stockham stated that all the Committee comments will be shared and noted that the Committee expressed a need to hear the amendments as information only prior to voting.

MOTION:

Committee member Vic Grace motioned to recommend denial of T-TA-3-23-Y.
Committee member Sharon Schmieder seconded the motion.

VOTE:

9-5-3; motion to recommend denial Z-TA-3-23-Y passed with Committee members Baumer, Eichelkraut, Garcia, Grace, Paceley, Schmider, Sharaby, Fischbach, and Swart in favor, Committee Member Augusta, Beckerleg Thraen, Langmade, Miller, Nye in opposition, and Committee Member Abbott, Jurayeva and O'Malley in abstention.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 11, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	7-1

No members from the public registered to speak on this item.

VPC DISCUSSION:

Mr. Matteo Moric, staff, provided an overview of the proposed text amendment.

Keith Greenberg asked what legal nonconforming meant.

Mr. Moric explained that it meant a structure was built legally at the time of construction - either it was done while it was part of the County or when the City rules were different, but no longer complied to the requirements of today. **Mr. Moric** explained that not all the parks would be able to expand the 50 percent.

Will Novak stated that homes in his neighborhood were legal nonconforming and asked if this would be to allow more units.

Mr. Moric stated that the applicant would have to submit a site plan for review by the Zoning Administrator.

Racelle Escolar, staff, explained that this is more of an opportunity for more options where they could go. **Ms. Escolar** indicated that the City Managers Report shows how there are many efforts related to mobile home parks, and this is just one effort.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

MOTION:

Brandon Shipman motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation. **Will Novak** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

7-1; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Davenport, Greenberg, Novak, Shipman, Virgil and DiLeo in favor; and Field in opposition.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 2, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation with modifications
VPC Vote	9-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Anthony Grande, staff, described the proposed text amendment and provided an overview of the purpose and intent of the request and the details of the proposed changes to the text.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Vice Chair Lagrave asked about setback requirements and about the process. **Mr. Grande** stated that the Zoning Administrator would review and that the intent would be to maintain existing setbacks.

Chair Bowser asked about a process to ensure that manufactured homes will follow life and safety requirements. **Mr. Grande** replied that the developments would all be reviewed to ensure safety.

Committee Member Dickson asked about notification requirements. **Mr. Grande** replied that the process would be administrative and would not require notifications.

Committee Member Reynolds expressed concern that the proposed text could lead to further displacement as property owners make changes to their existing mobile home parks. **Mr. Grande** stated that the intent was to allow additional units, which would expand affordable housing options.

Committee Member Israel asked about the potential for stacking units vertically. **Mr. Grande** stated that vertically stacking units would go beyond the definition of manufactured homes and would be considered multifamily housing.

Committee Member Kollar asked about density limits for developments approved for expansion and about the rationale for allowing a 50 percent increase. **Mr. Grande** replied that density limits may not be relevant for nonconforming developments, but that each instance would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. **Racelle Escolar**, staff, stated that the 50 percent increase is the same as what the code allows for expansion of nonconforming single-family uses.

Committee Member Kollar noted that the example mobile home park in the presentation seemed dense and may not be appropriate for expansion. **Mr. Grande** replied that the example aerial photo demonstrates that the Zoning Administrator would have to review and determine if any additional mobile homes were appropriate, rather than simply allow the 50 percent increase.

Chair Bowser asked for clarification on how mobile homes are nonconforming. **Mr. Grande** replied that it could be that they are in a district that doesn't allow mobile homes or that they don't meet the development standards in the code.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked about the number of nonconforming mobile home parks in Phoenix. **Mr. Grande** replied that staff wasn't able to provide that number.

Committee Member Nowell asked about setbacks and whether the Desert View Village has any mobile home parks. **Mr. Grande** replied that setbacks would be based on the existing perimeter of the development, rather than a fixed standard in the code, noting that nonconforming mobile home parks often wouldn't have a standard to reference in their zoning district. **Committee Member Dickson** stated that there is one mobile home park in Desert View.

Vice Chair Lagrave stated that any reference to allowing the Zoning Administrator to enforce requirements should be changed to make it a mandate.

Committee Member Kollar asked about compliance with the rest of the code for mobile home parks allowed to expand. **Mr. Grande** stated that they would not necessarily be required to meet all the site and development standards.

Chair Bowser provided a hypothetical example of a mobile home park with some unused space that could be filled in with some additional units, noting that it would be difficult to bring the rest of the site up to code.

Committee Member Nowell noted there is significant cost with site improvements and that is an issue for providing affordable housing.

Committee Member Reynolds stated that the application of setbacks and other standards should not be discretionary.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked whether nonconforming setbacks would be allowed to continue and apply to new units in this scenario. **Mr. Grande** replied that the setbacks would be related to the existing build-out of the site, rather than a fixed standard in the code. **Chair Bowser** noted the example that it might not make sense to apply standards from an industrial district to a mobile home use if a nonconforming mobile home park were in that district.

Vice Chair Lagrave suggested that the language in the proposed text should be changed to “Zoning Administrator shall review and mandate that the added units” rather than “Zoning Administrator shall review and have discretion to ensure that the added units.”

Committee Member Dickson stated that a notification requirement should be included in the text, noting that the existing residents of the community deserve to be notified.

Committee Member Kollar suggested that the proposed text should be changed to “meet the existing setbacks,” rather than “meet the intent of adequate setbacks.”

Committee Member Reynolds suggested revising the word “shall” to “may” in the first sentence of the added text and asked about the height requirements. **Mr. Grande** replied that height would be included in the development standards under review in this process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Lee Reynolds introduced himself and stated that he supported the modifications discussed by the committee members to remove discretion from the process.

STAFF RESPONSE

None

MOTION

Vice Chair Lagrave made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y with modifications. **Committee Member Israel** seconded the motion.

Modifications:

1. “An expansion of a mobile home development ~~shall~~ may be permitted to increase the number of mobile home units by up to fifty percent of the units that legally existed before July 1, 2023 with administrative review and approval by the Zoning Administrator. The Zoning Administrator shall review and ~~have discretion to ensure~~ mandate that the added units meet the ~~intent of adequate~~ existing setback between units, perimeter setbacks, and other development standards that are consistent with that mobile home development.”
2. That language is added for a requirement that all residents of a mobile home park be notified prior to any changes and provided the opportunity to make comments to

the Zoning Administrator.

VOTE

9-0, motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y with modifications passed; Members Barto, Dickson, Israel, Kirkilas, Kollar, Nowell, Reynolds, Lagrave, and Bowser in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 1, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	11-3

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

STAFF PRESENTATION

John Roanhorse, staff, provided a presentation on Z-TA-3-23-Y. Mr. Roanhorse explained that the request-to allow the expansion of non-conforming mobile home developments which includes increasing the number of mobile home units, review by the Zoning Administrator and allowing alternative units. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the schedule for moving the text amendment to the Planning Commission and City Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

John Roanhorse, staff, provided a presentation on Z-TA-3-23-Y. Mr. Roanhorse explained that the request-to allow the expansion of non-conforming mobile home developments which includes increasing the number of mobile home units, review by the Zoning Administrator and allowing alternative units. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the schedule for moving the text amendment to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Committee Member Drew Bryck asked how the underlying zoning for density would be addressed and would there be any requirements to rezone a site. **Mr. Roanhorse** said that development standards would still be applicable and the amendment is to allow flexibility for mobile home residents.

Committee Member Jorge Picos inquired about the addition of tiny homes and container homes and if they are viable options that can be brought into existing parks. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that it would be allowable but they would be subject to development standards.

Committee Member Paul Benjamin questioned the status of mobile home parks and the situations for owners and residents who lease the space and how the expansion would impact them. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that the changes are intended to provide flexibility and to include mobile and manufactured homes as affordable home options.

Committee Member Paul Benjamin referenced the distinction of manufactured homes and how they are treated in trailer parks where they are commonly more expensive.

Committee Member Jeremy Thacker asked if park owners could increase lease prices and drive out residents, are there any protections to prevent divestment, and will there be a shift away from mobile homes. Mr. Thacker asked how costs for changes would be handled. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that the amendment is to provide housing options and development and changes are subject to review and approval.

Committee Member Rick Mahrle asked will this change effect lots where mobile homes are leased and will property lines be created to identify individual homes. **Mr. Roanhorse** stated that any changes or additions would be subject to development standards so it not expected that there will be substantial changes in current mobile home parks.

Committee Member Drew Bryck asked are the text amendments clear and ready to move forward, and can they be brought back at a later date. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that the amendments are set for Council review and that the process for developing the language has been extensive and they are ready to move forward.

Chairperson Opal Wagner asked is there a map of where mobile homes are located, and how many units are located in the City. Committee Chair Opal Wagner mentioned that the text amendment allows the Zoning Administrator to make decisions on zoning issues and there should be more public input. **Mr. Roanhorse** responded that there is no current inventory of mobile parks and the amendment will allow improvements and continued use as available housing. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that they are bringing the text amendments to all the Villages expect to get feedback in the process.

Chair Opal Wagner asked is there a map of where mobile homes are located and is it known how many units are located in the City. Chair Wagner mentioned that the text amendment allows the Zoning Administrator to make decisions on zoning issues and there should be more public input. **Mr. Roanhorse** responded that there is no current inventory of mobile parks and the amendment will allow improvements and continued use as available housing. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that they are bringing the text amendments to all the Villages and expect to get feedback in the process.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MOTION:

Committee Brent Kleinman made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Paul Benjamin** seconded to the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

11-3; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Benjamin, Bryck, Jewett, Kleinman, Matthews, Procaccini, Schiller, Searles, Tedhams, Thacker, and Chair Wagner in favor; and Committee Members Cothron, Mahrle, and Picos opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 16, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Denied
VPC Vote	4-3

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Rebecca Perrera entered during this item, bringing quorum to 7.

Staff Presentation:

Nayeli Sanchez Luna, staff, described the proposed text amendment and provided an overview of the purpose and intent of the request and the details of the proposed changes to the text. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by providing staff's recommendation and the text amendment hearing dates.

Questions from the committee:

Dean Chiarelli noted that the meeting agenda had 'by 50 percent' and the presentation had 'up to 50 percent' and asked for what language would be used when making a motion. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** stated that the language proposed in the staff report would be language used. **Mr. Chiarelli** asked for clarification on the language in the staff report. **Tricia Gomes**, the Deputy Director for the Planning and Development Department, stated that the language was 'up to 50 percent'. Ms. Gomes added that the intent would be to allow up to 50 percent but there would still have to be an analysis based on technical requirements.

Patrick Nasser-Taylor noted that the example could allow up to 15 additional units but wanted clarification on where those units would be located. Mr. Nasser-Taylor stated that most mobile home developments were at capacity and asked if all units within one development would be moved to accommodate the additional units. **Ms. Gomes** noted that the example was not presented to the City Council, but the example was an existing mobile home park within the city. Ms. Gomes noted that some mobile home parks will be at capacity and will not allow for any additional units, but others would. Ms. Gomes added that the current example will probably not have the capacity for 15 additional units. Ms. Gomes stated that many nonconforming mobile home parks came in through the county and in the mid 1960's and 1970's the requirements for mobile home developments changed significantly. Ms. Gomes noted

that additional research would be required to determine the number of units allowed. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked how this would affect nonconforming mobile home parks. Ms. Gomes stated that nonconforming means that it currently doesn't meet current standards. Ms. Gomes noted that whatever was permitted legally in the past code, then that would be analyzed.

JoAnne Jensen asked what the review process would be and what involvement would village planning committees have in the process. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the entire review process has not been finalized, but that it would be done administratively. Ms. Gomes stated that staff would review the requests. **Ms. Jensen** asked for clarification on the committee's role in the process. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the committee's role would be to provide a recommendation for the proposed text amendment. Ms. Gomes stated that the proposal would be like a site plan review where numerous staff reviewing a proposal.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor asked if the City has done any research on the impact on mobile home parks based on distance requirements and other design requirements. **Ms. Gomes** stated that each proposal will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Gomes noted that there were numerous items to be reviewed.

Carlos Ortega stated that any text amendment approved should also protect individuals living in existing mobile home parks. Mr. Ortega asked for additional policies to protect mobile home renters.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor asked if a property owner could remove all existing units and redevelop the site with the 50 percent additional units and displace individuals. **Ms. Gomes** stated that if someone owns the mobile home and rents the space, the owner can't sell the mobile home unit. Ms. Gomes noted that if the property owner also owns the mobile home unit, then they can remove the old unit and create a new one. Ms. Gomes reiterated that the property owner cannot remove a mobile home unit if it owned by a different individual. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** stated that if an individual owns the mobile home but not the lot, the owner could still evict the individual. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the proposed text amendment would not change who owns the property.

Rebecca Perrera stated that proposed text amendment could incentivize mobile home park owners to redevelop their properties, creating displacement. **Ms. Gomes** stated that redevelopment would eliminate any nonconforming rights. Ms. Gomes noted that the text amendment would maintain existing parks by allowing a modest expansion.

Mr. Ortega noted that the example provided was a poor.

Ms. Perrera stated that she would like to see some sort of staff policy in the review process to prevent property owners from pushing out existing renters. **Vice Chair Hurd** stated that it hard to understand the review process since one hasn't been finalized.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor stated that an analysis of all mobile home parks could help with the assessment. **Ms. Gomes** stated that existing mobile home parks cannot expand their number of units. Ms. Gomes summarized numerous design features that would be reviewed for any additional units.

Public Comment:

Phil Hertel asked if an existing mobile home park development is nonconforming, would any changes have to meet current code requirements. **Ms. Gomes** stated that staff would be reviewing the distances between units and other requirements. **Mr. Hertel** asked if the new units would have to meet the nonconforming standards. **Ms. Gomes** stated that there would be a staff analysis on spacing, access, but that the setbacks would be to the nonconforming standards. **Mr. Hertel** asked if the number of units would change if a double-wide mobile home was removed and replace it with two single units. **Ms. Gomes** stated that staff is looking at the number of units. **Mr. Hertel** asked if only a portion of the site was modified, then the other half would be nonconforming. **Ms. Gomes** noted that each additional unit would be reviewed by staff through the administrative process.

Jon Kimoto stated that the majority of mobile home parks in Laveen are nonconforming. Mr. Kimoto added that he would like to see improvements in existing mobile home parks and requested a public hearing process to review any changes to mobile home parks. **Ms. Gomes** clarified that the text amendment would allow the expansion through an administrative review and not a public hearing process. Ms. Gomes stated that the intent is not to cram units into one development but to allow for a modest expansion.

Staff Response:

None.

Committee Discussion:

Vice Chair Stephanie Hurd asked for clarification on the intent of Z-TA-3-23-Y. **Ms. Gomes** stated that it would allow existing mobile home parks up to a 50 percent expansion and the requirements are reviewed through an administrative process in a case by cases basis to improve existing parks.

JoAnne Jensen asked for clarification if the purpose would be to improve existing mobile home parks. **Ms. Gomes** stated that if the existing units don't meet the requirements, then staff would work with the property owner, so all units meet standards.

Mr. Ortega stated that the text amendment would be an opportunity to improve existing mobile home parks.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor stated that the allowed expansion of 50 percent would encourage property owners to evict existing renters. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked if there are existing nonconforming mobile home parks in Laveen. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the City does not map mobile home park locations. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** stated that the idea was great in theory but that there would be a lot of unintended consequences to this text amendment.

Vice Chair Hurd asked if the analysis would consider the type of mobile home units proposed to avoid displacing people. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the review would include setbacks, building code, and other requirements.

Motion:

Francisco Barraza made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Carlos Ortega** seconded the motion.

Vote:

3-4-0, Motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, did not pass with Committee Members Barraza, Ortega, and Hurd in favor and Committee Members Chiarelli, Jensen, Nasser-Taylor, and Perrera in opposition.

Mr. Chiarelli stated that he voted no because he would like to see some opportunity to remove hazards and improve existing mobile home developments and bring them up to current code. Mr. Chiarelli stated that the proposal is a good idea, but it needs modifications to prevent unprecedented consequences. **Ms. Jensen** voiced her agreement.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor stated that he voted no because of the proposal could lead to exploitation based on the vagueness of the language.

Ms. Perrera stated that she voted no because she had concerns with the proposal creating more harm than good.

Ms. Perrera asked if the committee could make a motion with a recommendation. **Ms. Jensen** asked why the motion failed. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the proposed motion failed. **Ms. Perrera** stated that the committee could make a motion to recommend denial or a motion to recommend approval with a certain recommendation. **Ms. Jensen** stated that the committee should recommend denial or approval.

Vice Chair Hurd asked if a new motion needed to be made. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** stated that if the committee did not make a new motion, then there would be no recommendation since the previous motion failed. Ms. Sanchez Luna stated that if the committee did not support the text amendment, the committee could make a motion to recommend denial.

Motion:

JoAnne Jensen made a motion to recommend denial of Z-TA-3-23-Y. **Patrick Nasser-Taylor** seconded the motion.

Vote:

4-3-0, Motion to recommend denial of Z-TA-2-23-Y passed with Committee Members Chiarelli, Jensen, Nasser-Taylor, and Perrera in favor and Committee Members Barraza, Ortega, and Hurd in opposition.

Vice Chair Hurd asked if both motions will be provided to Planning Commission. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** confirmed that the village planning committee summary would include both motions. **Vice Chair Hurd** asked if the reasoning would also be included. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** confirmed.

Mr. Ortega asked if this would go through all villages. **Vice Chair Hurd** confirmed.

Vice Chair Hurd asked what recommendations were received by the other villages. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the majority recommended approval, but others have approved with recommendation or modifications. Ms. Gomes noted that one other village has recommended denial.

Mr. Nasser-Taylor stated that more research should be done on the current land uses and existing mobile home developments.

Vice Chair Hurd stated that the text amendment would still go to Planning Commission and City Council and that members could still provide comments at the public hearings. **Mr. Ortega** voiced his agreement.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 10, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 11, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Meeting was cancelled
VPC Vote	Meeting was cancelled

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

Meeting was cancelled due to a lack of quorum.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	June 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	5-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Zambrano provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-3-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the proposed changes and displayed an example of an existing nonconforming mobile home park. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule, noting that the Planning Commission already heard this item on June 1, and that this item was supposed to be heard by the Committee last month, but was not able to be heard due to the meeting being cancelled because of a lack of quorum. Mr. Zambrano then stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from Committee:

None.

Public Comments:

None.

Staff Response to Public Comment:

None.

Discussion:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

Mr. Johnson motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Ms. Simon** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

5-0; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y passes with Committee members French, Johnson, Simon, Ricart and Read in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 17, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	13-0-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

No speaker cards were received on this case.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Mr. Klimek, staff, provided an overview of the text amendment and the staff recommendation.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

None.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Members noted the example should be replaced with one that does not appear so overcrowded and expressed concern that the proposal may allow non-conforming mobile home parks to replace their amenity areas with new units and that parks without amenity areas would not be required to install amenities. **Committee Members O'Hara** and **Freeman** noted that the staff report clearly states that amenities are required and that non-conforming parks will need to be brought into compliance before adding additional units.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED

MOTION:

Committee Member Matthews made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Perez** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE: 13-0-0, motion to approve Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Alauria, Freeman, Larson, Matthews, McBride, O'Connor, O'Hara, Perez, Member Veidmark Whitney, Wiedoff, Vice Chair Fogelson, and Chair Jaramillo in favor; none in opposition, and none abstaining.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 1, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with direction
VPC Vote	11-2

VPC DISCUSSION:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Zambrano provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-3-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the proposed changes and displayed an example of an existing nonconforming mobile home park. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule and stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from the Committee and Discussion:

Ms. Sepic asked how there could be a 50% increase for the mobile home park example if it is already nonconforming and not meeting minimum requirements and who would cover the price of relocating mobile home residents. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the request is a change to the nonconforming section of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance and that there are provisions that allow other nonconforming developments to expand to a certain extent. Mr. Zambrano stated that the request is to allow the same kind of expansion that other nonconforming developments are already allowed.

Mr. Goodhue asked if the request would also make existing violations of mobile home parks exceeding their maximum allowed density to become legalized administratively. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that he was unsure if that was part of the intent of the request, but that theoretically they would become legalized as long as it does not exceed the 50% expansion.

Ms. Gerst asked what prompted the initiation of this text amendment. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Planning Commission initiated this request to address the housing crisis and housing affordability. Mr. Zambrano stated that the request is addressing

equity as well to allow existing nonconforming mobile home parks to expand as other types of nonconforming developments are already allowed per Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance. **Ms. Gerst** asked if the 50% expansion would allow mobile home parks to expand as long as they stay within the required setbacks and do not overcrowd the property. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, adding that some mobile home parks may have been built while under Maricopa County jurisdiction, and when annexed into the City of Phoenix jurisdiction, it did not meet the current standards for the City of Phoenix, making it legal non-conforming. Mr. Zambrano added that they can remain legal non-conforming and expand up to 50% with the proposed text amendment. Mr. Zambrano stated that if a mobile home park were illegally non-conforming, the City would need to verify how the park existed during annexation to verify what needs to come into conformance.

Ms. Stockham stated that part of the request is the Zoning Administrator administrative review which will look at certain requirements such as setbacks, landscaping, separation requirements, access, and safety. Ms. Stockham stated that with the expansion there still has to be the administrative review which would look at all these elements.

Mr. Gubser asked if review of legal non-conforming mobile home park expansions would look at other items that may be non-conforming, such as landscaping. **Ms. Stockham** stated that it depends on proportionality and depends on what part of the site is non-conforming, and that the Zoning Administrator may ask to bring it up to code depending on the specific site in question. **Mr. Gubser** asked for clarification that the administrative review may potentially ask to bring certain items up to code. **Ms. Stockham** responded that it depends on how much the property owner wants to change on the site.

Abram Bowman asked if there is a push to have a greater number of smaller dwelling units, such as tiny homes. **Ms. Stockham** responded that the request is just to allow more density where possible in these types of developments.

Vice Chair Anita Mortensen asked if a mobile home could be removed and replaced with two tiny homes. **Ms. Stockham** responded that she believes the intent is to allow a mobile home park to expand if they have enough vacant land to expand.

Mr. Gubser recommended that a better example be used.

Mr. Wise stated he believes the request may allow a place for residents to relocate to from mobile home parks that are being closed down and redeveloped.

Chair Popovic concurred.

Ms. Sepic stated that she would like to make a motion that the language be updated to have a maximum limitation on illegal non-conforming mobile home parks and to require code violations to be brought up to code. Ms. Sepic stated that a lot of mobile home parks that are being developed have a lot of issues such as insufficient lighting and

landscaping. Ms. Sepic stated that she believes it should be a requirement that these items should be improved. Ms. Sepic stated that pushing more people into an unsafe neighborhood does not benefit anyone.

Mr. Zambrano asked for clarification if Ms. Sepic was only referring to illegal non-conforming mobile home parks. **Ms. Sepic** responded affirmatively, adding that other non-conforming mobile home parks should also require lighting improvements and a minimum standard for landscaping improvements.

Mr. Goodhue added that signage should also be improved to City code standards.

Ms. Sepic stated that there is an old mobile home park on 40th Street and McDowell Road which has fencing that is falling down, insufficient lighting, and overgrown and excessive weeds. Ms. Sepic stated that the proposed language is generic and needs to address major City code issues that exist in these older parks so they can be brought up to code.

Ms. Stockham asked if Ms. Sepic was referring to the entire site being brought up to code. **Ms. Sepic** responded affirmatively. **Ms. Stockham** asked for clarification that Ms. Sepic was referring to both illegal and legal non-conforming mobile home parks. **Ms. Sepic** responded affirmatively. Ms. Sepic reiterated that adding density alone does not help these communities if they are already crowded and not designed well. Ms. Sepic stated that she does not believe it helps the situation to remove a mobile home and place two tiny homes in its spot without doing anything else to improve those residents' lives.

Mr. Goodhue stated that the use permit is reviewed by several departments, including the Neighborhood Services Department, and that if there were an active violation case, the Neighborhood Services Department would advise the Hearing Officer to stipulate the improvements per the violation. Mr. Goodhue stated that if there are any violations that the City is aware of, it would be taken care of during the use permit review process.

Ms. Sepic stated that if the special permit process was kept, it would be required to go through a more in-depth analysis.

Ms. Stockham stated that a special permit is a rezoning case.

Mr. Zambrano stated that the use permit goes to the Zoning Hearing Officer also at a public hearing, but is a quasi-judicial process, whereas the special permit would require three different public hearings that the rezoning process requires.

Ms. Sepic stated that she will have to change her vote to be opposed to the prior request, Z-TA-2-23-Y, based on that information.

Public Comment

None.

Staff Response:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

Ms. Sepic motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, with direction to require that any expansion of illegal and legal non-conforming parks have site improvements for improved safety, including lighting, signage, walls and landscaping. **Ms. Gerst** seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Ms. Hall stated that she cannot understand the purpose for this text amendment. Ms. Hall stated that adding 50% more density to non-conforming mobile home parks is a lot. Ms. Hall stated that the previous text amendment allowed more flexibility for these types of parks to come in and that now this text amendment is allowing older mobile home parks to add a lot more smaller units.

Mr. Goodhue clarified that the 50% allowance does not mean they would be allowed up to 50% due to varying factors.

Ms. Hall stated that she is not comfortable with the request.

Mr. Goodhue stated that various mobile home parks may have added more units over the years without City approval, and the request is a way of now allowing those additional units. **Ms. Hall** responded that it would be awarding bad behavior.

Mr. Goodhue stated that the 50% increase allowance is misleading because there are other factors to consider.

Ms. Sepic stated that theoretically more units could be added if the mobile homes are being changed to tiny homes.

Mr. Goodhue stated that it could be possible to add more units to a park if removing mobile homes and replacing them with tiny homes but would depend on if the property owner wants to go through redevelopment of the property.

Ms. Sepic stated that the request is allowing that additional density and with a very limited public process. Ms. Sepic stated that she believes that is very important and that the language needs to be clarified to understand if the unit would be affixed or not, if units would be moving in and out of the park and having all the different types of housing options in the park. Ms. Sepic stated that tiny homes could constantly be coming in and out of the park versus manufactured homes that are affixed. **Mr. Goodhue** responded that manufactured homes are not affixed. Mr. Goodhue stated that modular homes are built to building code standards and are affixed whereas manufactured homes are on a chassis with skirting to block the view underneath them.

Mr. Goodhue stated that manufactured homes could be permanent, but in mobile home parks they are not permanent and can be moved out. Mr. Goodhue stated that manufactured homes are more permanent than park models were, which were seasonal, but are now more long-term and tiny homes are now falling into these parks.

Ms. Sepic responded that she has a problem with those definitions being lumped together and believes it should be updated to differentiate all the different types of housing.

Mr. Bowman asked if staff knows how many non-conforming park developments there are for the Paradise Valley Village. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that staff does not know and that the request is general City-wide.

VOTE – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

11-2; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, with direction, passes with Committee members Bustamante, DeMoss, Gerst, Goodhue, Gubser, Mazza, Sepic, Soronson, Wise, Mortensen and Popovic in favor and Committee members Bowman and Hall opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 9, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Continued
VPC Vote	6-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

MOTION:

Jeff Riederer motioned to continue Z-TA-3-23-Y to the next Rio Vista Village Planning Committee meeting date. **Massimo Sommacampagna** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

6-0; motion to continue Z-TA-3-23-Y to the next Rio Vista Village Planning Committee meeting date passes with Committee members Holton, Riederer, Scharboneau, Sommacampagna, Virgil and Lawrence in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

The committee members continued the item because the meeting facility was closing and there was no time to hear the case..

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	June 13, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	3-1

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Zambrano provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-3-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the proposed changes and displayed an example of an existing nonconforming mobile home park. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule, noting that the Planning Commission already heard and voted on the item on June 1, and that the Committee was supposed to hear and vote on this item last month but had to continue it due to time constraints. Mr. Zambrano then stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from the Committee:

Chair Lawrence asked for clarification that mobile home park owners would be allowed the additional units but would not be able to move all the units and separate them. Chair Lawrence asked how it would be allowed and stated he does not see the benefit of increasing the number of units.

Mr. Virgil stated that another text amendment to allow a reduction in parking may allow them to add additional units in place of the parking spaces.

Chair Lawrence stated that mobile home parks are already tight enough as they are and asked why they should be allowed an increase of units by 50%. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that 50% is the theoretical number of units that could be added, but that they would still need to comply with setbacks and other development standards. Mr. Zambrano added that although they would be allowed a 50% increase in units, it would not mean that they would be able to fit in that many units. **Chair Lawrence** asked about the intent of the text amendment. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it is trying to address housing affordability by allowing mobile home parks to expand if they have enough room. **Chair Lawrence** asked what makes a mobile home park considered to be nonconforming. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it means that certain development

standards are not being met, such as setbacks or lot coverage. **Chair Lawrence** stated that he does not see how spending all the money to reconfigure the lots would address affordability, unless there is vacant land on a property. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that in the presentation example, they likely would not be able to fit many more units on the property. **Chair Lawrence** asked if there are existing zoning development standards for mobile home parks. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, adding that new mobile home parks are currently limited to the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts. **Chair Lawrence** stated that he understands that it would provide more affordable housing units in the City but does not understand how owners of these developments would be able to spend all the money to reconfigure their site and still keep it affordable. Chair Lawrence added that the presentation example does not meet fire access. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that those items would be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and other City departments to ensure that the development is still meeting required vehicular access and circulation, in addition to life and safety requirements.

Mr. Virgil asked where the mobile home park in the presentation example is located. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that he does not know.

Vice Chair Perreira stated that he does not think of crammed modular home developments when thinking about his vision of Phoenix. Vice Chair Perreira acknowledged that there is a housing shortage but stated that this proposal is not a permanent solution and is not fixing the problem.

Mr. Zambrano stated that the text amendment is also trying to address a problem that has been occurring with nonconforming mobile home developments. Mr. Zambrano stated that many nonconforming mobile home developments have wanted to expand but were not allowed to with the current provisions in the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Zambrano continued that what has happened is that nonconforming mobile home developments are being redeveloped and are displacing all of the lower-income people that lived in the nonconforming mobile home developments. Mr. Zambrano stated that the main intent behind this text amendment is to help avoid displacement of lower-income people.

Chair Lawrence stated that he is supportive of nonconforming mobile home parks being able to add units as long as they meet requirements for fire and life and safety. Chair Lawrence added that he does not understand how it would make sense financially to revamp a mobile home development to be able to add additional units.

Mr. Virgil added that if mobile home developments would need to spend money to revamp the site to add additional units, it will not be low-income housing anymore because they would want to get top dollar for their housing units after having to spend that much money.

Mr. Zambrano clarified that not every nonconforming mobile home development would be able to expand and that it would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis based on if there is enough room to allow that expansion.

Vice Chair Perreira stated that he has a problem with the language because of the potential being a 50% increase. Vice Chair Perreira added that he would be more supportive if it was a 25% increase.

Chair Lawrence added that the language could say that the expansion is allowed based on what would realistically be able to fit on an individual site.

Mr. Zambrano stated that density is the same, since a maximum density allows a certain number of units, but based on the size of the lot, setbacks, lot coverage, and building height limitations, sometimes developers are not always able to get the maximum density allowed on a lot.

Chair Lawrence stated that the 50% expansion would only require administrative review by the Zoning Administrator, indicating that no one else would look at it except the City of Phoenix internally. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, stating that the Zoning Administrator and other designated staff in the City would be reviewing these requests to ensure they are still meeting life and safety requirements.

Mr. Virgil stated that the City has not denied any project that have come through.

Chair Lawrence stated that he would support the proposal if it resulted in improvements to the park. Chair Lawrence asked how many mobile home developments would be successful in following this process. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that in the presentation example, they may only be able to add a couple units, but in other mobile home developments across the City, they may have more room to be able to expand.

Vice Chair Perreira stated that the picture of the mobile home park development in the presentation example looks like the homes are already crammed into the site and indicated a different example could have helped the Committee to better understand how many additional units would be able to fit in an existing nonconforming mobile home park.

Chair Lawrence stated that this proposal is only for nonconforming mobile home parks. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, stating that a development is considered nonconforming because they are not meeting certain development standards, such as perimeter setbacks. **Chair Lawrence** asked if the additional units would have to conform to current standards. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that they could conform with the development standards of the nonconforming mobile home park. **Chair Lawrence** asked if there are existing development standards for RV parks. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that RV parks are different because they are actual vehicles with wheels. Mr. Zambrano stated that mobile homes would be on a chassis and typically would be skirted. **Chair Lawrence** asked what the existing development standards would be for a new mobile home park. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that new mobile home parks are currently only allowed in the R-2 and R-3 zoning districts, and that the previous text amendment, Z-TA-2-23-Y, was to allow new mobile home developments in all multifamily and commercial zoning districts. Mr. Zambrano added that with the previous

text amendment, it would change the process to require a Use Permit, which would be a public hearing process. Mr. Zambrano clarified that the text amendment currently being discussed would be for existing nonconforming mobile home developments. **Chair Lawrence** asked if the intent is to try to improve existing nonconforming mobile home developments so they can become conforming. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it would allow nonconforming mobile home developments to expand to a certain number of units, reiterating that mobile home parks have wanted to expand, but cannot with the current Phoenix Zoning Ordinance provisions, so they are being closed and sold to developers, resulting in displacement of all the low-income people that lived in those parks. Mr. Zambrano added that there is a housing affordability issue as well which does not help this problem.

Vice Chair Pereira stated that the residents would still be displaced if the owners of these mobile home developments have to spend so much money to reconfigure and rearrange their site to be able to fit the additional units, which would result in the owners wanting a higher rent or mortgage for the homes, especially if the newer homes look a lot nicer.

Mr. Virgil stated that the City would get more money.

Mr. Zambrano stated that it would only allow a 50% increase, and after that it would require the site to be brought up to current standards.

Vice Chair Pereira asked how the City currently addresses nonconforming mobile home developments. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that currently nonconforming mobile home developments are not allowed to add any additional units.

Chair Lawrence stated that this allowed expansion could potentially keep some of these nonconforming mobile home developments from being sold.

Mr. Zambrano stated that the 50% increase comes from the existing nonconformities chapter of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, which allows nonconforming single-family homes to expand up to 50%.

Chair Lawrence stated that adding additional square footage to a house is different than adding additional units, and that for a development with 100 units, it would allow 50 more units. Chair Lawrence added that he likes the idea of trying to save the mobile home developments from being sold to developers that would redevelop them. Chair Lawrence stated that he would want to ensure these developments are still meeting fire and life and safety requirements. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that those requirements would still be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator and designated staff in those disciplines.

Mr. Sommacampagna asked what the Planning Commission vote was. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Planning Commission recommended approval, per the staff recommendation.

Public Comments:

None.

Staff Response:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

Mr. Virgil motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Sommacampagna** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

2-2; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation fails with Committee members Sommacampagna and Virgil in favor and Committee members Perreira and Lawrence opposed.

MOTION – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

Chair Lawrence motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Virgil** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-3-23-Y:

3-1; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-3-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Sommacampagna, Virgil and Lawrence in favor and Committee member Perreira opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-3-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 9, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 9 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance to address nonconforming mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.