



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

GPA-DSTV-1-24-2

Date of VPC Meeting	April 1, 2025
Request From	Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre Commercial / Commerce/Business Park
Request To	Residential 15+ dwelling units per acre / Commercial
Proposal	Multifamily residential and commercial uses
Location	Northeast corner of 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	12-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Agenda Item 5 (GPA-DSTV-1-24-2) and Agenda Item 6 (Z-87-D-03-2) are companion cases and were heard concurrently.

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

Staff Presentation:

Adrian Zambrano, staff, provided an overview of General Plan Amendment Case No. GPA-DSTV-1-24-2, including the location of the request, surrounding land uses and General Plan Land Use Map designations, and the proposed General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mr. Zambrano shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval. Mr. Zambrano then provided an overview of Rezoning Case No. Z-87-D-03-2, including the location of the request and surrounding zoning and land uses. Mr. Zambrano shared background information on the site regarding the Paradise Ridge PCD (Planned Community District) and the Desert Ridge/Kierland Major Employment Center. Mr. Zambrano discussed the proposal, including the land use, development standards, landscape standards, fence and wall standards, lighting standards, and design guidelines, and displayed the site plan and renderings. Mr. Zambrano stated that the request had not received any community correspondence. Mr. Zambrano shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval subject to stipulations. Mr. Zambrano shared the recommended stipulations and the public hearing schedule. Mr. Zambrano displayed modified language for Stipulation No. 8, noting that staff recently received the updated stipulation language from the Floodplain Management section, and there was not enough time to publish an addendum to the

staff report. Mr. Zambrano recommended that if the committee voted to recommend approval on this item, that their recommendation include the modified language for Stipulation No. 8.

Applicant Presentation:

Nick Wood, representative with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, introduced himself and the development team, and displayed other projects that the developer has built in Phoenix and Scottsdale. Mr. Wood discussed the surrounding context of the site. Mr. Wood stated that the existing wash on the site appeared small, but it would not be small anymore once Rawhide Wash was built. Mr. Wood stated that the wash corridor would be 90 feet wide. Mr. Wood stated that the Committee had previously asked when this project was last presented to the Committee if the trails along the wash could be extended to the north under the freeway. Mr. Wood stated that they looked into it and found that the culvert under the freeway was not tall enough for trails to pass through. Mr. Wood displayed the existing and proposed General Plan Land Use Map designation and zoning. Mr. Wood displayed and discussed the conceptual site plan and landscape plan, noting that due to the size of the wash, two bridges would need to be constructed. Mr. Wood discussed the improvements of Mayo Boulevard, proposed ingress and egress to and from the site, and the circulation plan. Mr. Wood emphasized that the main entrance to the site would be from 66th Street, noting that this was the reason the main signage would be at that corner. Mr. Wood stated that the site would be split up into four quadrants. Mr. Wood discussed the proposed development standards. Mr. Wood noted that there would be an enhanced corner feature at the corner of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard, and that there would be a building stepdown along Mayo Boulevard for Parcel D (Phase 5). Mr. Wood shared the renderings, noting the enhanced landscaping, Mayo Boulevard improvements, and that the wash would be preserved in an undisturbed, natural state. Mr. Wood stated that they are in agreement with the stipulations and would continue working with staff on the sign at the corner of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard.

Questions from Committee:

Committee Member Michelle Santoro asked if there was a reason that the General Plan Amendment included commercial, but the Planned Unit Development (PUD) did not. Committee Member Santoro noted that when this project was last presented to the Committee, a hotel was included, which was removed. **Mr. Wood** responded that the hotel and commercial uses were removed from the PUD since the property at the southeast corner of Mayo Boulevard and 64th Street would have a hotel and commercial uses. Committee Member Santoro stated that the maximum lot coverage requested of 75 percent was much higher than 50 percent lot coverage, which is typical of the R-3 and R-3A zoning districts. Committee Member Santoro asked what the current site plan showed for lot coverage. Mr. Wood responded that it was a conceptual site plan that was likely under 75 percent lot coverage, but 75 percent allowed some flexibility. Committee Member Santoro stated that the proposed development standard for open space was five percent, which is the standard for multifamily residential development. Committee Member Santoro asked what the site plan showed for open space calculations, noting that more than five percent open space should be codified. Mr. Wood responded that the site plan was over five percent of open space. Committee

Member Santoro commended the right-in right-out along 64th Street, noting that it would help to reduce traffic congestion at the 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard intersection. Committee Member Santoro expressed concerns with traffic congestion along Mayo Boulevard as the roadway transitions to one lane west of 64th Street. Committee Member Santoro asked if there was timing for the expansion of Mayo Boulevard west of 64th Street. Mr. Wood responded that they have spent a lot of time with the Street Transportation Department since the beginning of this application, which resulted in three entries into the site to address the traffic volume in the area.

Committee Member Rick Nowell expressed concerns with landscaping not being replaced when it dies or is taken out by storms. Committee Member Nowell asked if a stipulation could be added to ensure that the landscaping would be maintained and replaced in accordance with the PUD landscape standards for the life of the project. **Mr. Wood** responded that it would be difficult for staff to enforce this kind of stipulation. Mr. Wood stated that high-end multifamily residential developers do a good job of taking care of their landscaping because of their residents. Committee Member Nowell asked if there would be a bicycle lane along Mayo Boulevard. Mr. Wood responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Jill Bunnell asked if there was an existing traffic signal at the intersection of 66th Street and Mayo Boulevard. **Mr. Wood** responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Gary Kirkilas asked if the Committee should entertain a motion to add stipulations related to water conservation, or if the applicant would be willing to be committed to doing them. **Mr. Wood** responded that the developer had gave his word to commit to water conservation measures.

Vice Chair Louis Lagrave stated that he liked the project. Vice Chair Lagrave echoed concerns with traffic congestion as Mayo Boulevard transitions to one lane west of 64th Street. **Mr. Wood** responded that the hope was that many of the residents would work at the Mayo Clinic Hospital or close by. Mr. Wood stated that the traffic engineers would know much more about the traffic volume and traffic flow. Mr. Wood added that the proposed density was much less than many other multifamily residential projects they have worked on.

Committee Member Bunnell recommended that the trails along the wash cross underneath Mayo Boulevard for pedestrians to easily access the south side of Mayo Boulevard, where the Mayo Clinic Hospital is located. Committee Member Bunnell stated that the community needs to be walkable and there should be separation of pedestrians from the major streets whenever possible.

Chair Steven Bowser asked when 64th Street to the south would be constructed and who would be responsible for its construction. **Mr. Wood** responded that 64th Street was under construction and the City of Phoenix would be constructing the west half of 64th Street south of Mayo Boulevard. Mr. Wood added that the adjacent developments along the east side of 64th Street, south of Mayo Boulevard, would be constructing the east half of 64th Street. Mr. Wood clarified that 64th Street would be constructed before this development was fully built out, since it would be constructed in phases. Chair

Bowser asked if the City of Phoenix would construct 64th Street to Bell Road. Mr. Wood stated that it would be done in phases, first extending to Reach 11. Chair Bowser asked if the ultimate plan would be to extend 64th Street to Bell Road. Mr. Wood responded affirmatively.

Committee Member Mark Warren asked if a culvert was planned to be installed under Mayo Boulevard for the wash. **Mr. Wood** responded affirmatively.

Public Comments:

None.

Applicant Response:

None.

MOTION – GPA-DSTV-1-24-2:

Committee Member Mark Warren made a motion to recommend approval of GPA-DSTV-1-24-2, per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Richard Carlucci** seconded the motion.

VOTE – GPA-DSTV-1-24-2:

12-0; the motion to recommend approval of GPA-DSTV-1-24-2 per the staff recommendation passed with Committee Members Barto, Birchby, Bunnell, Carlucci, Israel, Kirkilas, Nowell, Reynolds, Santoro, Warren, Lagrave and Bowser in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
GPA-DSTV-1-24-2
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	September 10, 2024
Request From	Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre Commercial / Commerce/Business Park
Request To	Residential 15+ dwelling units per acre / Commercial
Proposal	Multifamily residential and commercial uses
Location	Northeast corner of 64th Street and Mayo Boulevard

VPC DISCUSSION:

Item No. 3 (GPA-DSTV-1-24-2) and Item No. 4 (Z-87-D-03-2) are companion cases and were heard together.

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 describing previous projects by the developer, the surrounding context of the proposed site, the proposed development, and the details of the proposed PUD.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Bunnell asked about trail connections with the wash on site. **Mr. Wood** stated that more information could be provided about the culvert under the freeway at the next meeting.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked about maintaining the wash in a natural state. **Mr. Wood** stated the channelized wash would be in a natural state.

Committee Member Santoro asked if the 90-foot height limit is proposed for the entire site. **Mr. Wood** noted that the height limit allows flexibility in the future, although nothing shown on their current plans is that tall. **Ms. Santoro** asked about issues caused by narrower right-of-way on Mayo Boulevard west of 64th Street. **Mr. Wood** provided a description of the proposed condition and noted that the Street Transportation Department will require certain improvements to handle the traffic as new development

is added to the area. **Dawn Cartier** with CivTech provided additional context to demonstrate that this development will not create traffic congestion.

Vice Chair Lagrave asked if there is a traffic signal at 66th Street. **Mr. Wood** replied that there is, and it would remain.

Committee Member Carlucci asked how many units would need to be added to start to create a traffic problem. **Ms. Cartier** replied that the analysis is done based on the proposal. **Mr. Carlucci** asked if the 1,200-unit limit was to avoid traffic impacts. **Ms. Cartier** replied that the site could probably handle more units.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked about the trails shown on the map and any setbacks from the trails. **Mr. Wood** clarified that the adjacent trails are not part of Reach 11 but link to it to the south. **Noel Griemsmann** with Snell & Wilmer, LLC noted that the trails would be 10-foot-wide paths along the sidewalk.

Committee Member Younger asked if there was consideration for reducing the height because of the neighbors across the street. **Mr. Griemsmann** described the height step down requirements proposed in the PUD. **Mr. Wood** stated that the distance from the nearest house is about a football field in length and that the height may not be 90 feet depending on the final design.

Committee Member Nowell asked about the material for the trails. **Kevin Ransil** with JLB Partners stated that the trails would be compacted gravel.

Committee Member Carlucci asked for the rationale for limiting the development to 1,200 units and if it's a missed opportunity. **Mr. Ransil** stated that the density is based on the R-3A density and meets the needs of the developer.

Committee Member Nowell asked about the height represented in the renderings. **Mr. Wood** replied that it was 70 feet.

Committee Member Kollar asked about the review of the TIA (Traffic Impact Analysis) by the Street Transportation Department. **Mr. Wood** stated that the City bases their stipulations on the review of the TIA.

Committee Member Bunnell asked about parking, citing parking issues at a nearby development in Scottsdale. **Mr. Wood** provided a description of parking provided for each proposed building.

Committee Member Younger asked about charging stations. **Mr. Wood** replied that they would be provided.

Chair Bowser asked about the future connection on 64th Street to Bell Road. **Mr. Wood** replied that it was included in the Mayo Clinic development agreement. **Chair Bowser** stated that there could be opportunities with the water reclamation plant.

Committee Member Kirkilas stated a concern about light pollution and suggested full cutoff light fixtures.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Staff has no comments.