

# Camelback East

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-62-22-8

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	February 7, 2023
<b>Request From</b>	R1-6
<b>Request To</b>	R-3
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Multifamily residential
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 200 feet east of the northeast corner of 42nd Street and Edgemont Avenue
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation
<b>VPC Vote</b>	13-2

### VPC DISCUSSION:

*Committee members Sharon Schmieder and Vice Chair Fischbach recused themselves and committee member Jerryd Bayless left during this item, bringing quorum to 15.*

*Six members of the public registered to speak in opposition, and 26 members of the public registered in opposition, not wishing to speak. Three members of the public registered in support, not wishing to speak.*

### STAFF PRESENTATION:

**Ms. Sarah Stockham**, staff, provided an overview of the of the request including the location of the request, existing and proposed zoning and districts and surrounding land uses. Ms. Stockham displayed the site plan and elevations for the multifamily project and shared the proposal has received one letter of support and twenty-two letters of opposition to date. Ms. Stockham shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval subject to stipulations.

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

**Mr. William Lally**, representing the applicant with Tiffany & Bosco, P.A., introduced himself. Mr. Lally displayed aerial images, zoning maps, and the proposed site plan. Mr. Lally shared the outreach efforts to surrounding property owners including meetings, letters sent, and signs displayed. Mr. Lally shared revisions to the site plan and stipulations after meeting with the community.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

**Ms. Christina Eichelkraut** inquired if the development is market rate housing. **Mr. Lally** replied affirmatively.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

**Ms. Susan Traylor** introduced herself as a long-time resident in opposition. Ms. Traylor stated she was unaware of the changes made to the density. Ms. Traylor is concerned with the ingress/egress onto Edgemont Avenue and stated a change in zoning may set a precedent for the neighborhood and affect property values.

**Ms. Patricia Powell** introduced herself as neighbor in opposition. Ms. Powell stated she was not made aware of the changes made by the developer, but she is still opposed to the proposal. Ms. Powell expressed concern with the dumpster bin as all the residents around the property have singular trash bins. Ms. Powell shared that zoning regulations exist to protect from additional land uses and the proposal does not fit with the neighborhood as she referenced city materials to protect existing land uses to end her statement.

**Mr. David Teel** introduced himself as a property owner on Edgemont Avenue in opposition. Mr. Teel echoed the sentiment of opposition for Ms. Traylor and Ms. Powell. Mr. Teel expressed concern with the lowering of his property value.

**Mr. Dave Jackson** introduced himself as a long-time resident and the president of the Rancho Ventura Neighborhood Association in opposition. Mr. Jackson expressed concerns with the density and shared that the property to the west (Edgemont 12) has had a hard time selling, and the neighborhood would prefer a single-story, single-family home instead.

**Mr. Neal Haddad** introduced himself as neighbor in opposition. Mr. Haddad stated there has not been compromise on this project from the beginning. Mr. Haddad stated a lack of communication between the developer and residents nearby as many residents were not aware of changes made to the density. Mr. Haddad echoed Ms. Powell's disapproval of the quality of the units, dumpster, and zoning changes.

**Mr. Jason Baker** introduced himself as a neighbor in opposition. Mr. Baker stated the neighborhood is quiet and on a dead-end street, the north part of the site belongs to the commercial property and should not be included in the rezoning case, and this project would largely impact the overall neighborhood negatively.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

**Mr. Lally** replied that the proposal is not as tall or dense as the project to the west, they will provide ample setbacks and guest parking, and will provide an enhanced frontage that is compatible with the surrounding area.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

None.

**Ms. Christina Eichelkraut** stated she supports housing and gentle density but is in opposition to this proposal.

**Mr. Barry Pacey** stated the area is in need of housing, he appreciates the applicant for lowering the number of units but is opposed.

MOTION:

**Committee member Tom O'Malley** motioned to recommend approval of Z-62-22-8 per the staff recommendation. **Committee member Dan Rush** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

**13-2;** the motion to recommend approval of Z-62-22-8 passes with Committee Members Abbott, Augusta, Baumer, Beckerleg Thraen, Garcia, Grace, Jurayeva, Langmade, Miller, O'Malley, Rush, Wilenchik, and Swart in favor; and Committee members Eichelkraut and Pacey opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.