



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-64-19-4

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	January 11, 2021
<b>Request From</b>	P-2 TOD-1 (Parking, Interim Transit-Oriented Zoning Overlay District One)
<b>Request To</b>	PUD (Planned Unit Development)
<b>Proposed Use</b>	A self-service storage facility, household moving center, car sharing, and all uses permitted in WU Code T5:7 (commercial and residential)
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 238 feet west of the southwest corner of 3rd Street and Thomas Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approve per staff recommendation with modification
<b>VPC Vote</b>	<b>7-6-0</b> ; motion passes with members Coates, Mahrle, Ressler, Kleinman, Matthews, Wagner, Chair Adams in favor; Benjamin, Bryck, Jewett, Rodriguez, Searles, Vice Chair Cothron in dissent; and none in abstention.

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

*No speaker cards were received on this item.*

### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Klimek**, staff, provided an overview of the site, the request, the proposal, and the recommendation. The subject site is located between 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Central Avenue on Thomas Road and is presently zoned P-2 TOD-1 (Parking, Interim Transit-Oriented Zoning Overlay District One) and the applicant is requesting PUD (Planned Unit Development) to allow for a self-service storage facility, household moving center, and car sharing uses in addition to those uses permitted in the Walkable Urban Code Transect T5:7.

The proposal is to create a flagship for U-Haul's Smart Mobility Center as an extension to the U-Haul International Headquarters Campus. The proposal is consistent with the Phoenix General Plan Land Use Map designation of Commercial, the surrounding zoning entitlements, and the scale and intensity called for in the Midtown Transit Oriented Development Policy Plan and the Transit Oriented Development Strategic Policy Framework.

The development narrative broadly utilizes the provisions of the Walkable Urban Code with notable enhancements including streetscape shade and amenities and the inclusion of active transportation amenities.

The staff recommendation is to approve the request subject to five stipulations including the following: No. 1 pertaining to document clean-ups and signage regulations; No. 2 prohibiting westbound egress onto Thomas Road; No. 3 being a standard archaeology stipulation; and Nos. 4 and 5 being Aviation stipulations pertaining to Sky Harbor Airport.

### APPLICANT PRESENTATION

**Parul Butala**, U-Haul, introduced herself and the proposal for the Flagship Smart Mobility Center PUD as an extension of their International Headquarters located in Midtown Phoenix. At the headquarter campus, U-Haul employs more than 2,200 employees, has expanded overtime, and currently produces approximately \$7,000,000 in payroll every two weeks. U-Haul has been reinvesting in its campus including its fitness center and the proposed flagship store to better compete for talent. She thanked the committee for their time and offered to answer any questions they may have.

### QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

**Jewett** asked about the target market for this facility. **Butala** indicated that 90 – 95 percent are households within 3 miles in addition to some professional offices that require storage. **Jewett** asked why U-Haul would elect to locate this low traffic use along Thomas Road which provides the greatest access to arterial streets. **Butala** indicated that this property was chosen for the flagship store because it was bare ground and the location offers good visibility which is important to the success of the mobility center and because the company will view the facility as a point of pride.

**Wagner** expressed concerns of vehicular access and asked why the signage stipulations are less restrictive than the towers which recently received a Zoning Adjustment. She asked staff whether the committee can modify the stipulations for consistency with the recent zoning adjustment. **Klimek** responded that the committee's recommendation can add, modify, or remove stipulations.

**Bryck** stated that he respectfully disagrees with the staff recommendation that this suburban use is appropriate for Midtown Phoenix. Phoenix needs 163,000 housing units and that this use is not compatible with the 2018 Midtown TOD Policy Plan nor the Walkable Urban Code which specifically prohibits these uses. He suggested that it would better if they would build housing for their employees and then concluded by asking what the applicant changed based on the first set of VPC comments. **Butala** thanked member Bryck for his input and indicated that the revised PUD Narrative further enhances the Thomas Road frontage, includes "connectivity" with the core of the campus, and U-Haul leadership has continued exploring partnerships with local non-profits at the request of the committee. **Bryck** reiterated that he does not feel the use is appropriate, that this is an end-

run around the Walkable Urban Code and may set precedent for more self-storage in transit-oriented development corridors.

**Vice Chair Cothron** echoed Bryck's concerns about the use not being appropriate at this location and expressed her disappointment in the few changes made since the last meeting. Regarding connectivity, she indicated that all efforts to convey the idea of a cohesive campus rely on color and there are no efforts to use architecture or urban design. Specifically, the U-Haul towers incorporate interesting design elements that could have easily been carried forward, but this opportunity was lost entirely in a failure of architecture. **Butala** responded that there are also pedestrian walkways that incorporate the corporate colors of teal and gold.

**Rodriguez** echoed the concerns of Bryck and Cothron regarding the appropriateness of the use and the quality of the development. She stated that she will be voting in opposition because she doesn't want her name associated with this project which does not reflect city policy for transit-oriented development, walkable urban design, and quality architecture.

**Rodriguez** added that the type of trees placed along Thomas Road should be carefully selected to be low water use, low maintenance and sustainable. Additionally, she voiced that workforce housing would be preferable at this location. While not supportive of the project, she urged the committee to consider including language from Wagner regarding signage and lighting to ensure consistency with the previous zoning adjustment.

**Chair Adams** indicated that he is not seeing the connections and design elements being discussed by the applicant. He asked for detail on the Car Rental and if U-Haul has been doing anything elsewhere that is not being proposed here. **Butala** provided a series of renderings of pedestrian walkways on campus, stated that the car share program will operate similar to ZipCar and is included as a future option, and that this facility will be used to test innovations before they are rolled out nationally.

**Kleinman** inquired about the land directly north of the subject property and the location and orientation of signage. **Klimek** stated there is a multifamily complex directly north of the subject property and that there is signage depicted on the east, west, and north sides of the building.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

#### APPLICANT RESPONSE

None.

#### FLOOR/PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED: DISCUSSION, MOTION AND VOTE

#### Discussion

**Wagner** indicated that while this is not an ideal use for the Walkable Urban Code, it will function as an extension to their headquarters which is a major

employer in Midtown Phoenix. She stated that she will be supportive to the request, subject to additional sign stipulations previously shared.

**Kleinman** indicated that U-Haul has been a longstanding partner with the community and that development on the campus has been beneficial to the area and these relationships are important to the health and vitality of the district.

**Rodriguez** stated that she is opposed to the request which is not compatible with the city policy and the developer did not take input from the VPC seriously, which would have provided true activation for the Thomas Road frontage.

**Searles** stated that he will be voting in opposition to the request because it does not activate the street frontage or the area.

### **Motion**

**Wagner** motioned to approve the request per staff recommendation with the following modification to Stipulation No. 1.f. to include the language approved in ZA-544-20-4 with regard to brightness (reduce from 80 to 60 Nits) in “iv” and the addition “v” to require that all high-rise and wall signage have a dimmer control to reduce luminance to 50 percent at 10:30 pm. Second by **Kleinman**.

### **Vote**

**7-6-0**; motion passes with members Coates, Mahrle, Ressler, Kleinman, Matthews, Wagner, Chair Adams in favor; Benjamin, Bryck, Jewett, Rodriguez, Searles, Vice Chair Cothron in dissent; and none in abstention.

## **STAFF COMMENTS**

**Regarding modifications to Stipulation No. 1.f.:** The VPC recommended the provisions of Stipulation No. 1.f. be modified to more closely represent the result of ZA-544-20-4 which focused on signage for the U-Haul Towers. Below is an excerpt from the results for the above referenced zoning case:

### *ZA-544-20-4 Recommendation Language – Referenced in the Motion*

- 1) The Correlated Color Temperature (CCT) of illuminated white sign elements of the high-rise signs shall not exceed 4000K nominal. Prior to issuance of the sign permit, a post fabrication/pre-installation affidavit sealed by a qualified electrical engineer certifying with this standard, including component specifications, shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department.
- 2) Sign luminance (brightness) for the high-rise signs shall be limited to 60 Nits measured at the sign face surface. Prior to issuance of the sign permit, a post fabrication/pre-installation affidavit sealed by a qualified electrical engineer certifying compliance with this standard, including test results, shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department.
- 3) The high-rise wall signs shall have a dimmer control installed and the signs' luminance shall be dimmed 50% at 10:30 PM.
- 4) Adherence to the sign drawings, other than changes required to meet the Sign Code standards, as depicted in the Comprehensive Sign Plan submitted to the Hearing Officer.
- 5) Twelve months to apply for and pay for sign permits.

**Regarding modifications to Stipulation No. 1.f.i.i.:** Staff is recommending language to clarify the intent of the stipulation pertaining to the “wall mural (lifestyle graphic)” to reflect maximum height FROM GRADE TO THE TOP OF THE SIGN, rather than “maximum height.”

## **RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS**

1. An updated Development Narrative for the U-Haul Smart Mobility Center Flagship Store PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with Development Narrative date stamped December 11, 2020 as modified by the following stipulations.
  - a. Front Cover: Add “City Council adopted: [Insert Adoption date]” below “Hearing Draft: December 10, 2021.”
  - b. Page 12: Revise the table entry for Parking Standards to: delete Bullet No. 1 regarding bicycle parking and to modify Bullet No. 2 to specify that the bicycle repair station shall be installed outside the building, in a conspicuous location, and accessible from the public sidewalk.
  - c. Page 12: Revise the table entry for Signage Standards to read as follows: “The PUD will meet the requirements of this section aside from one deviations and requirements found in Section E. Signs on page 14.”
  - d. Page 12: Revise the table entry for Landscape Standards to read as follows: “The PUD will meet the requirements of this section, as applicable to the T5:7 transect, with the additional requirement that the Thomas Road frontage be planted with a minimum of seven (7) drought tolerant shade trees with 25 percent four-inch caliper and the remainder being three-inch caliper or greater.
  - e. Page 13: Revise the table entry for Character Areas to read as follows: “The PUD will meet the requirements of this section, as applicable to the T5:7 Transect, for the Transit Midtown Character Area, with three additions and clarifications...:
    - i. Delete Bullet No. 1
    - ii. Modify Bullet No. 2 to read “Trees as required per the Section 1309 and as modified by the Section 1309 reference in this table, in addition to shrubs to provide 75% groundcover between the sidewalk and the building frontage, excluding vehicular driveways.
  - f. Page 14 and 15: Delete the table beginning with “Sign Type” in the upper left cell, delete the remaining paragraph, and replace with the below language:

- i. "To govern signage on the site, the development shall adhere to the following conditions, as approved by the Planning and Development Department:"
  - i. The wall mural (lifestyle graphic) shall not exceed 112 square feet in area and 46 feet FROM GRADE TO THE TOP OF THE SIGN.
  - ii. Prior to the issuance of any sign permits within the PUD, a Comprehensive Sign Plan will be adopted in accordance with the procedures in Section 705.E.2.
  - iii. Signs over 56 feet in height FROM GRADE TO THE TOP OF THE SIGN shall be incorporated into the approved or amended Comprehensive Sign Plan.
  - iv. In order to reduce lighting impacts to nearby residential uses, the maximum luminance (brightness) for all wall signs shall be ~~80 Nits~~ 60 NITS measured at the sign face. The maximum color temperature for all wall signs shall be 4,000 Kelvin. Sign permit applicants shall provide certification from a qualified registrant of compliance with these lighting standards prior to the issuance of permits for wall signs.
  - v. THE HIGH-RISE WALL SIGNS SHALL HAVE A DIMMER CONTROL INSTALLED AND THE SIGNS' LUMINANCE SHALL BE DIMMED 50% AT 10:30 PM.
2. The driveway on Thomas Road shall be restricted to a three-quarter access prohibiting left-turn egress constructed per City of Phoenix modified Standard Detail P1243-1, or as approved or modified by the Street Transportation Department.
3. 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.
4. The developer shall provide a No Hazard Determination for the proposed development from the FAA pursuant to the FAA's Form-7460 obstruction analysis review process, prior to construction permit approval, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department.
5. The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.