



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-138-F-83-5

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	April 13, 2022
<b>Request From</b>	PUD PCD
<b>Request To</b>	PUD PCD
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Major Amendment to the DC Ranch PCD to allow an amendment to the Aldea Centre PUD to allow multifamily residential
<b>Location</b>	Northwest corner of 99th Avenue and Missouri Avenue

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Committee Member Sandra Cole entered during this item, bringing quorum to 8.*

**Brian Greathouse**, representing the applicant with Burch and Cracchiolo P.A., provided an overview of the proposed rezoning application Z-138-F-83-5. Mr. Greathouse stated that the proposed 15-acre multifamily development would be located on the southwest corner of 99<sup>th</sup> Avenue and the Bethany Home Road alignment, adjacent to the SRP substation. Mr. Greathouse provided information about the surrounding area such as a large number of existing employers, other new employment developments, and the lack of existing housing types within the Maryvale Village. Mr. Greathouse also provided the land use map for the DC Ranch PCD that designated the subject area as multifamily residential. Mr. Greathouse pointed out that the Aldea Centre PUD calls for hotels and an amusement park; however, there is existing development surrounding the PUD boundaries that meet the commercial goals described in the Aldea Centre PUD. As a result, Mr. Greathouse explained that the major amendment would be required to achieve their request of a multifamily development due to their proposed density and unit count exceeding the provisions in the Aldea Centre PUD. Mr. Greathouse provided conceptual building elevations, floor plans, and site configurations that include multifamily amenities proposed within the development. Mr. Greathouse stated that the proposed multifamily development would have several pedestrian connections within and surrounding the development. Mr. Greathouse also stated that the pedestrian connections would connect to the canal located on the north portion of the site. Mr. Greathouse concluded his presentation by stating that the major amendment is not necessarily to allow multifamily development but to increase the maximum number of

units and density allowed within the Aldea Centre PUD as well as within the DC Ranch PCD.

**Questions from the committee:**

**Christopher Demarest** asked Mr. Greathouse if he or his team was aware of the industrial uses that would be permitted on the south side of Montebello Avenue. Mr. Demarest stated that the area south of Montebello Avenue was going to be designated for RV sales as approved by Z-138-E-83-5. **Mr. Greathouse** confirmed that Mr. Demarest was correct and that the location south of Montebello Avenue was in fact going to be utilized for recreational vehicle sales, service and show rooms as approved in Z-138-E-83-5. Mr. Greathouse stated that with the addition of recreational vehicle sales and the proposed multifamily development, it would increase the mix of uses within the Aldea Centre PUD.

**Sandra Cole** asked if the proposed pedestrian pathways within the development would be lighted. **Mr. Greathouse** confirmed that all pedestrian pathways would be lighted and that could be something that would be addressed as a standard the PUD.

**Chair Gene Derie** asked staff to confirm that the applicant would be required to come back to the Village Planning Committee for recommendation at a later date and that committee members were still able to ask questions during this presentation. **Sarah Stockham**, staff, confirmed that this was an information only presentation but that committee members were still recommended to ask questions regarding their request and their proposed development.

**Ms. Cole** asked the applicant how many stories the proposed multifamily development would be and if the development would include elevators. **Mr. Greathouse** confirmed that the proposed development would be three (3) stories in height and elevators would be provided.

**Ms. Cole** asked the applicant if there would be a professional maintenance company that would ensure that the proposed multifamily development would remain maintained after the completion of the project in the future. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that a professional company would be in charge of maintaining the development and that the rent would include fee charges that would pay for the maintenance within the multifamily development.

**Ms. Cole** asked the developer if this proposed multifamily development was a rent to own development or if it was just a rental development. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that this was solely a rental development and that the rent prices would range from \$1,100 to \$1,500 dollars depending on the unit.

**Ken DuBose** asked the applicant regarding ingress and egress along Missouri Avenue. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that this northern multifamily development would have ingress and egress from 99th Avenue and that the southern development would have ingress and egress from Montebello Avenue. Mr. Greathouse also confirmed that they were in the process of conducting a traffic study that they would be issuing to the City of Glendale since the city of Glendale's jurisdiction borders 99th Avenue. Mr. Greathouse stated that the direct path to and from the development would be from 99th Avenue.

**Denise Garcia** asked the applicant if there was going to be some sort of rental cap on the units. Ms. Garcia stated that there has been a large concern with the lack of affordable housing or the ability to find equitable housing in the Village and that the rent affordability could become a challenge as the years progressed. Ms. Garcia added that people migrating to Arizona are probably accustomed to paying high rental rates, but that Arizonans are not. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that there would not be any sort of rental cap on the development since it is unlawful in Arizona and that the result would be to address the supply of housing. Mr. Greathouse added that they proposed a large variety of rent options that range from \$1,000 to \$2,000 monthly and that this would be the best way to tackle the affordability issue as they cannot enforce a cap on rent.

**Mr. DuBose** asked the applicant if they have had any public meetings regarding this rezoning proposal as well as the proposed multifamily residential development. **Mr. Greathouse** confirmed that they had their first neighborhood meeting and that two (2) members of the public attended. Mr. Greathouse stated that one (1) community member had numerous questions regarding the rezoning process, the process for notifying community members, and questions regarding this specific development. Mr. Greathouse stated that he is currently working with this individual and stated that the next neighborhood meeting would be in a week or in two (2) weeks.

**Joe Barba** stated that he would like to know the specific concerns that this particular citizen had during their neighborhood meeting. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that his concerns were stated in the letter that was submitted to staff and to the Village Planning Committee. Mr. Greathouse stated that some of the concerns included the proposed setbacks, floor to area ratio, the timeline of the project, and the anticipated impact on property taxes. Mr. Greathouse stated that he and his team have been doing research on the concerns that this community member had and that they would be responding to his questions at a later date. Mr. Greathouse stated that this community member had not stated whether he was in favor or in opposition to the proposed rezoning request.

**Vice Chair Jeff O'Toole** asked the committee what other commercial developments have been proposed around this development, in addition to the RV sales to the south and American Furniture Warehouse to the east. **Chair Derie** stated that east of 99th Avenue was an American Furniture Warehouse, south of the development was going to be utilized for recreational vehicle sales, and that south of the recreation vehicle sales was for a multifamily development called Cabana.

**Vice Chair O'Toole** asked if multifamily was allowed at this location by the Aldea Centre PUD and the DC Ranch PCD and their request was just to increase the number of allowed units within the PUD and the PCD. **Ms. Stockham**, staff, stated that the Aldea Centre PUD is part of the existing DC Ranch PCD and that the unit maximum proposed in the PCD and the maximum density proposed in the PUD have reached their limit. Ms. Stockham stated that the DC Ranch PCD would only allow two (2) more units to be built and that the major amendment would increase the number of allowable units to over 500 and that multifamily residential is an allowable use in the PUD. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that the proposed multifamily development and RV sales use to the south would contribute to a mix of uses within the PUD area and that multifamily residential is appropriate given the nearby commercial uses. **Vice Chair O'Toole** stated that the proposed site would be more beneficial as a commercial use and thanked the applicant for answering the committee's questions.

**Public comment**

**Erik Espinoza** thanked the applicant and the committee for their discussion regarding this proposed development. Mr. Espinoza stated that he was a part of the nearby Larissa subdivision and also part of the HOA. Mr. Espinoza stated that the proposal required more revisions, especially along the canal. Mr. Espinoza stated he had concerns with the reduction in setbacks adjacent to the SRP substation. Mr. Espinoza stated that the developer was sacrificing the interest and quality of the future residents in exchange for profit. Mr. Espinoza added that he was not opposed to the change within the PUD but was opposed to the high increase in requested density. Mr. Espinoza stated that the applicant and developer wanted to amend the PUD but disregarded the surrounding residential development and the schools in their request. Mr. Espinoza shared that many people in his residential development are not happy with the increase in multifamily development and that it was not equitable for people to live in areas with high commercial and high-density housing. Mr. Espinoza stated that the proposal as it has been presented sacrifices safety, ingress, and egress. Mr. Espinoza ended his comment by stating that he is not opposed to the project, that housing is necessary, but that the way the development is proposed, he is not supportive.

**Applicant response:**

**Mr. Greathouse** responded by stating that the only way to control the increase in housing prices would be through increasing supply, and that by providing a diverse range of housing options would allow a wide range of people to afford housing and that is what they were proposing.

**Committee Discussion:**

**Chair Derie** stated that the committee is looking forward to the applicant's next presentation.