



**Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary  
Z-91-18-2**

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	June 3, 2019
<b>Request From</b>	C-2 PCD (Intermediate Commercial, Planned Community District) (2.21 acres)
<b>Request To</b>	PUD (Planned Unit Development) (2.21 acres)
<b>Proposed Use</b>	LCG Kierland Planned Unit Development to allow a mix of uses including multifamily residential and/or C-2 commercial uses
<b>Location</b>	Southeast corner of 71st Street and Tierra Buena Lane
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation
<b>VPC Vote</b>	11-1

**VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDATION:**

**Mr. David Simmons**, Planning and Development staff member, provided an overview of the request to include the background, issues and analysis of the site. He displayed an aerial map, zoning map, General Plan designation map, proposed site plan, setback exhibit, landscape plan and elevations. Mr. Simmons also touched on the proposed projects features that go above and beyond traditional zoning including the pedestrian friendly street frontages, bicycle parking and amenities. Mr. Simmons provided an overview of the recommended stipulations for the case and explained why they are important.

**Mr. Nick Wood** with Snell and Wilmer, LLC representing the applicant introduced himself to the committee. Mr. Wood started by highlighting similar PUD projects that were recently approved and/or under construction in the Kierland area that are comparable in size, use and intensity as this request. He also mentioned that Optima has acquired the former DMB site, as well as the site abutting the south property boundary as this proposal, and will be submitting a rezoning application to the City of Phoenix soon. He stated that he has been working with the Optima team in an effort to address the ingress/egress issues highlighted in stipulation number 2 of the staff report. Mr. Wood continued to emphasize the conformity of this proposal to the surrounding area. He highlighted many of the features that this proposal provides that stand out, including the service entry interior to the parking garage designated for Lyft, Uber, pizza delivery and the like. The site has directional signage for these types of services so there will not be a traffic backup on surface streets as a result of Lyft, Uber and food delivery stopping on public streets adjacent to the building. Mr. Wood highlighted other high-end elements of

the proposal including private garages within the parking structure for ground level units, landscaping on all four sides of the project, tree lined detached sidewalks, architectural embellishments on all sides, increased building setbacks along street frontages, a dog park and dog wash area for residence, a loading dock for truck delivery and moving trucks, an outdoor reading garden, a yoga space, and pool area. Mr. Wood went over the setback exhibit, the signage plan, and conceptual renderings.

**Mr. Robert Goodhue** stated that he has parking questions.

**Mr. Wood** asked the traffic engineer, Dawn Cartier, to take the podium.

**Mr. Goodhue** referenced the parking at Scottsdale Quarter on the east side of Scottsdale Road and asked if the current project under consideration was the only project in the area that has requested a parking reduction and if so, why is this request acceptable.

**Ms. Dawn Cartier**, traffic engineer for the project, stated that more reductions have been seen in the area due to ride share services and other technologies coming to market that have resulted in people driving less. She stated that she will check on surrounding cases to see if their parking reduction requests were approved.

**Mr. Eric Cashman** asked why parking reductions would be considered for ride share service companies that have not made a profit. He stated that companies that do not make profits usually do not sustain themselves for too long.

**Ms. Cartier** stated that the data gathered nationwide suggests that trips are being reduced due to ride share services.

**Mr. Goodhue** stated that he would like to see more parking data reflected from a staff perspective and emphasized that reductions in parking should be justified.

**Ms. Cartier** stated that it is cheaper for many people to utilize ride share services than to own and maintain a private vehicle and trends are increasing in this arena.

**Ms. Allison Barnett** stated that she has noticed the ride share trend increasing internationally and shared that it is really gaining traction in the United States as well. People can work in the back of a car on their way to and from work and not have to focus on driving.

**Mr. Mathew Avrhami** asked what the parking ratio was for the case the committee heard last month.

**Ms. Cartier** stated that the parking ratio for that case in question is 1.6 parking spaces per unit.

**Mr. Avrhami** stated that he has concerns about setbacks. He spoke on the Greystar project and stated that he does not think it looks good. A tree can't even be grown in the minimal setback area. He has concerns stemming from this

mistake. Mr. Avrhami stated that he does not think the setbacks are adequate for this proposal either and wants to see an aesthetically pleasing streetscape.

**Mr. Goodhue** asked the applicant what the density is proposed for this project compared to Optima Kierland. He stated that the setbacks proposed for this project looks greater than what Optima provided.

**Mr. Wood** stated that he is not proud of the streetscape that materialized with the Overture project and takes criticism where criticism is due. Mr. Wood went over surrounding projects approved standards and explained why these standards were recommended. He explained that Overture is one long building with no architectural breaks in the façade. He compared the existing proposal to Overture and highlighted that LCG Kierland in front of the committee today is far superior than Overture as it contains many architectural breaks in the façade. He spent a lot of time with the developer, staff and the community working through the design of the project.

**Mr. Avrhami** shared concerns after reviewing the site plan that it looks like the front doors of the ground units open right up to the sidewalk.

**Mr. Cashman** stated that residential doors open inwards not outwards onto the sidewalk but concurred with Mr. Avrhami that it doesn't seem like this proposal offers enough room on the street frontage. He compared this proposal to something that might be found in Chicago, not Scottsdale.

**Chairwoman Jennifer Hall** stated that the setback is 10 feet with additional footage in the right-of-way.

**Mr. Wood** pulled up the setback exhibit and showed how the plantings will be incorporated into the streetscape. He noted that this proposal provides much more room than the Overture project. Mr. Wood reiterated that he and his team spent a substantial amount of time with surrounding stakeholders in regard to the design of this proposal.

#### **Public Comment:**

**Mr. Wayne Maillaux** with Kierland Community Alliance spoke in support of the project stating that the Kierland Community Alliance and Optima Homeowners Association help to foster responsible development in the area and this project is just that.

**Mr. Tom Stern** with Landmark Condominium Association spoke in support of this project stating that they learned a lot through prior cases. He shared that several prior cases did not come through with promised design features. He shared that he is really pleased with this developer due to the fact that they worked with the association from the beginning of the process and addressed all major concerns.

**Mr. Avrhami** inquired as to what the height of the roof overhang is below the pool deck.

## **Applicant Response:**

**Mr. Wood** stated that the height of the roof overhang is 14 feet above grade and was designed to provide shade to the pedestrian plaza below.

**Mr. Avrhami** inquired as to what the distance is between the property line and the overhang.

**Mr. Wood** stated that he believes the distance from the property line to the overhang is 16 feet.

**Mr. Cashman** stated that the open space is not as open as the slide depicting the open space plan suggests because there is a structure over it.

**Mr. Wood** defended the open space plan and stated that the pool overhang is intended to provide shade to the pedestrian plaza below.

**Mr. Sparks** asked the applicant how much space under the pool overhang is open to the public.

**Mr. Wood** stated that all of the space under the pool overhang is open to the public.

**Mr. Cashman** stated that he would like to see more space provided for pedestrians along the street frontages moving forward.

**Mr. Wood** concurred with Mr. Cashman and stated that he does encourage developers that he represents to design for ample pedestrian open space and this project is an example of that compromise. He shared that this developer lost a lot of living units resulting from the architectural breakup in this proposal. He stated that the amount of open space is superior and creates an open feel.

**Mr. Cashman** stated that the open feel should be for people living around these sites as well as within the sites.

**Mr. Avrhami** stated that he is undecided about this proposal because of the setbacks and parking. He stated 2 spaces per unit should be required for this proposal because people in Phoenix drive cars.

**Mr. David Simmons**, staff, shared that the development in question proposes a reduction in the amount of vehicular parking from 332 to 304 spaces, a ratio of 1.51 spaces per unit compared to 1.38 spaces per unit respectively. He stated that the PUD narrative includes a parking study as Exhibit M that has been reviewed and approved by the City of Phoenix.

**Ms. Cartier** took the podium and shared the ratios for parking for many of the surrounding PUD projects that have been approved in the surrounding area.

**Mr. Cashman** expressed concerns that the ratio of parking seems to keep coming down. He does not feel this is responsible.

**Vice Chair Robert Gubser** asked if there is visitor parking provided.

**Mr. Wood** shared that there is visitor parking provided on the ground level of the garage. He shared with the committee that the reason they do parking studies is to obtain expert advice for specific product types.

**Mr. Avrhami** asked Mr. Wood about the tandem parking spaces depicted on the plan and asked if these were for guests or tenants.

**Mr. Wood** stated that the tandem parking spaces are intended for couples, roommates or individuals with two cars that live in a single unit.

**Mr. Thomas Hoy** with Leon Capital Group (applicant) shared that they designed the tandem spots to maximize space in the garage for individuals with 2 cars, weekend cars, hobby cars and the like. He also shared that Leon Capital Group develops similar projects across the country and the parking requirements in Phoenix are a bit more stringent than in other cities. He stated that a 1.4 parking ratio or above would be ideal, but this is not always economically feasible in some instances. Mr. Hoy went over implications of parking wars and gave a few examples of projects in Tempe, Arizona. He stated that Leon Capital Group does everything they can to maximize parking. He stated that they are currently working on a unit mix to increase the size of some smaller units in an effort to decrease the parking ratio at this site.

**Mr. Goodhue** asked the applicant if they reach their maximum use of parking spaces for tenant parking before they are leased out, would they assign guest spaces to the remaining prospective tenants.

**Mr. Hoy** responded by stating that they will ensure there are controls on license plate registrations with the leasing office. He gave the example that if a tenant is renting a one bedroom and has three cars they will not be able to register all three cars with the property as there will be restrictions.

**Mr. Roy Wise** stated that he is single and has 2 cars. This place would have to accommodate the needs of the prospective tenants. He went on to state that his children utilize ride share services and believes ride share is here to stay and more people will utilize it moving forward.

**Ms. Allison Barnett** stated that one bedroom in the Bay area gets 1 space per unit. However, there are creative solutions for this like ride share and other alternatives.

**Mr. Hoy** shared that he also agrees that parking will be tight on this site.

**Vice Chair Gubser** reminded the committee that this area of focus is on the Paradise Valley Character Area Plan as high density. He stated that this proposal falls in line with the Character Area Plan for the area as it provides pedestrian friendly amenities, a walkable environment, is adjacent to a bike path and provides ample shade. He stated that he believes that the parking provided for the site is sufficient and wants to stay competitive with Scottsdale Quarter on the Scottsdale side of Scottsdale Road.

**Chairwoman Hall** concurred with Vice Chair Gubser and shared that she is supportive of the project.

**Mr. Sparks** shared that he travels down 71st Street every day and has not noticed any parking issues at all. He shared that Optima is an outstanding project and has many desirable design features. He stated that the project being considered today provides a great streetscape along 71st Street. He stated that Overture is a horrible failure and wants to know why so many promises were broken in regard to design features the developer promised the community and did not follow through with including a loading zone that was never incorporated, sign lighting that was not implemented, building setbacks seem to narrow and queuing lanes were never implemented. These were all broken promises. Mr. Sparks stated that he is in support of the proposed project today and feels it is close to ideal for the area.

**MOTION:**

**Committee Member Allison Barnett** made a motion to recommend approval subject to staff's stipulations.

**Committee Member Daniel Mazza** seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 11-1**

**Yes:** Motion passed, with Committee Members Hall, Gubser, Avrhami, Barnett, Belous, Cantor, Cashman, Knobbe, Mazza, Sparks and Wise in favor.

**No:** Committee Member Goodhue not in favor.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

Committee Member Goodhue opposed the motion as he has concerns with parking in the area. Staff has no concerns.