



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-49-19-8

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	April 14, 2020 (Canceled) May 12, 2020 (Continued) June 10, 2020 (Recommendation)
<b>Request From</b>	PSC
<b>Request To</b>	C-2 HGT/WVR DNS/WVR
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Multifamily
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 175 feet north of the northwest corner of 19th Avenue and Southern Avenue
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approve per staff recommendation
<b>VPC Vote</b>	<b>11-4-0</b> Motion passes; with members Aguilar, Alvarez, Brownell, Daniels, Holmerud, Monge Kotake, Larios, Said, Tunning, Busching and Trites in favor; Members Coleman, Shepard, Muriel Smith and Shelly Smith in dissent; none in abstention.

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

*Eight email messages were received, two from individuals supportive of the case and six from individuals in opposition, and wishing to speak.*

**Mr. Bojorquez**, staff, provided a presentation on the proposed rezoning case. Staff recommends approval, subject to stipulations found in Addendum B. He then invited the applicant to provide their information presentation with the committee.

**Mr. Russell Condas**, of Dominion Inc., introduced himself and went over a presentation on the Dominion company then providing an overview of the affordable housing needs in Arizona. He then discussed how this project would provide workforce housing and that all units would be affordable. An overview of discussions with local experts pertaining to the Food Action Plan was provided, and stated that an agreement with the Tiger Mountain Foundation was made. He then went over discussions with experts on how to address issues related to three formerly incarcerated. A review of the amended site plan was provided and it was shared that gates were intended to remain open. Building setback exhibits within the presentation were provided to show the before and after of the building modifications. A comparison with other three-story apartment buildings at the

Colonia Del Sol apartments in the area was provided, then the presentation ended.

**Chairwoman Trites** asked for comments from the committee.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked whether energy efficient appliances or materials were considered, based on the changes to the Building 7 layout.

**Mr. Condas** responded that yes, the project has considered this. He added that the operator is responsible to pay the utility costs, not individual renters, and that the project plans to incorporate solar panels on top of the carports.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked whether the project was intending on renting to former incarcerated people and if the applicant was willing to contact the Tiger Mountain Foundation.

**Mr. Condas** responded that yes, under certain conditions they would rent to formerly incarcerated people. He added that yes, he was also willing to reach out to the Tiger Mountain Foundation.

**Ms. Alvarez** asked the applicant what was the feedback received from the public after the site plan changes.

**Mr. Condas** shared that his team had gone into the community to distribute flyers and had received mixed feedback.

**Mr. Brooks** stated that he was pleased with the work done by the applicant on contacting food organizations.

**Mr. Coleman** asked what type of fencing was proposed along the western property line, specifically to address concerns with vehicular headlights and if the project had considered abandoning the adjacent alley to the west.

**Mr. Condas** responded that they were unsure about the type of fencing along the alley, but are considering a CMU wall there. Also, they are unsure about pursuing an alley abandonment there.

**Mr. Gary Todd**, with Todd and Associates, responded that his experience is that the city usually requires a CMU wall along the alleyway for this type of project and that the project has provided a landscape setback between vehicular parking spaces and the western property line.

**Ms. Tamala Daniels** mentioned that she is in support of the project.

**Mr. Gene Holmerud** stated that he went over the letters and comments provided in the correspondence, which contained concerns about increases in noise for the area.

**Mr. Todd** provided an overview on the type of materials to be used to reduce the noise from the units.

**Mr. Martin Hayime Kotake** asked what has been done to address complaints from people on rent increases and management practices.

**Mr. Condas** responded that there are different scenarios that lead to these circumstances but the company is wanting to work with residents on any issues raised.

**Mr. Larios** referenced policies and stated that he was please that the applicant was willing to view property management through different lenses, especially from the formerly incarcerated.

**Ms. Fatima Said** stated that she echoes the previous comments and supports the applicant for being willing to learn about community issues.

**Ms. Muriel Smith** stated that she is not supportive of the project due to the height of three stories given that properties in the area are single story with some two stories in height.

**Mr. Shelly Smith** asked the applicant why the project was still proposing three stories and thus adding more units. He also asked how the negative complaints had been addressed.

**Mr. Condas** responded that he had talked with the community, in particular Ms. Audria Nunley who took on a role of a community organizer.

**Mr. Todd** added that the changes to the building layout was meant to accomplish the desires of the community.

**Ms. Tunning** stated that she was pleased with the six hours of meetings that the developer participated in.

**Ms. Busching** stated that she was pleased with the level of outreach conducted by the applicant.

**Chairwoman Trites** was also pleased with the level of outreach by the applicant, then opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

**Ms. Audria Nunley**, member of the public, stated that she had concerns with the affordability of rents, management practices, landlord practices, discrimination

practices, rent hike practices and recent complaints in the Better Business Bureau (BBB) for Dominion Inc.

**Mr. Condas** responded to the comments from Ms. Nunley.

**Mr. Fred Jones**, member of the public, stated that he sees the property as incompatible with the area and is concerned with the scale of the project. He asked if committee members could explain their vote on this project.

**Mr. Alvis Fletcher**, member of the public, asked the applicant to consider other properties in the area that are for sale for this project due to the single family nature of this area. He added that the lives next to this project site and opposes having a view of this project. He also stated that the had not received flyers from the applicant on Sunday.

**Mr. Condas** responded that his group was constantly seeking new properties to develop, but was not aware of those other properties being for sale.

**Ms. Patra Carroll**, member of the public, stated that the area lacks infrastructure and that the existing zoning on the property should be preserved.

**Mr. Darren Chapman**, member of the public, is with the Tiger Mountain Foundation and supports this project from a food security perspective, however he recommends to the applicant to solve the ongoing issues with the community.

**Ms. Rose Jones**, member of the public, stated that she opposes the project due to traffic issues, increased crime and the intended use at this location.

**Mr. Bojorquez**, staff, attempted to connect Mr. Donald Jones, in opposition, and Mr. Kris Gangadean, in support, who had sent emails requesting to speak but these members were no longer connected to the virtual meeting.

**Chairwoman Trites** closed the public portion of the meeting and asked for further discussion from committee members.

*Dr. Brooks left the meeting at 8:09pm, bringing the quorum to 15 members.*

**Ms. Alvarez** stated that she has concerns with the level of community opposition, but applauds the outreach efforts by the applicant.

**Mr. Brownell** stated that he does not oppose the project, but is interested in obtaining data from the City of Phoenix on rental housing stock within the South Mountain Village.

**Mr. Coleman** echoes the comments from Ms. Alvarez and Mr. Brownell.

**Ms. Daniels** stated that she is divided in her opinion of the project but is looking into the future planning and needs of this area.

**Mr. Holmerud** echoes Ms. Daniels comments.

**Mr. Monge Kotake** discussed being interested in learning about the city's experience in working with this applicant on any other projects.

**Mr. Condas** responded that he has met with the city on this project and others, and is seeking to partner with the city in future projects.

**Mr. Larios** stated that he looks to Native American Connections for wisdom on affordable housing. He also referenced single-family zoning and the lack of affordable housing as part of a systematic problem in the current housing crisis.

**Ms. Said** expressed support for the project due to food security and accessibility to the community.

**Ms. Kay Shepard** expressed opposition to this project.

**Mr. Shelly Smith** shared negative experiences with some apartments near his home that has led to an increase in crime. He also expressed concern with the three stories proposed by this project and added that he would support a two story proposal.

**Ms. Tunning** expressed support for the project due to the affordability aspect.

**Ms. Busching** echoes comments from Ms. Daniels.

**Chairwoman Trites** agrees with the comments made by the committee, including the need to obtain housing data on this Village to help drive decisions. She then closed the discussion portion of the meeting and asked for a motion.

#### **MOTION**

**Mr. Larios** made a motion to approve the item per the staff recommendation presented in Addendum B of the staff report. **Mr. Aguilar** seconded the motion.

#### **VOTE:**

**Joseph Larios motioned to approve the request per the staff recommendation. Matthew Aguilar seconded the motion.** Members Aguilar, Alvarez, Brownell, Daniels, Holmerud, Monge Kotake, Larios, Said, Tunning, Busching and Trites in favor; Members Coleman, Shepard, Muriel Smith and Shelly Smith in dissent; none in abstention.

**11-4** Motion passes; Members Coleman, Shepard, Muriel Smith and Shelly Smith voted against.

Mr. Brooks left the meeting at 8:09pm thus did not vote on this item.

**The following members explained their vote:**

Mr. Aguilar supports this project due to the commitments made by the developer.

Ms. Alvarez echoes Mr. Aguilar's comments but encourages further dialogue with the community.

Mr. Coleman is in opposition to the case due to the height proposed.

Mr. Brownell stated that he supports the project for the reasons provided previously.

Ms. Daniels supports the project but encourages further research.

Mr. Holmerud is in support due to the affordability.

Mr. Monge Kotake is in support due to the affordability.

Ms. Busching supports this due to the outreach and modifications made by the applicant.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

Applicant stated during the presentation that all pedestrian gates would remain unlocked to permit public access to the site which has been desirable with regard to this and other projects by the South Mountain Village Planning Committee. This offer by the applicant is not reflected in the current stipulation language.