



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-91-25-6

Date of VPC Meeting	November 4, 2025
Request From	R-5
Request To	PUD
Proposal	PUD to allow a self-service storage facility and R-5 uses
Location	Approximately 320 feet west of the southwest corner of 54th Street and Thomas Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	17-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Anthony Grande, staff, provided a presentation summarizing the surrounding context, the proposed zoning district, and the staff recommendation, including the recommended stipulations.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mike Maerowitz, representing the applicant with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, provided a presentation summarizing the subject site and the proposal, highlighting the changes made since the last presentation, including the addition of landscape setbacks on the sides, a prohibition on commercial auto repair, a restriction on owners living in units, and noise limits.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Sharaby noted that some of the changes made seem very restrictive and questioned if it would harm the viability of the project. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the developer is comfortable with the limitations in the PUD.

Committee Member Abbott asked what zoning district would be required for this use. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that it would require C-2 zoning.

Committee Member Eichelkraut noted that street racing has been an issue in the area. **Committee Member Swart** provided additional context about police enforcement of street racing.

Committee Member Schmieder asked how much a unit will cost. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied approximately 800,000 dollars.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

MOTION:

Committee Member Beckerleg Thraen made a motion to recommend approval of Z-91-25-6, per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Schmieder** seconded the motion.

Committee Member Whitesell stated that this property could be a housing property, and the staff report does not mention the Housing Phoenix Plan, adding that approving a luxury vehicle garage at this location defies logic.

VOTE:

17-1; motion to recommend approval of Z-91-25-6, per the staff recommendation, passed; Committee Members Abbott, Augusta, Baumer, Beckerleg Thraen, Eichelkraut, Grace, Jurayeva, Langmade, McClelland, Schmieder, Sharaby, Siegel, Swart, Todd, Williams, Paceley, and Fischbach in favor. Committee Member Whitesell opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-91-25-6
INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	September 9, 2025
Request From	R-5
Request To	PUD
Proposal	PUD to allow a self-service storage facility and R-5 uses
Location	Approximately 320 feet west of the southwest corner of 54th Street and Thomas Road

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Jurayeva joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 17 members.

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Mike Maerowitz, representing the applicant with Snell & Wilmer, LLP, provided a presentation summarizing the proposed site, surrounding context and streets, the proposed development and design and performance standards, noting noise limits and a prohibition on outdoor activities.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Sharaby asked if the developer had built this type of development before and what would be the size of the units. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the developer had not built this type of development before and that the height inside the units would be 30 feet. **Mr. Sharaby** asked whether there would be any outdoor activities. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied there would be a requirement written into the PUD that would not allow outdoor activities.

Committee Member Todd asked for clarification on the proposed side building setbacks. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the proposal is for the buildings to abut the property line.

Committee Member Noel noted that many applications are presented to the Committee based on the fact there is a need for housing in Phoenix and asked why housing couldn't be constructed here, and if the existing R-5 is not feasible. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the site is rather narrow and it would be challenging to do many units here.

Committee Member Guevar asked about pedestrian access at the side lot lines. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied there would not be pedestrian access to the adjacent properties. **Mr. Guevar** asked if powerlines would be undergrounded, if the units would be owned individually, and if there would be customizations for each unit. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the units would be owned, the powerlines are not able to be undergrounded, and that the builder will allow customizations for each unit.

Mr. Sharaby asked about the cost for each unit. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied it would likely be about 800,000 dollars for a finished product. **Mr. Sharaby** asked if someone could live in the unit. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that it's not anticipated that people would live in the units, but someone could choose to stay there, noting that the units would be finished with bathrooms.

Committee Member Whitesell asked how far the neighboring building to the west is set back from the property line. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied it is about 5 feet and does not have much landscaping. **Mr. Whitesell** asked about the driveway width and the distinction between self storage and a repair garage. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the driveway is around 55 feet wide and that the expectation is not that extensive vehicle repairs would be conducted on site.

Committee Member Jurayeva asked if there are any design photos of the interior of the units. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that they would consider having some for the next hearing.

Committee Member Grace asked if the CC&Rs will limit business in each garage. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the CC&Rs have not been drafted yet.

Chair Fischbach stated that the applicant should give thought to adding restrictions in the PUD regarding what activities can be done in each garage unit.

Committee Member McClelland asked if this type of development has been done before. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that there are examples of this in Arizona. **Mr. Sharaby** noted they are prevalent in the Scottsdale Airpark, and people will be working on the cars and a certain amount of noise will be made.

Mr. Grande provided context about the allowance of residential use in the PUD. **Chair Fischbach** noted that the applicant should consider a restriction in the PUD on overnight stays.

Committee Member Schmieder asked how noise will be managed. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that they considered that cars can be loud and have added noise limits that can be enforced by the City and will be in the CC&Rs.

Ms. Schmieder asked about outreach conducted to adjacent neighbors. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that letters were sent to the owners of the apartments, but they haven't heard from them.

Committee Member Guevar asked for an analysis of why this project is the highest and best use for the site.

Ms. Jurayeva asked how many cars would fit in each garage. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied they could fit up to 4 cars.

Committee Member Langmade asked about security measures for the cars.

Committee Member Swart replied that it would be a gated development and that these would mostly be luxury cars that have enhanced security by the owners.

Committee Member Swart commented that when the police are called for a noise complaint, they do not have the proper equipment to measure the decibel level. **Mr. Maerowitz** replied that the zoning ordinance does have decibel limits and the City has issued violations for noise.

Ms. Schmieder asked if noise levels have been an issue at these types of developments. **Mr. Swart** replied that many exotic cars are over 70 decibels, but the owners tend to take very good care of the cars and likely don't make much noise with the engines.

Mr. Sharaby noted that this development will be busy because of its location in town.

Chair Fischbach suggested the applicant consider qualitative limits regarding the noise issue.

Mr. Guevar suggested looking into sound dampening building materials and plants.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.