

# Camelback East

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

**Z-91-25-6**

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

# Camelback East

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-91-25-6

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	September 9, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	R-5
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposal</b>	PUD to allow a self-service storage facility and R-5 uses
<b>Location</b>	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.