



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary GPA-SM-1-21-8

Date of VPC Meeting	May 11, 2021
Request	To amend the General Plan Land Use Designation on approximately 18.41 acres from Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre to Residential 10 to 15 dwelling units per acre
Proposed Use	Multifamily residential townhome community (condominiums)
Location	Approximately 100 feet north of the northwest corner of 36th Street and Wayland Drive
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation in the staff report
VPC Vote	11-0 Motion passes; with members Aldama, Alvarez, Brownell, Busching, Holmerud, Marchuk, Ray, Shepard, M. Smith, Viera and Daniels in favor; None in dissent.

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

8 requests to speak in support from members of the public were received regarding cases GPA-SM-1-21-8 and Z-8-21-8. Two other members of the public registered their support but did not wish to speak.

Enrique Bojorquez, staff, introduced himself and provided a joint presentation for companion cases GPA-SM-1-21-8 and Z-8-21-8. He discussed the location of the site, noting surrounding land uses including a public park, various schools and commercial services including a grocery store and urban farm. He discussed the existing General Plan Land Use map designation and the requested Land Use map amendment. He discussed the surrounding zoning districts in the area, Esteban Park Area Plan, and other policy documents including the General Plan. The conceptual site plan was shown, indicating the vehicular access points, open space, perimeter landscape areas, amenities, density proposed and shown, and lot coverage. The conceptual building elevations and materials were discussed. He concluded the presentation by providing a staff recommendation on the case and describing the proposed stipulations, as presented in the staff report.

Andrew Biskind, with Avenue North, introduced himself and the project.

Benjamin Tate, with Withey Morris PLC., introduced himself and discussed the subject site and site conditions. An overview of the proposal and site plan was

provided, followed by renderings of the proposed development. He discussed community open space areas and the pedestrian seating node located north of the site. An overview of neighborhood outreach including adjacent neighbors, businesses, Parks and Recreation Department and other community groups. The three community benefits were addressed per the General Plan, including goals and policies. Various letters of support were received, and an overview of this project addressed various priorities listed by the South Mountain VPC. An example of another project along 16th Street was provided and concluded the presentation by requesting approval of both cases.

Greg Brownell asked the following questions:

- Have you considered imposing a limit on the number of homes that can be owned by investors as part of this development?
- Will VA and FHA loans be available?
- Have you considered changing the term “community garden” to “garden area” referenced in the stipulations?

Mr. Biskind responded that it is difficult to restrict qualified buyers but do intend to prohibit short-term rentals in this community.

Mr. Tate responded that they can consider CC&R restrictions that could limit the number of units owned by a single individual or entity within this community. The ability to offer FHA and VA loans will be applied for and is intended to be provided.

Kassandra Alvarez asked for clarification on the lighting provided within this development.

Mr. Tate responded that pedestrian-scale lighting is proposed along pedestrian paths, including along Esteban Park.

Kay Shepard asked the following questions:

- What is the density proposed?
- How many uncovered parking stalls are provided?
- Why are palm trees proposed within landscape areas?
- What is the size of each residential unit?

Mr. Tate responded that 192 units are proposed and that there was a discrepancy on the number of units within this development. Excess parking stalls are distributed throughout the site, and palm trees were conceptually depicted but may not be ultimately chosen. The community will be comprised of 2 and 3-bedroom units.

Mr. Marchuk asked if there is a community benefit agreement proposed? And why the R-2 zoning district was not selected if the project can fit within that density permitted?

Mr. Tate responded that no community benefit agreement is proposed at this time, and the R-2 zoning district was not selected originally since the density in the site plan changed following a revision during the rezoning process.

Mr. Bojorquez responded that the R-2 zoning district allows the envisioned project density but could require a landscape setback modification.

Mr. Tate responded that a site plan revision at this moment would be very difficult due to all the engineering that has been done so far.

Ms. Busching asked if the applicant would be willing to reduce the number of units referenced in Stipulation No. 5 to not exceed 192 units total. Also, adding the word “public” to Stipulation No. 15, in order to allow the pedestrian seating node to be publicly accessible.

Mr. Tate responded that he would support those proposed stipulation modifications.

Gene Holmerud asked for clarification on perimeter setbacks and access along 36th Street.

Mr. Tate discussed the orientation of units and street improvements along 36th Street.

Mr. Holmerud stated that bike lockers are needed and discussed the building elevations proposed.

Mr. Tate discussed the bicycle amenities provided within the pedestrian seating node.

Muriel Smith asked for clarification on dustproofing requirements along Esteban Park.

Mr. Tate responded that there were ongoing discussions with Council District 8 to consider relocating the green waste area along Esteban Park to another location.

Chairwoman Daniels asked the following questions:

- Will this project change from lot sales to unit rentals in the future?
- What will be the HOA fees?
- What is the price-point for these new homes?

Mr. Tate responded that the community will not change from lot sales to rentals. It is too early at this time to project HOA maintenance costs and actual project costs. The price of the homes is projected to be in the mid-\$300,000 range.

Chairwoman Daniels is pleased to encourage homeownership in this community. She opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Dr. Bruce McHenry works in South Mountain Community College (SMCC) and discussed the classroom engagement by the applicant, Andrew Biskind and Ryan, who reached out to him years prior and provided a presentation to students at SMCC regarding entrepreneurship. He supports the developer and this new project.

Darren Chapman, with Tiger Mountain Foundation, introduced himself and discussed his 15 years of experience with community gardens. He was contacted by the developer who is engaged with the community. His experience will help keep up and ensure that the community garden can last. He supports the developer, who has been amazing to work with.

Cristian Perez, soccer coach with a soccer club at Esteban Park, introduced himself and discussed the reutilization of the current green waste area, transforming this into usable open space. He likes the project's architecture and discussed how the developer has approached him. The project will allow for first-time home buyers and others to continue to live in South Phoenix and is pleased with this development.

Jimmy Scroggins is a motivation speaker and is pleased to see this community develop. He discussed the youth in the area and applauds the type of development that adds value to the Esteban Park area for the South Phoenix community.

Timothy Hills, Nate, Wendy and Chris registered to speak in support of these two cases but were not connected during the meeting or could not be identified by staff.

Committee member Lee Coleman left the meeting at 9:15pm bringing the quorum to 11 members.

Chairwoman Daniels asked for discussion or a motion on both cases.

MOTION – GPA-SM-1-21-8

Ms. Busching made a motion to approve case GPA-SM-1-21-8 per the staff recommendation presented in the staff report. **Ms. Shepard** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

11-0 Motion passes; None in dissent.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.