



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary PHO-1-22--Z-146-06-8

Date of VPC Meeting	July 11, 2022
Date of Planning Hearing Officer Hearing	July 20, 2022
Request	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Modification of Stipulation 1 regarding general conformance with the site plan and elevations date stamped October 26, 2006.2) Modification of Stipulation 3 regarding townhome architecture fronting Polk Street.3) Deletion of Stipulation 6 regarding exterior planters on balconies.4) Modification of Stipulation 8 regarding a plaza at grade level along Van Buren Street.5) Technical corrections for Stipulations 2, 4, 5, and 7.
Location	Approximately 200 feet west of the northwest corner of 11th Street and Van Buren Street.
VPC Recommendation	Approval
VPC Vote	12-2

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Christopher Colyer recused himself for this item, bringing quorum to 14 members.

Anthony Grande, staff, described the location of the request, the existing zoning, and the proposed use. Mr. Grande described the project approved under the previous zoning case, noting that the project was never developed and the site is currently vacant. Finally, he described the applicant's requested modifications to stipulations.

Christopher Colyer, representative with Snell & Wilmer, summarized the proposal, stating that the applicant is not seeking a rezoning but is seeking modifications to stipulations to do something much smaller and less intense than the original approval. Mr. Colyer provided an overview of the subject site and surrounding context. He stated

that the approved zoning allows for high-rise towers and townhomes, and that the applicant is proposing much less height at only 70 feet, noting that the townhome portion is no longer necessary as there is no transition to the high-rise towers. He reviewed elements of the proposed development, including access points and amenity spaces, and summarized each stipulation modification requested and the rationale for each. He stated that they had a letter of support from the Garfield Organization and summarized the next steps in the PHO process.

Questions from the Committee

Eva Olivas asked for clarification of the shade canopy that will be provided around the entire project. **Mr. Colyer** replied by referencing the stipulation to remain unchanged that requires shade around the project. **Ms. Olivas** commented that neighborhood scale could be viewed differently considering the single-family homes nearby.

Janey Pearl Starks asked how many people participated in the Garfield neighborhood meeting. **Dana Johnson** noted that approximately 25 to 28 people attended the meeting.

Ms. Starks asked if there was an affordable housing component. **Mr. Colyer** replied that there is no affordable component planned at this time.

Darlene Martinez commented that the pedestrian features at the Greenleaf building was a good example and that it has good landscaping and trees.

Cyndy Gaughan commented that the palm trees in that example look good but don't provide much shade and asked if the pedestrian area could provide more shade trees. **Mr. Colyer** replied that they would consider that as they develop the landscape plans.

Patrick Panetta asked if the development would be similar to other Broadstone buildings, such as the one on 3rd Street and Roosevelt.

Ian Swiergol, representing Alliance Residential Company, replied that this development would be similar to the other Broadstone products, noting that Broadstone also developed the Arts District building shown in the example image. He acknowledged the comment about shade trees, rather than palm trees.

Vice Chair Boyd asked how the proposed development fits into the urban context, especially without a mixed-use component. **Mr. Colyer** replied that the ground floor units will create a quality urban experience with the frontage and that the project will be a great compliment to the biomedical campus to the west and the project will provide pedestrian access to nearby amenities.

Vice Chair Boyd asked why the developer is proposing more parking than required. **Mr. Colyer** replied that the developer's studies show this amount of parking is needed due to the demand generated from the residents, but that maybe in the future they could adjust to less parking.

Nicholas Gonzalez asked if any student housing would be provided. **Mr. Swiergol** replied that students may live in the building, but it is not designed for that purpose.

Darlene Martinez commented that there are shade trees provided on the side and the back of the development.

Public Comment

None.

Committee Discussion

Vice Chair Boyd asked for clarification on whether the committee would vote on the item. **Mr. Grande** replied that the committee can make a motion and vote on the item. **Dana Johnson** commented that the committee can send a recommendation for the case and noted that the neighborhood voted to approve the project.

MOTION

Dana Johnson made a motion to recommend approval of PHO-1-22--Z-146-06-8. **Darlene Martinez** seconded the motion for approval.

VOTE

12-2, the motion to recommend approval of PHO-1-22--Z-146-06-8 passes; Members Burns, Gaughan, Gonzalez, Johnson, R. Johnson, Lockhart, Martinez, Nervis, Olivas, Panetta, Boyd, and Sonoskey in favor. Members Starks and Uss opposed.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.