

Encanto

VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-20-21-4

Date of VPC Meeting	September 13, 2021
Request From	UR TOD-1
Request To	PUD
Proposed Use	Single-family attached residential development, and uses per WU Code T5:3
Location	Approximately 1,300 feet north of the northeast corner of Central Avenue and Indian School Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval with per staff recommendation
VPC Vote	11-3

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

One speaker card was received on this item, in support, and wishing to speak.

At this time, Cothron arrived bringing the quorum to 14 members, 8 being required for a quorum,

STAFF PRESENTATION

Klimek, staff, provided an overview of the proposal, the contents of the Planned Unit Development (PUD), alignment with land development policies, and the staff recommendation. The site is located north of the west entrance of Steele Indian School Park on Central Avenue and between two light rail stations. The request: is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Map designation and adopted Place Types; advances the vision and recommendations contained in the Uptown TOD Policy Plan for pedestrian oriented development in proximity to light rail; and will create new housing opportunities in proximity to transit. Staff is recommending approval subject to 11 stipulations including: proposed revisions to be incorporated into the final PUD document, if approved; compliance with Central Avenue Design Standards; a requirement for a public access easement to avoid landlocking a parcel; a standard ADA stipulation; standard aviation stipulations; and standard archaeology stipulations.

Rodriguez asked for clarity on who in comprises the term “staff.”

- **Klimek** responded that the term “staff” represents the Planning and Development Department and that all rezoning cases are reviewed by a deputy director, the zoning administrator, and representatives of the long-range division, the zoning division, and the site planning division.

Mahrle noted that the staff report does not include an account of the comments provided by the Village Planning Committee at the Informational Session and the revisions made by the applicant. He asked if this is normal, noting that it does not appear many changes have been made in response to concerns.

- **Klimek** responded that PUD Staff Reports do not typically include that content. He asked the applicant to touch on these items in their presentation.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Alan Beaudoin, of Norris Design, introduced himself as representing the applicant, Cresleigh Homes. He provided an overview of the proposal including changes made in response to comments from the community and from the Village Planning Committee. Of note, the proposal: added enhanced internal circulation corridors and connectivity to Central Avenue; added a centralized connection to Steele Indian School Park; added an enhanced amenity area that was enlarged by removing surface parking originally proposed; and added stone accents to building elevations. He then provided an overview of the public engagement process which included meetings with a representative of the Midtown Neighborhood Alliance, the Carnation Neighborhood, and the Pierson Place Historic District.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Vice Chair Bryck asked for detail on the Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations described in Klimek’s presentation. Are the EV Charging Stations going to be located in a quasi-public area or in-unit? Regarding rooftop solar, he asked if solar will be prohibited in the CC&Rs.

- **Wade Kempton**, from Cresleigh Homes, stated that the EV Charging Stations will be located in all residential garages and that because the roof slope, orientation, and size are not ideal for solar, a prohibition will be incorporated into the CC&Rs.
- **Vice Chair Bryck** thanked Wade for the answer, stated that in garage EV Charging is a good, but that this Village Planning Committee supports rooftop solar and asked Cresleigh Homes not to design against solar.

Jewett asked for detail on the proposed pedestrian connection to the un-gated portion of Steele Indian School Park. Has this connection been removed in the current draft or does it remain?

- **Beaudoin** responded that the pedestrian gate and a pedestrian pathway leading into Steele Indian School Park is still depicted but that it is subject to final approval from the Parks and Recreation Department.

Rodriguez asked for detail on the material and color of the roof materials.

- **Kempton** responded that they are still selecting the material but that they will likely use a dark shingle because of the narrow and sloped roofs.

Chair Kleinman asked if they are looking to include environmentally friendly features such as tankless water heaters.

- **Kempton** responded that the project will utilize tankless water heaters.

Wagner noted that palm trees offer no shade benefit and asked that the applicant replace all palms with shade trees.

- **Beaudoin** responded that the city requires palms along Central Avenue.

Rodriguez asked if the applicant met with the Midtown Neighborhood Alliance or only Margaret Dietrich and whether they would consider a project at the Phoenix Country Club where this scale would be more appropriate.

- **Beaudoin** responded that the team only met with Margaret Dietrich and that, while he is unfamiliar with the property at the Phoenix Country Club, that he knows Cresleigh Homes is looking for additional properties in Central Phoenix for similar projects.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Margaret Dietrich, of the Midtown Neighborhood Alliance, stated that this project is technically outside of the group's focus area and that they have plenty on their plate already for additional meetings. She expressed her support for the project and suggested the northern vehicular access should be better used to reduce the likelihood of congestion from vehicle crashes on Central Avenue.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Beaudoin thanked Dietrich for the comment. He indicated that the driveway along the north edge of the property is limited to egress-only because it crosses other private properties and only exists as an easement. He added that the applicant has already fulfilled the stipulation that a public access easement be recorded.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE.

MOTION

Rodriguez motioned to deny the request. *The motion failed due to there not being a second.*

MOTION

Wagner motioned to approve the request per the staff recommendation. **Mahrle** seconded.

DISCUSSION

Jewett stated that he did not have a great first impression of this project but that the applicant did a good job explaining the project. While he would prefer not to have townhomes here due to its transit proximity, the project has made strides toward the vision, especially with the addition of view fencing onto the park and the stone on the facades.

Rodriguez stated that this project should never have appeared before the Village Planning Committee. The owner was involved in the ReinventPHX process and the current proposal is not compatible with the recommendations of that plan, the requirements of the TOD-1 Overlay, the 10 Goals contained in the Climate Action Plan, or the recommendations regarding Urban Heat Island and Tree and Shade issues. She added that this project would be appropriate at the Phoenix Country Club and indicated that a land-swap should be pursued.

VOTE

11-3-0; motion passed with Benjamin, Coates, Cothron, George, Jewett, Mahrle, Matthews, Picos, Procaccini, Wagner, and Vice Chair Bryck in favor; Rodriguez, Searles, and Chair Kleinman in dissent; and none in abstention.

STAFF COMMENTS

None.