



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-123-23-3

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	June 2, 2025
<b>Request From</b>	R1-14
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposal</b>	Single-family residential
<b>Location</b>	Northwest corner of 31st Street and Winchcomb Drive
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation, with modifications
<b>VPC Vote</b>	14-0

### **VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:**

*One member of the public registered to speak on this item.*

### **Staff Presentation**

**Matteo Moric**, staff, introduced the case and provided background information about the PUD rezoning request including where the proposal was located, the site's size, and what the request is. Mr. Moric followed by explaining the current general plan land use map designation and zoning and that of the surrounding properties. Mr. Moric shared an exhibit of the proposed site plan which included an 8-lot single-family subdivision. Mr. Moric stated the staff's recommendation of approval, subject to stipulations and identified the three findings. Mr. Moric summarized the recommended stipulations by staff and noted the next steps of the PUD public hearing process.

### **Applicant Presentation**

**Trevor Barger** introduced the applicant team with Espiritu Loci Incorporated and provided the builder's background and information as an award-winning home builder locally from Arizona. Mr. Barger showed the context of the existing neighborhood and the neighbors desire for it to blend in with the context. Mr. Barger shared the timeline showing the work on the case since 2023. Mr. Barger explained it originally came in for R1-6 zoning, followed by the applicant proposing R1-8 standards and the neighbors with the desire of R1-10 development standards. Mr. Barger explained the City, in this instance, is not able to give a small increase in density without crafting a PUD and the proposal was for an 8-lot single-family subdivision. Mr. Barger mentioned the PUD requires a whole lot of technical requirements and the project received technical

appeals for transportation, fire, and drainage items in which the project received all its blessings. Mr. Barger added for the PUD that they tried to match the base zoning as much as possible.

Mr. Barger said his team have kept neighbors informed through neighborhood meetings and monthly updates, as they were going through the technical pieces of the project. Mr. Barger said this was the way the neighbors wanted to see the proposal. Also, Mr. Barger shared the special requests from the neighbors and identified how they had been responsive. Mr. Barger explained the project was not trying to skimp on tree shade as they were going to be expensive homes, and made mention of barriers in some locations. Mr. Barger then shared a slide showing the neighbors' petition of support including 39 individuals in support with 25 of the properties within the neighborhood.

Mr. Barger requested a recommendation and summarized the stipulations he requested to delete or amend. These included a deletion of a stipulation regarding shade; terminology of using text "with the neighborhood context" instead of "pedestrian environment" for landscape setbacks, as this was a desire of the neighbors; amend a stipulation to delete design guidelines; and delete another stipulation related to design guidelines.

The applicant requested the following stipulations to be deleted and amended:

- *Delete 1.c.*
- *Delete 1.g.*
- *Amend 1.i. to, "Page 16, Design Guidelines, Modified Design Guidelines: Delete the following design guidelines: A.II.C.7.10."*
- *Delete 1.l*

### **Questions from the Committee**

None.

### **Public Comments**

**Pam Kufert**, resident at 2920 East Crocus Drive, raised questions regarding maintenance of the landscaping and expressed concerns about rain and standing water.

### **Applicant Response**

**Mr. Barger** responded to the resident's questions explaining how there would be a Homeowner's Association (HOA) which would take care of much of the landscaping and noted how drainage would work onsite.

### **Floor/Public Discussion Closed: Motion, Discussion, and Vote.**

**Committee Member Robert Gubser** commended the applicant for all the work completed with the neighbors.

### **MOTION**

**Patrice Marcolla** motioned to recommend approval of Z-123-23-3 per the staff recommendation with modifications presented by the applicant. **Amber Sommer** seconded the motion.

### **VOTE:**

**14-0**; motion to recommend approval of Z-123-23-3 per the staff recommendation with modifications passes with Committee members Balderrama, Franks, Goodhue, Gubser, Hamra, Marcolla, Mazza, Petersen, Schmidt, Sepic, Soronson, Wise, Sommer, and Mortensen in favor.

### **VPC Recommended Stipulations**

1. An updated Development Narrative for the 31st Street & Winchcomb Drive PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with the Development Narrative date stamped April 15, 2025, as modified by the following stipulations:
  - a. Front Cover: Revise the submittal date information to add the following: City Council Adopted: [Add adoption date].
  - b. Front Cover: Replace “4th Submittal” with “Hearing Draft” and update the date to April 15, 2025.
  - c. ~~Page 11, Development Standards Table, Street Standards, Sidewalk Tree Shade Coverage: Replace “0%” with “50%”.~~
  - d. Page 11, Development Standards Table, Auto Court Drive: Replace “Auto Court Drive” with “Street Standards (internal)”.
  - e. Page 11, Development Standards, PUD Parking Standards: Replace “should” with “shall”.
  - f. Page 12, Development Standards, Landscape Standards Table, Rear/Side Yard Landscape of Individual Lots: Replace “; live coverage area is limited to the minimum interior building setbacks area of each lot and excludes hardscape, pool, space, and turf areas” with “, planted within a 5-foot-wide landscape area along the side and rear property lines of each individual lot”.

- g. ~~Page 12, Development Standards, Landscape Standards Table, Landscaped Setback Landscape: Replace “with the neighborhood context” with “with a pedestrian environment”.~~**
- h. Page 13, Development Standards, Fences/Walls: Delete “when mitigating noise from a school or neighboring property, particularly”.
- i. ~~Pages 14 – 16, Design Guidelines, Modified Design Guidelines: Delete the following design guidelines: A.II.A.1.1, A.II.A.2.4, A.II.A.3.1.1, A.II.A.3.1.6, A.II.A.3.1.8, A.II.A.3.1.10, A.II.A.3.1.14, A.II.A.3.1.16, A.II.A.4, A.II.A.5, A.II.A.6, A.II.A.9, A.II.B, A.II.C.2.4, A.II.C.3, A.II.C.6.1, A.II.C.7.10, A.II.C.7.11, and A.II.C.8.~~
- j. Pages 14 – 17, Design Guidelines, Modified Design Guidelines and Elevated Design Guidelines: Delete “A.” before the section number for each section header of modified and elevated Section 507 Tab A design guidelines.
- k. Page 17, Design Guidelines, Additional Design Guidelines: Add the following after the first sentence: “The design review guidelines indicated with the markers (R), (R\*), (P), (T), and (C) shall be applied and enforced in the same manner as indicated in Section 507. Items not indicated with an (R), (R\*), (P), (T), and (C) shall be treated as (R).”
- ~~l. Page 18, Design Guidelines, Additional Design Guidelines: Replace (C) with (T) for #10, replace “(C)” with “(R)” for #11-13, 15-16, replace “should” with “shall” for #10-13, 15-16, add “, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development Department” at the end of the first sentence of #10, add “, as approved by the Planning and Development and Water Services departments” at the end of #11, add “as approved by the Planning and Development Department” at the end of #12, and add “as approved by the Planning and Development Department” at the end of the first sentence of #13.~~**
- m. Page 21, Sustainability, Practices Enforceable By the City: Add the green stormwater infrastructure and water consumption measures (#10 – 16 of Additional Design Guidelines section) to the summary list of enforceable sustainability measures of the PUD.
- n. Page 48, Exhibits, Building Setbacks: Revise the setback labels for the east property line of Lot 3 and west property line of Lot 6 to differentiate the interior front and interior side setback.

2. A minimum of 25 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for the north side of Winchcomb Drive, adjacent to the development, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
3. A curved radius street connection between 31st Street and Winchcomb Drive shall be dedicated and constructed, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
4. The developer shall coordinate with the owner of the adjacent parcel to the east (APN 214-55-972) to dedicate sufficient right-of-way to accommodate the curved radius street connection at 31st Street and Winchcomb Drive, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
5. Unused driveways shall be replaced with sidewalk, curb and gutter. Also, any broken or out-of-grade curb, gutter, sidewalk, and curb ramps on all streets shall be replaced and all off-site improvements shall be upgraded to be in compliance with current ADA guidelines.
6. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping, and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
7. In the event archeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archeologist, and allow time for the Archeology Office to properly assess the materials.
8. Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition 207 waiver of claims form. The waiver shall be recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder's Office and delivered to the City to be included in the rezoning application file for record.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

Staff does not recommend the modifications to the stipulations as proposed by the applicant and recommended by the Village Planning Committee. As noted in Stipulation 1.c, staff recommends a minimum of 50 percent shade. The Phoenix Zoning Ordinance requires pedestrian walkways and sidewalks to be shaded a minimum of 50 percent. The PUD proposes zero percent sidewalk shade, which is in conflict with plans and policies adopted by the City Council to address citywide shade and pedestrian comfort, including the Complete Streets Guiding Principles and the Shade Phoenix Plan. Staff does not recommend the stipulation be deleted.

Staff does not recommend the deletion of Stipulation No. 1.g, which is a technical correction to the “Landscaped Setback Landscape” row in the Landscape Standards Table to replace “consistent with the neighborhood context” in the last paragraph with “consistent with a pedestrian environment”. This is the standard language used on all rezoning cases and ensures that pedestrian comfort is still addressed with the alternative design solution for shading.

Staff does not recommend the modifications to Stipulation 1.i. other than deletion of design guideline A.II.A.5 (Trails / Paths) and A.II.A.9 (Hillside Development Guidelines) from the stipulation to remain listed as “not applicable” within the PUD Development Narrative, as there are no public multi-use trails or trailheads within or adjacent to the site, and the site is not a Hillside property. The remainder of this stipulation covers many design guidelines from the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance Section 507 Tab A that staff does not recommend modifications to due conflicts with rationale in the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, conflicts with the intention for PUDs to provide superior standards that go above and beyond minimum Phoenix Zoning Ordinance standards, conflicts with City Council adopted plans and policies, and conflicts with the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance design guidelines applicability on a case-by-case basis.

Staff does not recommend the deletion of Stipulation 1.l as it is related to green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) and water conservation requirements that the City Council directed City staff to apply as standard stipulations / requirements on all rezoning cases on a case by case basis, in relation to the Phoenix Climate Action Plan and the Conservation Measures for New Development policy that were adopted by the City Council.



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-123-23-3

### INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	October 7, 2024
<b>Request From</b>	R1-14
<b>Request To</b>	PUD
<b>Proposal</b>	Single-family residential
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 330 feet north of the northwest corner of 31st Street and Winchcomb Drive

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*One member of the public registered to speak in favor of this item.*

#### **Applicant Presentation:**

**Jon Carlson**, representative with Espiritu Loci, Inc., introduced himself and the development team and provided context of the site, including surrounding land uses, zoning, and context photos. Mr. Carlson discussed history of the project and iterations of the site plan based on neighborhood input. Mr. Carlson shared the revised site plan that addressed neighbor concerns and items that would need to be approved by the City to allow the plan. Mr. Carlson explained the reasoning for requesting a PUD and summarized the proposal.

#### **Questions from the Committee:**

**Jennifer Hall** asked if the City is okay with all the trash bins of the homes being taken out onto Winchcomb Drive. Ms. Hall expressed concerns with the distance some residents would have to walk to take their trash bin out. **Mr. Carlson** responded that this is part of the compromise with the neighbors and because the community will not have a public street, trash pickup will have to be on Winchcomb Drive. **Ms. Hall** asked for clarification if the City is okay with this. **Mr. Carlson** responded that they will be required to go through all the standard City processes to obtain City approval. **Ms. Hall** asked if Mr. Carlson has ever done this before with a previous project. **Mr. Carlson** responded affirmatively.

**Rob Gubser** asked how many technical appeals are going to be requested. **Mr. Carlson** responded that there will be quite a few. **Mr. Gubser** asked if they have gone through the process at all to discuss the technical appeals with the City. **Mr. Carlson** responded that they cannot submit the technical appeals until the zoning is entitled. **Mr.**

**Gubser** asked for clarification if they have discussed the design with the City to ensure this proposed design would work. **Mr. Carlson** responded that they have had a subdivision pre-application meeting with the City, but they are now on hold until the zoning is entitled. **Mr. Gubser** asked if the City will provide any comments regarding the technical appeals before this PUD goes through the public hearing process for approval. **Mr. Carlson** responded that their goal is to have the technical appeals submitted immediately following rezoning approval. **Mr. Gubser** stated that he likes the plan and likes that it is an infill project, but the technical appeals can always be tricky at the end.

**Mr. Wise** asked how delivery trucks and garbage trucks would maneuver within the community without going onto a home's private driveway. **Mr. Carlson** responded that the trash pickup would be located on Winchcomb Drive. Mr. Carlson added that other delivery truck drivers would have to make decisions on their own based on if their truck size would be able to maneuver within the community or if they would have to park on Winchcomb Drive and walk to the home.

**Regina Schmidt** asked how on-street parking would work within the community. **Mr. Carlson** responded that guests would be able to park on the street and may also park on the driveways.

**Ms. Hall** asked when the case will be coming back to the Committee for a recommendation. **Mr. Carlson** responded as soon as Mr. Zambrano will let them.

**Public Comments:**

**Rick Parizek** introduced himself as the neighbor to the north of the site, in favor of the project. Mr. Parizek stated that he is not officially speaking on behalf of all the neighbors, but he has been working with them. Mr. Parizek stated that he has lived in the neighborhood for a long time. Mr. Parizek stated that there is pride of ownership within the neighborhood. Mr. Parizek stated that the neighborhood is concerned with density, but it is a reasonable compromise. Mr. Parizek stated that the applicant has been good to work with. Mr. Parizek stated that he has to walk a far distance along his driveway to place his trash bin on the street. Mr. Parizek stated that the neighbors may have other concerns, but the project will ultimately blend into the neighborhood.

**Applicant Response:**

None.

**STAFF COMMENTS:**

None.