



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### PHO-1-18—Z-103-04

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 13, 2018
<b>Planning Hearing</b>	November 28, 2018
<b>Officer Hearing Date</b>	
<b>Request</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Modification of Stipulation No. 1 regarding general conformance to site plan date stamped November 23, 2004</li> <li>2) Deletion of Stipulation No. 2 regarding maximum number of residential lots</li> <li>3) Modification of Stipulation No. 5 regarding fence themes, building materials and color</li> <li>4) Modification of Stipulation No. 6 regarding internal subdivision sidewalks and landscape strip</li> <li>5) Modification of Stipulation No. 10 regarding a bus bay</li> <li>6) Deletion of Stipulation No. 13 regarding contribution to an escrow account for improvements to a 69KV line along the north side of Dobbins Road</li> <li>7) Modification of Stipulation No. 15 regarding dedications and improvements along Dobbins Road</li> <li>8) Modification of Stipulation No. 18 regarding contact information for the MAG Transportation Improvement Program</li> <li>9) Technical corrections to Stipulation Nos. 4, 7, 8 and 12</li> </ol>
<b>Location</b>	Northeast corner of 27th Avenue and Dobbins Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, with an additional stipulation
<b>Vote</b>	13-1 (Ealim dissented) (Daniels recused)

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Ms. Tamala Daniels recused herself.*

**Ms. Elyse DiMartino** provided an overview of the original rezoning approval. She displayed an aerial map, previously approved site plan and proposed site plan. She explained the stipulation requests and noted the differences between the approved and proposed site plan, noting that the street network would remain the same.

**Mr. Shawn Kaffer and Mr. Mark Doerflein**, applicants with MAK Construction, played a short video for the Committee which provided information about agricultural neighborhoods, or “agrihoods”. Mr. Kaffer discussed the proposed site plan and presented

fly-through views of Dobbins Road with bike lanes and trails, as well as the interior of the community. He explained there would be landscaping and amenities that would promote a healthy, active lifestyle such as bicycle racks, front porches to engage neighbors, energy efficient homes/ solar panels, and turf or agricultural landscaping for harvesting in the front yard. Additionally, he discussed the elements of the community that would keep with a modern agricultural feel such as gabion walls, woven wire mesh fencing, arched rusted steel entry arbors, split rail fencing, and decomposed granite in lieu of sidewalks. He further explained that an open-air community center and harvesting distribution center would be incorporated into the development. The community center would have an outdoor kitchen and dining area which could accommodate cooking classes for residents. The harvesting distribution center would prepare and distribute fresh produce to residents.

**Mr. Patrick Brennan** asked if the drainage ditch needed to be relocated or tiled. **Mr. Doerfein** explained that the City codes and ordinances require the utilities to be tiled and buried; however, it would be the applicant's preference not to bury the utilities.

**Ms. Sara Christopherson** asked if flows were taken into consideration and if there was sufficient retention. **Mr. Doerfein** stated that this would be addressed through the sunken orchard.

**Mr. Gene Holmerud** stated that bicyclists like to utilize Dobbins Road and he that he had concerns that there would not be enough room for bicyclists to ride safely.

**Ms. Kay Shepard** asked if the applicant was providing ribbon curbs. **Mr. Kaffer** explained that there would be a flat curb with a decomposed granite path.

**Ms. Shepard** asked if the Home Owner Association (HOA) would cover all of the amenities, and, if so, what would happen if agrihood never came to fruition. **Mr. Kaffer** explained that production would cover the cost of the landscaping fees. He further explained that if production does not materialize and agrihood concept does not come to fruition, then the subdivision would be landscaped like a regular, typical subdivision.

**Mr. Perry Ealim** asked if the applicant would be using manure to fertilize. **Mr. Kaffer** explained that they would be using manure; however, when utilized correctly, there will be limited smell.

**Mr. Ealim** asked if the applicants had worked in the South Mountain Village prior to this project. **Mr. Kaffer** stated they had not worked in the Village before the proposed project.

**Mr. Ealim** suggested getting involved with the schools, neighborhoods, and South Mountain Community, when developing in the Village. **Mr. Kaffer** explained that they were ready to do more engagement with the community and looking to provide educational opportunities at local schools.

**Mr. Greg Brownell** asked how the HOA fees would be determined. **Mr. Kaffer** stated that the HOA fees will depend on whether the individual homeowners utilize the agricultural landscaping in the front yards. The community area fees would apply to all residents.

**Mr. Joseph Larios** stated that there are groups and community organizations who are already educating the community in farming and agricultural practices. He suggested the applicant reach out to some of those groups for their farming and educational classes.

**Mr. Larios** explained that he had discussed the project with the applicants prior to the meeting and expressed concerns with the price of the homes. He explained that he was told the prices of the homes had to go up in price because the City would not support more density at the subject site and asked the applicant to clarify. **Mr. Kaffer** clarified that the applicants had initially requested to rezone to R1-10 (Single-Family Residence District) and at the Planning pre-application meeting they were advised that R1-10 was not appropriate and was not consistent with the General Plan. He explained that because of the feedback provided, the applicants decided to move forward with a PHO to modify the existing stipulations of entitlement.

**Mr. Larios** expressed that there is a great need for diverse housing options in the Village.

**Mr. Ealim** asked what is the price point for the homes. **Mr. Kaffer** stated the sales pricing had not been solidified yet, but may be around \$500,000.

**Ms. Christopherson** asked what is the current and proposed density. **Mr. Kaffer** stated the current density is 2.34 dwelling units per gross acre, and the proposed density is 2.33 dwelling units per gross acre.

**Dr. George Brooks** stated that he appreciated all of the information about the development and neighborhood. He requested the applicant explain the stipulation modifications and their rationale.

**Mr. Patrick Brennan** asked if any soil testing would be done to confirm citrus can be planted. **Mr. Kaffer** explained that soil will be exported and imported to accommodate.

### **MOTION**

**Ms. Kay Shepard** made a motion to recommend approval of the request. **Ms. Sara Christopherson** seconded the motion.

**Ms. Marcia Busching** stated that she had met with the applicants prior to the VPC meeting. She explained that the applicants took many of her comments and incorporated them into the proposal. She stated she thought this proposal was a good project.

**Mr. Greg Brownell** requested to make a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor. He requested the following stipulation be added to the motion to recommend approval:

- The development shall comply with a dark sky ordinance.

**Ms. Shepard** accepted the friendly amendment.

**Ms. Jennifer Tunning** requested to make a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor. She requested the following stipulations be added to the motion to recommend approval:

- The development shall comply with a dark sky ordinance.
- The developer shall do additional public outreach.

**Ms. Elyse DiMartino** explained that the proposed friendly amendment stipulations by Mr. Brownell and Ms. Tunning would be difficult to enforce via stipulations. She explained that there is not a dark sky ordinance for the City of Phoenix. She further explained that there are lighting standards in the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance and City Code. Additionally, she explained that the outreach requirements for the PHO process were met.

**Ms. Shepard** did not accept this friendly amendment.

#### **VOTE**

**13-1 (Ealim dissented) (Daniels recused)** Motion to recommend approval of the request with an additional stipulation passed.

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

Additional Stipulation:

- The development shall comply with a dark sky ordinance.