

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary PHO-1-21—Z-23-18-8

Date of VPC Meeting December 13, 2021

Request From December 15, 2021

1) Deletion of Stipulation 4.c regarding on-site

security.

2) Deletion of Stipulation 5 regarding cross block access between adjacent streets.

3) Modification of Stipulation 6 regarding detached sidewalks, streetscape landscaping and

bioswales.

Location Northeast corner of 16th Street and Polk Street

VPC Recommendation Approval

VPC Vote 10-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

Request

Sarah Stockham, staff, provided background information on the request. Ms. Stockham displayed an aerial map, reviewed the site history and previously approved stipulations and site plan, and displayed the requested changes to the stipulations, proposed site plan and elevations.

Ed Bull, representing the applicant with Burch & Cracchiolo, introduced himself, displayed an aerial image of the site, and reviewed the site history and current zoning. Mr. Bull shared that the site is a vacant infill development site, the site is no longer meant to be a publicly accessible Veterans Affairs Hospital site, there is no need to provide public access through the residential development and such access would be detrimental to future residents, there is insufficient room within the required setbacks to include bioswales on the site and the proposed multifamily residential project will not be detrimental to the nearby properties. Mr. Bull ended his presentation by reviewing other projects by Greenlight Communities and the community outreach done for the request.

Questions from the Committee:

Ryan Boyd asked the applicant to elaborate on how public access through a site that is a super-block could be detrimental to the residents, explaining that the AL Krohn multifamily residential community located near the subject site has public access. **Mr.**

Central City Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary PHO-1-21—Z-23-18-8

Bull replied that residents now are requesting gated communities, Aeroterra (also located near the subject site) is gated, and that the stipulation was proposed to accommodate vehicle access and public access for a hospital, which is not conducive to the residential project that is now being proposed for the site.

Dana Johnson shared that the Garfield neighborhood had originally asked for the bioswales, and that making the subject site a gated community would isolate the future residents to the community so that they don't mingle with others, adding that a gated community would not be cohesive to the area and that Aeroterra is gated because it is federally funded. **Mr. Bull** replied that they will have pedestrian access to and from Polk Street and 16th Street, and that a gated community is what residents want. Mr. Bull added that it is not their intent to turn their backs on the community, but security is an important aspect of providing housing in an urban area.

Eva Olivas shared that Aeroterra is senior and family housing site, that Henson Village is also gated, and has mixed feelings about the proposal as this is a vacant site proposed for hosing which is needed. Ms. Olivas asked what the proposed rents will be. **Mr. Bull** replied that the rents are proposed to be from \$999-\$1,349 a month and that the units range from studios to two-bedrooms.

Ryan Boyd asked if there will be a fence around the entire site and if there will be pedestrian gates. **Mr. Bull** replied that the site might not be completed fenced around the entire area and that there will be pedestrian access to enter the site, one does not have to get into a car to enter/exit the site.

Vice Chair Nate Sonoskey asked about public outreach and how the neighborhood meeting went. **Mr. Bull** replied that because this is not a rezoning request, the applicant is not required to hold a neighborhood meeting. Mr. Bull added that he has been an advocate for neighborhood participation over his 40-year career, and that they complete the required mailing notification and did not receive any feedback from members of the community.

Dana Johnson added that the Garfield Organization received the notification, reviewed the request, and had concerns about the connectivity to the surrounding area and that they would not be thrilled to have a gated community on the site, noting that the aspect of gates on the site is outside of the PHO request.

Public Comment:

None.

Motion:

Patrick Panetta noted that this project will be significant investment to the area and motioned to recommend approval. **Zach Burns** seconded the motion.

Discussion:

Ryan Boyd shared concern with removing Stipulation No. 5 and that the site should still have public access, noting that he represents the west side of the village and

Central City Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary PHO-1-21—Z-23-18-8

asked for those committee members who represent the east side of the village to share their thoughts.

Eva Olivas shared that the level of pass-through for this site will increase due the new residents on this site and other redeveloped sites in the vicinity.

Dana Johnson asked staff to clarify what the committee can vote on. Ms. Stockham replied that the committee can motion to recommend approval as is, approval with additional or modified stipulations, denial, or make no motion and not act on the item.

Eva Olivas asked for clarification on fence requirements. Ms. Stockham replied that the Walkable Urban Code has fence height requirements that the applicant will have to adhere to.

Ryan Boyd added that while this proposal will be an investment in the area, the entire property does not have to be fenced and that the purpose of the Walkable Urban Code is to have a walkable community, not a structure with a fence surrounding the front of the building.

Will Gaona shared that the committee is looking for a compromise for Stipulation No. 5 and that is not reflected in the motion.

Dana Johnson shared that a Walkable Urban Code fenced-in site is an oxymoron.

Chair Rachel Frazier Johnson supports the comments made by committee member Boyd, urged the applicant to consider other options, and that this is too great of an opportunity to pass up that will activate the vacant site.

Vote:

10-1, motion to approve passes with Committee Members Boyd, Burns, Colyer, Gonzalez, Johnson, Lockhart, Olivas, Panetta, Sonoskey and R. Johnson in favor and Gaona opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION: None.