



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-SP-9-22-7

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	December 12, 2022
<b>Request From</b>	C-2
<b>Request To</b>	C-2 SP
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Self-service storage warehouse and underlying C-2 uses
<b>Location</b>	Southwest corner of 35th Avenue and Broadway Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval, per the staff recommendation with additional stipulations
<b>VPC Vote</b>	9-0

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

*3 members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION:**

**Enrique Bojórquez**, staff, provided an overview of the rezoning proposal, describing the location of the requests, the existing and proposed zoning districts and land use designations and the proposed use. Mr. Bojórquez reviewed the surrounding zoning districts and land uses and described the proposed site plan plus building elevations. Mr. Bojórquez listed several policy plans and described how these are furthered by this proposal. Mr. Bojórquez stated that no community input had been received and provided staff findings, followed by the staff recommendation of approval subject to stipulations as presented.

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION:**

**Nathan Frame**, representing the applicant with Stack Storage, introduced himself and the proposed self-service storage project. Mr. Frame discussed the location of the site and discussed current uses on the site and surrounding area. Mr. Frame described the proposed site layout and proposed building elevations. Mr. Frame described their public outreach and stated that the Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development (LCRD) support this project. Mr. Frame requested a recommendation of approval.

**Nache Nielson**, representing the applicant with Stack Storage, introduced himself and thanked the committee for their time.

## QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE:

**Carlos Ortega** asked why another self-service storage use is needed at this location given that a self-service storage facility exists across the street, and another is under development in the area. **Mr. Nielson** responded that there is a lack of storage in the area and the site's access constraints make development on the site very challenging. Mr. Nielson added that this type of development does not generate much traffic and the increase in housing warrant more storage. Mr. Nielson has other active storage projects in growing cities across the Valley.

**Stephanie Hurd** shares the concerns from committee member Ortega and in general has concerns with certain type of development that includes self-service storage, multifamily, car washes, and other uses. Ms. Hurd is concerned over the loss of commercially zoned land.

**Chair Glass** spoke with the applicant and Isaac Serna who was in favor of the use. Ms. Glass stated that this applicant did do their due diligence.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS:

**Dan Penton** introduced himself and stated that he had spoken with this applicant ahead of the meeting. Mr. Penton feels that they went above and beyond with their outreach and have provided enhanced architecture. Mr. Penton agrees that there are lots of self-storage uses but feels that this site is a good fit as it for this type of use and will enhance the corner and area. Mr. Penton discussed several self-storage project locations and expressed his support as access is a problem on the site. Mr. Penton added that this developer proposes large building setbacks along the western portion of the site next to single-family residential.

**Phil Hertel** introduced himself and stated that he had also spoke with the applicant about their project. Mr. Hertel stated that this is a good use for this corner as it does not seem like a bad land use. Mr. Hertel does not see the sign and landscape plans that he had discussed with this applicant.

**Jon Kimono** stated that this project is on a gateway to the Laveen Village and is surrounded by industrial and other impactful uses. Mr. Kimono added that self-service storage uses require few city services and sees the importance of keeping a buffer and low buildings along the western property line. Mr. Kimono stated that this applicant broke up the large building using design elements, thus improving the overall design. Mr. Kimono suggested that the applicant work with the community on an art project at this corner.

## APPLICANT RESPONSE:

None.

## FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

**Chair Glass** asked the applicant to present their sign and landscape plans to the committee. **Mr. Nielson** responded that sign and landscape plans were not included in the project materials submitted to the city, but the stipulations proposed by staff will

address these. **Mr. Frame** added that additional time is needed to complete those plans.

**Mr. Ortega** would like a stipulation added to require the review and comment from the Laveen Village Planning Committee on the sign and landscape plans.

**Vice Chair Abegg** stated that developers usually conduct a market demand study before proposing a use in an area but echoes the concerns over the loss of commercially zoned land. Ms. Abegg added that this area may not be the most attractive to notable commercial uses. Ms. Abegg stated that building elevations are broken up and sees roof changes plus other nice elements. Ms. Abegg would support a stipulation requiring the review and comment of signs and landscape plans by the Laveen Village Planning Committee. **Mr. Nielson** responded that sign permits are usually applied for after building permit. Mr. Nielson added that future landscape plans would comply with the proposed stipulations and wish for signs to meet existing Zoning Ordinance requirements.

**Vice Chair Abegg** feels comfortable with adding two stipulations requiring that no monument signs be developed on the site and that no illuminated signs be oriented towards residential uses. **Mr. Ortega** is concerned that comments from the committee will not be incorporated into those plans.

**Vice Chair Abegg** asked for clarification on the two potential additional stipulations. **Mr. Bojórquez** discussed various options to word the stipulations.

#### MOTION:

**Vice Chair Abegg** motioned to approve Z-SP-9-22-7 per the staff recommendation with two additional stipulations. **Chair Glass** seconded the motion.

#### Additional Stipulations for Z-SP-9-22-7:

*16. No monument or ground signs shall be permitted on the site.*

*17. No illuminated signs are allowed on Building B, as depicted on the site plan date stamped November 29, 2022.*

#### VOTE:

**10-0;** motion to recommend approval of Z-SP-9-22-7 per the staff recommendation with two additional stipulations passes with Committee Members Barraza, Chiarelli, Hurd, Jensen, Ortega, Perrera, Rouse, Senters, Abegg and Glass in favor.

#### STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS

None.