



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-31-25-8

Date of VPC Meeting	June 10, 2025
Request From	S-1
Request To	R-3
Proposal	Multifamily residential
Location	Approximately 1,130 feet east of the northeast corner of 23rd Avenue and Baseline Road
VPC Recommendation	Deny as filed and approved as R-2 with a deleted stipulation and a modified stipulation
VPC Vote	6-5

Item Nos. 6 (GPA-SM-1-25-8) and 7 (Z-31-25-8) are companion cases and were heard concurrently.

Five members of the public registered to speak on this item, one in support, and four in opposition.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Samuel Rogers, staff, displayed the location of the subject site and noted the acreage and proposal. Mr. Rogers stated that the applicant was proposing a multifamily development, provided an overview of the proposed General Plan Land Use amendment, summarized the surrounding land uses, and explained the site would act as a transition between the adjacent commercial and single-family developments. Mr. Rogers displayed the site plan and elevations and concluded the staff presentation by summarizing the staff findings and proposed stipulations.

Committee Member George Brooks asked where the subject site is located. **Mr. Rogers** displayed the subject site's location.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Brian Greathouse, representing the applicant, introduced the development team, explained that the development would be a transition between commercial and single-family residential, explained the site would be gated, stated that the development would be primarily single-story units, explained access would be from Baseline Road, and described the amenities, open space, and units. Mr. Greathouse described the request, discussed land use transitions, traffic generation, the traffic study, and the demand for the housing type.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Chair Arthur Greathouse III asked the applicant team to speak to the public outreach conducted for the project. **Mr. Greathouse** described the outreach process and efforts made to inform nearby residents.

Committee Member Brooks inquired about the square footage of the proposed homes. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that the homes would range in size from approximately 700 to 1,400 square feet.

Committee Member Kassandra Alvarez asked if the amenities would facilitate a sense of community and expressed concern about the lack of sustainability measures and potential traffic impacts. **Mr. Greathouse** explained that many of the traffic concerns are related to 23rd Avenue and existing half-street conditions and explained that a different rezoning case in the area includes stipulations to expand 23rd Avenue and incorporate traffic mitigation. Mr. Greathouse explained that current conditions do not warrant a traffic signal, stated that Baseline Road's capacity had been studied, and explained that the traffic study had been approved by the City. Mr. Greathouse stated that the project team is evaluating features such as solar panels and stated that the applicant is providing energy-efficient pavement seal and EV charging. Mr. Greathouse explained the rezoning request includes stipulations related to the plant palette, shade, bike parking, and a bike fix-it station. **Chris Williams**, with the applicant team, stated that a right-turn deceleration lane was the only mitigation measure identified in the traffic study, stated that a warrant analysis showed a signal is not currently justified, and explained a signal may be warranted if additional development occurs on 23rd Avenue.

Chair Greathouse stated that a large rezoning case at 19th Avenue and Baseline Road will increase density in the area and may eventually warrant a traffic signal. **Committee Member Mark Beehler** echoed Chair Greathouse's comments and asked whether the applicant team had reviewed the two recent rezonings in the area. **Mr. Williams** stated that the team always considers growth factors when analyzing traffic. Committee Member Beehler commented that the Committee is receiving many development proposals in the area. Mr. Williams responded that the goal is to space signals approximately every half mile and explained that it is a balancing act to avoid excessive signals that slow down traffic while ensuring placement at key intersections.

Committee Member Ralph Thompson II asked for confirmation that the proposed rents would be in the range of \$1,600 to \$2,100. **Mr. Greathouse** confirmed that the projected rents fall within that range.

Committee Member Fred Daniels asked whether the City evaluates nearby developments collectively when reviewing traffic impacts. **Mr. Rogers** stated that the City requires applicants to submit traffic studies and that those studies must be approved by the City. Mr. Rogers explained that the City is aware of other rezonings in the area and

considers them during the review process. **Chair Greathouse** asked about the review process by the Street Transportation Department. **Mr. Rogers** stated that he would follow up with more information. **Mr. Williams** stated that there are sometimes unknowns in the process and not all future developments are visible during traffic evaluations.

Committee Member Alvarez asked what solutions are available to address traffic issues on Baseline Road. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that developers will add improvements over time as the area continues to develop.

Committee Member Brooks asked whether fire and water studies had been conducted and requested elaboration on the sustainability measures. **Cholla Susini**, with the applicant team, described planned features including dual-pane windows and high-efficiency materials, stated that the energy efficiency rating of the homes would exceed that of typical new construction, and offered to provide additional information.

Committee Member Beehler asked whether dedicated left-turn and right-turn lanes could be added. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that approximately 60 trips were anticipated during peak hours, averaging about one car per minute. **Mr. Williams** stated that the lane widths should accommodate two cars and offered to follow up with additional detail.

Committee Member Lee Coleman asked whether the community would be gated. **Mark Reddie**, with the applicant team, stated that the entry gate is set back 200 feet to allow for vehicle queuing.

Committee Member Coleman asked whether there was a landscape plan. **Mr. Greathouse** displayed and described the landscape plan for the project.

Committee Member Brooks asked where the fire exit would be located. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that the development is not required to have secondary access. **Mr. Reddie** explained that secondary fire access is not required because all units will be equipped with fire sprinklers.

Committee Member Brooks asked whether applicants are advised to review the South Mountain Village Food Action Plan. **Mr. Rogers** stated that during the pre-application process he informs all applicants of the 2025 Food Action Plan and recommends that they review it. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that the project team had not yet reviewed the Food Action Plan.

Committee Member Alvarez asked how the applicant could guarantee the proposed unit prices. **Mr. Greathouse** stated that the units would be market-rate, explained that pricing would be determined by market conditions, and stated that the development is not intended to be either “attainable” or “luxury” housing.

Committee Member Alvarez asked whether there had been difficulty in attracting tenants or if there was interest in the product. **Ms. Susini** stated that there has been high demand and that people are excited about the project.

Chair Greathouse asked for details regarding parking, including whether garages would be provided and whether the overall parking count meets City requirements. **Mr. Reddie** stated that some of the townhomes would include garages, stated that the project exceeds the minimum parking requirements, and explained that the development model has been successful in 50 similar projects over the past 12 years without parking issues. Mr. Reddie stated that each unit would have one designated space, with additional shared and visitor parking available.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Thomas Kelly stated that he is with Valley Leadership, stated that he is in favor of the request, and explained that Valley Leadership supports promoting quality projects within the community. Mr. Kelly acknowledged that all development places stress on a community but stated that the project represents a good approach. Mr. Kelly stated that the proposed buffers between the single-family neighborhood and commercial areas are appropriate.

Tawee Phattarak expressed concern about cumulative traffic impacts, stated that additional subdivisions in the area will also contribute to congestion, and asked about the traffic generation. **Mr. Williams** stated that the traffic study predicted 31 left turns and 31 right turns out of the development during the morning peak hour, with approximately 600 total trips anticipated over the course of the day. Mr. Williams stated that post-COVID traffic patterns have shifted and that changes in travel behavior were considered in the study. Ms. Phattarak stated that there are already traffic issues in the area and that this development would worsen them.

Joe Melton expressed concern with the proposed density and the target market for the development, stated that he would not have chosen to live in the area if he had not had the opportunity to purchase a home, and stated that while he understands the need for a land use transition this project should offer something different. Mr. Melton expressed doubt that a \$5,000 incentive would make a significant difference for a home buyer and stated that a mix of condominiums and for-sale homes would be more appropriate.

Melissa Campos echoed the comments made by Mr. Melton, stated that she had reviewed other Yardly communities and found that they generally have two to three points of access and greater spacing between access points, expressed concern about traffic, and stated that a previous rezoning proposal for the site included 50 to 60 fewer units. Ms. Campos stated that her written comments focused more on concerns about water and electricity availability in the area, rather than the energy efficiency of the proposed homes.

Josepha Garcia stated concerns about traffic impacts and that the development would create additional congestion.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Brian Greathouse stated that the property is going to be developed and that all development generates traffic. Mr. Greathouse stated that the proposed residential project would generate less traffic than a commercial use, stated that the development team has worked with the City to confirm water and sewer availability, and explained that the proposal represents a reasonable compromise for the area.

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

Chair Greathouse stated that he is not in favor of the proposed density and asked whether the applicant was open to reducing the number of units.

Committee Member Alvarez asked whether a second point of access could be added, including pedestrian or vehicular connections to adjacent retail.

Chair Greathouse noted that other developments in the area have connected to adjacent commercial properties.

Committee Member Busching stated that the Committee has required pedestrian connections in the past and that this project could include a vehicular access point.

Chair Greathouse asked about the density of a nearby townhome development.

Mr. Reddie responded that the nearby development has a density of 13 to 18 units per acre.

Committee Member Busching asked what the maximum density is under the R-2 zoning district.

Samuel Rogers, staff, stated that the R-2 PRD option allows for a maximum of 10.5 dwelling units per acre.

Chair Greathouse asked whether the applicant team would consider reducing the unit count.

Committee Member Busching reiterated that the proposal does not conform to the Rio Montana Area Plan.

Chair Greathouse asked what options are available to the Committee.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Committee could either stipulate a maximum number of units or deny the request as filed and approve the R-2 zoning district. Mr. Rogers noted that the application includes a stipulation requiring general conformance with the site plan, and that this stipulation would need to be removed if a new motion is made.

Committee Member Busching stated that stipulating the unit count would allow the number of units to be changed through the Planning Hearing Officer process, whereas approving R-2 zoning would require a full rezoning process to increase the density.

Motion:

Committee Member Kay Shepard made a motion to recommend denial of Z-31-25-8 and approve as R-2 with a deleted stipulation and a modified stipulation. **Committee Member Lee Coleman** seconded the motion.

Vote:

6-5, motion to recommend denial of Z-31-25-8 and approve as R-2 with a deleted stipulation and a modified stipulation, passed with Committee Members Alvarez, F. Daniels, Falcon, Shepard, Viera, and Greathouse in favor and Committee Member Beehler, Brooks, Busching, Coleman, and Thompson, opposed.

Committee Member Beehler stated that Committee Member Busching argued that the development should be denied as filed and approved as R-2 but voted against the motion and asked Committee Member Busching to explain her vote. **Committee Member Busching** explained that she voted against the motion because the R-2 zoning district does not comply with Rio Moñtana Area Plan designation for the site and stated that reducing the project's density through the zoning district is more effective than through stipulations.

VPC recommended stipulations:

- ~~1. ***The development shall be in general conformance with the site plan date stamped April 21, 2025, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.***~~
- ~~2. ***Building elevations AND SITE PLAN shall be presented for review and comment to the South Mountain Village Planning Committee prior to preliminary site plan approval***~~
- ~~3. ***Building elevations shall contain multiple colors, exterior accent materials and textural changes that exhibit quality and durability such as brick, stone, colored textured concrete or stucco, or other materials to provide a decorative and aesthetic treatment, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.***~~

- ~~4.~~ *A minimum of one-third of the dwelling unit buildings shall not exceed one*
- ~~3.~~ *story or 20 feet in height.*
- ~~5.~~ *The development shall incorporate bicycle infrastructure as described below*
- ~~4.~~ *and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
 - a. *Secure bicycle parking shall be provided per Section 1307 of the Zoning Ordinance.*
 - b. *Guest bicycle parking shall be provided at a minimum rate of 0.05 spaces per dwelling unit, up to a maximum of 50 spaces required.*
 - c. *A minimum of 10 percent of the provided bicycle parking spaces shall include standard electrical receptacles for electric bicycle charging capabilities.*
 - d. *Bicycle parking spaces shall be shaded by a structure, landscaping, or a combination of the two to provide a minimum of 75% shade.*
 - e. *A bicycle repair station ("fix it station") shall be provided and maintained on site within an amenity area or near a primary site entrance, and separated from vehicular maneuvering areas, where applicable. The repair station shall include, but not be limited to:*
 - i. *Standard repair tools affixed to the station;*
 - ii. *A tire gauge and pump affixed to the base of the station or the ground;*
 - iii. *A bicycle repair stand which allows pedals and wheels to spin freely while making adjustments to the bike.*
- ~~6.~~ *A minimum 5% of the required parking spaces shall provide EV installed*
- ~~5.~~ *infrastructure.*
- ~~7.~~ *Site lighting shall be provided at building entrances/exits and in public*
- ~~6.~~ *assembly and parking areas, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
- ~~8.~~ *If perimeter fencing is provided along the south side of the site it shall be a*
- ~~7.~~ *minimum of 75 percent open view fencing, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*

- ~~9.~~ *The landscape setback along Baseline Road shall be planted to include*
- ~~8.~~ *native cacti or similar spiny desert accent plants, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
- ~~10.~~ *All landscape setbacks shall be planted with minimum 2-inch caliper, large*
- ~~9.~~ *canopy, shade trees, planted 20 feet on center, or in equivalent groupings, with a minimum five 5-gallon shrubs per tree, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Where utility conflicts exist, the developer shall work with the Planning and Development Department on alternative design solutions consistent with a pedestrian environment for installing the required plants.*
- ~~11.~~ *A minimum of 10% of the required shrubs, shall be a milkweed or other*
- ~~10.~~ *native nectar species, and shall be planted in groups of three or more, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
- ~~12.~~ *All internal pedestrian pathways shall be shaded by a structure, landscaping,*
- ~~11.~~ *or a combination of the two to provide a minimum of 75% shade, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
- ~~13.~~ *Where pedestrian walkways cross a vehicular path, the pathway shall be*
- ~~12.~~ *constructed of decorative pavers, stamped or colored concrete, or other pavement treatments that visually contrasts parking and drive aisle surfaces, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*
- ~~14.~~ *A minimum of 25% of the surface parking areas shall be shaded, as*
- ~~13.~~ *approved by the Planning and Development Department. Shade may be achieved by structures or by minimum 2-inch caliper, drought tolerant, shade trees, or a combination thereof.*
- ~~15.~~ *A minimum of two green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) elements for*
- ~~14.~~ *stormwater management shall be implemented, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development and/or Street Transportation departments. This includes but is not limited to stormwater harvesting basins, bioswales, permeable pavement, etc., per the Greater Phoenix Metro Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development Details for Alternative Stormwater Management.*
- ~~16.~~ *Natural turf shall only be utilized for required retention areas (bottom of*
- ~~15.~~ *basin, and only allowed on slopes if required for slope stabilization) and functional turf areas located on properties for uses such as residential common areas, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.*

- ~~17.~~ Prior to final site plan approval, documentation shall be provided that
- ~~16.~~ demonstrates a commitment to participate in the Water Efficiency Checkup program for a minimum of 10 years, or as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
- ~~18.~~ The developer shall reconstruct the bus stop pad on westbound Baseline
- ~~17.~~ Road. Bus stop pad shall be constructed according to City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1260 with a minimum depth of 10 feet. Bus stop pad shall be spaced from an intersection according to City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1258, as approved or modified by the Public Transit Department. Trees shall be placed to provide 50% shade coverage to bus stop pad at full maturity.
- ~~19.~~ A 30-foot-wide multi-use trail easement (MUTE) shall be dedicated along the
- ~~18.~~ north side of Baseline Road, adjacent to the subject site and a minimum 10-foot-wide multi-use trail (MUT) shall be constructed within the easement, in accordance with the MAG supplemental detail and, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development Department.
- ~~20.~~ The sidewalk along Baseline Road shall be a minimum of 6 feet in width and
- ~~19.~~ detached with a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip located between the sidewalk and back of curb and planted to the following standards, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
- a. Minimum 2-inch caliper, single-trunk, large canopy, shade trees planted 20 feet on center, or in equivalent groupings.
- b. Shrubs, accents and vegetative groundcovers with a maximum mature height of two feet evenly distributed throughout the landscape area to achieve a minimum of 75% live coverage.
- Where utility conflicts exist, the developer shall work with the Planning and Development Department on alternative design solutions consistent with a pedestrian environment for installing the required plants.
- ~~21.~~ A minimum of 55-feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated and constructed for
- ~~20.~~ north side of Baseline Road.
- ~~22.~~ All existing electrical utilities within the public right-of-way shall be
- ~~21.~~ underground, adjacent to the development. Developer to coordinate with the affected utilities company for their review and permitting.
- ~~23.~~ Existing SRP facilities along Baseline Road are to be relocated outside of
- ~~22.~~ City right-of-way, unless otherwise approved by the Street Transportation

Department. Relocations that require additional dedications or land transfer require completion prior to obtaining plat and/or civil plan review approval.

- ~~24.~~ *Replace unused driveways with sidewalk, curb and gutter. Also, replace any*
- ~~23.~~ *broken or out-of-grade curb, gutter, sidewalk, and curb ramps on all streets and upgrade all off-site improvements to be in compliance with current ADA guidelines.*
- ~~25.~~ *All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with*
- ~~24.~~ *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.*
- ~~26.~~ *The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and*
- ~~25.~~ *operational characteristics of the Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.*
- ~~27.~~ *If determined necessary by the Phoenix Archaeology Office, the applicant*
- ~~26.~~ *shall conduct Phase I data testing and submit an archaeological survey report of the development area for review and approval by the City Archaeologist prior to clearing and grubbing, landscape salvage, and/or grading approval.*
- ~~28.~~ *If Phase I data testing is required, and if, upon review of the results from the*
- ~~27.~~ *Phase I data testing, the City Archaeologist, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, determines such data recovery excavations are necessary, the applicant shall conduct Phase II archaeological data recovery excavations*
- ~~29.~~ *In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction,*
- ~~28.~~ *the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.*
- ~~30.~~ *Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition*
- ~~29.~~ *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:

None.