



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-100-24-3

Date of VPC Meeting	July 7, 2025
Request From	R-3
Request To	R-5
Proposal	Multifamily residential
Location	Southeast corner of 21st Place and Eugie Terrace
VPC Recommendation	Denial, with direction
VPC Vote	9-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item

Staff Presentation

Matteo Moric, staff, provided an overview of the proposal. Mr. Moric described the location of the proposal and identified the rezoning request. Mr. Moric explained the proposal was not consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of Residential 5 to 15 dwelling units per acre, but that it did not require a general plan amendment since it is smaller than 10 acres in size. Mr. Moric shared the land use map showing the areas to the north, south, and west are designated Residential 5 to 15 dwelling units per acre and to the east is designated Commercial. Mr. Moric then showed an aerial photo noting the surrounding land uses and zoning, the proposed site plan and noted how the building will be four stories and would cantilever over the parking area and have architectural balconies which were shared in the 3-D renderings. Mr. Moric stated staff recommended approval subject to stipulations and went over the findings and stipulations. Mr. Moric explained the next steps and dates for the Planning Commission and City Council meetings.

Applicant Presentation

Randy Marks, the applicant with Rezio, LLC, stated the overall goal of the project was to provide more housing in a multifamily space. Mr. Marks noted the site was a unique property with the street curving along the front. Mr. Marks said the plan is to build twenty-four 2-bedroom, 2-bath units with one- and one-half parking spaces per unit. Mr. Marks said the design would allow for parking to sit underneath the living structure with elevators and stairs. Mr. Marks felt this presented a nice view of the area and was a well-oriented building. Mr. Marks indicated that this is near other multifamily sites and

next to commercial zoning, and this would provide an opportunity for people working in the area to have nearby housing. Mr. Marks said he was rezoning to the R-5 zoning district because unlike R-3 zoning it would allow for 24 units and the development could include a 4-story building. Mr. Marks added the design of the building incorporates modern architecture and it advances housing and provides green communal areas. Mr. Marks noted there is a nice grass and barbeque area within the project location. Mr. Marks also stated the uniquely shaped lot plans to have a large 20-foot landscaped area with enhanced trees and shade making the site appealing. Mr. Marks said the goal is for each unit to have balconies and 32 shaded parking spots, access to trash and recycling, and bicycle parking. Mr. Marks explained the community outreach efforts and sign postings. Mr. Marks noted there was a citizen participation report and said they would be available for continued community engagement. Mr. Marks said he wanted access with two driveways and based on trip generation it was very minimal impact on the traffic in the area.

Questions from the Committee

Regina Schmidt asked if the community was going to be gated in and out. Mr. Marks said yes, it would be gated to restrict entry and exit.

Robert Goodhue asked if a study was done on if the units would be occupied by families. Mr. Marks said there was not a specific demographics study of who would be renting the units yet. Mr. Goodhue had concerns that there was no extra parking for guests and thought people would need to park along the streets, which he was not a big fan of.

Ms. Schmidt asked if the project was designed for rent or for purchase. Mr. Marks replied they were initially designed for rent.

Ms. Schmidt questioned what the height of the project was. **Jennifer Hall** clarified it was listed as 46 feet 6 inches tall in the staff report.

Larissa Balderrama asked what type of development was across the street. **Mr. Marks** thought it was multifamily. **Daniel Mazza** clarified there was an elderly care facility like a retirement community across the street on the west side.

Robert Gubser asked what the maximum height was allowed in the current R-3 zoning district. **Jennifer Hall** responded it is 2 stories and 30 feet.

Public Comments

Richard Bocardo, resident at 13435 North 21st Street, expressed concerns. Mr. Bocardo's first concern was related to the number of units listed on the posting sign from 17 to 52 units. Mr. Bocardo indicated the whole neighborhood is one story for the most part and this proposal will be totally different from the whole neighborhood and had concerns that it would have balconies all around. Mr. Bocardo said he lived to the north and had a swimming pool and felt he would lose his privacy with there being a 4-story building. Mr. Bocardo described some of the properties around there as being single family and he explained some of the other uses such as townhomes, a trailer

park and apartment complexes. Mr. Bocardo added there were some nearby units which were already visually intruding into his yard where he had to put shades up to ensure people on the second floors could not visually intrude on his property. Mr. Bocardo also had concerns about traffic indicating there was a church and other multifamily projects having lots of parking issues in the neighborhood. Mr. Bocardo said he was glad something was going to be built because the site had been an eyesore. Mr. Bocardo said there was no 3 or 4-story buildings on this block. Mr. Bocardo said when he bought the house in 1983 it was a very peaceful and quiet area and this would be a lot more traffic and reduce his privacy. Mr. Bocardo summed up his concerns as the height, lack of privacy, the increase in traffic and why the posting sign said up to 52 units were permitted.

Applicant Response

Mr. Marks said the maximum possible number of units listed on the sign posting is 52 units in the R-5 zoning district; however, they intend to build only 24 units and have a stipulation for such. Mr. Marks said there would not be enough room for parking to have 52 units. Mr. Marks noted he would be willing to chat with Mr. Bocardo and share the traffic study, he said without the height they would not be able to get 24 units. Mr. Marks said it was designed as an “L” shape so it was not intrusive on the street. Mr. Marks said the balconies and building were a distance from the street and many more feet from Mr. Bocardo’s property. Mr. Marks said the intent of the project was not to overhang over people’s backyards, but the opportunity for people to live in a nice livable space.

Mr. Bocardo wanted to understand the next steps. Chair Mortensen reminded the group that this was just an advisory committee, and the recommendation would go onto Planning Commission and City Council. Mr. Bocardo said that there is a slope in the area making the views even more intrusive into his property. Mr. Bocardo stated the site is an eyesore because no one takes care of the landscaping and maintains the property.

Committee Discussion

Ms. Hall said it was a very nice-looking project, but she was concerned with the height of 46 feet 6 inches and four stories. Ms. Hall understood it was a challenging site.

Ms. Sepic said this was a well-designed project but felt it would be better suited for the midtown area than this site.

Ms. Marcolla asked about the surrounding zoning. **Mr. Marks** stated the properties to the west were multifamily, directly south multifamily, north is residential, and to the east is commercial.

Chair Mortensen liked the design and layout, but thought the height was too much and two stories would have been nice.

Daniel Mazza asked if three stories would be 36 feet tall. **Ms. Hall** said yes and she would feel more comfortable with that.

Mr. Marks said they had accommodated for over 2,000 square feet of common space required in front of the 20-foot landscape buffer, 36 parking spaces, grassy areas, trees, barbeque and bicycle parking spaces.

Ms. Sepic asked if the parking was at grade. **Mr. Marks** replied it was at grade and they want access to stairwells and elevators so it functions as a nice place to live.

Mr. Gubser asked if the R-5 zoning would allow other uses other than multifamily. **Mr. Moric** indicated it would allow some other uses such as office and other restricted commercial uses. Mr. Gubser shared concern that the applicant could later come in for a Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) case to change the plans and allow commercial uses.

Ms. Hall asked if there was any opportunity to take a continuance and reduce the height of the building. **Mr. Marks** said it had taken several renditions already to get it at the height it is proposed at. Mr. Marks noted to get the parking it is difficult to reduce the height, but Mr. Marks thought maybe with lower ceilings they could get it down to 40 feet.

Ms. Marcolla suggested a line-of-sight diagram to see how the views are from the upper floors.

Ms. Hall said she was inclined to deny the request unless the applicant wanted a continuance.

Motion

Jennifer Hall motioned to recommend denial of Z-100-24-3 with direction to reduce the building height. **Anna Sepic** seconded the motion.

Vote

9-1; motion to recommend denial of Z-100-24-3 with direction passes with Committee members Balderrama, Goodhue, Gubser, Hall, Marcolla, Mazza, Schmidt, Sepic, and Mortensen in favor; and Soronson in opposition.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.