



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

GPA-CE-2-23-6

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	January 9, 2024
Request From	Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acres and Commerce/Business Park
Request To	Mixed Use (Industrial/Commerce/Business Park/Commercial)
Proposal	Minor General Plan Amendment for general commercial, commerce park, and industrial
Location	Southwest corner of 52nd Street and McDowell Road

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Cases GPA-CE-2-23-6 and Z-54-23-6 are companion cases and were heard together.

No members of the public registered to speak on this item.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Wendy Riddell with Berry Riddell, LLC introduced herself and noted she is presenting on behalf of Baker Development. Ms. Riddell stated the proposal is at a location known as the Motorola site a former conductor development site consisting of 66 acres. Ms. Riddell stated this site is currently occupied by Onsemi a conduct development company and it has been an industrial campus for a long time. Ms. Riddell displayed maps of this site from 1969 when it was a larger employer. Ms. Riddell said with the proposed redevelopment the site could be a productive employment center. Ms. Riddell stated the current overall site is in disrepair. Ms. Riddell expressed that Baker, the development company, has been in business for over 40 years and has been involved in many successful projects and are currently engaged in six active projects in the Phoenix area. Ms. Riddell discussed the request from mixed use to PUD with a minor General Plan Amendment which is part of the presentation. Ms. Riddell explained the PUD request is most applicable because it will allow a larger employer to the site with some flexibility for the development options. Ms. Riddell reviewed the proposed uses including C-3, commerce park, general commerce park, light industrial and public utility buildings are among some options. Ms. Riddell noted prohibited uses including residential uses on the site. Ms. Riddell stated the intent of the proposal is to be an employment center business park with no residential development. Ms. Riddell stated there is no site plan because they are still reviewing options for flexibility, but they will include landscape setbacks and improvements to the streetscape along 52nd Street

and McDowell Road. Ms. Riddell expressed the proposal may include a building height of up to 60 feet with accommodating steps backs, open space, shade requirements with enhanced amenities for the entire campus. Ms. Riddell stated that the design will increase setbacks when adjacent to residential areas and landscaped areas will be enhanced for the streetscape frontages. Ms. Riddell stated the landscape palate will include low water use plants and will be uniformly applied through the entire campus development for pedestrian circulation and to provide meaningful shade. Ms. Riddell stated the architecture for the site will include development standards and finish materials to be sensitive to the adjacent residential area. Ms. Riddell stated the campus area will have an amphitheater, a covered pavilion outdoor and activity areas. Ms. Riddell thanked the committee and concluded her comments.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

Committee Member Grace asked if they will be working with the EPA to remediate the site with all the existing infrastructure. **Ms. Riddell** responded that remediation has been ongoing. Committee Member Grace commented that access to the site should be maintained as the cleanup of the site continues.

Committee Member Augusta asked if the applicant is the current site owner. **Ms. Riddell** responded yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

None.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary GPA-CE-2-23-6

Date of VPC Meeting	March 5, 2024
Request From	Residential 5 to 10 dwelling units per acre and Commerce/Business Park
Request To	Mixed Use (Industrial/Commerce/Business Park Commercial)
Proposal	Minor General Plan Amendment for general commercial, commerce park, and industrial
Location	Southwest corner of 52nd Street and McDowell Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	15-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Cases GPA-CE-2-23-6 and Z-54-23-6 are companion cases and were heard together.

Two members of the public registered to speak in support of this this item.

STAFF PRESENTATION:

John Roanhorse, staff, provided an overview of the request including the location of the proposal, existing and proposed zoning and districts and surrounding land uses. Mr. Roanhorse displayed the site plan proposed PUD (Planned Unit Development) standards for building height, setbacks, streetscapes and open space. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the General Plan Land Use Map changes. Mr. Roanhorse shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval subject to stipulations.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION:

Wendy Riddell with Berry Riddell, LLC introduced herself and noted she is presenting on behalf of Baker Development. Ms. Riddell stated the proposal is approximately 66 acres and located at the former Motorola site located at 52nd Street and McDowell Road. Ms. Riddell stated this site is currently used by Onsemi an electronics conductor development company and the site no longer has the demand it once did for intense industrial uses. Ms. Riddell said originally the site was a larger and highly productive employment center and now it is time to reimagine the site for new opportunities. Ms. Riddell stated that Baker Development has experience in working with sites that require remediation, and the subject site is a Super Fund site and will require some specialization for development. Ms. Riddell expressed that the intended proposal is to

develop a PUD and align it with the General Plan and is an economic opportunity for development and is in a great location. Ms. Riddell stated that with a PUD the objective was to design a comprehensive development for flexibility and maximize the speed to market opportunity to attract users. Ms. Riddell explained with the design the site will be ready, flexible and suitable to the needs of various commercial, commerce park and industrial uses. Ms. Riddell stated that no residential uses are proposed for the site because of ongoing remediation and there is deed restriction that would prevent residential uses. Ms. Riddell discussed the building height in relation to setbacks, open space, landscaping, shading, site amenities and a revision to office spaces in response to employee comfort and functionality. Ms. Riddell expressed that the design includes setbacks and landscaping adjacent to the existing residential area. Ms. Riddell said the proposal includes high quality architecture and design as part of the aesthetics on the site. Ms. Riddell stated that in preparing the proposal they did extensive outreach and engaged the adjacent neighborhood and had two meetings to provide as much information as possible. Ms. Riddell stated they did respond to correspondence that was received to address access to the site and they did meet with the VPC Chair and discussed the applicant's response and proposed adjustments. Ms. Riddell said they are in agreement with staff's stipulations and concluded her comments to the committee.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE:

Committee Member Sharaby asked if the proposal includes an amphitheater as part of the development and if so what would be the capacity. **Ms. Riddell** responded that any outdoor venue would be small in scale and not a large concert area.

Chair Swart asked the committee if they had additional questions then noted the public would have the opportunity to ask questions or provide comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Christie Mackay, Director of the Community and Economic Development Department, thanked Chair Swart and the Camelback East Village Planning Committee for the opportunity to comment. Ms. Mackay noted the history of the Motorola site and its growth and economic success. Ms. Mackay stated that the development went through its life cycle and the former company has transitioned into smaller operations. Ms. Mackay stated many developing companies that come to Phoenix look for suitable sites that have transportation connections and are centrally located. Ms. Mackay stated that from an economic point of view development of the proposed site is an opportunity for redevelopment. Ms. Mackay stated that among the opportunities is to give new life to this brownfields site. Ms. Mackay stated they have been working with Baker Development of the site to increase the opportunity for new partners and prospects.

Chair Swart thanked Ms. Mackay for her comments and her work with the city. Chair Swart noted that Ms. Mackay has worked to bring many economic opportunities to the city and has worked through many challenges and has been successful with the new

Data Center. Chair Swart expressed that it is an honor to have Ms. Mackay present with the committee. Chair Swart stated that in addition to bringing in new businesses she has also worked to protect neighborhoods throughout the city.

Vice Chair Fischbach commented that Ms. Mackay's work has not only focused on businesses but explored solutions for homelessness. Vice Chair Fischbach stated that Ms. Mackay has also been engaged in seeking solutions for homelessness and affordable housing. Vice Chair Fischbach commended Ms. Mackay's service and continued effort to find solutions across various shareholders.

Jack Robson introduced himself and stated he is with a community business. Mr. Robson stated his company has been in operation for 50 years and is looking for a new headquarters south of the proposed site on 52nd Street. Mr. Robson stated his business broke ground last year and is excited about this proposal. Mr. Robson stated he would prefer that the project have a greater setback on 52nd Street and include more parking for other developments south of the site and this would attract more businesses to the area and consider other employers that are looking at proposed development site.

APPLICANT RESPONSE:

Ms. Riddell stated she had no additional comments and thanked the committee.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

None.

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

Committee Member Paceley asked for clarification on motions for the General Plan Amendment case GPA-CE-2-23-6, and the rezone request Z-54-23-6 and that each would be voted on separately. **Chair Swart** responded affirmatively that there would be two voting actions.

MOTION:

Committee Member Paceley motioned to recommend approval of GPA-CE-2-23-6 per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Abbott** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

15-0; motion to recommend approval of GPA-CE-2-23-6 per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Abbott, Augusta, Baumer, Bayless Eichelkraut, Guevar, Jurayeva, Langmade, Paceley, Schmieder, Sharaby, Whitesell, Williams, Fischbach and Swart in favor.

Committee Member Jurayeva commented that she is in favor of the proposal and the applicant should note the speaker Mr. Jack Robson's concern on parking and improvements to 52nd Street.

Chair Swart commended Ms. Riddell on the presentation and her work prior to bringing the project to the committee, and the outreach and preparation was highly professional and beneficial.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has no comments.