



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-49-19-8

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	May 12, 2020 (Continuance) April 14, 2020 (Canceled)
<b>Request From</b>	PSC
<b>Request To</b>	C-2 HGT/WVR DNS/WVR
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Multifamily
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 175 feet north of the northwest corner of 19th Avenue and Southern Avenue
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Continuance to June 9, 2020
<b>VPC Vote</b>	<b>13-0-0</b> Motion passes; with members Aguilar, Alvarez, Brooks, Brownell, Daniels, Holmerud, Kotake, Larios, Shepard, M. Smith, S. Smith, Busching, and Trites in favor; none in dissent or abstention.

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

*Four email messages were received, two from individuals supportive of the case and two from individuals in opposition, and wishing to speak.*

*Member Said left the meeting bringing the quorum to 13 members.*

**Chairwoman Trittes** announced that member Muriel Smith was recusing herself. She asked staff to read her written statement in regards to this case.

**Mr. Bojorquez**, staff, read the statement by Ms. Smith then provided a presentation on the proposed rezoning case. Staff recommends approval, subject to stipulations. He then invited the applicant to present their information presentation with the committee.

**Mr. Russell Condas**, of Dominion Inc., went over a presentation on the Dominion company then going over the proposed project. An overview of the site plan was provided, followed by a discussion on public outreach, including partnerships that were made or are underway. The development strengths were indicated in addition to how public concerns were addressed. It was explained that the property was zoned commercial, but this was never developed after many decades of sitting vacant. The area amenities were listed and an

explanation of the economic impact of this project was given. Crime and traffic concerns were addressed, in addition to the affordability of this project at 60-percent area medium income. An amended site plan was shown and explained, then the presentation ended.

**Chairwoman Trittes** asked for comments from the committee.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked whether property was going to be gated and whether there are any other proposed modifications besides the site plan.

**Mr. Condas** responded that yes, the property was to be gated due to security reasons and that the amended site plan proposed shows that the height of Building 7 is being lowered to two stories along the western property line.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked whether the project was intending on renting to former incarcerated people and if the applicant was willing to contact the Tiger Mountain Foundation.

**Mr. Condas** responded that yes, under certain conditions they would rent to formerly incarcerated people. He added that yes, he was also willing to reach out to the Tiger Mountain Foundation.

**Ms. Alvarez** asked the applicant to describe the site security.

**Mr. Condas** explained that each resident would use a “key fob” to access the property and that security cameras plus security personnel were to be used.

**Mr. Brooks** asked the applicant to explain their connection with Tiger Mountain Foundation and if he had read the Phoenix Food Action Plan.

**Mr. Condas** mentioned that he had not yet read the Phoenix Food Action Plan and that his conversations with the Tiger Mountain Foundation revolved around having a community garden, incorporating edible landscaping and ways of hosting a farmers market.

**Mr. Brownell** expressed support for 60-percent area median income target of this project and felt that this type of development was needed in this community.

**Ms. Daniels** shared her support for this project given the amenities, proposed rent and connection to transportation.

**Mr. Gene Holmerud** asked Mr. Brooks to share how the Food Action Plan could be implemented in this project.

**Mr. Brooks** provided an overview of the previous comments made.

**Mr. Monge** asked the applicant for clarification on the number of affordable units and whether housing vouchers would be accepted.

**Mr. Condas** mentioned that the property was going to be deed restricted to affordability levels for at least 30 years and that they would accept housing vouchers.

**Mr. Monge** asked whether the applicant had received any feedback from neighbors on the new site plan proposed.

**Mr. Condas** answered that yes, they had received some feedback on the modified site plan.

**Mr. Larios** asked the applicant whether he had reached out to organizations involved in the incarceration of individuals.

**Mr. Condas** responded that yes, his team had reached out to some of those organizations but that no response had been received.

**Mr. Larios** stated that the model proposed, crime prevention through environmental design, has historically been problematic.

**Mr. Shelly Smith** provided comments pertaining to the height of the project and viability of phasing it.

**Ms. Busching** mentioned that she could not support the project due to the level of security proposed, including concerns with the fencing of the project.

**Chairwoman Trittes** repeated her previous comment that there is a need for thousands of housing units in the City of Phoenix. She then asked the applicant if more buildings could be changed to two stories.

**Mr. Condas** stated that he was willing to lower the height to two stories on the western half of Building 8 along the western property line.

**Chairwoman Trites** opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

**Ms. Audria Nunley**, member of the public, shared her concerns with the proposed building height and traffic. She supports the site remaining commercial and that the community did not need any more crime or traffic.

**Mr. Alvis Fletcher**, member of the public, shared his concerns on increased traffic, crime and noise pollution. He added that another location should be explored by this project.

**Mr. Bojorquez**, staff, attempted to connect Mr. Brad Umansky and Mr. Kris Gangadean, who had sent emails requesting to speak in favor of this item, but these members were no longer connected to the virtual meeting.

**Ms. Smith** rejoined the virtual meeting to inform staff that other members of the public were on the line and wishing to speak.

**Chairwoman Trittes** indicated that she would allow other members of the public to provide comments.

**Mr. Fred Jones**, member of the public, expressed opposition to the case due to the proposed height, traffic and site access. He added that the area was a food desert and could use commercial uses.

**Mr. Condas** provided an explanation of how the project addressed the public concerns that related to height, traffic and others elements.

**Mr. Gary Todd**, of Todd & Associates, provided an overview of the design features of this project.

**Chairwoman Trittes** asked for other comments from the committee.

**Mr. Aguilar** expressed support for the applicant's willingness to work with former incarcerated people, but did have concerns with the gates proposed by this community.

**Mr. Condas** responded that the gates were in place due to potential safety issues.

**Mr. Brooks** stated that he echoes Mr. Aguilar's comments.

**Mr. Brownell** stated that he has no objection to the project and supports the request given that the existing zoning entitlement supports for buildings to be allowed there anyways.

**Ms. Daniels** stated that commercial zoning needs homes to establish and that she supports more affordable housing.

**Mr. Holmerud** stated that he supports view fencing.

**Mr. Larios** stated that he would support a continuance of the case to allow for additional engagement.

**Mr. Shelly Smith** stated that he has concerns with the level of community engagement conducted.

**Ms. Busching** stated that she has concerns with the lack of public access across the site. She asked the applicant to consider creative ways to design the site without gates.

**Ms. Daniels** stated that she understands the need for security features due to liability.

**Mr. Aguilar** expressed that he shares the concerns from Ms. Busching.

**Mr. Condas** stated that he is willing to consider options, but would still need to keep that component of security.

**Ms. Alvarez** asked the applicant to consider using the public alley along the west of the property for a possible connection and to help invite the adjacent community.

**Mr. Condas** provided an overview of the site connectivity to the adjacent school site and future convenience store.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked the applicant if he was willing to continue this item to establish further connections with other organizations.

**Mr. Condas** stated that he was open to a continuance of the case but noted that he would still keep the gate on the site.

**Chairwoman Trittes** asked the applicant to consider the following items:

- Add garden outside of the community for public access;
- Provide alley access from the west to the site;
- Conduct additional outreach with organizations mentioned;

**Mr. Larios** expressed concerns with the level of outreach conducted by this project.

**Ms. Busching** made a motion to deny.

**Ms. Daniels** seconded the motion.

**Ms. Busching** and **Ms. Daniels** withdrew their motions of denial on this item.

**Mr. Aguilar** asked the committee to consider a thirty day continuance to allow the applicant to contact organizations such as Mass Liberation Arizona, Tiger Mountain Foundation and address the concerns of other committee members including removing the gates to the community.

**Mr. Brooks** asked the applicant to formalize the interactions with the Tiger Mountain Foundation.

**Mr. Condas** agreed to the address the requests.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Busching** made a motion to continue the item. **Ms. Daniels** seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**

**13-0** Motion passes; with Ms. Muriel Smith rejoining the virtual meeting to vote on this item.

Mr. Larios left the meeting at 10:15pm after voting on this item.

**MOTION**

**Ms. Shepard** made a motion to approve the item with the recommended stipulations per the Addendum A staff report. **Ms. Busching** seconded the motion.

**VOTE:**

**Marcia Busching motioned to continue the case to June 9, 2020. Tamala Daniels seconded the motion.** Members Aguilar, Alvarez, Brooks, Brownell, Daniels, Holmerud, Kotake, Larios, Shepard, M. Smith, S. Smith, Busching, and Trites in favor; none in dissent or abstention.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:**

None.