



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

PHO-1-19—Z-97-02-7

Date of Meeting:	December 9, 2019
Planning Hearing Officer	December 18, 2019
Hearing Date	
Request	Modification of Stipulation 1, review of elevations per Stipulation 3, and technical corrections to Stipulations 1.E, 1.F, 2, 4.B, 5 and 16
Location	Approximately 900 feet north of the northwest of 51st Avenue and Baseline Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval with additional stipulations
VPC Vote	9-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Samantha Keating provided an overview of the request, noting the location, previous stipulations and current request.

Mr. John Mockus asked if the units would be stick built. **Ms. Keating** said she would defer the question to the applicant.

Mr. Scott Curtis from the Brown Group, applicant, provided some additional detail regarding the project, noting that there would 217 detached and attached units. The project would have a single-family feel but would be a gated and for rent development. A community center with amenities would be provided. The project would be stick built and not modular.

Vice Chair Tonya Glass asked what the price points would be. **Mr. Curtis** replied that typical rents would range from \$1,200 to \$1,700 per month.

Ms. Linda Abegg asked what the percentage of open space would be and if the gated development was part of the stipulations being requested. She noted she would like to see 20% non-stucco material on the elevations. **Mr. Lance Baker**, project architect with Synectic Design, explained that the common open space area was 7.5% of the project area with 36% of the site being devoted to landscaping. **Ms. Abegg** replied that she was concerned with small open space percentage and would like to see more because the city is no longer building parks. Other multifamily projects have provided between 10 and 18% open space. **Mr. Curtis** added that the 30 feet of the conveyance channel needs to be improved and would also serve as additional green area. The proposed stipulations did not include a requirement for a gated development, but they would be open to having this stipulated. They would also look into other materials for the elevations.

Vice Chair Glass commented that the elevations seemed similar and asked if the applicant could make them more dynamic.

Mr. Carlos Ortega asked where play areas would be located.

Mr. Curtis and **Mr. Baker** replied that the amenity areas have not been programmed and that all units would have their own yards.

Ms. Stephanie Hurd asked what material the yard fencing would be constructed out of. She also commented that use of wood or metal on the elevations would help break things up. **Mr. Curtis** and **Mr. Baker** replied that the fencing would be wood or vinyl and that the updated elevations have some of the features mentioned.

Ms. Jennifer Rouse asked if sufficient lighting for children to play would be provided.

Mr. John Mockus asked if windows or pop-puts could be provided to break up the side elevations. He asked about access, parking and commented he would also like to see more open space.

Mr. Baker responded that the variation in the elevations shown would produce 18 different elevation choices. Parking was in excess of code minimums.

Mr. Curtis also responded that main access to the property would be across from access driveway across 51st Avenue.

Vice Chair Glass asked how the applicant intended to deal with traffic on 51st Avenue. She added that the area around the shopping center to the south is problematic. **Mr. Curtis** responded that the gate would be set back to alleviate traffic congestion concerns.

Chairman Robert Branscomb asked about a deceleration lane. **Ms. Keating** responded that the Street Transportation Department reviews proposed traffic for warrants during the technical review phase.

Mr. Baker added that there is only 140 feet from the conveyance channel to the driveway, which is not enough room for a decal lane.

Mr. Gary Flunoy asked how many garages were planned and what the proposed height was. **Mr. Curtis** responded that about 40 units would have attached garages and the maximum height was slated to be 23 feet.

Ms. Abegg asked if the applicants were working with the school district. **Mr. Curtis** indicated they had not reached out to the school.

Mr. Vance Pierce commented that he lived in the area and was happy to see detached units being proposed instead of a traditional apartment complex. He was in favor of the plan presented.

Mr. Sandy Hamilton, chair of the LCRD, commented that the committee reviewed the proposal at their last board meeting and were pleased with the revised plan. They unanimously passed a motion with stipulations as follows:

- Maximum number of units to be 250
- Open space at 38%
- Return to the LCRD prior to preliminary site plan review to show elevations, wall plan and sign plans

- Landscaping to match the existing to the north and the south
- Dead or missing trees along 51st Avenue to be replaced within 45 days

Mr. Phil Hertel commented that traffic will impact the area, but by right the applicant could build almost double the units proposed tonight. The committee should be concerned more by the no U-turn restriction going southbound. The decal lane would not work and the open space is more in the range of 10 to 15%. The elevations should be upgraded to work in more detailing around the windows and provide more alternative materials.

Mr. Jon Kimoto explained that the project is a 50% reduction in height and density and is a benefit to the community. In general, he is supportive of the project, however feels that the entryway should be more defined. He also asked staff if the property's zoning could be changed to R-3 at this time since the proposed density was less. **Ms. Keating** explained that changing the zoning would go through an entirely different process and could not be done through the current request.

Vice Chair Glass asked if the management company would take care of the front and back landscaping. She also echoed the comments of other members regarding open space. **Mr. Curtis** responded in the affirmative except for the private yards. He explained they will look at the open space percentage, but worried that it would shorten the private yards. Mark Williams, the current owner of the property, relayed to the applicant that there was a tradeoff provided when land was dedicated for the conveyance channel.

Ms. Abegg added that other developments had a minimum of 10% open space.

MOTION

Ms. Linda Abegg moved to approve the proposal as presented by the applicant with the following additional stipulations:

- Minimum 10% open space
- Gated development
- Maximum of 220 units
- Elevations to have a minimum of 20% non-stucco material
- Return prior to preliminary site plan approval with detailed landscape plan, fence plan, playground locations, final elevations, detailed lighting plan and monument sign plan
- Landscape materials to match properties to the north and south

Mr. John Mockus seconded the motion.

Vote

9-0, Motion to approve, with Committee Members Abegg, Branscomb, Flunoy, Glass, Harlin, Hurd, Mockus, Ortega and Rouse in favor.