



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-91-23-2

Date of VPC Meeting	May 6, 2024
Request From	S-1 DVAO
Request To	CP/GCP DVAO
Proposal	Storage and light manufacturing
Location	Approximately 250 feet west of the southwest corner of Cave Creek Road and Quail Avenue
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	12-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

One member of the public registered to speak on this item.

Diane Petersen joined the meeting during this item, bringing the quorum to 12 members.

Staff Presentation:

Adrian Zambrano, staff, provided an overview of rezoning case Z-91-23-2, including the location, request, surrounding land uses and zoning, and the General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mr. Zambrano then described the proposal, discussing the proposed site plan and elevations. Mr. Zambrano noted that this request supports the goals and policies of several adopted plans, policies and initiatives, as noted in the staff report. Mr. Zambrano stated that staff had not received any letters of support or opposition. Mr. Zambrano concluded by sharing the staff findings, recommendation of approval and the recommended stipulations.

Applicant Presentation:

Kimberly Schroeder, representative with ProSteel STR, LLC, introduced herself and provided an overview of the request. Ms. Schroeder stated that the new manufacturing building would provide new employment for the area and would improve the area. Ms. Schroeder added that a similar project is being built by the owner down the street.

Questions from the Committee:

Marc Soronson asked if the stipulation related to bicycle parking spaces with electric bicycle charging capabilities is required by the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance or if it is the Planning and Development Department's stipulation. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it is not required by the Zoning Ordinance, and it is a rezoning case stipulation, and that this stipulation stems from the Transportation Electrification Action Plan, which discusses providing the needed infrastructure for electric vehicles and also electric micro-mobility options.

Eric Cashman asked if the property to the east of the subject site is residential or industrial. **Ms. Schroeder** responded to the north, across the street, is residential.

Mr. Zambrano stated that the properties to the east are restaurants.

Mr. Cashman asked that with the capability of semitrucks to come and back up to the loading dock, if anyone has had any concerns. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that they have not heard anything. **Mr. Cashman** asked if the applicant had done any community outreach. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that both letters were mailed, and the sign was posted on the site.

Karen DeMoss asked what the owner was building nearby. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that it was another warehouse similar to this proposal.

Chair Alex Popovic asked what type of business would be located in the warehouse. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that it would be a shell building for someone to lease.

Robert Goodhue asked what the maximum building height permitted is in the requested zoning district. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Commerce Park District, General Commerce Park Option, has a building height stepback provision. Mr. Zambrano explained that the maximum building height permitted within 30 feet of a perimeter lot line, or a lot line adjacent to a property that is not zoned CP, is 18 feet, which may be increased by one foot in height for every three feet of additional setback, up to a maximum of 56 feet in building height. Mr. Zambrano added that all lots lines of the subject site are perimeter lot lines, since there is no adjacent CP zoning. **Mr. Goodhue** asked if the proposal meets the building height stepback provision. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively. **Mr. Goodhue** asked if the building height was to the ridge of the roof. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance defines building height for pitched roofs to be measured at the midpoint between the ridge and eaves.

Public Comments:

Spencer Freeman introduced himself as a neighbor across the street to the north, with concerns. Mr. Freeman stated that the mailboxes for his two properties are on the south side of the street and asked if the mailboxes would stay on the south side of the street or if they would be moved. Mr. Freeman then expressed concerns with lighting, noting that the lighting from the properties behind his shines into their bedroom. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the applicant would be required to construct half street improvements,

so when they are doing these improvements, they would need to move the mailboxes as part of the process and would need to work with the property owner to move them.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Schroeder stated that they told Mr. Freeman that they would take care of the mailboxes and would make sure that he is not disturbed.

Committee Discussion:

Mr. Cashman asked about the lighting concerns. Mr. Cashman asked if business operations would be 24 hours a day for this building. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that the loading docks would be located in the back and there would be shade from trees in the front.

Chair Popovic asked if there would be streetlights in front of the property. **Ms. Schroeder** responded that the City may require that, but right now, there are none.

Mr. Goodhue stated that the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance requires site lighting to be a maximum of one-foot candle at the property line, so lighting would be pointed down, and there should not be any glare across the street.

MOTION – Z-91-23-2:

Anna Sepic motioned to recommend approval of Z-91-23-2, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Cashman** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-91-23-2:

12-0; motion to recommend approval of Z-91-23-2 per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Balderrama, Bowman, Bustamante, Cashman, DeMoss, Goodhue, Gubser, Knapp, Petersen, Sepic, Soronson, and Popovic in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.