



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-68-22-6

Date of VPC Meeting	December 19, 2022
Request From	CP/GCP
Request To	C-2 HGT/WVR DNS/WVR
Location	Approximately 1,500 feet south of the southeast corner of 50th Street and Ray Road
VPC Recommendation	Continued to January 23, 2023
VPC Vote	8-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

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

Staff Presentation:

Nayeli Sanchez Luna, staff, presented an overview of the rezoning case Z-68-22-6. Mrs. Sanchez Luna discussed the location of the site, the requested zoning designation, the surrounding land uses, and the General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mrs. Sanchez Luna displayed the site plan and elevations and noted the enhanced elevations, landscaping, and amenity areas. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by summarizing the staff findings and correspondence and providing the staff recommendation and proposed stipulations.

Applicant Presentation:

Manjula Vaz, representing the applicant with Gammage & Burnham, provided an overview for the proposed rezoning case. Ms. Vaz summarized the history of the site and noted that employments located along the I-10 freeway would benefit from the proposed housing development. Ms. Vaz noted that the current office buildings were underutilized on the site. Ms. Vaz displayed the site plan and summarized the proposed configuration noting the amenity locations and exit locations. Ms. Vaz noted that a traffic impact study was conducted and that there would not be a significant impact on traffic congestion. Ms. Vaz concluded the presentation by summarizing the impact fees and the community benefits.

Questions from the committee:

Darin Fisher asked if most of the units would be two-bedroom units. **Chapin Bell**, with the applicant's team, stated that there would be 201 one-bedroom units, 183 two-bedroom units, and 34 three-bedroom units. **Mr. Fisher** stated that the large number of one-bedroom units would not make parking problematic. Mr. Fisher asked if the proposed development was targeted towards high-income individuals, how did the traffic study conclude that these individuals would not contribute to rush hour traffic. **Ms. Vaz** stated that a lot of individuals have the opportunity to telework and that standard office jobs would have hours of operation between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Ms. Vaz added that in a typical multifamily development, numerous members of a family would leave at the same time. Ms. Vaz stated that the proposed development would allow for a larger timeframe to alleviate traffic. **Dawn Cartier**, with the applicant's team, added that the data used for the traffic study was from 2017 and had larger volumes of traffic. Ms. Cartier noted that more individuals have flexible working schedules so traffic would be dispersed throughout the day. **Mr. Fisher** stated that 40th Street and Ray Road has had a lot of traffic accidents and that the proposed development would add to the traffic congestion on Ray Road and Chandler Boulevard. Mr. Fisher asked if the Proposition 207 waiver had been recorded. **Ms. Vaz** stated that the Proposition 207 waiver has not been recorded and that that would be completed before the city council hearing.

Mike Maloney stated that three distribution centers were being constructed south of the subject site along 50th Street. Mr. Maloney asked how this development would impact the infrastructure of 50th Street, Ray Road, and Chandler Boulevard. **Ms. Vaz** stated that that warehouse development would be allowed under the current zoning, so the infrastructure would accommodate that use. **Joe Blackburn**, with the applicant's team, stated that the warehouse development would primarily travel south and that the vehicles would be vans rather than semitrucks. **Ms. Cartier** added that the surrounding land uses are suited to support expansion.

Max Masel stated that he had no previous information on the proposed development. Mr. Masel stated that he called the city council and that they did not provide any information and that the proposed development seemed to be expedited. Mr. Masel stated that he had a lot of concerns with the proposal and that the employment center supported employment and industrial uses rather than residential. Mr. Masel reiterated that he had not heard about his rezoning case and that the most traffic congestion occurred during the weekend or late hours of the day. **Ms. Vaz** stated that they had a neighborhood meeting where two members of the public attended, an article was published in the Ahwatukee Foothills News, and they had had discussions with city council staff and adjacent property owners. Ms. Vaz stated that the current office use has been underutilized and that the proposed multifamily development would alleviate the housing crisis in Phoenix. **Ms. Cartier** added that the proximity to commercial uses would promote alternative modes of transportation such as walking or bicycling.

Chad Blostone stated that there would be a significant increase of traffic congestion on Ray Road. Mr. Blostone stated that he had concerns with public safety and the ability to deliver emergency services. **Ms. Vaz** stated that the City did not have concerns with the ability to provide services. **Mr. Bell** stated that the proposed development would not have a large impact on public safety. **Mr. Blostone** stated that due to the added population, the current office structures would utilize less public safety services than the proposed multifamily development. Mr. Blostone added that the development would

strain the existing resources. **Ms. Vaz** added that they had not received any comments from the City stating that they would be unable to provide emergency services. Ms. Vaz noted that the impact fees and sales tax produced by these individuals would go towards public safety funding. Ms. Vaz stated that the proposed development would promote eyes on the street and that a new office building would hold more individuals. **Mr. Blostone** stated that the proposed development has not addressed the impact it would have on public safety or Ray Road.

Mr. Fisher stated that the rezoning case seemed expedited and that they did not receive adequate information in a timely manner. Mr. Fisher stated that more time was needed to evaluate the request and that he was unaware of the neighborhood meeting. Mr. Fisher asked staff the reason behind the rezoning case being presented if the committee needed more time to evaluate. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** stated that the Village Planning Committee had the choice to either continue the case, recommend denial, or recommend approval. Mrs. Sanchez Luna noted that the rezoning case presented tonight did not require a recommendation of approval and the committee could recommend a continuance. **Ms. Vaz** stated that they had been working with the City for over a year and that they had a neighborhood meeting a month ago. Ms. Vaz stated that she would support a continuance to allow the committee time to evaluate the request. **Mr. Blostone** stated that a continuance would be appropriate.

Public Comments:

Mrs. Sanchez Luna stated that Bradley Greger, who registered to speak, was not present in the attendee list. **Vice Chair Gasparro** asked if Bradley Greger was present to use the “Raise Hand” function. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** and **Vice Chair Gasparro** confirmed that no one had their “Raised Hand” function activated.

Committee Discussion:

Vice Chair Gasparro stated that a project that redevelops underutilized development is preferred but that there were underlying concerns that needed to be addressed by the applicant and staff. Vice Chair Gasparro voiced his support for a continuance.

Motion:

Chad Blostone motioned to continue Z-68-22-6 to the January meeting. **Jerry Youhanaie** seconded the motion.

Vote:

8-0, Motion to continue passed, with Committee Members, Blostone, Fisher, Maloney, Masel, Meier, Neese, Youhanaie, Gasparro, and Elliott, in favor.

REVISED Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-68-22-6

Date of VPC Meeting	January 23, 2022
Request From	CP/GCP
Request To	C-2 HGT/WVR DNS/WVR
Location	Approximately 1,500 feet south of the southeast corner of 50th Street and Ray Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per staff recommendation (Addendum A)
VPC Vote	6-2

VPC DISCUSSION:

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

Staff Presentation:

Nayeli Sanchez Luna, staff, presented an overview of the rezoning case Z-68-22-6. Mrs. Sanchez Luna discussed the location of the site, the requested zoning designation, the surrounding land uses, and the General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mrs. Sanchez Luna displayed the site plan and elevations and noted the enhanced elevations, landscaping, and amenity areas. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by summarizing the staff findings and correspondence and providing the staff recommendation and proposed stipulations found in Addendum A.

Applicant Presentation:

Manjula Vaz, representing the applicant with Gammage & Burnham, provided an overview for the proposed rezoning case. Ms. Vaz summarized the surrounding land uses and displayed the site plan noting the ingress and egress routes. Ms. Vaz described the site configuration noting the number of units, height, and amenities on site. Ms. Vaz stated that the proposed development would support businesses within the core due to its proximity. Ms. Vaz added that the proposed multifamily development would be located adjacent to an existing apartment complex and offices and not adjacent to single-family houses. Ms. Vaz concluded the presentation by summarizing the impact fees and comparing the proposed standards to the Zoning Ordinance.

Questions from the committee:

Mike Schiller stated that he had seen the subject site decline over the years and that high density housing was needed within the City. Mr. Schiller stated that he had concerns with maintenance and vandalism. Mr. Schiller provided an example of another development that had a decline after completion. Mr. Shiller asked if the applicant was going to keep the development after completion. Mr. Shiller asked for information on maintenance and promoting housing to young professionals. **Chapin Bell**, with the applicant's team, stated that with the current housing market, the applicant would maintain the proposed development after completion. Mr. Bell added that the proposed development would be maintained. **Mr. Shiller** asked how maintenance would ensure professional tenants. **Mr. Bell** added that the high-quality amenities and other benefits would ensure professional tenants. Mr. Bell noted that the majority of the tenants could afford a house but preferred living in their development due to its qualities. Mr. Bell added that they invested in creating a home for its residents. **Mr. Shiller** stated that he was glad that the applicant was invested in creating homes.

Peter Meier voiced his support for the proposed development.

Public Comments:

Constance Holcomb stated that she would have liked the meeting to be in person. Ms. Holcomb added that the multifamily development would add to the traffic congestion in the Village. Ms. Holcomb noted that the City Council has not done anything to add traffic lights in the area. Mr. Holcomb added that the children, living in the multifamily development, traveling to elementaries, junior highs, and high schools, would add to the traffic. Ms. Holcomb stated that she was not opposed to the development, but that traffic had to be addressed. Ms. Holcomb added that the village has struggled with emergency response times. Ms. Holcomb concluded her comment by stating that the project would be detriment to the area.

Applicant Response:

Ms. Vaz stated that the existing office complex would still create traffic in the area. Ms. Vaz noted that the impact fees from the proposed development would go towards adding traffic lights to the area. Ms. Vaz added that the office use would add traffic during peak hours of the day. Ms. Vaz stated that they will continue to work with the Street Transportation Department regarding traffic congestion.

Committee Discussion:

Chair Spencer Elliot asked for information on the trip generations for the proposed development. **Mike James**, with the applicant's team, displayed the trip generation for the proposed development and other allowed uses. Mr. James stated that the proposed development would create approximately 1,900 daily trips and the existing office building would generate approximately 1,600 daily trips. Mr. James noted that the multifamily trips would be dispersed throughout the day. Mr. James added that more individuals work from home so there would be a reduction in peak hour traffic. Mr. James stated that the freeway access points and adjacent commercial development supported the proposal.

Mike Maloney asked for clarification on the comments provided by the Streets Transportation Department. **Ms. Vaz** stated that the Streets Transportation Department reviewed the traffic report and reviewed items such as intersections, ingress, egress, and trip generation. **Mr. James** added that the Streets Transportation Department reviews the impact that the development would have in the area utilizing the City's criteria. **Mr. Maloney** asked where he could have access to the traffic report. **Ms. Vaz** stated that the report was submitted with the application and could be retrieved through a public records request. **Mr. Maloney** asked if their interpretation of the Streets Transportation Report meant that nothing needed to be modified. **Mr. James** stated that the Street Transportation Department require elements such as trip generation and ensuring that parking standards are met. Mr. James added that if additional information is required for mitigation, then they would be informed. Mr. James noted that the proposal did not require mitigations because it would not significantly impact peak hour traffic. **Ms. Vaz** stated that if the Streets Transportation Department has any comments, those are turned into stipulations. Ms. Vaz added that Stipulations No. 15 through 17 were from the Streets Transportation Department. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna**, staff, displayed the stipulations provided from the Street Transportation Department. **Mr. Maloney** asked if the traffic study was reviewed independently. **Ms. Vaz** stated that the City had traffic reviewers and consultants that review the provided study and applicant submittals. Ms. Vaz noted that the City review is independent from the traffic engineer from the applicant. Ms. Vaz stated that the City has their own criteria depending on the area, plans, or existing traffic patterns.

Suzanne Sharer asked if the proposed multifamily development would have Section 8 housing. **Ms. Vaz** stated that no Section 8 housing would be provided.

Motion:

Mike Schiller motioned to recommend approval of Z-68-22-6 per the staff recommendation (Addendum A). **Peter Meier** second the motion.

Vote:

6-2, motion to recommend approval passed with Committee members Crouch, Fisher, Lieb, Meier, Schiller, and Elliot in favor, and Committee members Maloney and Sharer in opposition.