



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-124-23-1

Date of VPC Meeting	April 9, 2024
Request From	C-2 (13.74 acres) and R-2 (0.55 acres)
Request To	R-2
Proposal	Single-family residential
Location	Approximately 2,260 feet north of the northeast corner of North Black Canyon Highway and Circle Mountain Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	4-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

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

Staff Presentation:

Adrian Zambrano, staff, provided an overview of Rezoning Case No. Z-124-23-1, including history of Rezoning Case No. Z-8-22-1 that the subject site was originally part of, the location of the request, surrounding zoning and land uses, and the General Plan Land Use Map designation. Mr. Zambrano displayed and discussed the site plan and elevations for the proposed project, noting that staff does not recommend general conformance due to various technical appeals and variances that would be required after the rezoning process for the current design proposed by the applicant. Mr. Zambrano summarized policies and goals of adopted plans, policies, and initiatives that would be furthered by this request. Mr. Zambrano shared that staff has not received any letters of support or opposition. Mr. Zambrano shared the staff findings and stated that staff recommends approval subject to stipulations.

Applicant Presentation:

Adam Baugh, representative with Withey Morris Baugh, PLC, introduced himself and provided an overview of the overall development. Mr. Baugh summarized the recent history of the approved rezoning case to the north and south and the PHO case to the south. Mr. Baugh noted that the subject site was originally included in Rezoning Case No. Z-8-22-1, but it was removed before being heard by the Rio Vista Village Planning Committee, because the home builder backed out and they did not want to rezone it

without knowing what would go there. Mr. Baugh stated that the existing C-2 zoning on the site allows multifamily residential up to R-3 zoning development standards by right, but it does not allow for detached single-family residential. Mr. Baugh added that they do not need the maximum density that R-2 zoning would allow. Mr. Baugh displayed and discussed the proposed site plan and elevations. Mr. Baugh explained why technical appeals would be required for the proposed design. Mr. Baugh stated that the darker streets displayed on the site plan would be public streets and the proposed alleys, which are wider than a typical alley but narrower than a local street, would be private. Mr. Baugh highlighted that the overall development would have a variety of housing products with different types of rental and homeownership opportunities. Mr. Baugh summarized elements of the Rio Vista Village Design Guidelines that would be enforced through the stipulations.

Questions from Committee:

Mr. Ferreira asked if there is general parking proposed within the subdivision. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that there would be garages for each townhome, in addition to driveways along the private accessways in the rear of the homes, and additional on-street parking along the local streets within the subdivision. Mr. Zambrano added that the private alleys in a typical alley-loaded design are usually about 25 feet wide; however, the applicant wanted their private alleys to be 29.16 feet wide, which is the minimum width required by the City to allow water and sewer infrastructure within them. Mr. Zambrano stated that the City classifies a thoroughfare that is 29.16 feet wide as a private accessway, or private street, which requires certain elements per the Subdivision Ordinance and triggers certain design requirements per the Zoning Ordinance, such as minimizing the impact of garages, so the current design would require the applicant to apply for technical appeals and variances, which is why staff does not recommend general conformance.

Chair Sommacampagna asked if the alleys would be private or if they would be dedicated as public. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the alleys would be private and the local streets within the subdivision could be either public or private, depending on what the applicant decides to do. Mr. Zambrano added that the Street Transportation Department is fine with the local streets within the subdivision being either public or private. **Chair Sommacampagna** asked why some stipulations include language for if multifamily residential development occurs. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the request is for R-2 zoning, which also allows multifamily residential, and since staff is not recommending general conformance to the site plan or elevations, multifamily residential could be developed on the site rather than the single-family residential development currently proposed. Mr. Zambrano added that if multifamily residential development occurs, the development would still be stipulated to a maximum density of 5.04 dwelling units per gross acre, unless a Planning Hearing Officer (PHO) request to modify the stipulation is approved through the PHO public hearing process. **Chair Sommacampagna** asked for clarification on why staff does not recommend general conformance to the site plan and elevations. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the current design does not meet certain Subdivision Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance requirements, so separate approval processes would be required for technical appeals and variances. **Chair Sommacampagna** asked if these were approved if staff could

then stipulate general conformance to the site plan and elevations. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that general conformance cannot be stipulated because these separate approval processes for technical appeals and variances would occur after the rezoning process when the required zoning is in place; thus, staff would not know if the technical appeals or variances would be approved until after the rezoning process. **Chair Sommacampagna** asked for clarification that if the technical appeals and variances do not get approved, then the applicant could choose to develop the site as multifamily residential instead. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, noting that the stipulations with the language for if multifamily residential development occurs would then be applicable in that instance. Mr. Zambrano added that the density would still be stipulated to a maximum of 5.04 dwelling units per gross acre, and if multifamily residential development occurs and wishes to exceed that density, then a PHO request to modify that stipulation would need to be approved through the PHO public hearing process.

Mr. Ferreira asked if the private accessways would be wide enough for on-street parking. **Mr. Baugh** responded they would probably not be wide enough, but each unit will have a two-car garage and a driveway, in addition to on-street parking along the local streets. **Mr. Ferreira** asked if there were any comments from City staff regarding parking. **Mr. Baugh** responded that there were not, noting that the proposal meets the minimum required parking spaces for single-family residential.

Mr. Lawrence asked if utilities within the private accessways would be public or private. **Mr. Baugh** responded that they would be public utilities.

Will Holton asked what the building setback between each home would be. **Mr. Baugh** responded that there would be 10 feet between each home.

Mr. Ferreira agreed that the variety of housing products within the overall development would provide for a variety of different opportunities. Mr. Ferreira asked what the projected number of dwelling units are for the overall development. **Mr. Baugh** responded that there would likely be somewhere around 800 dwelling units in total for the overall development, depending on what the adjacent development brings to the north and east in the remaining C-2 zoned area.

Chair Sommacampagna asked if utilities would still be brought across the I-17 freeway. **Mr. Baugh** responded affirmatively, noting that the Water Services Department is requesting the developer to install tanks on Arizona State Trust Land on the west side of the freeway, bring the lines from the tanks to the south three miles, cut across under the freeway, then bring the lines to the north on the east side of the freeway to two points. **Chair Sommacampagna** asked if the infrastructure would be for water or sewer. **Mr. Baugh** responded that there would be two water lines and one sewer line.

Mr. Lawrence asked about improvements for the I-17 frontage road. **Mr. Baugh** responded that the Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT) controls the frontage road and is requiring two lanes and a middle turn lane. Mr. Baugh clarified

that the improvements installed by the developer would be adjacent to the development. **Mr. Lawrence** asked for clarification that the frontage road would have two lanes in both directions and a middle turn lane. **Mr. Baugh** responded affirmatively.

Chair Sommacampagna asked if the subject site is within an impact fee area. **Mr. Baugh** responded affirmatively.

Mr. Holton asked about stipulation 42. **Mr. Baugh** responded that it is a standard stipulation regarding archaeology in case any materials are discovered during construction.

Public Comments:

None.

Applicant Response:

None.

MOTION – Z-124-23-1:

Mr. Lawrence motioned to recommend approval of Z-124-23-1, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Holton** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-124-23-1:

4-0; the motion to recommend approval of Z-124-23-1 per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Holton, Perreira, Lawrence, and Sommacampagna in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.