



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-29-11-7(8) (PHO-1-20)

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	March 10, 2020
<b>Planning Hearing Officer</b>	March 18, 2020
<b>Hearing Date</b>	
<b>Request</b>	1) Modify Stipulation No. 1 regarding general conformance with the site plan date stamped January 17, 2012; 2) Delete Stipulation No. 1.a regarding a 10-foot landscape setback along the south property line; 3) Delete Stipulation No. 1.b regarding a 5-foot landscape setback along the building facade; 4) Delete Stipulation No. 1.c regarding parking spaces between Central Avenue and the front of the buildings; 5) Modify Stipulation No. 2 regarding general conformance with the building elevations date stamped January 27, 2012. 6) Delete Stipulation No. 4 regarding a minimum of 5,000 square feet of open space and landscaping; 7) Delete Stipulation No. 5 regarding trash receptacles along the west property lines; 8) Modify Stipulation No. 6 regarding the construction of three pedestrian paths. Approximately 400 feet north of the northwest corner of Central Avenue and Euclid Avenue.
<b>Location</b>	
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Denial
<b>VPC Vote</b>	10-2 Motion passes; with members Busching and Holmerud voting against.

### VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

*One comment card was received, from the applicants.*

**Mr. Bojorquez**, staff, provided a presentation on the proposed stipulation modifications for this case.

**Ms. Daniels** asked Mr. Bojorquez to clarify the project being proposed and explain the changes requested.

**Mr. Bojorquez** explained the proposal in more detail and discussed the stipulations modifications requested by the applicant.

**Mr. Coleman** asked Mr. Bojorquez to clarify the location of the site.

**Mr. Bojorquez** described the location of the property.

**Ms. Daniels** expressed concern over the proposed site plan. She also expressed concern about the due diligence of the applicant and how the project considers incarcerated populations.

**Chair Busching** invited the applicant to introduce himself and address some of the comments provided by the committee.

**Mr. Andy Pitts** introduced himself and explained that the proposal was to modify existing zoning case stipulations. He mentioned that the project was proposing a multifamily use following the R-3 zoning district standards, which is an allowed use in the C-1 zoning district. He also explained that the aim of the project was to keep costs low while providing a high quality housing product. He described the size of the units and number of bedrooms, adding that electric vehicle charging was going to be provided at every home.

**Mr. Reece Satre** introduced himself and mentioned that the project proposes detached single family homes that seek to create an experience of homeownership.

**Chair Busching** asked if the community was gated.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that no gates were proposed and explained that the project proposed a ramada as an amenity along the northwest of the site and there were considerations for amenities within the retention area to the north.

**Chair Busching** mentioned that it was good for the community to not be gated.

**Ms. Alvarez** asked how the property was transitioning from C-1 to the proposed development following the R-3 standards. She also asked how long the applicant had been working on this project.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that the existing Dollar General to the north had abandoned part of the original site. He also mentioned of working on this project since November of last year. He is considering alternative construction types such as 3-D printing for this project.

**Chair Busching** asked the applicant what outreach has been done.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that the required level of outreach has been done. He mentioned that there are vacant properties nearby, including a dilapidated trailer park near the site. He mentioned that this project is proposing a home product

closer to South Mountain and that the project has undergone a site plan pre-application review already.

**Ms. Daniels** asked if the applicant had met with community organizations yet.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that they had not met with any community organization in the area.

**Ms. Daniels** mentioned that the project has issues with affordability and that the applicant has not done enough due diligence and thus is asking for more outreach to the neighboring community specially since the intended use is changing.

**Mr. Klimek** mentioned that there is not required neighborhood meeting as part of the Planning Hearing Officer process.

**Mr. Holmerud** expressed concerns with the fire access on the site.

**Mr. Pitts** provided an overview of the fire requirements provided to them including the requirements for windows.

**Mr. Coleman** mentioned that he could not support the project at this time. He wanted to explore the option to continue the project to another meeting date.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that rents for this development were projected to be in the range of \$1,000 to \$1,200 per month.

**Ms. Daniels** mentioned that she also has concerns with the project at this time.

**Ms. Smith** also shared concerns with fire access and accessibility.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that the project had undergone a site plan pre-application and met with different departments.

**Mr. Monge Kotake** and **Chair Busching** asked for clarification on the stipulation modifications being requested.

**Mr. Aguilar** mentioned that the project proposed tiny homes which was different than the existing plan. He expressed not being comfortable with the proposal and that the project was not affordable enough. He also questioned the market that this project was catering to. Other concerns expressed included the window location for the units.

**Chair Busching** asked for comments from the public.

## **MOTION**

**Ms. Daniels** made a motion to deny requested stipulation modifications.

**Mr. Coleman** seconded the motion.

**Chair Busching** opened the conversation for questions and other comments from the committee.

**Mr. Larios** asked Ms. Daniels to reconsider her motion to deny and instead proposed a motion to continue this item.

**Ms. Daniels** expressed concerns over the proposed amenities, the affordability of the project and the lack of due diligence from the applicant.

**Ms. Alvarez** asked the applicants how willing they would be to make this project part of the community. She asked if the applicant was willing to continue the case.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that they are still learning and want for this project to evolve into something below market.

**Ms. Daniels** asked the applicants if they would be willing to continue the case for 3 months.

**Mr. Pitts** mentioned that they would not be willing to continue the case.

## **VOTE:**

**10-2** Motion passes; Chair Busching and Mr. Holmerud voted against.

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

None.