



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

### Z-16-206

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 10, 2020
<b>Request From</b>	C-2 CEPCSP (Intermediate Commercial District, Camelback East Primary Core Specific Plan) (1.80 acres) and P-1 CEPCSP (Passenger Automobile Parking District, Camelback East Primary Core Specific Plan) (1.56 acres)
<b>Request To</b>	PUD CEPCSP (Planned Unit Development, Camelback East Primary Core Specific Plan) (3.36 acres)
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Planned Unit Development to allow multifamily residential and commercial uses
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 440 feet west of the northwest corner of 18th Street and Camelback Road
<b>VPC recommendation</b>	Approval, per staff recommendation, with a modification
<b>Vote</b>	16-1

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

**Ms. Sofia Mastikhina**, staff, provided an overview of the request, including the location, current and surrounding zoning, and General Plan Land Use Map designation. She noted that the site is located within the boundaries of the Camelback East Primary Core Specific Plan, which outlines several regulations and guidelines that this project will be subject to. As the request to rezone to a PUD differs from a regular rezoning case, the regulations from this plan have been incorporated into the development narrative. She highlighted the prominent regulatory components of the plan that were included in the narrative, including: streetscape enhancement, improved pedestrian circulation, location and concealment of parking garage structure, potential future mid-block crossing, water feature near building entrance, and architectural details and embellishments. She further explained that this plan regulated the maximum allowed building height of all properties within its boundaries. The property in question is located within Core Gradient 2, which permits a maximum building height of 30 feet, and up to 56 feet with bonuses. This PUD proposes the latter height and meets the following bonus provisions outlined in the plan: high density housing, extraordinary design quality, exceptional mitigation of structured parking, and creation of extraordinarily enhanced pedestrian areas within the project. She then presented an overview of the proposed development standards, noting that the site has three vehicular access points, a fully wrapped

parking garage, five stories at a maximum height of 56 feet, and a main pedestrian path that connects Camelback Road to the main building entrance, as well as to the commercial retail center adjacent to the west. She added that, along the eastern property line, there is a notch that is owned and operated by the Arizona Department of Transportation, so the proposed narrative allows for some flexibility in the building and landscape setbacks for this area alone. She presented the conceptual elevations and the proposed design guidelines of the PUD, which include requirements such as four-sided architecture, the use of a minimum of three building materials, maximum 60 percent stucco on each building elevation, consistent color palette, and fully screened parking. She then outlined the proposed landscape design standards, the amenity features included in the narrative, and the proposed signage standards, which will conform to the regulations set forth in the Camelback East Primary Core Specific Plan. She presented staff's findings and recommendation for approval and listed the recommended stipulations. She explained that, since the staff report had been finalized, one of the stipulations had been changed, which is noted in the presentation. The applicant worked with the city's Street Transportation Department and the Pedestrian Safety Coordinator to reword this stipulation as it is now being presented.

**Mr. Nick Wood**, representative with Snell and Wilmer, provided an overview of the proposed project. He presented the proposed site plan, which depicts a wrapped design, meaning that the multi-level parking garage is wrapped on all sides by the multifamily building. He presented the proposed amenity and landscape plans which include features such as pool/spa area, cabanas, and lush landscaping. He then presented the proposed elevations, which are intended to retain the overall theme of the Bluewater Grill, including some of the restaurant's color palette. He provided some examples of other projects completed by Wood Partners around the valley, to depict the quality of the design and amenities that are usually included. He then outlined the difference in traffic generation between the current restaurant use, the proposed multifamily residential use, and what is allowed by right in the existing zoning district, which could be a medical office. The traffic generated by the proposed use would be overall slightly less than the current restaurant use and significantly less than what would be generated by a medical use. In response to the traffic and circulation concerns that were brought up at the last meeting, he provided an aerial map depicting all the possible ways that vehicular traffic can exit the property to access the adjacent freeway during the morning rush hour. Residents will be able to exit the site either onto Camelback Road to the south or onto Medlock Drive to the north. He concluded his presentation by asking for a recommendation of approval from the committee.

**Ms. Hayleigh Crawford** reiterated a question she had posed previously to the applicant, which is why a PUD is being requested, as well as how the applicant has addressed the letters of opposition that were recently submitted by members of the public. She also expressed concern with the way staff explained the

modified stipulation, stating that this was not a rewording, but rather a complete modification of the requirement. She asked why the funds to be contributed into an escrow account for a traffic signal were so significantly reduced. **Mr. Wood** explained that the PUD is being requested due to the configuration of the site, the setbacks needed to accommodate this request, the design elements that the applicant wants to ensure are included in the narrative, and to avoid possibly multiple Variance requests that a development like this might require. Regarding the traffic concerns, his presentation included a map that showed the projected circulation and exit routes during morning rush hour. He had also provided the projected traffic volumes graph to show that a multifamily residential use will generate less traffic than the current restaurant use, and considerably less traffic than another use permitted in the zoning district, such as a medical office. He then addressed the concern with the modified stipulation, stating that his team had been working with Kini Knudson, the director of the Street Transportation Department, to come to an agreement regarding a fair stipulation for this potential traffic control device. He stated that the originally proposed \$75,000 constituted about half of what would be needed for this device. Given the location and configuration of the property, the developer deemed this figure to be unfair to ask of a single property owner, and they were able to negotiate down to a quarter of the total cost, which is a more proportional contribution for a development of this size. **Ms. Crawford** then asked what the price point for these new apartments would be, and if any affordable housing would be included. **Mr. Wood** replied that the units would be around \$2 per square foot, so a 1,000-square-foot apartment would be rented for \$2,000, and so on. No affordable housing will be included in this project.

**Motion:**

**Mr. Barry Paceley** made a motion to approve this request, with the modification to Stipulation No. 5 as presented by staff. **Mr. Greg Abbott** seconded the motion.

**Ms. Crawford** explained that she will be voting against this case, as she cannot support a project that will not be adding affordable housing to an area that desperately needs it.

**Mr. Craig Tribken** urged the committee to take a more active role in advocating for housing affordability in the community.

**Vote: 16-1**

Motion passes with committee members Swart, Fiscbach, Abbott, Bair, Garcia, Grace, McKee, Miller, Nye, O'Malley, Paceley, Scher, Sharaby, Trauscht, and Tribken in favor, and committee member Crawford in opposition

**Village Planning Committee Recommended Stipulations:**

1. An updated Development Narrative for the Alta Bluewater PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with the Development Narrative date stamped October 14, 2020, as modified by the following stipulations:
  - a. Front cover: Revise the submittal date information on the bottom to add the following: Hearing Draft: October 14, 2020; City Council adopted: [Add adoption date].
2. The developer shall dedicate a 10-foot sidewalk easement along Camelback Road.
3. The applicant shall submit a Traffic Impact Study to the City for this development. No preliminary approval of plans shall be granted until the study is reviewed and approved by the City. Contact Mr. Matthew Wilson, Traffic Engineer III, (602) 262-7580, to set up a meeting to discuss the requirements of the study. Upon completion of the TIS the developer shall submit the completed TIS to the Planning and Development Department counter with instruction to forward the study to the Street Transportation Department, Design Section.
4. The developer shall construct all streets within and adjacent to the development with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
5. ~~The developer shall provide \$75,000 in escrow to fund a future traffic control device along Camelback Road, between State Route 51 and 16th Street, prior to preliminary site plan approval, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.~~

THE DEVELOPER SHALL PROVIDE \$37,500 IN ESCROW TO FUND A FUTURE TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICE ALONG CAMELBACK ROAD, BETWEEN STATE ROUTE 51 AND 16TH STREET, PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF BUILDING PERMITS, AS APPROVED BY THE STREET TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT. THESE ESCROWED FUNDS SHALL BE UTILIZED WITHIN FIVE (5) YEARS OF THE ISSUANCE OF A FINAL CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR THE PROJECT. IF ESCROWED FUNDS ARE NOT UTILIZED WITHIN THIS FIVE (5) YEAR PERIOD, SAID FUNDS MAY BE REFUNDED UPON REQUEST OF THE THEN OWNER OF THE PROPERTY.

6. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33- foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.