



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-163-25-7

Date of VPC Meeting	January 13, 2026
Request From	R-4 SPVTABDO, C-2 SPVTABDO, and C-3 SPVTABDO
Request To	WU Code T5:5 SPVTABDO
Proposal	Mixed-use (multifamily residential and retail)
Location	Northeast corner of Central Avenue and Roeser Road
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	13-0

Committee Members Lee Coleman and Manish Gupta joined the meeting during this item bringing quorum to 13 members present (10 needed for quorum).

Three members of the public registered to speak in support of this item and 13 members of the public registered in support but did not wish to speak. One member of the public registered in opposition of this item but did not wish to speak. One member of the public did not indicate support or opposition but did not wish to speak.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Samuel Rogers, staff, presented the request, the location of the subject site, the surrounding context, the General Plan Land Use Map designation, the site plan, the staff recommendation, the staff findings, and concluded by presenting the proposed stipulations.

Committee Member Marcia Busching asked why amenities were not stipulated. **Mr. Rogers** explained that amenities are required by the Walkable Urban (WU) Code.

Committee Member Tamala Daniels asked what amenities are required.

Mr. Rogers stated that staff would review the code and follow up.

Committee Member Busching asked why the EV parking requirement is only three percent and not installed.

Mr. Rogers explained that affordable housing developments generally have lower requirements.

Chair Arthur Greathouse III asked about the required amount of affordable housing to qualify for incentive height.

Mr. Rogers explained that a minimum of 30 percent affordable housing is required to qualify for incentive height and that the applicant team is proposing more than 30 percent.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Fernando Ruiz, with the applicant team, passed out historic newspapers, described the work of his organization, described the community outreach, explained that six story structures were not proposed due to community feedback, and introduced the project.

Jennifer Boblick, with the applicant team, introduced the project, presented the proposal, the subject site, the policy context, and described the site plan, phasing plan and elevations. Ms. Boblick explained that the applicant team is requesting deletion of Stipulation Nos. 4 and 6 and a modification of Stipulation No. 7.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Committee Member Fred Daniels asked about the project timeline. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the timeline depends on funding. **Javier Espenoza**, with the applicant team, stated that Phase I will take approximately two years.

Committee Member Greg Brownell asked what the site would look like during the two-year period, expressed concerns about future problems, stated that there should be a way to hold the development to the original plan, and explained concerns about the project being split into multiple phases. **Chair Greathouse** explained that LIHTC restrictions limit the timing process. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the team considered a PUD but, due to uncertainty around affordable housing funding, did not want to be overly prescriptive. Ms. Boblick stated that the team selected the WU Code because staff worked with the community regarding the area vision and selected a transect consistent with TOD policies. **Mr. Ruiz** explained that LIHTC requires construction completion by the end of 2027 and stated that a federal funding bill passed last year provides additional affordable housing funding for the next 10 years. Mr. Ruiz stated that Council expressed that affordable housing is beneficial but ownership housing is preferable and explained that Phase II will be ownership housing, Phase III will be housing for teachers, and Phase IV will be the ministry.

Committee Member Petra Falcon stated that she has lived in the community for years and expressed confidence that the project will be completed.

Ms. Boblick explained that the existing zoning is burdensome for this type of project and stated that applying the WU Code provides assurance that the project can be built and

helps facilitate funding.

Chair Greathouse asked about parking and whether it would be adequate. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the project exceeds the required parking amount, stated that the project will provide approximately 1.02 parking spaces per unit, and explained that the applicant team encourages multimodal transportation.

Committee Member Fatima Muhammad Roque asked about the Phase I unit mix. **Mr. Espenoza** described the unit mix.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked about the stipulation regarding a paseo that is requested to be removed. **Ms. Boblick** explained the applicant team's concerns with the stipulation regarding the paseo public access easement.

Committee Member Manish Gupta asked about an image in the pamphlet. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the image was not included in the presentation and stated that it was an early conceptual site plan.

Committee Member Kay Shepard stated that the plan does not show landscaping. **Mr. Ruiz** explained that the WU Code requires trees along streets.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked about a landscaping plan. **Ms. Boblick** explained where landscaping will be provided on the site and stated that it is difficult to fund landscaping plans at the entitlement stage for affordable housing because funding has not yet been allocated.

Committee Member Gupta asked about the amount of open space. **Ms. Boblick** described the dimensions.

Committee Member Shepard asked what amenities are provided. **Ms. Boblick** explained the proposed amenities.

Committee Member Cassandra Alvarez asked that if the stipulation regarding the paseo is deleted, what the pedestrian interface with the project would look like. **Ms. Boblick** explained that if the stipulation is removed, a paseo will still bisect the site and connect Roeser Road to Cody Drive, but it will be gated.

Committee Member Alvarez asked about sidewalk lighting. **Ms. Boblick** explained that lighting will follow Complete Streets lighting requirements.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Leticia Ruiz thanked the Committee, stated that she lives in the area, expressed a desire to see the area beautified, raised concerns about a public paseo, stated that the

community wants soccer fields, and explained that the project's purpose is to provide community services and will not generate profit.

Elvis Tate stated that he is a teacher, has lived in the community for five years, and expressed support for the project.

Israel Diaz explained his involvement with the applicant team, explained that Committee Member Brownell stated concerns about how the plans may change over time but explained that the owners have been serving the community consistently and that their track record speaks for itself. Mr. Diaz stated that the community wants to see the area improve and thanked the Committee.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Ms. Boblick thanked everyone for their time, stated that the process has been lengthy for the Ruiz family, and explained that the request will allow the ministry to continue its mission and provide housing.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE

Committee Member Busching asked for staff's perspective on the stipulation deletion and modification requests.

Mr. Rogers explained that Stipulation No. 4 is intended to limit the height of Building 3 due to proximity to a single-family residence and stated that the stipulation reflects the height proposed on the applicant's site plan. Mr. Rogers explained that Stipulation No. 6 regarding the paseo is intended to prevent the paseo from being placed on the exterior of the site, create a midblock crossing, and position the paseo to connect with future pedestrian ways to the north. Mr. Rogers stated that a public access easement will be required regardless of whether the easement is stipulated. Mr. Rogers explained that Stipulation No. 7 is requested to be modified to relocate one of the required plazas from the paseo to the northwest corner of the site and stated that staff prefers plaza activation along the paseo.

Mr. Rogers explained that required amenities include open space, the paseo, two plazas that include artwork, and enhance bicycle infrastructure. Mr. Rogers stated that if the Committee has specific amenities they would like to require, they may be added through an additional stipulation.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked about ownership products and whether a landscape plan would be presented at a future meeting. **Mr. Espenoza** explained that Phase II will include a mix of townhomes and apartment-style condominiums and will consist of ownership products. **Ms. Boblick** stated that a landscape plan is not required, stated that PUDs generally include landscape plans, and explained that it is expensive to

produce at the entitlement stage.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked whether landscape plans are required. **Mr. Rogers** explained that landscape plans are not required but that the VPC has requested staff encourage applicants to submit landscape plans at pre-application. Mr. Rogers stated that this case completed pre-application prior to that Committee request, so the landscape plan request was not communicated.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked whether the applicant would be willing to return to present a landscape plan. **Ms. Boblick** stated that she is open to returning to present a landscape plan but explained that the rezoning request needs to move forward to apply for LIHTC funding.

Mr. Ruiz explained that the WU Code is prescriptive regarding landscaping requirements and stated that the applicant team is opposed to the paseo stipulation due to liability concerns associated with public access and safety issues, including frequent evidence of drug use in the area.

Committee Member Fatima Muhammad Roque asked about traffic and parking around the greenspace. **Ms. Boblick** explained that there is no parking requirement for open space and that parking will be determined by other uses. Ms. Boblick stated that the open space is not public and is intended as an amenity for the Project of Americas and explained the traffic study findings.

Chair Greathouse asked about the parking logic for the open space. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the greenspace is a community amenity and does not require parking, stated that it is on a separate parcel because it cannot use LIHTC funding, and explained that it is expected to be used by nearby residents who will walk to the site.

Committee Member T. Daniels asked about the paseo. **Ms. Boblick** explained that the applicant team prefers to address the paseo through the site planning process and stated that safety, security, and liability are concerns. **Mr. Rogers** explained that if the stipulation is deleted, the paseo can be relocated. Ms. Boblick stated that the applicant team prefers to proceed through the administrative process.

Committee Member Alvarez stated that the applicant team does not give itself enough credit for its community work, explained that the development would reduce crime and loitering, stated that removing the paseo requirement is difficult because the City seeks walkable places with connections, and acknowledged liability concerns. **Mr. Ruiz** stated that the applicant team supports a paseo and described Cody Drive as a natural paseo, explained that additional trees and benches have been added, and stated that while changes could occur in the future, the current conditions make it inappropriate.

Committee Member Falcon stated that this is the applicant's community, explained that

the applicant team understands what it is advocating for, stated that she moved to the area in her 20s, and emphasized the importance of working together. Falcon thanked the applicant team for attending.

Chair Greathouse asked what nonresidential uses are proposed under Stipulation No. 2. **Mr. Espenoza** explained that LIHTC funding prohibits commercial uses and stated that the space will be used as business incubator space.

Committee Member Shepard asked a question regarding general conformance to the site plan. **Mr. Rogers** explained that the City of Phoenix generally does not stipulate general conformance to the site plan for WU Code projects and explained that the WU Code has great design standards, so staff is not concerned if the project deviates from what the applicant shows at the entitlement stage.

Committee Member Cassandra Alvarez stated that the applicant team is building something beautiful.

MOTION

Committee Member Petra Falcone motioned to recommend approval of Z-163-25-7, per the staff recommendation, with deletions and a modification. **Committee Member Kay Shepard** seconded the motion.

Committee Member Ralph Thompson II stated that he supports keeping the stipulations as recommended by staff.

Committee Member Ralph Thompson II introduced a substitute motion to recommend approval of Z-163-25-7, per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Marcia Busching** seconded the motion.

VOTE

13-0, motion to recommend approval of Z-163-25-7, per the staff recommendation passed with Committee Members Alvarez, Brooks, Brownell, Busching, Coleman, F. Daniels, T. Daniels, Falcon, Gupta, Muhammad Roque, Shepard, Thompson, and Greathouse in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.