



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 22, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 23, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.

REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 2, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	13-2-2

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

STAFF PRESENTATION

Sarah Stockham, staff, provided a presentation on a text amendment to update the Zoning Ordinance address development standards and non-conforming standards. Ms. Stockham discussed the summary of the text amendment, background, modernization of development standards, definitions and alternative housing types. Ms. Stockham described the current requirements and what the request includes and the new definitions and the applicability for residential zones. Ms. Stockham discussed the removal of special permits and intent of removing roadblocks in the process. Ms. Stockham stated that the text amendment is being presented to all the Village and will proceed to the Planning Commission in June.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Ms. Schmieder asked if the text amendment would be grand fathered into existing residential zones and how does this impact neighborhoods. **Ms. Stockham** responded that the applicability would be for new development subject to permitting.

Mr. Abbott asked about timing and restrictions on the time for use and would this be a temporary use that may impact surrounding developments. **Ms. Stockham** responded that the amendment would be applicable in the residential zoned districts, and it would not be limited to a temporary use.

Ms. Jurayeva asked about permitting in residential districts for alternative housing types. **Ms. Stockham** stated the text amendment change would change the requirement from a special permit to a use permit which are heard by the zoning adjustment hearing officer and is a separate process.

Mr. Paceley asked would the text amendment apply to a tiny house on the same property for family or certain conditions. **Ms. Stockham** responded that the question may be more related to an accessory unit which is different, and the underlying zoning is still applicable.

Ms. Jurayeva asked what has been the response for the proposed text amendment and has there been any feedback. Ms. Stockham stated that the information is being presented at all the Villages and what is presented is in response to what the City Council has been hearing in relation to mobile home residents who are at risk of being displaced and the availability affordable of housing.

Ms. Baumer inquired about ownership of mobile homes and does this allow alternative home parks. **Ms. Stockham** said the applicability is for mobile home and alternative homes to expand into multifamily districts, this does not create a mobile home overlay.

Ms. Schmieder asked why there is a text amendment and not zoning that is more responsive and does this really address affordable housing and equality. **Ms. Stockham** responded this would allow for offsite manufacture developments, update the standards and allow for more flexibility. Ms. Schmieder stated this seems beyond the scope of a text amendment. Ms. Stockham stated the allowance for mobile homes is in the zoning ordinance and the text amendments are updates.

Mr. O'Malley asked would this allow someone to buy an older mobile home and place it on a lot on a temporary basis. **Ms. Stockham** responded that manufactured homes would have to be approved by the state and would be subject to standards.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MOTION:

Committee member Dawn Augusta motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y. **Committee member Danny Sharaby** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

13-2-2; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y passed with Committee members Abbott, Augusta, Baumer, Beckerleg Thraen, Eichelkraut, Garcia, Grace, Langmade, Miller, Nye, Paceley, Sharaby, and Swart in favor, Committee Member Schmieder and Fischbach in opposition, and Committee Member Jurayeva, and O'Malley in abstention.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

Staff has no comments.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 11, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation with a modification
VPC Vote	5-3

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

VPC DISCUSSION:

Mr. Matteo Moric, staff, provided an overview of the proposed text amendment.

Acting Chair Trilese DiLeo said that the 10 acre or more requirement is limiting options in the City and asked if there would be a minimum acreage size.

Keith Greenburg noted he was concerned with negatively impacting house values.

Al Field stated he wanted to see when one existing trailer park area gets removed a new one could come in as an exchange and he believed there were other items to consider in addition to the value of the homes.

Will Novak liked the reduction of the acreage size requirement and asked about the artificial increase of cost due to parking requirements.

Mr. Field felt parking spaces were too small to fit a full-size vehicle.

Acting Chair DiLeo mentioned this would provide a more affordable housing option and would address the concern of a more diverse housing stock and felt this would help with the affordable housing concerns.

Ozzie Virgil stated there was no affordable housing anymore and believed this text amendment would not help anyone. **Mr. Virgil** said developers are just coming in and throwing up all these apartment complexes, and added the City needs to keep these projects out of the airlight path.

James Sutphen believed this was already going to be a done deal and brought to the Village Planning Committees as a courtesy.

Mr. Field shared that for every acre developed for these manufactured home developments another one would be taken out, and the City has municipal powers to be able to make this happen.

Acting Chair DiLeo wanted to send the message and note in the record that there are multiple dilapidated mobile home parks in need of some love.

Mr. Novak said the impetus was by GCU to find ways to relocate these homes, and to open the opportunity to build smaller five acre lots. **Mr. Novak** commented that he felt it would open more diversity and options.

Brandon Shipman recommended to eliminate the acreage and keep the special permit requirement.

Mr. Moric responded to the parking question that it's based on the size and number of bedrooms of each unit. Mr. Moric also noted the minimum size of land would be based on the development standards such as density, setbacks, and lot coverage based on the zoning district it would fall within.

Ms. Racelle Escolar, staff, stated that there may be a future text amendment related to parking, but it is not part of this text amendment. Ms. Escolar also explained how the use permit process was less cumbersome than the Special Permit, and stated the use permit process would still require a public hearing with notification but would not need to come before the Village Planning Committee, Planning Commission or City Council.

Ms. Escolar stated it was like a variance, falling under the Zoning Adjustment process and added that this would allow for more diversity in housing.

Ms. Escolar explained if land already had the appropriate multifamily or commercial zoning in place, this text amendment would allow the applicant to go through the use permit process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

MOTION:

Al Field motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation with modifications that for each new development one dilapidated parcel be removed. **Keith Greenburg** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

2-6; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation with a modification was not passed with Committee Members Field and Greenberg in favor; and Davenport, Novak, Shipman, Sutphen, Virgil and DiLeo in opposition.

MOTION:

Brandon Shipman motioned to recommend the approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation with a modification that the special permit requirement remain.
Ozzie Virgil seconded the motion.

VOTE:

5-3; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation with a modification that the special permit requirement remain passed with Committee Members Davenport, Shipman, Sutphen, Virgil and DiLeo in favor; and Field, Greenberg and Novak in opposition.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 2, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	9-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

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

STAFF PRESENTATION

Anthony Grande, staff, described the proposed text amendment and provided an overview of the purpose and intent of the request and the details of the proposed changes to the text.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Chair Bowser asked about input from stakeholders. **Mr. Grande** replied that a work group had been formed to develop the recommendations.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked about the impetus behind forming the work group and proposing the text amendment. **Mr. Grande** described concerns with displacement pressures and affordable housing.

Committee Member Reynolds asked for clarification that this proposal would allow manufactured home developments to be developed in any multifamily district. **Mr. Grande** replied that it would with a use permit.

Committee Member Dickson asked about whether use permits would be periodically reviewed. **Mr. Grande** replied that stipulations can be applied to use permit approvals on a case-by-case basis.

Committee Member Nowell noted that regulations changed in 1976 and that manufactured homes built today are different than in the past. **Mr. Grande** agreed and noted the different manufactured home types described in the presentation.

Committee Member Kollar asked for clarification that the special permit process is described as unnecessary because of the steps in the rezoning process. **Mr. Grande** stated that the rezoning process is required for special permits and that it is what is referenced as the unnecessary step. **Mr. Kollar** asked about the development standards for new manufactured home developments. **Mr. Grande** stated that they would be treated the same as multifamily developments, using the Planned Residential Development option.

Committee Member Dickson asked for clarification on the definitions. **Mr. Grande** replied that the definitions are based on industry standards.

Committee Member Nowell asked for clarification that the 10-acre minimum lot size is eliminated in this proposal and whether that means one single manufactured home could be built on a small lot. **Mr. Grande** replied that it would be possible. **Chair Bowser** noted that the zoning would need to be a multifamily district. **Mr. Grande** agreed it would only be possible in multifamily zoning districts.

Committee Member Kirkilas asked about the statement that the special permit process is unnecessary for this type of development. **Mr. Grande** replied that multifamily districts already allow multifamily housing and that requiring a special permit for manufactured homes is adding an additional step that isn't required for other forms of housing in the same district.

Vice Chair Lagrave asked about the spacing of individual homes within a development. **Mr. Grande** noted that the proposed text includes a spacing requirement.

Committee Member Kollar asked about the other text amendments mentioned in the report. **Mr. Grande** replied that one of the other text amendments would be considered as the next agenda item and that the other one is not developed yet.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

STAFF RESPONSE

None.

MOTION

Vice Chair Lagrave made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Barto** seconded the motion.

VOTE

9-0, motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, passed; Members Barto, Dickson, Israel, Kirkilas, Kollar, Nowell, Reynolds, Lagrave, and Bowser in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

REVISED
Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 1, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647 A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	14-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

STAFF PRESENTATION

John Roanhorse, staff, provided a presentation on Z-TA-2-23-Y, a text amendment to address offsite manufactured homes by creating and refining definitions in Section 202 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Roanhorse added that the changes are intended to modernize and expand housing types to address affordability and include definitions for mobile homes and park models. Mr. Roanhorse discussed the schedule for the text amendment to the Planning Commission and City Council.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE

Committee Member Matthew Jewett asked if the changes will address pedestrians and walkability in mobile home parks. **Mr. Roanhorse** responded that any changes will be subject to development standards which includes sidewalk.

Committee Member Brent Kleinman asked how many mobile parks would be impacted with the text amendment change. **Mr. Roanhorse** stated that for the purpose of the text amendment there is no inventory of mobile home parks and the changes are intended to include this housing type as an option to address housing needs.

Committee Member Rick Mahrle asked how the amended language would impact utility connections within the right-of-way. **Mr. Roanhorse** responded that utility connections would not change and if a mobile home park were to expand it would still have to follow the same requirements for utility and infrastructure access.

Committee Member Jeremy Thacker asked how does the proposed amendment change impact the Walkable Urban Code and is this different from ADU's (accessory dwelling unit). **Mr. Joshua Bednarek**, staff, stated that ADU's are different and they will be addressed in future actions and that walkability would remain part of the review as it is applicable.

Committee Member Jeremy Thacker asked with multifamily districts being included how does this request also include single family developments as well. **Mr. Bednarek** responded that the amendment addresses multifamily residential districts and removal of the special permit requirement.

Committee Member Ann Cothron stated that mobile homes are low-income and an affordable housing option for some and asked are there other options for people that will be displaced if mobile homes are no longer available. **Mr. Roanhorse** expressed that mobile homes are one housing option and the amendment is intended to allow mobile homes to continue to be residential options and the amendment will allow mobile homes to improve and possibly expand as a housing type.

Committee Member Drew Bryck asked if a special permit is not needed will a use permit include stipulations, who will make those determinations. **Mr. Bednarek** stated that design standards would be administratively reviewed by the Zoning Administrator.

Committee Member Aaron Searle thanked Joshua Bednarek for clarifying the details of the text amendment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

MOTION:

Committee Member Jayson Matthews made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y. **Committee Member Matthew Jewett** seconded to the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

14-0; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-T per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Benjamin, Bryck, Cothron, Jewett, Kleinman, Mahrle, Matthews, Picos, Procaccini, Schiller, Searles, Tedhams, Thacker, and Chair Wagner in favor, none in dissent, and none in abstention.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 16, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	6-0

VPC DISCUSSION

Staff Presentation:

Nayeli Sanchez Luna, staff, described the proposed text amendment and provided an overview of the purpose and intent of the request and the details of the proposed changes to the text. Mrs. Sanchez Luna concluded the presentation by providing staff's recommendation and the text amendment hearing dates.

Questions from the committee:

Patrick Nasser-Taylor asked if the proposal would apply to multifamily residential zoning districts. **Mrs. Sanchez Luna** confirmed that the proposal would apply to multifamily residential zoning districts and commercial districts since it would allow for multifamily development by right. **Mr. Nasser-Taylor** asked if the text amendment would override any rules established by homeowner associations. **Tricia Gomes**, Deputy Director of the Planning and Development Department, stated that the text amendment would apply to new mobile home developments. Ms. Gomes noted that it would not impact existing mobile home developments. Ms. Gomes added that a manufactured home could be placed on a single-family lot, or a subdivision could be created utilizing manufactured homes if it met all the development requirements. Ms. Gomes noted that this would apply to numerous units on one lot.

Dean Chiarelli asked what type of density could be expected while meeting setback and frontage requirements. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the existing multifamily residential zoning districts already have setback and density requirements. Ms. Gomes noted that any new mobile home development would have to meet these requirements. **Mr. Chiarelli** stated that he had concerns with the proposed language as it did not point to the multifamily development requirements. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the proposal would apply to Section 608 of the Zoning Ordinance which addresses residential zoning districts. Ms. Gomes noted that the proposal would require mobile home developments to follow planned residential development requirements within the multifamily residential zoning districts.

Public Comment:

None.

Committee Discussion:

JoAnne Jenson noted that there have been news reports where mobile home developments are sold, and people are displaced. Ms. Jenson asked if this text amendment would address this sort of displacement. **Ms. Gomes** stated that three mobile home park developments have been purchased and as a result, people will have to find alternative housing. Ms. Gomes added that the City Council has asked staff to find potential solutions and to create alternative housing types. Ms. Gomes noted these text amendments are possible solutions that Planning and Development has brought forth to create alternative housing types and to prevent displacement. Ms. Gomes stated that it doesn't change the mobile home development where some people own the mobile home but not the land. Ms. Gomes noted that there are programs to assist the residents to own the land and the mobile home. **Ms. Jenson** stated that she was in favor of affordable alternative housing.

Mr. Chiarelli stated that individuals have had issues with moving due to the complexity of a mobile home unit or the reimbursement process. Mr. Chiarelli asked if the proposed text amendment would address the programs that help with moving the mobile home unit. **Ms. Gomes** stated that the relocation programs were occurring at the State level. Ms. Gomes added that the City has looked into working with the State but that the relocation programs were not part of the text amendment.

MOTION

Patrick Nasser-Taylor made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Dean Chiarelli** seconded the motion.

VOTE

6-0, Motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, passed with Committee Members Barraza, Chiarelli, Jensen, Nasser-Taylor, Ortega, and Hurd in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 10, 2022
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION:

No quorum.

Staff comments regarding VPC Recommendation:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 11, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Meeting was cancelled
VPC Vote	Meeting was cancelled

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

None.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

Meeting was cancelled due to a lack of quorum.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	June 8, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	5-0

VPC DISCUSSION:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Zambrano provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-2-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the new definitions proposed and displayed some examples of the new definitions. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule, noting that the Planning Commission already heard this item on June 1, and that this item was supposed to be heard by the Committee last month, but was not able to be heard due to the meeting being cancelled because of a lack of quorum. Mr. Zambrano then stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from Committee:

Mr. Johnson asked about removing the Special Permit requirement. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that it would be changing it from the Special Permit process, which is a legislative process heard by the Village Planning Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council, to the Use Permit process, which is a quasi-judicial process that would still be a public hearing process upon the Zoning Hearing Officer, which could then be appealed to the Board of Adjustments and could then be appealed to the courts. Mr. Zambrano added that the intent behind changing the Special Permit process to a Use Permit process is that it is an unnecessary step that adds additional costs to these types of developments that is not required of other housing developments.

Vice Chair Ricart asked where this text amendment came from. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the text amendment is trying to address the housing shortage, housing affordability and equity for different types of housing developments.

Public Comments:

None.

Staff Response to Public Comment:

None.

Discussion:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

Vice Chair Ricart motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Johnson** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

5-0; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y passes with Committee members French, Johnson, Simon, Ricart and Read in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting May 17, 2023
Request Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote 13-0-0

VPC DISCUSSION

Mr. Klimek, staff, provided an overview of the text amendment and the staff recommendation.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION
None.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Members Freeman and **O'Hara** expressed support for the text amendment. **Chair Jaramillo** expressed support also.

Committee Member Larson asked for confirmation that this pertains to ownership products rather than rentals. **Mr. Klimek** responded that the city does not regulate based on ownership or rental and that these housing types could conceivably be either.

Committee Member Perez asked if it is possible for someone to rezone a parcel to one of the districts that would newly permit these product types. **Mr. Klimek** responded that it is unlikely but technically possible if the applicant were to successfully navigate a full public rezoning process and then a public use permit process.

PUBLIC COMMENTS
None.

APPLICANT RESPONSE
None.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED

MOTION:

Committee Member Perez made a motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member O'Hara** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE: 13-0-0, motion to approve Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee Members Alauria, Freeman, Larson, Matthews, McBride, O'Connor, O'Hara, Perez, Member Veidmark Whitney, Wiedoff, Vice Chair Fogelson, and Chair Jaramillo in favor; none in opposition, and none abstaining.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 1, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	12-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

Staff Presentation:

Adrian Zambrano, staff, provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-2-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the new definitions proposed and displayed some examples of the new definitions. Mr. Zambrano shared the proposed refined definitions and described the proposed changes. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule and stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from the Committee:

Chair Popovic asked if the intent of deleting the 10-acre minimum requirement was for infill lots and smaller developments. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the majority of existing mobile home parks throughout the City are less than 10 acres in size. **Chair Popovic** asked if the mobile home parks could be converted to a tiny home or shipping container community. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, adding that additional units could also be added if there is enough room.

Ms. Sepic clarified that a park model, per the definition, is a trailer type unit not to exceed 400 square feet that is primarily designed to provide temporary living quarters for recreational, camping, or seasonal uses. Ms. Sepic stated that this definition, in her opinion, does not meet affordable housing criteria. Ms. Sepic recommended that tiny homes should not be lumped together with the park model definition nor shipping containers built for residential use with the modular home definition. Ms. Sepic stated that she believes a park model is more of a hotel concept which could be within commercial areas. Ms. Sepic stated that the park model definition sounds like it would

be for camping and recreational vehicles whereas mobile homes and modular homes are meant for long-term living.

Sarah Stockham, staff, stated that park model is meant for units of 400 square feet or less in size that are on wheels, which includes tiny homes.

Ms. Sepic stated that the request is to have these in any type of residential zoning. **Ms. Stockham** clarified that it would only be allowed in all multifamily zoning districts. **Ms. Sepic** stated that it was also proposed in C-1, C-2 and C-3 districts. **Ms. Stockham** clarified that those are the commercial zoning districts which allow multifamily residential development by-right. **Ms. Sepic** stated that she believes the park model type, specifically, should only be allowed in the commercial zoning districts.

Mr. Mazza asked if she believes that because it is temporary housing. **Ms. Sepic** responded affirmatively. **Ms. Sepic** stated that she believes the request needs to be changed since the park model is more of a hotel use since it is not meant for long-term living.

Ms. Stockham stated that tiny homes do not have to be temporary. **Ms. Sepic** stated that they are temporary while on wheels, and then get taken off the wheels, since they are built somewhere else off-site and then transported to the site.

Mr. Mazza stated that the confusing part is the existing language because it says it is primarily for temporary living quarters. **Mr. Mazza** asked for clarification if it would apply to permanent residences as well. **Ms. Stockham** responded affirmatively, noting that they could be made as shipping containers or tiny homes, and that the intent is to establish these terms.

Mr. Goodhue stated that many years ago, park models found their way into mobile home parks, so there were enforcement issues since they were meant for temporary living quarters, whereas modular and mobile homes were meant for long-term living quarters. **Mr. Goodhue** stated that the City integrated this into the Zoning Ordinance and that the proposal appears to be blending in tiny homes into the existing definition since it is a newer trend. **Mr. Goodhue** stated that originally, park models were temporary mobile homes that were brought in and out, but things are changing. **Mr. Goodhue** stated that he is concerned with the safety of the structures and that they need to be inspected ahead of time before they reach the site. **Mr. Goodhue** asked what assurance the City has that these units would be labeled by the State as a park model, modular home or manufactured home. **Ms. Stockham** responded that she believes they are already required to have an inspection off-site and that it has to be approved by the State regardless.

Chair Popovic asked if the committee could add stipulations to the case.

Mr. Goodhue stated that these structures are exempt from City permits other than the electric meter. **Mr. Goodhue** stated that the State inspects the structures and that they would have to be certified and approved by the State. **Mr. Goodhue** was concerned that

tiny homes may be manufactured in people's garages and then transported somewhere else. Mr. Goodhue wanted to ensure that inspection processes exist. **Ms. Stockham** responded that manufactured homes have to come through the Arizona Department of Housing approved list. **Mr. Goodhue** responded that he was more concerned with tiny homes, since someone could build a tiny home less than 400 square feet, tow it on the back of a truck and place it on a piece of property. **Ms. Stockham** responded that staff could ask if tiny homes are required to go through the same process and get that information back to the Committee.

Ms. Sepic stated that she was also concerned with bus conversions and camper vans. Ms. Sepic asked if the use permit versus the special permit deviates for the types of homes that are affixed or if all types are required to go through the process regardless of if they are affixed or not. Mr. Zambrano responded that the manufactured home development would require a use permit and include all the types of homes. **Mr. Zambrano** stated that mobile homes are permitted by-right on single-family lots in subdivisions, subject to the single-family design guidelines. **Ms. Sepic** asked if the design guidelines include ensuring they are affixed. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that he believed they do.

Mr. Goodhue stated that modular homes are allowed on single-family lots and manufactured homes and mobile homes have to go into a park. **Ms. Sepic** responded that they still have to be affixed. **Mr. Goodhue** responded that the affixed ones are modular homes, and the other ones are not.

Ms. Sepic was concerned with allowing these additional types if some were affixed and some were not.

Ms. Stockham stated that the difference between a special permit and a use permit is that a special permit is like a rezoning case that goes to the Village Planning Committee, Planning Commission and City Council and ends up with an ordinance which is legislative, whereas a use permit is also a public meeting but is heard by the Zoning Adjustment Hearing Officer and can be appealed to the Board of Adjustment, and is a quasi-judicial process so it can end up being appealed to the courts.

Mr. Goodhue stated that he does not see a major difference with the definitions and has no concerns as long as they are checked by the State.

Mr. Wise asked for clarification that the proposal is revising the definitions and is not related to a specific development but is rather defining it for the future. **Ms. Stockham** responded affirmatively, adding that it is also eliminating the 10-acre minimum requirement, changing it from the special permit process to the use permit process, and changing it from being allowed in R-2 and R-3 to being allowed in all the multifamily residence zoning districts and commercial zoning districts. Ms. Stockham clarified that this would not be allowed in single-family zoning districts, such as R1-6, and if someone wanted to do this in a single-family zoning district, they would still need to go through the rezoning process to rezone to one of the allowable districts.

Public Comment

None.

Staff Response:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

Mr. Wise motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Mr. Goodhue** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

12-1; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation, passes with Committee members Bowman, Bustamante, DeMoss, Gerst, Goodhue, Gubser, Hall, Mazza, Soronson, Wise, Mortensen and Popovic in favor and Committee member Sepic opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 9, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Continued
VPC Vote	6-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

MOTION:

Jeff Riederer motioned to continue Z-TA-2-23-Y to the next Rio Vista Village Planning Committee meeting date. **Massimo Sommacampagna** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

6-0; motion to continue Z-TA-2-23-Y to the next Rio Vista Village Planning Committee meeting date passes with Committee members Holton, Riederer, Scharboneau, Sommacampagna, Virgil and Lawrence in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

The committee members continued the item because the meeting facility was closing and there was no time to hear the case.

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	June 13, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	4-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Staff Presentation:

Mr. Zambrano provided an overview of text amendment case Z-TA-2-23-Y, describing the request and the purpose and intent of the request. Mr. Zambrano shared the new definitions proposed and displayed some examples of the new definitions. Mr. Zambrano shared the proposed refined definitions and described the proposed changes. Mr. Zambrano shared the upcoming hearing schedule, noting that the Planning Commission already heard and voted on the item on June 1, and that the Committee was supposed to hear and vote on this item last month but had to continue it due to time constraints. Mr. Zambrano then stated that staff recommends approval per the language in Exhibit A of the staff report.

Questions from the Committee:

Vice Chair Ferreira asked about the Park Model definition being defined for temporary living quarters. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the definition is worded like that because the homes are built off-site and then transported to the location where it will be placed.

Mr. Virgil stated that it is considered temporary as long as it is movable.

Mr. Zambrano added that these homes would typically still be on a chassis but would have skirting around the bottom to screen it.

Chair Lawrence added that it would not be considered permanent because the home would not be bolted to a foundation.

Mr. Sommacampagna asked what the difference is between a Special Permit and a Use Permit. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that a Special Permit is a legislative process similar to the rezoning process that require public hearings by the Village Planning Committee, Planning Commission, and City Council, whereas the Use Permit process is a quasi-judicial process that would only be heard by the Zoning Hearing Officer, and then could be appealed to the Board of Adjustments, and then to the courts.

Chair Lawrence asked for clarification that the City is trying to simplify the process and make it easier for developers to build mobile home parks with smaller modular homes.

Mr. Zambrano responded affirmatively, indicating that the text amendment would allow different types of housing products that are not currently addressed in the Zoning Ordinance, and that it would allow these types of developments to be built within all multifamily and commercial zoning districts, subject to a Use Permit, which is a less complicated and less burdensome process than the Special Permit process, which is not required of other types of housing developments. **Chair Lawrence** asked if the site plan and elevations would still be reviewed during that process. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, adding that the text amendment would also create new development standards that new mobile home parks would need to comply with, which would all be reviewed during the Use Permit process.

Mr. Sommacampagna asked what the Planning Commission voted. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that the Planning Commission recommended approval, per the staff recommendation, by an 8-0 vote.

Vice Chair Perreira stated that he believes there needs to be a more intensive permitting process for shipping container homes. Vice Chair Perreira stated that they should only be located in certain areas. **Mr. Zambrano** responded that nearby neighbors would still have an opportunity to provide input on a new mobile home park through the Use Permit process, indicating that notification of the public hearing would still be sent out to surrounding neighbors.

Chair Lawrence asked for clarification that the ultimate goal would be to align and simplify the permitting process for tiny homes with the permitting process of typical residential developments. **Mr. Zambrano** responded affirmatively, adding that a Use Permit would still be required, and that the text amendment would also create new development standards for these types of developments, and would allow new types of housing products that are not currently in the Zoning Ordinance.

Public Comments:

None.

Staff Response:

None.

MOTION – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

Mr. Sommacampagna motioned to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y, per the staff recommendation. **Chair Lawrence** seconded the motion.

VOTE – Z-TA-2-23-Y:

4-0; motion to recommend approval of Z-TA-2-23-Y per the staff recommendation passes with Committee members Sommacampagna, Virgil, Perreira and Lawrence in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-TA-2-23-Y

Date of VPC Meeting	May 9, 2023
Request	Amend Chapter 6, Section 647.A.2.k of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance regarding mobile home developments
VPC Recommendation	No quorum
VPC Vote	No quorum

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

No quorum.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

None.