

Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-148-24-8

Date of VPC Meeting February 4, 2025

Request From R1-6
Request To R-3A

Proposal Single-family attached residential

Location Approximately 530 feet east of the southeast corner of

34th Street and Windsor Avenue

VPC Recommendation Approval, per the staff recommendation

VPC Vote 13-1

VPC DISCUSSION:

Committee Members Abbott, Beckerleg Thraen, and Guevar joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 14 members.

Five members of the public registered to speak on this item, three in support, one in opposition, and one neutral.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Anthony Grande, staff, provided a presentation summarizing the surrounding context, the proposed zoning district, and the staff recommendation, including the recommended stipulations.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Jerry Palmer, representing the applicant with Palmer Architects, Ltd., provided a presentation regarding the proposal, highlighting the details of the proposed site plan, parking, and landscaping and noting the reduced unit count and other modifications made in response to feedback from the neighborhood.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Committee Member Guevar asked for the height of proposed buildings at the highest point. **Mr. Palmer** replied it will be 28 feet.

Committee Member Grace asked about the price for the homes. **Mr. Palmer** replied the target price is in the mid-400s to low-500s.

Camelback East Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary February 4, 2025 Z-148-24-8 Page 2 of 3

Committee Member Whitesell asked for confirmation that there would be no landscape setback on the east and west perimeters and asked about trash and recycling, including bulk trash pickup. Mr. Palmer replied that there would be no landscape setback provided on the perimeter, which is the only variance requested for this project, but that landscaping would be located within the private courtyards, rather than along the property line, adding that trash and recycling will be City of Phoenix curbside pickup along the internal private driveway, although it is not determined how bulk trash pickup will be handled.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chelsea Alfaro introduced herself as the President of the Rudyville Neighborhood Association and spoke in opposition to the request, stating that the neighbors would like more time to work with the developer on the proposal due to concerns about the number of units for this size of a site and issues with the surrounding streets that will be impacted.

Jill Blewett introduced herself and spoke in support of the request, expressing support for the reduction to 18 units and the fact that this project will be homeownership, while also noting a preference that the project not be gated.

Morgan Sailor introduced herself and spoke in support of the request, stating that it would be good to have this high-quality development at this location, rather than the empty lot, and that the number of units is not a concern.

Lee Busenbark introduced herself and provided neutral comments about the request, stating that the community needs more of this type of project in this area, but the lack of landscaping on the perimeters and any detached sidewalks is a concern, also noting a preference that it not be gated.

Bryan Krizek introduced himself as the owner of the property and spoke in support of the request, providing background information that the non-profit purchased the property but was not able to make use of the existing homes, so they changed the plan to rezone and build a different product.

Chelsea Alfaro stated that the community wants something in that space, but needs more time to review the proposal with the developer.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Mr. Palmer stated that he had spoken with many members of the community and did not see a lot of opposition, but the applicant has addressed the concerns that were raised as much as they could.

Committee Member Siegel asked about the width of the driveway. **Mr. Palmer** confirmed the driveway will be 24 feet wide.

Camelback East Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary February 4, 2025 Z-148-24-8 Page 3 of 3

Committee Member Grace suggested keeping the gates open during the day. **Ms. Siegel** asked for clarification if there would be pedestrian gates. **Mr. Palmer** stated the pedestrian access points would be gated, adding that the applicant team is open to keeping the gates open during the day. **Chair Fischbach** stated he does not recommend a stipulation related to keeping the gate open during the day.

Committee Member Whitesell asked about the rationale for not stipulating general conformance to the site plan, whether the SFI option allowed for more units, and how much time it would take the developer to obtain building permits. Mr. Grande replied that staff does not recommend general conformance to a site plan when the site plan requires variances, that the SFI option is not about gaining more density, but rather how the units are arranged on the site, and that the permitting process can be variable. Mr. Whitesell suggested adding a stipulation requiring the developer to construct the development within a certain timeframe. Chair Fischbach stated that such a stipulation would not be within the Committee's purview and would be unenforceable.

MOTION:

Committee Member Beckerleg Thraen made a motion to recommend approval of Z-148-24-8, per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Sharaby** seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION:

Committee Member Sharaby stated that this will be a great project for the neighborhood and is voting yes.

Committee Member Whitesell stated that for the overall project, the positives outweigh the negatives, and he is voting yes.

Vice Chair Paceley stated that this a good project and a good example of where the neighborhood should be going, and he is voting yes.

VOTE:

13-1; motion to recommend approval of Z-148-24-8, per the staff recommendation, passed; Committee Members Abbott, Beckerleg Thraen, Grace, Guevar, Jurayeva, McClelland, Sharaby, Siegel, Swart, Whitesell, Williams, Paceley, and Fischbach in favor; Committee Member Eichelkraut opposed.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:

None.