



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-5-20-7

Date of VPC Meeting	December 15, 2020 November 17, 2020 (Continuance)
Request From	A-1 SP (Light Industrial, Special Permit) (3.66 acres)
Request To	A-1 (Light Industrial) (3.66 acres)
Proposed Use	Light industrial uses, including a dispatch office with heavy truck parking
Location	Southwest corner of 32nd Drive and Jackson Street
VPC Recommendation	Continued to January 19, 2021
VPC Vote	7-0, motion passed; None in dissent.

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

Two requests to speak in opposition from members of the public were received before the meeting on this agenda item.

Mr. Bojorquez, staff, provided a presentation on the request. He discussed the location of the site, existing context, and surrounding zoning districts. He discussed the 2015 General Plan and Estrella Village Plan, noting that the property was designed as industrial and residential in both of these policy documents. The conceptual site plan was shown, and he indicated the location of a single building, parking areas and site access. He concluded the presentation by providing an overview of the stipulations presented in the staff report.

Mr. Milos Minic, with Integrated Design, introduced himself as the representative for the owner and introduced the project as a dispatch office with heavy truck parking. He showed an aerial imagery of the site and discussed the existing zoning in the area. He discussed the existing conditions on the site which is presently vacant and used as an illegal dumping ground. A landscape plan was shown and he discussed the landscaping buffer being proposed along the north property line. A summary of the neighborhood outreach was provided and images were shown indicating the site access along Jackson Street and 33rd Avenue. An application was submitted to the railroad company to have a private crossing south of the site across the railroad tracks. He is in agreement with all of the staff stipulations and discussed the opposition to the site from an existing property owner, La Canasta, who operates a tortilla manufacturing facility east of this site, including large delivery trucks. He showed a rendering of the site along Jackson

Street depicting what the site could look like in terms of enhanced landscaping along there and concluded his presentation.

Chairwoman Perez asked for comments from the public.

Ms. Josie Ippolito, with La Canasta, introduced herself and stated that she is in opposition to this case due to health and safety concerns for both residents of the area and employees of La Canasta. She is concerned with increased traffic and diminished property values. She discussed the letter dated November 12, 2020 that she submitted. She is concerned with traffic patterns around La Canasta and a nearby school.

Mr. Joseph Nicosia, with La Canasta, introduced himself and clarified the size of the trucks used by La Canasta as described by the applicant. He stated that there are lots of on-street parking and traffic along Jackson Street which will lead to issues for this user. He discussed other issues with allowing this use in the area, including concerns with commuters.

Chairwoman Perez asked for questions and discussion from the committee.

Ms. Wallace lives in the area and has numerous concerns with this project. Her questions for the applicant are:

- Which organizations did you contact as part of your outreach?
- Would you consider a community garden in your project site instead of a landscape "wall" along Jackson Street?

Mr. Kevin Danzeisen asked of the site is mostly used for parking and how many companies will be operating from there.

Mr. Minic responded that his intent is to screen the uses on the site with landscaping to minimize the view for residents living across Jackson Street. He added that most of the site is used for parking and the property owner purchased this property to move his company from another site he is using.

Mr. Danzeisen stated that he is not supportive of this case.

Chairwoman Perez asked for clarification on the existing zoning for the site.

Mr. Bojorquez, staff, responded that the site is zoned Light Industrial with a Special Permit which only allows for a cemetery.

Mr. Cardenas asked for clarification on the outreach conducted, including to the nearby school and La Canasta. He also asked if door-to-door outreach was conducted.

Ms. Wallace stated that she is concerned with air and light pollution related to this project and asked for clarification on the outreach conducted to the local school.

Mr. Minic discussed the neighborhood outreach conducted including the neighborhood meetings, where two individuals were present. He stated that an

invitation to meet was sent to La Canasta, but they were not able to meet. The notification process required by the City of Phoenix was followed, including notification to property owners within 600 feet of the site and Spanish translated notification letters.

Chairwoman Perez discussed the required City of Phoenix notification requirements.

Mr. Cardenas stated that all comments are important and encouraged going above the city required notification standards.

Mr. Minic discussed above and beyond elements incorporated into the site. He is willing to go above and beyond the outreach requirements.

Ms. Wallace is mainly concerned with impacts to existing residents but is also concerned with the lack of engagement with the neighbors. She also does not see a community benefit of having this large parking surface which adds to the heat island effect in the area.

Mr. Minic stated that the proposed zoning is consistent with existing zoning patterns in the area. He added that there are measures to reduce heat from parking surfaces that can be looked into. The proposed trucking company is often seeking new employees and could offer job opportunities to existing residents in the area.

Ms. Wallace has remaining concerns.

Chairwoman Perez stated that a cemetery on the subject site would not be an improvement to the area. She is concerned with having a cemetery across the street from existing homes and La Canasta.

Mr. Cardenas disagrees with Chairwoman Perez and the proposed use is also not an improvement in the area due to potential increased lead levels, dust, light pollution. A cemetery would not pollute the area.

Ms. Cartwright has family members who are buried in the adjacent cemetery and does not support having a parking lot next door.

Mr. Minic stated that site elements could be incorporated to buffer light industrial and residential uses. The site and existing area are presently zoned industrial.

Mr. Cardenas stated that industrial zoning is not appropriate at this location as the area experiences the highest rates of asthma and birth mortality.

Chairwoman Perez asked for further discussion or a motion.

Mr. Bojorquez, staff, clarified some of the possible motions that can be made:

- Motion to deny;
- Motion to approve per the staff recommendation;
- Motion to approve per the staff recommendation with additional or modified stipulations;

- Motion to continue the case to a future meeting date;

Mr. Minic asked for clarification on what committee members wish to see from the project if the project is continued.

Mr. Cardenas stated that the applicant does not seem to be inclined for a continuance of this case.

Mr. Danzeisen stated that he would support a continuance of this case to allow the applicant more time to try and gather more community support.

Mr. Minic is not opposed to continuing this case but notes the multiple community meetings held to date with little public engagement.

Mr. Cardenas is not opposed to continuing the case but feels the applicant may not support further community outreach. Only individuals who are in opposition to this case are present tonight and every voice in the community is important.

Chairwoman Perez asked for a motion on this case.

MOTION:

Ms. Cartwright motioned to continue case Z-5-20-7 to the January 19, 2021 Estrella Village Planning Committee meeting. **Mr. Cardenas** seconded the motion to continue.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE:

7-0, motion passed; None in dissent.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

No comments.