



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-60-21-6

Date of VPC Meeting	December 7, 2021
Request From	R1-6 (Single-Family Residence District) and R-3 (Multifamily Residence District)
Request To	R-3 (Multifamily Residence District)
Proposed Use	Multifamily residential
Location	Approximately 65 feet west of the southwest corner of 40th Street and Monterosa Street
VPC Recommendation	Approval per the staff recommendation with a modification
VPC Vote	15-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

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 explained that the request covers three current residential lots, two of which are already zoned R-3 (Multifamily Residence District). The request is to rezone one lot that is zoned R1-6 (Single-Family Residence District) to the same R-3 zoning as the other two lots. At staff's request, the applicant agreed to include all three lots to facilitate stipulating the entire site for improvements. She then presented the proposed site plan and elevations, noting the compatibility in scale and character with the surrounding neighborhood. She stated that the proposal will provide a transition from the commercial uses to the south to the residential neighborhood to the north. **Ms. Mastikhina** then presented the staff recommendation for approval, along with the recommended stipulations.

Mr. Brian Greathouse, representative with Burch & Crachiolo, provided an overview of the request, noting that they had agreed to include all three lots in the rezoning request to ensure transparency with the community as well as to allow staff to stipulate improvements such as landscaping and walkability throughout the entire site. He explained that the two lots zoned for multifamily are currently vacant and the previous buildings were demolished approximately five years ago. He then noted that the existing single-family residence on the third lot is uninhabitable and in no condition to sell or rent. He then explained that this site is in an interesting location, with a dentist office to the east and restaurants and a parking lot to the south, and that he believes the proposed townhomes are an appropriate transitional land use. He stated that the

building elevations were designed by local architect Jason Comer, and that the interior will be designed by Joel Contreras, both of whom have designed high quality development projects throughout the city. He then presented conceptual renderings of the project, noting the unique architecture and walkability and pedestrian-friendliness. He addressed some community concerns that arose through the process. The first was regarding on-street parking, to which he replied that each unit will have two designated parking spaces in a carport in the rear of the site, so residents will not have a need to park on Monterosa Avenue. The second concern was that they were proposing to rezone all three lots to allow townhomes, to which he clarified that only one lot will effectively be rezoned, while the other two already have the multifamily designation. He then presented the proposed floor plans of the units and asked if the committee had any questions.

Dawn Augusta asked if there had been any consideration or traffic study of the current access conditions to the rear alley, noting that northbound turns would exacerbate already problematic traffic patterns. **Greathouse** replied that due to the small increase in permissible units, a traffic study was not conducted nor was it required by the city.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Geoff Mathieux, neighborhood resident, expressed his support for the proposal, stating that the high-quality design and pedestrian-friendliness will add value to the neighborhood and that it will provide a buffer from the parking areas to the south.

William Jay Lichtsinn stated that the vacant lots have been used for overflow parking for the adjacent businesses and expressed concern that this overflow parking will now take place along the street, inconveniencing the neighborhood. **Greathouse** replied that the property owner has worked with the Police Department to address the illegal parking and homeless encampments for months, and that there is already overflow parking on the street from the dentist and restaurants. He stated that the townhomes will not change this condition, as they cannot monitor public streets where there are no parking restrictions.

Chair Swart stated that there was a case on 40th Street and Indian School Road with the same concern, which is that the expansion of the business there would exacerbate on-street parking. However, those property owners did not have any control over public streets, much like in this case. He stated that this will force the city to address long-overdue issues with on-street parking issues.

MOTION:

Vic Grace made a motion to approve this case per the staff recommendation. **Chair Swart** requested an amendment to the motion to include a modification to increase the required number of bicycle parking space from two to eight. **Grace** accepted the amendment. **Ashley Nye** seconded the motion.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Chair Swart offered to help the applicant with parking and safety enforcement in the area, as he is very involved with these matters.

Augusta expressed her support for the multifamily rezoning but reiterated her concern with northbound traffic on 40th Street attempting to turn left into the alley where the parking is located, as the turn area coincides with the left turn lane onto Indian School

Road. She asked that the applicant look into a different parking arrangement, as this will create problems. **Chair Swart** asked staff if the Street Transportation Department had provided feedback on this case. **Mastikhina** stated that the only comment from that department was regarding paving of the alley.

Christina Eichelkraut asked that the applicant address a question brought up by resident Pam MacMillan in her letters to the city regarding if there will be individual back yards in the rear that residents can spend time in, instead of being on their street-facing balconies. The resident's concern was privacy intrusion into the single-family homes to the north of the project. She then stated that she has no problems with the proposal, but simply wanted to ensure that all community questions and concerns were addressed. **Greathouse** stated that the rear yard will be commonly held and will have seating and barbecue areas for resident use.

Nye seconded committee member Augusta's concern regarding the northbound turn into the alley and asked that the applicant work with the Street Transportation Department to address this concern and come up with an alternative access solution. She also mentioned that there is an avid biking community in this area and that residents will likely receive guests who bike to the property. She suggested that additional bicycle parking spaces be provided in the common area to accommodate this. **Greathouse** stated that his client is happy to add more bicycle parking spaces.

Grace stated that, based on Google aerials, it looks like the previous structures on the site had a carport along the alley, so parking in that area was present before.

VOTE:

15-0; Motion passes with committee members Swart, Fischbach, Abbott, Augusta, Bayless, Czerwinski, Eichelkraut, Grace, McKee, Miller, Nye, O'Malley, Paceley, Rush, and Sharaby in favor.

STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION & STIPULATIONS:

The Camelback East Village Planning Committee recommended approval of the case per the staff recommendation with a modification to Stipulation No. 7 to increase the number of bicycle parking spaces provided.

The following stipulations incorporate the changes approved by the Camelback East Village Planning Committee on December 7, 2021 with modifications in bold text:

1. The development shall be in general conformance with the elevations date stamped September 2, 2021, with specific regard to the following and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. There shall be a maximum building height of 2 stories and 30 feet.
 - b. Individual entryways on front (Monterosa) elevation shall be clearly identifiable as the primary pedestrian access for residential units.
2. The developer shall construct a minimum 5-foot-wide public sidewalk along the south side of Monterosa Street, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.

3. The primary entryways into residential units shall face Monterosa Street. These entryways shall incorporate a patio or seating court area, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
4. The required landscape setback along Monterosa Street shall include minimum 3-inch caliper single-trunk large canopy shade trees planted 20 feet on center or in equivalent groupings, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Five, five-gallon shrubs per tree, and additional shrubs or live groundcover shall provide minimum 75 percent live cover at maturity, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
5. A minimum 10-foot landscape setback shall be required along the west and east property lines. These areas shall be planted with minimum 2-inch caliper shade trees placed 20 feet on center or in equivalent groupings, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
6. All uncovered surface parking lot areas shall be landscaped with minimum 2-inch caliper drought-tolerant shade trees. Landscaping shall be dispersed throughout the parking area and achieve 25 percent shade at maturity, as approved by Planning and Development Department. Shade may be provided with a combination of trees and structural shade.
7. A minimum of ~~two~~ **EIGHT** bicycle parking spaces shall be provided through Inverted U and/or artistic racks located on the southwest portion of the site, to the north of the pedestrian entry gate depicted on the site plan date stamped September 2, 2021. These parking spaces shall be installed per the requirements of Section 1307.H. of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Artistic racks shall adhere to the City of Phoenix Preferred Designs in Appendix K of the Comprehensive Bicycle Master Plan.
8. Clearly defined, accessible pedestrian pathways shall be provided to connect building entrances and public sidewalks, using the most direct route for pedestrians, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
9. Where pedestrian pathways cross drive aisles, they shall be constructed of decorative pavers, stamped or colored concrete, or other pavement treatments that visually contrast with the adjacent parking and drive aisle surfaces, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
10. The developer shall provide 20 feet of paving per the local street requirements for the alley from the western boundary of the property to 40th Street, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
11. The developer shall construct all streets within and adjacent to the development with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, landscaping and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with the current ADA Guidelines.
12. The developer shall grant and record an avigation easement to the City of Phoenix for the site, per the content and form prescribed by the City Attorney prior to final site plan approval.

13. The developer shall provide a No Hazard Determination for the proposed development from the FAA pursuant to the FAA's Form-7460 obstruction analysis review process, prior to construction permit approval, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department.
14. The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of Phoenix Sky Harbor Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.
15. 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.