



## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary Z-6-22-2

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	May 3, 2022
<b>Request From</b>	S-1
<b>Request To</b>	R1-10, R-2, and R-3A
<b>Proposed Use</b>	Single-family and multifamily residential
<b>Location</b>	Approximately 2,400 feet southwest of the southwest corner of Cave Creek Road and Jomax Road
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Approval
<b>VPC Vote</b>	6-3

### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*Cases GPA-DSTV-1-22-2 and Z-6-22-2 were heard concurrently.*

*One request to speak in favor and nine requests to speak in opposition were made for this request.*

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a combined presentation for companion cases GPA-DSTV-1-22-2 and Z-6-22-2. Mr. Grande provided an overview of the location of the request and summarized the General Plan Land Use Map designation and proposed amendment, noting that staff recommends approval of the GPA. He described the surrounding land uses and zoning, the proposed zoning districts, and the proposed development, noting the unit counts in each portion and certain aspects of the open space and trails to be provided. He summarized the community input and the staff findings, noting that the staff recommends approval of the rezoning with stipulations.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** asked about the setback from Cave Creek Road. **Mr. Grande** replied that it is 140 feet from the property line, which would be 205 feet from the centerline of the street.

**Benjamin Tate**, representative with Withey Morris, summarized the history of the property, existing zoning, and surrounding land uses. He described the details of the proposal, including the housing product types, network of proposed trails, the hillside dedication to the city, the maintenance of the existing wash as a natural resource, and the landscaping and shade aspects of the proposal. He described the existing densities in the surrounding area, which he stated are comparable to the density of the

applicant's proposed development. He described the transportation aspects of the project, including dedicating right-of-way for Cave Creek Road, a new traffic signal at the intersection with Cave Creek Road, and the connections with the existing stub streets.

### **Committee Questions**

**Chair Bowser** asked whether the lots on the western edge are hillside lots. **Mr. Tate** replied that there would be no hillside lots in the development.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated that he believes the proposal fits with the surrounding area, but that he is concerned with the lots directly adjacent to the existing R1-18 zoning district. **Mr. Tate** stated that the site plan concentrates a significant amount of open space along that edge of the development to create a buffer and that the development has an appropriate density gradient.

**Committee Member Powell** asked if the developer would be widening Cave Creek Road to three southbound lanes and if there would be a change to the northbound lanes. **Mr. Tate** replied that the developer would be widening the southbound side to three lanes, but that the northbound lanes would be up to a future developer on the east side of Cave Creek Road.

**Committee Member Nowell** asked about the stipulated bus stop and if there was bus service along Cave Creek Road today. **Mr. Tate** replied that he didn't believe there was existing bus service on that corridor but that it is likely stipulated because of the potential for future service.

**Committee Member Hankins** asked about the dam to the north of the project and the remote-control air strip on the other side of the dam. **Chair Bowser** noted that the question about the dam was not a land use issue. **Mr. Tate** replied that the remote-control air strip doesn't require notification, but that they would disclose the existence of the air strip to future residents. **Chair Bowser** agreed that it is better to disclose it.

**Mr. Powell** asked if the apartments would have electric vehicle charging stations installed. **Mr. Tate** stated that they would be provided, as this is now considered an expectation in luxury buildings.

**Committee Member Israel** asked about the community outreach conducted. **Mr. Tate** replied that they had conducted the required notifications and neighborhood meetings and had individual conversations with neighbors to address concerns.

**Mr. Israel** asked if the 3-story buildings would have elevators and what the cost for electric vehicle charging would be. **Mr. Tate** replied that the buildings would be walk-ups and that the electric vehicle charging cost to the tenants is minimal and only covers the cost of the electricity, not generating profit for the developer.

**Mr. Nowell** asked about the density when the hillside area is subtracted from the calculation. **Mr. Tate** replied that it would be 4.25 units per acre. **Mr. Nowell** followed up by asking if it made more sense to be less dense closer to the preserve. **Mr. Tate** agreed and stated that the development provides its largest lots and lowest densities along the edge of the preserve, creating a desirable density gradient between the eastern and western edges of the property.

### **Public Comments**

**Denny Hasenbank** introduced himself and stated that he had moved to the neighborhood because of the larger lots and that 80 percent of the residents are opposed to the development. He stated that the development economics doesn't work out without the apartment component and that he is concerned about the minimal architectural styling and the effect of the development on surrounding property values.

**Robert Funk** introduced himself and stated that adding 400 rental units is a problem, as it would result in over 1,000 people living there. He stated that residents of this area want single-family housing, noting that residents have made comments about infrastructure and schools. He stated he wants to enjoy the lower density of the area.

**Jeff Karau** introduced himself and stated that he was concerned about the connecting streets, which require a half-mile drive within the existing subdivision. He stated that he suggests removing the stub street connections. He further stated that there are no three-story buildings along this stretch of Cave Creek Road and that he believes the height is a problem.

**William Langdon** introduced himself and asked about floodplain issues and stated concerns about traffic on Hillstone Way. He asked whether a new development would be on the adjacent hillside area. He stated that traffic on Cave Creek Road is a problem and that there is too much density in the area. He further stated concerns about schools.

**Joe Abrahamson** introduced himself and stated that the density is getting too high in this area. He stated that he didn't move to this area to have apartments nearby and that they didn't need those types of buildings in this area.

**Marcy Mevorach** introduced herself and stated that the population is growing and Phoenix needs to accommodate the growth with new development. She stated that the existing communities also had to clear vacant land, noting that eventually every piece of land will be developed. She stated that she believes the developer is proposing a good product.

**Mead Summer** introduced himself and stated that the community had argued against the three-story request for the other multifamily development in this area and the committee agreed to limit it to two stories. He stated that Cave Creek Road has a lot of traffic and it's not safe to add more, further stating concern about the stub street

connections to the existing subdivision.

**Lauren Prole** introduced herself and stated that she is concerned about the density of the proposal and that Desert Peak Parkway already has a lot of traffic. She stated that the roads are getting busier and unsafe for children. She stated that she believes schools are an issue as well.

**Brian Wilson** introduced himself and stated he was concerned with the connections to the stub streets into the existing subdivision, which doesn't add value to the existing residents since the new development would be gated. He stated that it would be an expense to the existing community to take down fencing.

**Z. Prole** introduced himself and stated that he is concerned about the traffic generated from the proposed project.

**Chair Bowser** stated that it was important to note the correct information about the schools in the area and that the schools are under capacity.

### **Applicant Response**

**Benjamin Tate** stated that the development is driven by what the General Plan calls for, not simply economics. He stated that the connection to the stub streets is not driven by the developer, rather by requirements of the Street Transportation Department, and that the applicant would work with the City to see if they can make the connections emergency only. He stated the development team had a meeting with the school superintendent to discuss school needs and that there was no need for a new school since the school are not at capacity. He stated that the vast majority of the traffic from the site will be southbound and that the multifamily buildings will be over a mile from any of the homes in the existing subdivision, where neighbors have concerns.

### **Committee Discussion**

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated that the committee tries to keep the zoning similar to the surrounding area and that the proposal fits. He stated that adding people will drive demand for new commercial uses and that he understood the desire to limit the development to two stories.

**Chair Bowser** stated that the grade of Cave Creek Road is another factor to consider.

### **MOTION – Z-6-22-2**

**Vice Chair Lagrave** made a motion to recommend approval of Z-6-22-2 per the staff recommendation. **Committee Member Santoro** seconded the motion.

### **VOTE**

**6-3**, motion to recommend approval per staff recommendation passed; Members Dean, Hankins, Powell, Santoro, Lagrave, and Bowser in favor; Members Israel, Nowell and

Reynolds against.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

None.