



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary
Z-47-21-4

Date of VPC Meeting	September 28, 2021
Request From	C-3 (General Commercial District)
Request To	C-3 DNS / WVR (General Commercial District, Density Waiver)
Proposed Use	Multifamily Residential
Location	Approximately 400 feet northwest of the northwest corner of 33rd Avenue and Grand Avenue
VPC Recommendation	Approval, per the staff recommendation
VPC Vote	12-0

VPC DISCUSSION & RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS:

No speaker cards were received on this item.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Klimek, staff, provided an overview of the case as detailed in the published staff report including background, the proposal for the development of the site for multifamily, and the policy analysis completed by staff. Staff is recommending approval subject to 11 stipulations focusing on applying R-5 Development Standards, and requiring shaded open space, a replenished landscape setback along Grand Avenue, bicycle parking and a fix-it station, and on-site pedestrian pathways to provide access to area transit, in addition to standard aviation and standard archaeology stipulations.

Keyser expressed concern over the prevalence of asphalt parking lot immediately outside of unit entrances, how it will be desolate, and if anything can be done to soften the feel of the motel as it is converted to permanent housing.

- **Klimek** explained that staff has discussed softening the development with landscaping and noted that the applicant has been agreeable to adding landscaping throughout the development with special attention on the open space area and on the street frontage.

Bryck asked staff to explain the density waiver and how it modifies the base zoning district.

- **Klimek** explained that most commercial zoning districts allow multifamily by right using the density and development standards – excluding height – from the R-3 Multifamily District. A density waiver functions like an overlay zone can be requested to increase the density and development standards to R-3A, R-4, R-4A, or R-5. The process is a full rezoning process with all notices, neighborhood meetings, and public hearings.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Bill Allison, of Withey Morris, introduced himself as representing the applicant, S.T.A.N.D. on this proposal to create much needed affordable housing in an area with excellent public transit connectivity. The site was originally developed as a hotel/motel, was later converted to a Community Residence Center operated by U.S. Vets until they outgrew the space, and the applicant is proposing a similar model to U.S. Vets but with some long-term leases. The applicant will work with local not-for-profit organizations to provide supportive housing opportunities for those in need of affordable, transitional and/or permanent living accommodations, with additional services for its residents such as counseling and job training.

QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

Acting Chair Williams asked the applicant to define affordable housing and to provide additional detail on the additional services that will be offered on-site.

- **Allison** indicated the project will utilize the Federal Voucher System and will abide by those affordability thresholds. Regarding additional services, he introduced Bob Collopy from S.T.A.N.D..
- **Bob Collopy** introduced himself as a representative of S.T.A.N.D. and indicated that the community will coordinate with local not-for-profits to find individuals in need of supportive housing on voucher programs and most will have counselors. Specifically, the current model is looking for a collaboration with UMOM to provide supportive housing to women escaping domestic violence and will coordinate with other organizations to provide on-site job training and job fairs to help residents get back on their feet, hence the organization name “stand.” Additionally, concepts that may be incorporated include meal distribution in cooperation with local organizations, healthy food trucks regularly, and allowing pets in collaboration with a shelter.

McCabe asked about the parking supply and the unit mix.

- **Collopy** responded that there will be 18 one-bedrooms and 115 studios. Many of the women escaping domestic violence are very young and just need a stable place to live for a few months to a few years. Regarding parking, Collopy indicated that, from experience, he expects they will not use much of the required parking and expects bicycles to be the most common form of transportation.
- **McCabe** indicated that he would not be opposed to less parking on the site.

Sanchez asked the applicant to elaborate on what type of “games” will be provided in the amenity areas because the children that may be present with the female tenant will

need safe, physical activities. For example, a playground would be helpful but asked her fellow committee members if it is possible to stipulate.

- **Collopy** responded that the final programming for the amenity spaces is not finalized at this time but that the conceptual site plans depict “cornhole”, barbeques, and expansive turf areas. He added that many of the tenants are going to be very young and may not have children. Additionally, the site is gated and includes a swimming pool.

Bryck suggested that, if desired, the committee can stipulate a “tot lot” in their motion to approve.

Keyser reiterated previous comments about how the project still feels like a motel and, that while that is acceptable for a night or two, it would make for a depressing place to live full time and he added that the impact of environment and mental health are well documented. He asked the applicant and the committee for ideas on how to soften the development and, potentially, how to stipulate landscaping between the doors and the parking areas including ways to locate funding for landscape improvements. He asked the applicant to explain the configuration of the former motel office and how it will be used in the proposed configuration.

- **Collopy** indicated the office contains a kitchen and a meeting room. The kitchen will be used to assemble and serve meals when possible and the office space will be used for job training, job fairs, and individual and group counseling.
- **Allison** responded that the zoning ordinance requires 183 parking spaces and, while they do not expect needing that amount of parking, that a deviation from the zoning ordinance would require a variance which is a separate process. He added that it may be costly to install new landscape planters and difficult to irrigate.

Keyser offered to support a variance to reduce the parking requirements and expressed support for stipulating a “tot lot.”

Harris asked how they arrived at the unit mix of mostly studio apartments and suggested that they consolidate more of the studios into one-bedrooms to serve more family types such as women with children.

- **Collopy** responded that the unit mix was selected because that is the mix that exists onsite today. There is a significant need for supportive and affordable housing and many existing facilities have long waitlists and indicated that the organization wants to serve as many households in-need as possible. There are facilities designed to accommodate larger families by many have waitlists and, if residents need a larger accommodation, they may be able to live on this site until something opens at another facility. He concluded by stating that there is a significant need for supportive housing in both type and quantity.

Harris agreed that the site is overparked, expressed support for a tot-lot stipulation, and asked if the applicant had considered a community garden. A garden can provide a place a safe and healthy activity for individuals and families.

- **Collopy** responded that a garden is a difficult amenity to manage and that they would need another partner to ensure this amenity is productive to the overall mission of the facility. Without effective management, a garden space can quickly become blight.

Krietor asked for more detail on food trucks and food distribution including whether it will be limited to residents or open to the public. He indicated that he is becoming concerned that this could evolve into a food / meal distribution facility.

- **Collopy** indicated that they have no interest in opening the facility to the public and their mission is to serve their residents. The community center building may be partially open during job fairs and/or job training facilities but visitors will not be allowed within the gates to the units.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

APPLICANT RESPONSE

Allison thanked the committee for their suggestions, indicated that the applicant is open to a “tot lot”, and that they look forward to additional discussions regarding landscape enhancements.

FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: MOTION, DISCUSSION, AND VOTE.

MOTION: Sanchez made a motion to approve the request per staff recommendation with an additional stipulation to require a “tot lot” amenity. Second by **DeGraffenreid**.

DISCUSSION:

None.

VOTE: 12-0-0, motion passes with: Adams, Bryck, DeGraffenreid, Ender, Fitzgerald, Harris, Jones, Keyser, Krietor, McCabe, Sanchez, and Acting Chair Williams in favor; none in dissent; and none in abstention.

STAFF COMMENTS

The Village Planning Committee recommended approval of the request per staff recommendation with the addition of a “tot lot” as an on-site amenity but did not provide suggested language for the stipulation. Staff suggests the following language to fulfil the intent of the recommendation:

- The developer shall provide a “tot lot” as an amenity in a centrally located open space, as approved by the Planning and Development Department:

RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS

1. The development shall utilize the standards contained in the R-5 (Multifamily Residence District) zoning district development standard, except as modified by the below stipulations and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
2. A minimum of 6 percent of the gross project area shall be retained as open space and be shaded to a minimum 50 percent by minimum 2-inch caliper large canopy shade trees and architectural shade such as ramadas that shall account for no more than 25 percent of the required shade area, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
3. The developer shall replenish the existing landscape planters adjacent to Grand Avenue per the C-3 streetscape landscape standards for planting type, size and quantity contained in Chapter 624.E.4.e of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance, unless underground utilities and/or drainage are found to conflict, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. Where utility conflicts exist, the developer shall work with the Planning and Development Department on alternative design solutions consistent with the creation of a comfortable pedestrian environment.
4. The developer shall incorporate and maintain bicycle infrastructure as described below and as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. Secure bicycle parking for residents at a rate of 0.25 spaces per dwelling unit, up to a maximum of 50 spaces.
 - b. Inverted-U style bicycle racks with capacity for a minimum of 10 bicycles for guests shall be distributed throughout the site near the primary pedestrian entrance(s) or amenity area.
 - c. A bicycle repair station (“fix it station”) shall be provided in an area of high visibility such as near a central amenity area. The repair station shall include: standard repair tools affixed to the station, a tire gauge

and pump affixed to the base of the station or the ground, and a bicycle repair stand which allows pedals and wheels to spin freely while making adjustments to the bike.

5. The developer shall provide a system of internal, clearly defined pedestrian pathways including the following elements, as approved by the Planning and Development Department:
 - a. Connect all building entrances, exits, and amenity areas, to all public sidewalks, by a direct route.
 - b. Where pedestrian pathways cross drive-aisles, the crossing shall visually contrast with parking and drive aisle surfaces.
6. The developer shall construct all streets within and adjacent to the development with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping, and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
7. All right-of-way improvements and access control shall be reviewed, permitted and approved by ADOT.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. THE DEVELOPER SHALL PROVIDE A "TOT LOT" AS AN AMENITY IN A CENTRALLY LOCATED OPEN SPACE, AS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.

