

Summary of Campo Bell Meeting

September 28, 2010

The meeting convened at the Paradise Valley Community Center in the Multi-purpose room at 6:04 p.m. Approximately 27 neighbors were in attendance.

Ms. Bixler welcomed all present and introduced herself and Michelle Dodds from the City of Phoenix Long Range Planning Team. She showed a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed the qualities of the neighborhood that residents wished to preserve. Photographs followed, emphasizing the variety of housing, the “country/rural” look of the area and the development of new homes and small apartment buildings.

The presentation then detailed the General Plan category of the area which includes a Commercial designation on the south side of Danbury, and Mixed Use Residential 3.5 -5 and 5-15 units per acre for the remaining neighborhood. Staff showed a slide with a map of the zoning pattern within the neighborhood which included a C-1 and C-3 parcel with the remaining being R-3. Another slide showed the street classifications indicating the locations of arterial, collector and local streets within the study area.

Ms. Bixler introduced the property owner proposing to rezone the property at the northwest corner of Hartford Avenue and 32nd Street: Mr. Mark Jones. Mr. Jones explained that he had lived in the area a long time and naturally picked an area within the neighborhood to start his business. His business has expanded more quickly than he anticipated. He showed PowerPoint photographs of his business over the years. It showed that he had made many improvements to his property making it more attractive. He stated that he plans to do even more if the rezoning is approved.

Residents had questions about Mr. Jones’s proposal. They wanted to know why he located in their neighborhood and why he didn’t locate his business where it was appropriately zoned and permitted. Mr. Jones stated that he liked this area and that his business started off very small and then grew very fast. He showed photographs of other residentially styled office buildings in the area. He stated that he planned to make his office look as nice as the ones in the photographs. Neighbors wanted to know if he was going to tear down the existing building to build a larger, taller building. They also wanted to know how high the building would be. Neighbors stated that they wanted something in scale with their neighborhood and that would match the residential character of the area. Mr. Allison of Gallagher and Kennedy, representing Mr. Jones, stated that they proposed to keep the same buildings that currently exist on the site and use them as administrative offices. The parking lot would be located in the rear of the building and it would be paved. He added that it was also possible that another administrative office (like an attorney’s office) would locate in the other existing building on the site and that the property would be heavily landscaped.

Ms. Dodds added that conditions of approval, or stipulations, could be added to rezoning cases to limit the square footage and height of the structures. She also noted that additional landscaping could be stipulated to improve the existing street frontage.

Mr. Kurt Jones, a planner from Gallagher and Kennedy, presented a PowerPoint. It showed the neighborhood and the area of notification. Mr. Jones noted that they had previously held a neighborhood meeting but that no one attended. Neighbors complained that they did not receive any notice. Ms. Dodds explained the city's notice requirements.

One resident in attendance wanted to know why so much was being made of this little office case and she didn't feel it would generate cut-through traffic as discussed in the previous meeting.

Ms. Bixler responded that at the previous meeting she asked the neighborhood what they liked about their area and what they wanted to preserve. She stated that neighbors identified the attributes of the neighborhood they wished to preserve and also brought up some of their more challenging issues, like cut-through traffic. Planners wanted to discuss with the neighborhood the potential for office and/or commercial rezoning along 32nd Street. While rezoning would not require a General Plan Amendment along 32nd Street because requests are likely to be less than ten acres in size, it might impact the area.

Ms. Dodds answered questions regarding the process for future rezoning requests and encouraged the neighbors to come to the Village Planning Committee meetings. Neighbors wanted to know how their input would impact decision makers. Ms. Dodds explained that staff would take their input from the past two meetings and from the mapping exercise, and incorporate it into the study document. This document would then be reviewed by the Paradise Valley Village Planning Committee and the Planning Commission. Further, it would be used in formulating the staff recommendation for rezoning proposals on 32nd Street.

Fourteen maps were passed out to residents at the meeting and they worked in groups to identify whether they wanted their neighborhood to remain residential, or if they thought it appropriate to change the land uses, anywhere in the study area. Some residents also added conditions to changes in land uses.

The result of this exercise is as follows:

- Seven (7) maps indicated that the neighbors wanted the area to remain residential.
- Five (5) maps indicated that they were fine with a mix of office zoning along 32nd Street but only to a depth of one lot or approximately 192 feet.

- One (1) map indicated that it was appropriate to have commercial zoning as far north as Hartford Avenue, R-4 zoning north of Hartford Avenue and R-3 zoning north of Angela Drive.

Before neighbors left the meeting, Ms. Bixler gave them a schedule for review of the study as follows:

- October 4, 2010 update the Paradise Valley Village Planning Committee
- November 1, 2010 recommendation by the Paradise Valley Village Planning Committee of the Campo Bello Neighborhood Study
- December 8, 2010 review by the Planning Commission of the Campo Bello Neighborhood Study