



**CITY OF SCOTTSDALE HOUSING BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
ONE CIVIC CENTER, 3rd FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
7447 E. INDIAN SCHOOL ROAD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA
JUNE 4, 2009**

PRESENT: Joe Campodall'Orto, Chair
Nancy Cantor, Vice-Chair
Denise Carroll, Board Member (arrived at 5:36 p.m.)
Daniel Gottlieb, Board Member
Nick Thomas, Board Member

ABSENT: Gary Morgan, Board Member
Kathleen Puchek, Board Member

STAFF: Raun Keagy, Citizen & Neighborhood Resources General Manager
Jewel James, Community Assistance Office
Kira Wauwie, AICP Project Coordination Manager

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:

Chair Campodall'Orto called the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Housing Board to order at 5:30 p.m. A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

1. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 12, 2009 (Action)

Vice-Chair Cantor requested that "collaboration" be replaced with "work study" as well as inserting Neighborhood Enhancement Commission in front of the Housing Board in the last paragraph of page two. She also requested that the second paragraph from the bottom of page three be deleted.

VICE CHAIR CANTOR MOVED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 12, 2009 HOUSING BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER GOTTLIEB SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO ZERO (0). BOARD MEMBERS MORGAN AND PUCHEK WERE ABSENT, AND BOARD MEMBER CARROLL ABSTAINED.

2. **PROPOSAL TO ADD THE HUD MANDATED VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT (VAWA) AS A PART OF THE ANNUAL AGENCY PLAN THAT WAS RECENTLY APPROVED UNDER RESOLUTION #7888. AGENCY HAS TO GIVE A DESCRIPTION OF ANY ACTIVITIES, SERVICES, PROGRAMS, OR PARTNERSHIP THAT BENEFIT CHILD OR ADULT VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, DATING VIOLENCE, SEXUAL ASSAULT, OR STALKING.** (Action)

Chair Campodall'Orto invited the Board to approve the proposed Amendments to the Annual Agency Plan Policy.

Mr. Keagy introduced Jewel James from the Community Assistance Office. She explained that the amendments were being added to the Annual Agency Plan Policy because they were HUD mandated.

BOARD MEMBER THOMAS MOVED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ANNUAL AGENCY PLAN POLICY AS PRESENTED. VICE-CHAIR CANTOR SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO ZERO (0). BOARD MEMBERS MORGAN AND PUCHEK WERE ABSENT.

3. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE BOARD ACTION ON THE PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) ORDINANCE—SEE ATTACHED STAFF MEMO AND DRAFT ORDINANCE.** (Discussion/Possible Action)

Ms. Wauwie reported that she was in attendance to present information on the new Planned Unit Development District. Vice-Chair Cantor presented a workbook on the PUD produced by the Planning Department last year, consisting of background information on planned zoning districts.

Definition and Purpose:

Ms. Wauwie recalled that the Planning Department began working on this project in 2007 and prepared a significant study on planned district development as a result of 25 community/board/commission meetings.

She explained that planned development zoning in Scottsdale usually consists of very large parcels of land hundreds of acres in size known as master development communities, and pointed out that Scottsdale does not have a district that addresses parcels smaller than 15 acres.

In response to Board Member Carroll's inquiry regarding whether the PUD proposal was a result of Scottsdale running out of space, Ms. Wauwie agreed that is part of the reason for the proposal.

She elaborated that the Planning Department recognized that traditional county styles of commercial development in the city were in need of upgrading, such as the McDowell corridor and Scottsdale Road.

Community Involvement:

Ms. Wauwie recalled that the 2007 Gruen Report prepared on south Scottsdale demonstrated that there was enough commercial land as well as a lack of housing units. She stated that the proposed PUD development ordinance allows for mixed use, thereby encouraging new housing development, an opportunity for infill, and flexible development standards.

In response to Chair Campodall'Orto's inquiry regarding whether the Housing Board had been involved with the PUD, Ms. Wauwie recalled that this was the Planning Department's second presentation to the Housing Board. Mr. Lusardi made a presentation to the Board in July 2008.

Elements of the PUD Zoning District:

Ms. Wauwie explained that anyone interested in applying for this zoning district would have to present a development plan consisting of a drawing setting out the building locations, uses, commercial areas, and the residential units.

She summarized that the location criteria states that the district could be used along major and minor arterials as well as major collector streets throughout the community with the exception of environmentally sensitive lands and the downtown area.

Ms. Wauwie stated that mixed use includes commercial/retail, commercial/office, employment uses, as well as multifamily types of housing including town homes.

In response to Chair Campodall'Orto's comment that he did not realize that the PUD would not include a commercial district, Ms. Wauwie responded that it is not geared as an overlay district but instead is a free-standing district.

District Approval Criteria:

Ms. Wauwie reported that the district approval criteria promote revitalization and noted that all requests must be consistent with the General Plan's designation for mixed use.

She stated that the type of use and development proposed would not be permitted within an existing zoning district and the ultimate development must be compatible with adjacent land uses.

Ms. Wauwie discussed the fact that there was no cap or density standard in the PUD proposed district noting that the development plan would therefore designate the location of the uses and amounts of residential/commercial. She reported that the commercial intensity was set at .8 floor area ratio.

Ms. Wauwie summarized that the standard base acreage is from half an acre to 15 acres, and a site could go up to 25 acres with City Council approval. The setbacks allow for flexibility to build single family residential into the district, as well as creating a nice street frontage setting.

In response to Board Member Gottlieb's inquiry regarding whether the PUD requirements were open to interpretation by the Planning Commission and City

Council, Ms. Wauwie explained that the zoning administrator is charged with enforcing the provisions for administrative interpretation.

Development Standards:

Ms. Wauwie reported that when the Planning Commission reviewed the PUD proposal their recommendation to City Council was that the height be limited to 48 feet plus 10 feet for mechanical.

In response to Board Member Carroll's inquiry regarding whether this PUD fit within the new standards of higher ceilings, Ms. Wauwie said it does. She explained that the regulations use a footage requirement rather than a story limit, and staff's recommendation was to allow a height range of 48+10 up to 78 feet maximum with specific criteria for energy efficiency. These criteria are set out on page 5 of the PUD workbook presented earlier by Vice-Chair Cantor.

Chair Campodall'Orto expressed his concerns about the workbook's statement that, "the project should demonstrate a combination of features that promote measurable increases in energy conservation and/or decrease in water use compact onsite drainage," because the Ordinance deals with zoning rather than building standards.

Provide Options for Infill Housing:

Ms. Wauwie reported that they intended to place the district within infill locations, encouraging housing located along major streets and near places of employment.

In response to Board Member Thomas' inquiry regarding whether the analysis was backed by hard data or paper policies, Ms. Wauwie explained that the information being presented was based on existing documents such as the General Plan. The new district will have quality, compatibility, and energy efficiency elements built in and encourages housing choices and diversity.

In response to Board Member Thomas' inquiry, Ms. Wauwie explained that diversity meant that the district would include a variety of homes such as townhomes, condominiums, and apartments. She pointed out that outside of this PUD single residences are included.

In response to Board Member Gottlieb's inquiry regarding whether this district would allow reduction in parking, Ms. Wauwie recalled that the Planning Department opined that the district did not warrant reduced parking at this time. She elaborated that the Zoning Ordinance has a provision allowing proposed shared parking options.

Discussion Regarding the PUD Ordinance Supporting Affordable Housing:

Discussion ensued regarding what portions of this PUD Ordinance support affordable housing. Ms. Wauwie summarized that this district adds available options for building housing to increase the number of available units.

Vice-Chair Cantor expressed her concern about the lack of language promoting affordable housing and pointed out that the definition of mixed use should include mixed income housing. Board Member Carroll agreed, stating that it should encourage housing choices, diversity, and affordability.

Ms. Wauwie recalled staff's lengthy discussions regarding the definition of "diversity" including mixed income and affordability. The legal department advised them that they do not have the ability to make that change. Board Member Carroll argued that omitting the word "affordability" sends the wrong message.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding further developing the City's policies and laws to allow such changes in a zoning district. Board Member Thomas argued that without adding the language to the ordinance, developers are allowed to build whatever they want. Vice-Chair Cantor recommended a discussion with the legal department regarding this subject.

Vice-Chair Cantor requested that the Housing Board's concerns be included in the Planning Department's presentation to City Council or that Board members attend the June 9, 2009 City Council meeting to voice their concerns.

Mr. Keagy pointed out that it was too late to incorporate them into the City Council Action Report and agreed to discuss the best method for incorporating the Board's concerns into the presentation with the management team. Board Member Carroll suggested writing a letter to Mayor Lane regarding this issue.

Ms. Wauwie confirmed that her PUD Ordinance presentation will be presented to City Council along with the Planning Commission and staff's recommendations.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the recommendation to allow a height range of up to a 78-foot maximum in mixed uses would be condemning the value of the surrounding homes and whether any safeguards were in place. Ms. Wauwie explained that a 78-foot tall building would have to be at least 150 feet from a single family home.

Chair Campodall'Orto pointed out that there was a requirement in the PUD definition that a line of sight for view analysis plan be prepared. Ms. Wauwie summarized that the impact on views should be discussed during the public hearing process to get the zoning.

Chair Campodall'Orto requested that City Council be informed that the Housing Board was concerned that the definition of diversity did not clearly define the types of diversity allowed and should include affordability, income levels, and workforce housing.

Board Member Thomas opined that the City does have the ability to develop design standards such as use of materials, window glass, and the ability to adapt a building for multi-usage in the future. Vice-Chair Cantor recalled adaptability for use being discussed at the Urban Land Institute and said that safety is her greatest concern.

Discussion ensued regarding the adaptability of interior space relative to a building's usage. Ms. Wauwie stated that the Fire Department and Code Enforcement were involved in the review team on all zoning text amendments and the Police Department was only involved when discussing nightclub or bar usage.

Mr. Keagy recalled his discussion with Chief Rodbell where the Chief expressed an interest in encouraging Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.

Vice-Chair Cantor summarized that the PUD would be impacting existing neighborhoods by introducing new building styles and argued that the new buildings must be a safe fit for the existing community.

Board Member Thomas suggested the submission of a mandated neighborhood analysis that includes an impact statement in terms of occupancy, noise, and economic factors.

Discussion ensued regarding forcing the building of adaptable structures and amending the International Residential Code.

4. DISCUSSION AND STATUS OF PROPOSED PROJECTS ON BELLEVIEW STREET. (Discussion Only)

Mr. Keagy reported that the Belleview Street project is still looking for partners in order to apply for additional funding and the project would still have a 15-year rental agreement before transferring to ownership. The project has been changed from patio homes to condominium style homes.

Mr. Keagy had inquired why they were not required to clear the property and was informed that they need the value of the land to stay intact while locating new partners, since removal of the buildings would devalue the property. They have until the middle of July to start construction on this property.

Board Member Thomas explained that two elements are used during appraisals to figure out resurgent land value; one is the existence of current buildings as well as future plans for the site.

Board Member Carroll opined that there might be tax consequences involved. Chair Campodall'Orto explained that water retention issues were grandfathered into a lot of the codes.

In response to Chair Campodall'Orto's inquiry regarding whether there was a staff member in charge of CSA and their funding, Mr. Keagy stated that Paul Ludwick is involved with Human Services funding and Kroy Ekblaw is the development contact.

Board Members noted that the SkySong developers are unhappy with CSA regarding their non-demolition of the Belleview Street buildings. Board Member Thomas pointed out that CSA not bringing forth a preliminary financial pro forma adds to the unrest about the situation.

It was the consensus of the Board that staff provide a funding update on the Belleview Street project at next month's meeting.

5. DISCUSSION OF SETTING PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR. (Discussion/Possible Action)

Mr. Keagy announced that the setting of priorities and objectives was only agendized to clarify that there were no additional priorities or objectives for the Board to consider.

Vice-Chair Cantor summarized that they discussed working on the Housing Strategy and the Housing Element of the General Plan. She suggested scheduling a work study session to develop goals and objectives for the Housing Board's Bylaws as well as developing a strategy for the upcoming year.

Mr. Keagy invited the Board to discuss scheduling a half-day retreat to gain a sense of direction. Vice-Chair Cantor and Board Member Carroll suggested inviting Mayor Lane to the retreat and suggested researching successful housing boards throughout the country to see what their goals are.

It was the consensus of the Board to schedule July 9, 2009 as their regular monthly as well as a tentative special meeting on July 23, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

6. STAFF AND COMMISSION UPDATES (A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K))

Vice-Chair Cantor recalled meeting with both the Fire and Police Chiefs to discuss the impacts of redevelopment in the older parts of Scottsdale. She relayed their interest in understanding what the City's redevelopment was all about and participating in the development of strategic plans.

Mr. Keagy summarized that the strategic plans are reviewed by a Fire Department representative to ensure that fire trucks can maneuver and that the fire hydrants are located correctly. He agreed that from a Police Department public safety perspective there was no participation.

Vice-Chair Cantor stated that the Fire Chief Rodbell was unhappy to hear about the lack of PUD criteria that would ensure that ladder trucks can access every side of a building..

Mr. Keagy said he has not yet forwarded Vice-Chair Cantor's email regarding issues such as the PUD and R1-7 onto the Fire and Police Chiefs.

Vice-Chair Cantor recalled that there were text amendments made to the R1-7 zoning in 2007. Although the zoning was to be accomplished in three phases, the first phase has already been completed without input from the Fire and Police Departments. Neither department had provided input on Text Amendment 1-TA-2007, which allows for walls and fences in the longer street frontage yard and on the property line of the longer street frontage of corner lots. That text amendment was approved by City Council in 2007.

Vice-Chair Cantor stated that phase two, which deals with zero property lines and the forfeiture of property lines, would begin soon. Mr. Keagy agreed to forward the Board members a copy of Vice-Chair Cantor's email and suggested repackaging the information and forwarding it to Dave Richert.

Discussion ensued regarding inviting Dave Richert to the July 9, 2009 meeting to discuss how the City chooses who to involve in the redevelopment process. Board Member Gottlieb suggested that the PUD Ordinance should be postponed rather than going before City Council next week.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT (A.R.S. § 38-431.02(K))

No members of the public wished to address the Board.

8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Keagy agreed to gather funding information on the Belleview Street project or to invite Paul Ludwick and Kroy Ekblaw to the Board's July meeting.

Board Member Thomas presented applications for CDBG grants along with the supporting proposals and argued that the Housing Board does not receive the documentation with sufficient time for review before the Human Services Commission holds their public hearings. He stated that the Board was not allowed to be involved in the Human Services Commission post public hearing discussions, nor the voting on the proposals.

Vice-Chair Cantor explained that many of the proposals relate to preservation and safety of housing stock, and argued that the Board should be informed about the many programs the City participates in, as well as their impact on single family housing in south Scottsdale.

Board Member Carroll suggesting holding a housing convention, symposium, or seminars to bring housing issues to the public to increase citizen input on housing issues. Chair Campodall'Orto said the senior center is an excellent venue for such an event. Board Member Gottlieb recommended scheduling such an event for Design Day.

Vice-Chair Cantor suggested that the redevelopment process address issues relating to the integration of more people into smaller areas and the resulting infrastructure needs. Board Member Carroll suggested including foreclosure issues related to open pools and squatters.

Mr. Keagy announced that Code Enforcement is being assigned to Economic Development starting in July 2009 and he will be running the Neighborhood Planning Program under the Planning Transportation Neighborhood Division.

Board Member Thomas requested that Chair Campodall'Orto formally invite the mayor to attend a future Housing Board meeting to discuss his views on housing issues.

Chair Campodall'Orto requested that staff email him an outline of the Board's upcoming meetings so he could include it with his letter to Mayor Lane.

ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc. DBA AVTranz