
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the February 8, 2022 City Council Regular meeting and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

A copy of the agenda for this meeting, including a summary of the action taken on each agenda item, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2022-agendas/02-08-22-regular-agenda.pdf>

An unedited digital video recording of the meeting, which can be used in conjunction with the transcript, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/scottsdale-video-network/council-video-archives/2022-archives>

For ease of reference, included throughout the transcript are bracketed “time stamps” [Time: 00:00:00] that correspond to digital video recording time.

For more information about this transcript, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 480-312-2411.

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:01]

Mayor Ortega: Hello. Good evening. I call to order the February 8th, 2022 city council meeting, again to order. Deputy city clerk Cathie Butteweg, would you conduct the roll call?

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:20]

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Mayor David Ortega.

Mayor Ortega: Present.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Vice Mayor Tammy Caputi.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Councilmembers Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Betty Janik.

Councilmember Janik: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Solange Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Manager Jim Thompson.

Jim Thompson: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

Sherry Scott: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Treasurer Sonia Andrews.

Sonia Andrews: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

Sharron Walker: Here.

Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg: And the deputy is present.

[Time: 00:00:50]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much. We have Scottsdale Police Officers Anthony Wells and Dustin Vusevich and Ray Liagne here if anyone should need assistance. I will ask Councilmember Littlefield to lead us with the pledge.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands: One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Well, yesterday was first day of the Phoenix open. This will be great golf, live entertainment, and activities all week. So be sure to get there and check it out before the final day, which is Sunday, February 13th. The highlight is on Scottsdale and the Phoenix open and then right afterwards, of course, Super Bowl Sunday.

Next week, making your plans, plan ahead, February 17th is the beginning of the Scottsdale Arabian horse show, beginning at WestWorld. The show goes until Sunday, February 27th. It's packed with equestrian competitions and events, known worldwide. Take the family out for one of their behind-the-scene tours or attend one of their demonstrations. Our very own Scottsdale police horse patrol is also in the vicinity. So we hope you will meet and greet them on Sunday, February 20th.

Lastly, I'm sad to say that the city of Scottsdale lost a wonderful long-time volunteer and former employee. Scott Harkness also known as Scottie will be remembered by all who knew him as a kind-hearted, hard-working man who was always ready to jump in and help. He was a wonderful guy and we will miss him greatly. Last time I saw Scottie was at Club Czar and I know he was at hash knife. Let's pause and have a moment of silence for Scottie.

[Moment of silence]

PUBLIC COMMENT

[Time: 00:04:08]

Mayor Ortega: The next item on our agenda is public comment. Public comment is reserved for Scottsdale citizens to comment on any non-agendized items that are within the council's jurisdiction. No official council action can be taken on those items and speakers are limited to three minutes to address the council.

So we do open public comment and I'm told there is none. So accordingly, I will close public comment. It appears as though we have no minutes for approval. Normally we would review our minutes at this time. There are none.

CONSENT AGENDA

[Time: 00:05:00]

Mayor Ortega: So we will go directly to our consent agenda items 1 through 17. The consent agenda items have been reviewed and posted and presented. We also give the public an opportunity to comment on any of the items 1 through 17, and looking over, I don't see any comments. Therefore, I will close public comment on the consent agenda items. At this point, I would like to receive a motion to approve the consent agenda items.

Councilmember Durham: So moved.

Councilmember Whitehead: Second.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilman Durham and then seconded by Councilwoman Littlefield. Any discussion? Please register your vote. Okay. Thank you. That was unanimous.

ITEM 18 – GREENBELT 88 REZONING (15-ZN-2020)

[Time: 00:06:08]

Mayor Ortega: Now, we will move on to the regular agenda item, which is posted as greenbelt 88, and it's a rezoning case. The presenter is Bryan Cluff, our principal planner. We have received numerous public comments which, again, we will listen to after the presentation. So we have the staff presentation and then the applicant presentation. Come forward. Thank you. We will have Bryan Cluff, the principal planner.

Bryan Cluff: Good evening, Mayor Ortega, Vice Mayor and councilmembers. My name is Bryan Cluff, I'm the principal planner with the planning department. I will give an overview of the applicant's request regarding greenbelt 88, case number 15-ZN-2020. The specific request this evening from the applicant is for the council to adopt ordinance 4522 related to a zoning district map amendment from the planned neighborhood center planned community district, to the planned unit development district.

This also includes a development plan with amended development standards for building setbacks and it is for a mixed-use center with 238 multifamily dwelling units and approximately 29,000 square feet of nonresidential floor area. They are requesting one amended development standard and then also there's a development plan included as well as a development agreement.

The site that we're looking at this evening is at the southwest corner of Hayden Road and Osborn Road, highlighted in yellow here. Here's a closer look at the site which is an existing shopping center.

The boundary outlined in yellow is the area subject to the application owned by applicant. I will make note that it doesn't include the bank at the corner, the Carl's Jr. or the Starbucks building in the same shopping center. And the proposal would include demolishing the existing site that you see in yellow for the redevelopment proposal.

This is the existing zoning map of the property, zoned plan neighborhood center, planned community district. And the proposed zoning map with the planned unit development designation.

This here is the site location relative to the city's 2035 general plan land use element, with the

site designated as mixed use neighborhoods, which are intended to accommodate higher density housing, together with complimentary office or retail uses, and a mixed use environment with residential above commercial.

The site is also within the southern Scottsdale character area plan, that's identified here. And I will note that the application did come on the council agenda a few months back, and there were some updates made to the application between then and now. So this slide summarizes some of those changes that were made to the application. The applicant did conduct some additional neighborhood outreach in the surrounding community.

[Time: 00:10:13]

The number of units in the proposal were reduced from 278 to 234 units. So that's now a density proposed at 34 dwelling units an acre. Additionally, the applicant adjusted the massing adjacent to the northwest and the east sides by removing -- removing and pulling back portions of the fourth floor area of the building.

The building height was reduced from 48 feet with 10 feet of mechanical to 45 feet with limited to 5 feet of mechanical. There was an increase in commercial or you might say nonresidential floor area from 25,000 square feet to 29,000 square feet, which now includes 4,000 square feet of flex space. Additionally, there were some terms added to the development agreement for workforce housing with a proposal that would include eight units with workforce housing in the development. Here's a look at the proposed site plan.

You can see the new multistory building here, which would house the 238 residential units. It also includes a commercial pad closer to Hayden Road here and another commercial pad closer to Osborn. This slide here highlights some of the pedestrian circulation through the development. You can see, oops -- sorry. The blue is internal pedestrian circulation. I will make note the red that circles -- that goes along the west side of the property, is a pedestrian access route that's proposed to be a public access that will actually have a public access license easement over it to allow the public to move through the property there, and the area will include a -- an open space plaza here, as well as enhanced landscaping along that western side of the site.

This is the open space plan for the site. Mainly highlighting here new open space areas that would be proposed as part of the development. Most of the existing open space and landscaping along Hayden Road will be remained. So the areas that you see in green would be added open space over the property and the yellow is private open space.

And there is in total about 80,000 square feet of open space provided on the project. These are some renderings here that show some of the enhanced landscape areas. This on the left focusing along that public access way on the west side of the building. On the right here would be on the east side of the building, along the retail storefronts.

And then this is showing the public plaza area that's on the north side of the building. This here identifies the proposed building elevations. They are conceptual. It would be subject to future development review board approval, showing the heights of the building at 45 feet, with the 5 feet additional for mechanical equipment.

The one amended standard that the applicant is requesting as part of the application is having to do with the average setback requirement that is within the planned unit development district. The intent of this average setback requirement is to bring buildings closer to the street. So in order to accommodate the redevelopment and the existing shopping center, the building is feeding to be further set back.

So the request is amending the average setback to increase that distance to allow the building to be set back further away from Osborn and Hayden roads. Really quick, a few key highlights of the development agreement. Some of the key terms there, do include a zoning reversion. If the construction does not commence within 5.5 years from the effective date of the development agreement.

[Time: 00:14:15]

Additionally, there would be limitations on the flex space that's identified within their plan which is the 4,000 square feet that I mentioned earlier, that's limiting that space from being used as residential units. There's also some language limiting subletting of tenants within the development and the applicant is agreeing to record a condominium plat over the development as well.

The workforce housing is included in the eight units and the terms related to the public license agreement that I mentioned for that walkway along the west side of the property. A quick summary of the public outreach for the project does go back a couple years, just about for the applicant sponsored open houses that you see, the four dates there as well as some additional outreach that they have done over the last couple of weeks.

The city and applicant have sent multiple notices to properties in the area, as well as publishing our normal planning and zoning publications in newsletters and social media. There have been hundreds of public comments received, both in support and in opposition to the development. The other boards and commissions, it did go before our development review board, originally March 18th of 2021.

It was continued with a vote of 6-0 with concerns related to density, open space, pedestrian connectivity and landscaping, as well as traffic. It came back on May 6th with some updates to the application, and was approved by the development review board by a vote of 4-0.

Subsequently, it went before our planning commission originally on June 9th, and was continued from the planning commission as well, with some similar concerns related to density, height and massing, traffic and architectural quality, additional changes were made to the application, and

presented to the planning commission again and then on August 25th, 2021, it was recommended for approval by the planning commission with a vote of 4-3.

Here again is just a summary of the requests this evening. And that concludes staff's presentation. I would be happy to answer any questions and the applicant is also here with a presentation prepared. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Great. At this point, we will move forward with the applicant's presentation and then questions and public comment.

[Time: 00:17:08]

Jason Morris: Mr. Mayor, council, good afternoon. For the record, my name is Jason Morris with the Morris on behalf of the applicant of greenbelt 88. It's been a pleasure to present this at the DR level, present it to staff and also to your planning commission. As staff mentioned all of which have recommended approval of this case.

We're also happy to stand behind -- before you today, with not only a survey, but also an actual petition with over 1200 names of support from your citizenry, from this neighborhood, in support of this project as we stand here today. Now, I will go through some of the details of this case, although fortunately you are very familiar with it.

There's so much to say about this application and I don't know that I've had the opportunity to present a better application to the city of Scottsdale on any case, let alone a case that stands in front of you with this much support and support from virtually every one of your recommending bodies below. Let's see if I can get the presentation up. There we go. Thank you. I am not Bryan Cluff for the record. He did a much better job.

Thank you and good evening. Mayor and council, while we are waiting for the presentation to come up, I can just share with you much of the outreach that has occurred within the time that you have allowed us to go back through continuances and work not only with the neighborhood but the city at large, because that support that I referenced earlier does not only come from the citizens in this neighborhood and you will hear from people who live within proximity of the site, but you will also hear from the small business owners who are looking for an opportunity to see development in an area where there's vacancy because their businesses depend upon the citizens of Scottsdale being able to have good access to these sites and to be able to spend money within these shopping centers.

The shopping center that we're talking about today, lucky plaza is almost as old as me and I'm old. And this particular owner has had this property over 18 years. So this is not a developer coming to you and asking for a quick buck or speculation. In fact, just the opposite. It's a Scottsdale property owner who kept his site up to date, and continuing to put money into the property, and keep it maintained at the highest level despite the fact that there's been vacancy, 8,000 square feet of vacancy in this particular shopping center for over eight years.

So we're dealing with the larger retail situation, but the larger retail situation -- and here's the presentation is also coinciding with a residential crisis and a residential strain. So we will talk more about that and thank you for bringing this up. Let's see. Councilmember and mayor, thank you for your patience.

I started to say what the impetus for this application is. It's extremely important for me to be able to convey what drives this applicant. I discussed, this is not a developer coming to Scottsdale, seeing if they can make a quick buck, seeing if they can change the zoning in order to take a piece that was in escrow and turn it into something else. Instead, it's a property owner who has struggled for 18 years to make a property successful and has done so largely over those years with national tenants.

[Time: 00:22:29]

But that landscape has changed and there isn't a shopping center owner anywhere, Scottsdale or otherwise, who wouldn't first seek just to lease their space. Because leasing the space of buildings that exist is the clearest path to both a profit and a successful shopping center, and if that was viable, I would not be here today, and this applicant and this particular application would not have languished for last two years to make sure it's ready for your approval.

I'm sharing some highlights and headlines that talks about that retail apocalypse. It talks about American consumers, but this is all information you know. If you were ordering online today, you recognize it.

If you are shopping today, you recognize the change in attitudes and activities. You recognize that by and large, if something can be ordered online, it is. And if something can be purchased at one large retail rather than several small retailers, it is.

So what we have is successful restaurants and services and that's what we're trying to build around with this particular application. You see a 20% reduction overall and that's C.B.R.E.'s report, PriceWaterhouseCoopers have similar numbers and as you look at the per capita square foot, this to me is the most striking number in this presentation, and that is the amount of per capita square foot of retail in Scottsdale versus other cities, we have a national average of 56 square feet, Scottsdale is at 90.

You have been incredibly successful and Scottsdale will always be successful because of its nature. That doesn't mean that individual parcels will be successful, and everything needs to be evaluated because nothing is static. The status quo does not work on this property and if it did, I would not be here and a property owner who spent 18 years making this property work would not be here.

Instead, we are looking at a dated and shopping center that suffers from the fact that the two largest tenants which represent 63% of the space, have expiring leases and have indicated they

will not be there long term. That doesn't mean there aren't options but the options that are available under the existing zoning are not beneficial to the city itself. We could do a church. We could look at doing storage on site as other people have done. We could change to office to the extent that office was there, and if not, look at schools, professional schools. None of which add value or interest to the neighborhood. None of which support these surrounding small business members.

The plaza itself, because of its age has a series of deficiencies, the most striking of which to anyone who has walked the greenbelt, is that the greenbelt has the back of the shopping center. It is loading zones. It can back of house and trash dumpsters and that's not what Scottsdale deserves. It's one of the best sites for the sunset in the city of Scottsdale.

[Time: 00:25:46]

The solution has been and will be adding vitality and residential to this site. It's what this application requires. It's what has been done in Scottsdale successfully already. The project details itself add 25,000 square feet of new retail and I'm going through this quickly forgive me. I know I lost some time while we were playing with this. So hopefully you will indulge me, but I want to make sure that you are heard and this application is heard.

The idea was to add additional retail as well as units to support that retail in an open space and promenade setting. The promenade, the Paseo is 1,000 square feet of open space and direct access from the green belt so that citizens can walk this area instead of looking at garbage bins and the back of house and the loading areas. It would be replete with public art, landscaping and hard scaping.

It's designed as a resting place and a gathering spot that does not exist now, especially in this portion of Scottsdale. It also includes a 14,000 square foot plaza that's dedicated by license to ensure that it's there long-term. It's not just part of the site plan. It's the heart of the site plan for open space.

This gives an idea of how that area will be utilized, how it will be landscaped and the idea of having a game lawn and event area in that space. In addition to that, it's the conversion and addition of retail space, so if we look at the numbers, it's a 65,000 square foot shopping center today, with two large tenants who have indicated they will not be there long term.

Instead, we're replacing that with residential and 25,000 square feet of new, small, boutique retail and services in addition to the existing retail that will remain which is another 10,000 square feet. So with that square footage, we're still over half of the existing square footage, much more public benefit, a much better design and residences, which are sorely needed, not only in Scottsdale as a whole but this part of Scottsdale in particular.

We have not been deaf to the concerns of neighbors and those who have had interest in this case. And I don't want to go over every one of these, because I don't have the time but

hopefully this gives you a sense of the changes to meet the needs of either the city or the residents of this area.

We've also removed large sections of the existing -- of the proposed fourth floor to push back areas to make it less obtrusive and make it blend into the other buildings in the area. This gives you an indication of the greenbelt, taking away the cantilever design, replacing it and pushing it back and ultimately pushing it back even farther so it's not visible from the ground level.

As this indicates, we removed the entire fourth floor of residences on the Hayden side to bring it down a full floor when there were concerns about four floors facing Hayden Road above the retail. So instead, it was ground for retail with the two floors above. It's not a high-rise, but a midrise. A small portion of it is 45 feet tall. Fourth floor is set back 230 feet from Hayden itself.

[Time: 00:29:35]

The PUD just for point of the reference allows 48 feet with a cap of additional 10 feet for screening. But we're not taking advantage of that and we have stipulated to a total height of 50 feet at the highest portion which is a very minuscule 30% of the overall building. This gives a sense of the building heights but also shows the red arrows an indication of how far setback we are from both of the arterials, both Hayden and Osborn. As well as the greenbelt itself.

This gives perspective in terms of building design and also shows in terms of how this blends into that area and how it will not be perceived as a building in excess height especially because the vast majority of this is at 36 feet. There were concerns about traffic early on by saying, there's less traffic if you approve this application than there will be if this is a retail center. We can quantify it. These are numbers verified by your transportation department as well.

Not only do we have less traffic overall, and not only is the applicant paying for traffic improvements we have better access for increase and egress for this site than any other multifamily site in the city of Scottsdale that's been before you, both the existing condition, what we are looking at for entering the site, and overall access to this site. In terms of density.

I know there are questions and other speakers. In terms of density, we need to talk about what that means. Overall, there is a request that the density be around 24 units to the acre because that was what other multifamily in the area was requesting. Our application does not include the out parcels and the Carl's Jr. that is closed for lack of business and the bank.

In those instances, if we take out that acreage, we have a higher overall acreage, but with those sites, and I will give them to you as both numbers because that's only fair. The site itself, the 7 acres is 34 dwelling units to the acre. If we included just the right of way, not even the property, but the right-of-way adjacent to our property, which includes the shopping center, we would be at 29 dwelling units to the acre.

But if we do what any member the public would do, any citizen visiting this site who cannot see

an invisible property line because they are visiting a shopping center, they would recognize that the entire site of is 23.8 dwelling units per acre which is in line with what those opposed to the application. I have discussed density. I discussed the housing considerations, but I need to just close with this. This is not just a pipe dream and these are not just scare tactics there. Is a shortage of housing.

That shortage of housing is affecting Scottsdale just like it's affecting other municipalities. But Scottsdale because of its scarcity, because of the special nature of Scottsdale, frankly, because of the demands of Scottsdale residents and the city council and what you want to see, there is less housing opportunity. And there are less housing opportunities moving forward this addresses the scarcity and the scarcity will have a huge impact on the actual price of housing.

[Time: 00:33:41]

Most importantly, this is in accordance with your plans. This isn't in accordance with a plan we're changing. We are not looking at changing your general plan. We are looking at designing with Scottsdale's general plan that as you know with your leadership, was just reaffirmed by the citizens of Scottsdale. This is a mixed use parcel.

We are doing mixed use within that parcel, and we're fortunate to have support, frankly, from the folks who are since retired but I saw a letter to the council talking about when they wrote the mixed use provision within the code this is precisely the type of development that was considered.

With that mayor, with staff's support with D.R.'s unanimous support from members of the council would sit here tonight, with the planning commission's support and with overwhelming community support, I urge you to allow this application to be approved so we can improve this site for the entire city, thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We will now move on to public comment and we are certainly permitting remote call-in. I believe there are eight public comment remote requests. They each have three minutes and if the subject is covered, then we can have eight in person.

Shane Stone: Good evening, Mayor Ortega and members of the city council, this is Shane Stone with the city manager's office. Our first remote public comment is coming from Angela Underwood to be followed by Jake Mathie. Ms. Underwood, please press star six and begin your public comment.

Angela Underwood: Can you hear me? My name is Angie Underwood and I work as a nurse at the hospital here in Scottsdale and I wanted to verbalize my support for this project. Due to housing shortages, it has been a challenge for young professionals to find safe and desirable places to live.

And idea of having a new rental community that makes good use of the current space is really

appealing to me. I want to live and work in a community where I can advantage of neighboring business offerings. I continue to support this project, the improvement space through the past months make it even more -- make me even more excited to see this development. Thank you for your time.

Shane Stone: Thank you, Ms. Underwood. Our next public comment will be coming from Jake Mathie to be followed up by Travis Julian. Mr. Mathie, please press star six and begin your public comment.

Jake Mathie: Hi, can you hear me?

Shane Stone: Yes, we can.

[Time: 00:36:54]

Jake Mathie: Fantastic! Good evening, mayor and council. My name is Jake Mathie. I am a return missionary and soon to be graduate of Arizona State University and will be married. As I start my professional career in Scottsdale, my wife, a police officer, are looking for a place where we can form a community of our own.

We have a severe lack in inventory and housing options in the area. We want to live in a city with other young professionals. This is exactly the type of experience we are searching for as we look to start our life in Scottsdale. We like the projects before and we like it even more with all the improvements that have been made. Please accept my support in favor of this project. Thank you.

Shane Stone: Thank you, Mr. Mathie. And our next public comment will be coming from Mr. Travis Junion to be followed up by Becky Jones. Please begin your public comment.

Travis Junion: Good evening, Mayor Ortega and members, Travis Junion, 4183 north 83rd street in Scottsdale. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak telephonically this evening. I have not been shy in my support for this project.

I'm continued to be professed with the professionalism of this team as they engaged the neighbors it thoughtful dialogue and put the current version of greenbelt 88 before you. Numerous substantive changes for the better have been made to this project pursuant to input from the neighbors.

While many silver has been an exemplary property owner, he cannot be expected to overcome the reality of changing consumer habit. The status quo is very simply not an option. All over the valley, we see examples of dead retail centers blighting neighborhoods. Greenbelt 88 is an opportunity to re-invent this into a thriving community asset. That's why I'm involved. I want this project in my neighborhood.

This kind of quality redevelopment, re-investment in Scottsdale is the re-investment that Scottsdale should embrace, and residents deserve. This is an opportunity for this council to course correct away from the recent high density infill projects which offer zero benefit to the surrounding neighborhood.

If a project of this caliber was brought forwarded by a trusted community member, designed by an architect who lives across the street from the project cannot succeed after an arduous approval process and considerable investment, Scottsdale's reputation as a desirable place to do business, is in serious trouble. I strongly urge your support of greenbelt 88.

Shane Stone: Coming up is Ms. Jones. Please begin your public comment.

Becky Jones: Hi, can you hear me?

Shane Stone: Yes, we can.

[Time: 00:40:27]

Becky Jones: Okay. Hi, my name is Becky Jones. I'm at 3200 north Hayden Road in Scottsdale. And I just wanted to also express my support for this project. I think it's really exciting, modern and also visually appealing. I like that it will take over the mall which has been in decline for quite a while. And I have seen on some of the opposition petitions that they don't want apartment people or those kind of people living in the area and I wanted to point out that I lived in an apartment for years and I'm a single mom and just because I wasn't able to come up with a down payment for something else, and I think all of us adults have probably lived in an apartment at some point in life.

Just taking the stance of no more apartment in Scottsdale is backwards and can be bad for business. This development is really exactly what we need to bring just some new life into the existing hear and I urge you to support this project. Thank you.

Shane Stone: Thank you, Ms. Jones. And the next public comments is coming up by Krista Sobol.

Krista Sobol: Can you hear me?

Shane Stone: Yes, we can.

Krista Sobol: He had, I'm Krista Sobol on North Kierland Boulevard and I'm an active Scottsdale real estate agent. I never attended a Scottsdale city council meeting before in person or virtually, but I felt it was really important for me to express my support for greenbelt 88, mostly because as a Realtor, it bothered me when I heard that people would be opposed to this project said it will be bad for their property values.

Do you know what's bad for property values? Aging strip malls with both big and small strip

malls that Scottsdale is riddled with and empty and vacant commercial spaces. These developers have bent over backwards for with us transparency, to the opposition starting two years ago. If you don't pass this project tonight, I'm not sure what you think is going to come next.

This is a mixed use low-rise development that we want. Don't be scared to having more people move to Scottsdale. It's good for Scottsdale's community and small business community. New residents continue to move here every day and this project is where entry level workers, public servants and corporate professionals would be proud to live in.

There's a clear housing shortage that's been talked about tonight and we hear all in the news in the valley every single day and continues to drive home and rent prices through the roof and makes my job very difficult. Please continue to support additional housing options in Scottsdale. Thank you.

Shane Stone: Thank you. The next comments come from Michael Norton. Please begin your public comment.

[Time: 00:43:39]

Michael Norton: Good evening, my name is Michael Norton. I have lived in Scottsdale since 1994. I want to thank you, Mayor Ortega and Vice Mayor Caputi and the city council for allowing me to speak.

I really respect the fact that we get to talk to our city council and get to participate in the decisions that happen in our community. Over the last ten years when whether it was intentional or not, Scottsdale has watched the number of families living in our community. We effectively pushed them out each and every year from 2012 through today.

The number of young families living in our community is it is declined. In their place, we have senior citizens and I'm certainly one of those. One of the remarkable things about my era is that we believed that we will be young forever. We will never grow old. We will never become feeble. We will never get to the point that we have to be wheeled around in a chair or require medical care.

Truth of the matter is that's the opposite of reality. As our city has grown old, our demand for medical care will multiply. About 20 years ago, the hospital administrators and the people that studied the effect of aging in our nation, warned that as we grew old, we would face a crisis. There would not be enough younger people left to take care of us as we grew old and needed extra care every year.

While our era of human beings is more healthy than the aged people before us, the cost of medical care and the needs of staff have multiplied. Over the next five years, if you were to approve 5,000 to 8,000 residences for a year, in area near our hospitals, it might be enough to provide for the workers that need to move to our community to care for us as we grow old.

Maybe you will laugh about this, but with the exception of Vice Mayor Caputi, every single one of us are part of what will become that demand. I urge you to support and approve any housing development near our hospital so we can move the critical healthcare workers necessary to support our community, the community that we have created however we did it, we need healthcare workers and we need them to have a place to live, and we need to get over the notion that having them move somewhere near us to provide services could conceivably be a bad thing for our community.

Approve this project. We need to get over the notion that somehow of building above two stories is a bad thing. It's not. Thank you.

Shane Stone: Thank you, Mr. Norton. Next is Nicole Golding, and Rebecca Bills. Ms. Golding, please press star six on your device.

Nicole Golding: Hi. Can you hear me?

Shane Stone: Yes, we can.

[Time: 00:47:10]

Nicole Golding: Hi, my name is Nicole and I live at 2635 Northeast Hayden Road. I live right near the property. So I really hope you will take my comment in strong consideration as me and my neighbors will be affected the most.

Since the start, I have fully supported the rezone of greenbelt 88, the development team has been really compliant with listening to the neighborhood, communicating with the neighborhood and making changes to the development. I have seen so many updates that they put out that you guys have on your city website.

I fully support the project, the current density, the proposed height. I really don't think it's tall at all, as some of the opposition has been claiming. It's only three and four floors, which, again, I don't think is tall at all and I really don't think it will be blocking any views. I'm looking forward to the public areas to go enjoy the sunset and I honestly think that greenbelt 88 is the change that Scottsdale needs.

I really urge the city councilmembers to listen to the Scottsdale community and that the majority of us supports and wants greenbelt 88. I'm more than confident that it will be a great benefit to Arizona and it should get approved. Thank you.

Shane Stone: Thank you, Ms. Golding. Our next public comment will be coming from Rebecca Mills. Ms. Mills, please press star six on your device and begin your public comment.

Rebecca Mills: Hello? Hello?

Shane Stone: Yes, Ms. Mills, we can hear you.

Rebecca Mills: Okay. My name is Rebecca mills and I live in Scottsdale all my life. I currently live at 3015 north Hayden Road. And I'm 100% in support of this project and I urge all of city councilmembers and the mayor to approve greenbelt 88.

I believe that greenbelt 88 is exactly what is needed to bring positive development to Scottsdale. The developer has made so many changes based off of what the community has said, and the developer has been acting in good faith throughout the entire process.

The developer really has been open to the community and it's time for the city council and the mayor to fully support greenbelt 88. I think the number of apartments, the height and the proposed public plans are absolutely perfect for the area. I fully support greenbelt 88, and I know many Scottsdale friends and family who support it as well.

I urge members of the city council vote in the best interest of Scottsdale and approve the greenbelt 88 rezone. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I believe that concludes the remote input from the public. We will now turn to in person. And we have eight in person, beginning with Thomas Mayer and then Don Henninger. Please state your address and welcome.

[Time: 00:50:18]

Thomas Mayer: Can you hear me?

[Laughter]

My name is Thomas Mayer and I live at 2824 north 69th place in Scottsdale, south Scottsdale. I'm here to voice my support for greenbelt 88 and to ask that you vote in favor of this project. And here's why.

I live and work in south Scottsdale and I'm quite familiar with the area. I shop at the stores, I dine in the restaurants and I enjoy our parks, our galleries and our museums. I like Scottsdale. It's my home.

And as a Realtor, a licensed Realtor, I spend much of my time working with buyers looking for homes in Scottsdale. But there's two little available housing and prices for single family homes are a little too high. Whether for rent or to purchase. We can't build more single family homes in built out neighborhoods, but we can build high quality multiuse projects to meet the demand for affordable housing in south Scottsdale. Greenbelt 88 is such a project.

It rejuvenates a struggling shopping center into a thriving multiuse community. It combines

affordable residential living with retail shops and restaurants. It has plenty of parking and open space and provides immediate access to walking and biking paths and it even has a golf course nearby. There will be no short-term rentals.

The residents of this project will likely already be employed in Scottsdale, and in time will be potential buyers of single family homes right here in Scottsdale. Current retail tenants including Uncle Sal's restaurants one of my favorites were offered leases and an opportunity to relocate to a new building to facilitate continuous operations during construction.

This project is a win for south Scottsdale, and for those who wish to make Scottsdale their home. I ask that you approve the greenbelt 88 rezoning and I thank you for your time.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next we have Don Henninger and then Jeffrey Davidson.

[Time: 00:52:59]

Don Henninger: Mayor Ortega, Vice Mayor Caputi, members of council, my name is Don Henninger, 8282, also with Scott, the Scottsdale coalition of today and tomorrow. I'm here in support of greenbelt 88. The timing on this project is of interest.

One, it's been winding through the city process for a couple of years now and it's had many revisions along the way to make it more amenable to neighbors in that area. I have now heard at least five city councilmembers speak in positive terms about what the developers have done to the project based on community feedback. And as we have heard now, they have done quite a lot. But the timing is of interest for another reason too.

It's now well known that Scottsdale, as well as other cities in the valley is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis. We have known that about Scottsdale for a long time, the fact that 80% of those who work in our city come from somewhere else, mostly because they can't afford to live here, is well documented.

The result is that many needed jobs are going unfilled, resorts and restaurants, and patrons are frustrated when they wait in long lines, while the restaurant is half full. Healthcare faces similar challenges and we hear the same thing from police and fire as well. It's attracting the attention of the state legislature.

The legislature is now considering ways that will allow the state to override city zoning requirements with less stringent ones. There's a bill in the house right now that would contain a buy right zoning process for apartment and single family home developments. Much the land that would be affected currently can be rezoned only by cities. The bill allows for higher density housing that most metro Phoenix cities are approving now. It would require faster decisions on zoning changes.

Cities surely don't want this to happen. And this these groups are lobbying hard. Back to

greenbelt 88, what we have here is a known entity, a quality project with lots of concessions that would turn a dilapidated retail center into an attractive neighborhood attraction. It would be a shame to see this fail because of pressures who live nowhere near it. And if doesn't pass who knows what we might encounter if the state decides to override zoning laws that guide your decisions.

This is worthy of approval and I hope you view it favorably with it comes time for a vote. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Jeffrey Davidson and Anthony Levy.

[Time: 00:56:01]

Jeffrey Davidson: Good afternoon. My name is Jeffrey Davidson. I live in Scottsdale at 14145 north 92nd street. I work at the waterfront and I jog on the greenbelt when the weather is nice and I'm fully in support of this project. I'm a lifelong renter, especially with housing prices being the way they are right now and that's what I will be doing in the foreseeable future, and I would be thrilled to live in a complex like this with the greenbelt.

It's been said that big box stores are struggling and this would bring more people and businesses to Scottsdale and I look forward to jogging by it in the near future and your support. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Anthony Levy and Jan Vichich.

Anthony Levy: Good evening mayor and Vice Mayor and councilmembers. My name is Anthony Levy, I live at 8750 East Monterey Way, 85251. Our group safeguards Scottsdale has never called anyone a disparaging name. We have never said we were against progress. We have never said we look down on people that live in apartments we have never used the plan at the developer's open houses to speak against this program but this is -- this has been what has been said and done to at the open house in the Arizona republic, in the industrial publications.

We have -- all we have ever asked for is a three-story building, with 24 units per acre, or upgrade lucky plaza. What we were -- what we got was threatened to build storage rental building units on the property. There are already 10,000 apartments approved for Scottsdale that have not yet been completed. Then there are also thousands more completed. Most of these are in south Scottsdale. The most densely populated area of our city. Enough is enough.

Be the first city council in the valley to stand up to these developers. We were told in the last election that this council would listen to the people, and it's time to prove that.
Vote no on the greenbelt 88.

Mayor Ortega: Next we have Jan V and Margie Creeden.

Jan Vuicich: Mayor Ortega, Vice Mayor Caputi, and councilmembers, as you guys know, I have

gotten to know you well over the past two years, and I appreciate all the hard work that you guys have put in, as well as the developers.

So when we started this group, it was to voice our thoughts on how we can get this project to a community benefit. We did that. If we hadn't stood up, we would be sitting here with a five-story 388 unit apartment, building multiuse complex. But what we have got today is actually a really good project. Kudos. You guys. Jeff, amazing. Seriously, I love this project, but it's not an overall community benefit. You have reduced the density. It's tell a four-story building.

And the dwelling units are still above the 20 to 24 units which are in our area. Now it does coincide what is happening on Scottsdale Road. This would be the first four-story building on the greenbelt. To me, that is not a precedence that we want to set. I have sent you numerous letters as well as other people here, talking about the community overall benefit. Talking about the infrastructure, the strain that we feel in our area.

The census was completed in 2021 and based off of that census, the average density for population per mile in Scottsdale is 1400 people per square mile. And our zip code 85251, it is over 5,000 people per mile. That's a tremendous amount of infrastructure strain. We are feeling it, the pressure, the traffic, and the community is feeling the lack of resources, the shortage of all of our grocery store shelves, the lack of quick retail that we can get to.

[Time: 01:00:54]

Now, retail is changing, I give you that, big box stores are probably going away, that is true, but the need to have an instant gratification and walk into a store and get what you need right away is what we need.

If this was a successful property, that was managed with a property manager that returned cars and actively got in tenants at this place, then we would probably see very successful retail. The shop at Thomas and Hayden is very successful and is keeping up. All we're asking is make it more of a community benefit. As a group hard, we have worked hard to get our voices here for two years. Not my job. Not my day job. We are still here. We are still asking you to support us and vote no on the PUD.

We don't want it to come back with more apartments than what they are coming you today. That has happened at 1000 Scottsdale Road. Please vote no on this PUD.

Mayor Ortega: Next.

Margie Creeden: I'm Margie Creeden, 2940 north 83rd street. I came from the Phoenix Open today. Didn't phone it in. Ubered down here. Because it was a lot of fun. But anyways, I'm here because we have been here for two years. Our neighborhood has been here for two years trying to speak out.

There's been a lot of talk about housing shortage. We have 8,000 to 10,000 apartments already on the bill, on the docket ready to go. Let's see how that pans out before we have to do this 2.5% of that 8,000, 238. I just think it's a small amount but if you see the heart of the neighborhood, you see that we want something different.

If you heard us, at least, would you know that we have talked about right sizing. We have right sized our elementary schools because we had to. We right sized our middle schools in this town, we right sized retail. It's not storage rooms and churches or mixed use hybrid apartment complexes.

It should be that the developers offer something to the owner that's something different and if the developers can't, I certainly can. Ask me, I will talk with the owner and show him exactly what we need to do. I go to that place probably three or four times a week. We have been at the dance studio. We have been to office max and big five. I get my Tonto rim permit there to go kayaking.

I don't know if the owner has ever really sat down to talk to us, and maybe we are way beyond that but there's already 8,000 on the docket and we had a handful of new councilmembers here. I'm sure you were inspired to do something different for the city of Scottsdale, for the people of Scottsdale would voted for you and what is different if we did 8,000 with the prior council, what are you going to do that is different.

[Time: 01:04:23]

I want to live in Carmel Valley, Carmel Valley is not going to build me a four-story so I can go live there because I want to. You know, they are just not going to do that and we have 8,000 available. So this is peanuts and we are sitting here and talking for two years. We don't get paid for this. Like I said, I cut my day short to come down here and not phoning it in. I'm trying one last time to be heard by the people I voted for and oh, we're a different council and keep Scottsdale special. That's all I'm asking for. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Next we have Alex McLaren and Paula Sturgeon and five more in-person speakers to go.

Alex McLaren: Mayor, members the council, Vice Mayor, my name is Alex McLaren. I live at 7642 Osborn Road. I don't live as close as the project architect, but I live pretty close. I know there's been a lot of neighborhood input and I applaud that. I applaud all of the citizens who take the time to come down to the council and make their voices heard on projects. So I appreciate that. I think we all need to comment on that.

There's been significant inputs, significant opposition to the project, I was initially opposed to this project when I first saw it. It was a four-story building for me it was the -- the massing was to intense. Papago Plaza, I think I opposed that from this podium, two or three years ago. I was concerned about the massing.

In November last year, I heard that there might be some changes to the project and I met with George Pasquale and he showed me what the changes would be and how the buildings have been pulled back, when you saw those exhibits that were presented. Also the height has been lowered. So I think the pulling back of the building and the pushing the height down has ameliorated the problem. The massing problem.

The development plan, I think you saw that existing building turns the existing buildings turn their back on the Indian bend wash. They don't face the wash. The new buildings will face the Indian bend wash. And the plaza area and the Paseo, the walkway around the building, I think is going to be a great enhancement.

The development agreement was talked about, if the zoning expires after five and a half years, they have committed to commercial 25,000 there's the flex office space and also the workforce housing. This is a graphic of Gentry on the Green, which was approved unanimously by council. It's a four-story building with over 1,000 units. I think that the density on that is 48 dwelling units per acre.

[Time: 01:08:16]

The economic impact that this project will have in the city, the development review -- the sewer impact fees, the water impact fees, the sales tax revenue from the properties will be significant. Also it will go on the city's tax rolls. There will be property taxes which are collected over the years. If you don't approve this project, I think it's going to give a signal that the city is not prepared to approve high-quality development, which I think this is. I would urge you to approve it project. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Ms. Paula Sturgeon.

Paula Sturgeon: Good evening mayor, Vice Mayor and members of the council. I really thought I knew what I wanted to say to you tonight, but I have heard it from so many others. Asking you, pleading with you to hear the needs of the neighbors. Asking to are more housing, more opportunities for retail and the like. But, you know what I really think is important for you to hear is that Scottsdale is not a static city. It never has been. Nor do I think any of you want it to be.

We cannot roll back the clock. We cannot turn back to the golden years of Scottsdale if you ask me, that was in the late '60s and early '70s when we ran through the fields. We're not going to do that. That's long gone, but it took great vision to see the impact and the power of the greenbelt.

It takes great vision to see a city like ours where there can be folks living far north on beautiful acre lots, and folks living in the south and small humble homes and folks all throughout our city living where they can afford to live, in apartments and condos and townhouses. The future, my

friends is a different kind of housing mix.

We are not going to have John Paul move in and build more red brick homes. My dear friend and bridge partner just sold a home that her family bought just north of Indian School for \$11,300 because they put air conditioning in it. Sold for \$625,000. Bite down hard on that one. You know what that became? It is now a bnb, a party house.

These will be home to the nurses that called in, to the technicians who want to work here. It will help alleviate the 180,000 vehicle trips made into this city every single day. We need housing for the people who want to work here. Gone are the days when officer Jones parked his cruiser in the parking lot down the street from our house on mulberry drive. Now we are in a new era in Scottsdale.

You are our elected leaders. We hope and we pray that those of us in favor of this project, that you listen. There are 12,000 signatures -- 1200 signatures on a petition in favor of this project. Listen to the people who called in. Listen to the future asking you to lead. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next we have Craig Citizen and Sara Andrews followed by Jason Alexander.

[Time: 01:12:21]

Craig Citizen: Thank you very much. A lot of very passionate people. Thank you, mayor, Vice Mayor. My real name is Craig Citizen. It's my last name. It's not just an alias as my parking tickets probably show. I would like to voice my support for the project.

I have heard both sides of it, and just to bring in a different outlook that I think we have all heard the same thing quite a few times but I think that one of the things that impresses me the most about it is that it's not taking up any more of desert. It's not pushing any animals or putting pore strain on our environment. This area is already built. It's already part of the urban dynamic. I'm a real estate agent. So I won't beat a dead horse and tell you what it looks like out there, but it's gnarly. We need more houses. This is progress.

And I think it's the only way forward but I do appreciate being part of the civic process. So thank you, everybody, and I'm happy that everybody in the city that here tonight loves the city of Scottsdale so much. It's incredible. Thank you all.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Sara Andrews and then Jason Alexander. And then Dan Rumen.

Sara Andrews: Hi, good evening, Mayor Ortega, Vice Mayor Caputi. As a Arizona native, I frequent this shopping center for regular basis. I use the credit union. I know that's old school, but I do. I go to neighborhood areas that have walking paths to take my dog along the greenbelt, sitting in the grass enjoying our great weather here.

As a millennial, professional, homeowner, I'm excited to see the redevelopment of this plaza. It's great to see new developments put in time and effort in Scottsdale to keep us fresh and desirable.

As shown time and again, the updating of development in the area has helped our home values more in comparison to other cities in the Phoenix area. The update to this dated plaza helped the appearance and perceived view of this neighborhood. This will keep our property values strong and encourage the upkeep of surrounding properties as well keeping it clean.

This project as presented and shown by staff and planning commission, I have full confidence that this project has been reviewed in the best interest of us as neighbors, in bringing a quality project.

I hope with everything considered on this project, and benefit to our great city, that this project is approved to finish design and begin development. I'm if full support of this project. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Jason Alexander and then Dan Rumen.

[Time: 01:15:22]

Jason Alexander: Hi, Jason Alexander, 9976 East Jasmine Drive. Each of you ran on a promise of quality growth. Not pro growth, not antigrowth, but quality growth. This project before you today is a totally different project than what it was two years ago. It has 50% less units, nearly 50% more retail. A list as long as my arm of improvements that were driven by resident feedback. This project shows that the process works.

The collaboration and, yes, the pushback from the neighborhood has been excellent if creating a better project. I don't know if they showed it yet I was standing up there, but I certainly hope at some point we see a before and after of what this project looked like versus where it is today. Before it was a big ugly box and none of us would want that anywhere in Scottsdale. That is not what it is today.

Jeff Brant has done a phenomenal job of opening this up and making it a project the city can be proud of. The people were heard. Yes, there have been lots of letters for and lots of letters against over the course of two years. I think to be fair and honest to the feedback you received, you should qualify the feedback as to how it reflects current project. I think if you do that, most of those objections have been met.

I have been monitoring the social media on this project, and Facebook for the last three months at least on this has been virtually quiet. Nextdoor which we all know can be a very robust and sporting environment has also been virtually quiet open this subject. At the outreach meeting, about two weeks ago, when you were all at, I think there were maybe two questions in opposition to this project.

There were a number of, I would say, far more people in support. Tonight, I just did a count of the comments and I make the 16th speaker in favor of this project versus three against. There are only a few people would remain opposed to this project and as you have seen in the many emails they sent to you, some of them are opposed to apartments. They have been quoted as saying no more apartments.

We all know the crisis that is happening with housing, with Scottsdale residents being priced out of their homes, priced out of their apartments. I sent you a letter on that, about an 80-year-old woman being priced out of her apartment. We have an obligation to help our current citizens, our future citizens and our essential employees and our professional employees to have a place to live.

Finally, I read an article in the progress on the budget discussions from I believe it was last week. And what we saw was that retail taxes are pay up, but fees for new starts have not kept up. They are dramatically below. What we are seeing is a boon from the COVID retail spending. This economy will contract. The spending will dry up. Interest rates are already rising. And Scottsdale is due for a correction in what will prove to be one of the worst economies it's seen probably since the great recession, in 2024 and that will be an election issue for each of you. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next we have Dan Rumen and Scott Modalski.

[Time: 01:19:13]

Dan Rumen: Hi, I'm a 55-year-old long resident living on that street on Osborn and 84th place and I would like to I'm not anti-development. There's no reason to increase density and development in the neighborhood where they're not going to be able to handle 500 plus cars coming in and out of that development, where they are going to be pulling out -- the gentleman at the start of this thing said that these are the access points.

Those access points are going to be that number of cars going through this daily. You approved a development on Indian School and granite reef that cannot handle the parking situation on that corner to this day S. there going to be enough parking? That's my major concern. The parking is going to be overflowing. So number four out of 16 against it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Scott Modalski.

Scott Modalski: I'm here to mention my support of the project and really my comments are going to echo what many of the other supporters have said. Number one, we all know retail landscape is changing. This site is obsolete, and it's going to continue to become more obsolete. And I think, you though when you look at the environment, 100,000 people are moving to the valley. We need housing for them. Home prices have doubled in Scottsdale.

That's great for existing owners but it's not great for people trying to buy a home. And I think we need to support the growth. With we're a borough growth city, and a pro growth

state, and I think that's we should be supportive of the project. I think the density is sufficient for the streets and what is already built. I think there's enough access, there's enough room for the additional residents.

And truthfully if you don't let a development like this, the site becomes more obsolete and it will be a hindrance to the neighborhood and not a benefit like this project could be and that's why I'm supportive.

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you one and all. I see no other requests for public comment. I will close the public comment. I will open up to first of all, to questions to that allowing the applicant to answer any questions that council may have, and that could go for either question to staff or the applicant. Okay. And I guess we will allow a rebuttal.

Vice Mayor Caputi: I will ask one quick question, only because it was brought up in the public comments and I don't think we addressed it in the presentation. This was a question about parking and I don't remember that the applicant described the parking situation. So maybe just a quick explanation to satisfy that question would be great.

[Time: 01:22:40]

Jeff Brand: Hello, my name is Jeff brand. I work at Nelson partner but I live at 8128 east Mitchell. I may be the closest person to this site. Thank you for the question. I realized actually just sitting there that listening to all the public comments, because through DRB and planning commission, I actually have never had a chance to address publicly this entire project.

So with your permission, I would like to add maybe a minute on that response to give my history on the project and also answer that question. Is that okay, Mayor Ortega.

Mayor Ortega: Yes, proceed.

Jeff Brand: As I said before, my name is Jeff brand, I approached this project because I was a concerned neighbor. I live right up the street. I had seen the plans for it and I didn't care for what was being developed in the neighborhood.

I came on to the project and was really hoping for coming of working on the Papago Plaza project which was a lot of community -- intense community feedback and negative experience that turned positive.

I was hoping for a really grassroots project to be able to participate on a fundamental level on what was being developed in literally my backyard. Because of complications from COVID and complications of community outreach and the platforms we have been able to do, it's turned into something really difficult, which is regrettable.

I want to say in summary, I'm less concerned about -- there's a lot of concerns about housing.

My number one concern was saving and retaining the retail and the restaurants and what we love and use on this site to begin with and that's why when we started this process, there was a requisite.

We retain all the shops and the retail that's currently there and we retain the restaurants and we add restaurants and add a great place making experience. I wanted to add that in there as I realized I never even addressed council or any of the boards and commissions.

The project is over parked with all the city standards. During the process of this project, the parking standards for multifamily were upgraded and the garage was expanded and accommodates fully 100% of the parking requirements of project.

Furthermore, the complications of the project on granite reef and Indian School Road which I drive by every single day is primarily because all of the garages were translated into storage units on the ground level and so there's no control over that project and it is leaking out into the single family neighborhoods.

There's zero adjacent single family neighborhoods to this mixed use multifamily portion. So there's no changer of leakage of cars out in the single family neighborhoods.

Mayor Ortega: I have one quick question. The name always intrigued me greenbelt 88, and then I also heard that at one point this project had 388 units.

[Time: 01:26:03]

Jeff Brand: I believe that the application that was filed a year before our application was filed, which is the site plan that I had looked at had a unit count of 388 units, that's correct.

Mayor Ortega: That would be approximately 213 more than what we normally would consider an R.5, which would be 24 units per acre. Thank you for clarifying that. I think if there's any other area that the applicant would like to cover based on some of the public testimony -- we are not going to give you more time to complete your -- whatever you feel is appropriate to answer any objections or questions you have got three minutes to the applicant.

Jason Morris: I appreciate that mayor and council, I think predominantly having Jeff who is the project architect have an opportunity to share with you his experience, was vital to explaining what drove this project. But I will say first and foremost, I want to echo something that Jan V. mentioned that I think is absolutely true.

This project is a better project today because of her involvement and because of the community involvement that volumed as a result of where we started and where we are. It is a better project and oftentimes that compromise, that work creates a better project. I will also point out no project is ever perfect.

And if we were working towards a perfect project, nothing would ever get built. What I will say and I shared this with you at the outset, there has been no better project in terms of checking every box. We stood here today. We listened to five times as many supporters as those opposed and frankly, even those opposed were circumspect about what they said on the project.

Next, I think it's worth talking about the fact that as we listen to some of the comments made, there was a comment made about right sizing. And creating a right sized project. We have striven to do that over the last two years because frankly, it's more lucrative to have retail than to have a residential unit and I started with that and I will end with that as well.

The idea is to make this a successful mixed use project and bring that retail and right size it and fortunately we had the benefit of someone like Jeff Brant who has done mixed use, who has worked open some of the premier Scottsdale retail experiences and asks for his assistance to create that right sizing.

And we have done that we have done that by bringing in traffic consultants to ensure we don't have those issues. We have addressed parking. We addressed height. We addressed density. We addressed setback. We have addressed public amenities. We have addressed the improvements. We have addressed the surrounding business owners, the surrounding residential communities, and finally, we have got your community support behind this project. So thank you. Thank you for your time and we are happy to answer any additional questions.

[Time: 01:29:50]

Mayor Ortega: At this point, I don't see any questions but I think it's important for you. You put up a slide showing the density and I think it started to reference adjoining properties, talking about off-site properties in my opinion that slide is pretty incriminating, okay? Because whenever you represent a project, you normally don't say, well, if you added the adjacent property into it our average is lower or if you averaged something across the street and in this case you are even adding the area of the center line of the street which is not on your property, or not fronting your property.

So what you have done is you have exposed what -- one of the problems I have with this project because you have danced around the density question, by trying to include these other areas. Now that's not a door I want to open as the mayor or in my position as an architect in the past.

You can't do that in the long term and then do it to justify the greater density. The reason I brought up the 88 -- the 388 that would have pushed the density at 55 units per acre. So that may have been before they started in some dream world thinking they could do that. I came on board later, you know. It was already many process, I believe.

So then, you know, we see the questions of how far do you push the envelope and that, to me is a -- is an obstacle on this case. You then reduced it to, I think, 283. So you lopped off 100. And

then right now, you are still about 63 over what we would call an r5. And that is also excessive from what we would say is normal. Now, I asked the staff to always show what the variance is so

it's clear for public and we understand the difference pretty clearly. Regardless of whether you want to add 1,000 parking spaces there and then say well, we will allow more density, the density rule still remains pretty regular and the outside of the main growth areas.

Now, with this context, again, I like leaving that up because it tells me that this is exceeding the criteria and even today, it's exceeding the criteria by 63 units. That's an excessive density, and you illustrated it for me to see. So the question is: Is it appropriate for us to -- or for me to basically have about a 25% or almost 30% -- you would have been allowed 175 units to consider that. And -- and why? That's -- that's the problem we're having with this. Now --

Jason Morris: If that's the question --

Mayor Ortega: And then we will go to Councilmember Milhaven and other discussion before we hear a motion.

[Time: 01:33:39]

Jason Morris: Thank you so much, mayor. I appreciate the question, and all of the background behind the question. And frankly, I'm glad that you pointed out this particular slide, because it is important to the understanding of this, and I appreciate your reference to the r5 density, but we're not requesting r5.

So we're not 63 units ahead of r5. We're requesting a different zoning category. I will also point out that typically, as you look at multifamily, the cutoff for the viability, the management, of a multi family community is 250 units.

Unless it was some type of specialized boutique type use, you typically see about 250 units being the cutoff. As you noted, the numbers have dropped dramatically. And we provided this exhibit because one of the neighbors specifically indicated that a 24-unit project was one that would be considered compatible with this community, this portion of the community.

So given that and understanding that lucky plaza was built 40 years ago as a plaza. It wasn't built as four different property owners coming in and building four different properties. It was a shopping center and all of us you and I and the community have experienced driving in to a shopping center.

And I want to make it very clear, when we were doing these density calculations, we didn't try to take advantage of any properties across street or nearby. We gave two different densities as we are showing here so it was illustrative of what property feels like. We took out first so we were being completely transparent and in accord with your rules, regulations and application processes. All land that we didn't own and under your calculations that was 34 dwelling

communities to the acre. That's the top number and the number on our application and the number in your staff report.

But frankly, it's unfair to the council, up fair to the community and misleading to consider it 34 units per acre. You can't see the property lines. Unless you are a surveyor and knows where the brass caps are. No one driving to the bank looks and thinks, I wonder who owns the bank. I wonder who owns the now closed Carl's Jr. I wonder who owns Starbucks. They look at it and experience a shopping center.

So our perspective in this exhibit was if you are feeling it as a shopping center and you want to know what the true density is, sort of like the real temperature versus adding in the wind chill, what it feels like. It is, in fact, 24 units per acre. But that's not how we calculate it. So we wanted to make sure you have the benefit --

Mayor Ortega: You were talking about a sensible thing that you --

Jason Morris: I very rarely do.

Mayor Ortega: And then just this bringing forth other comments from colleagues. In the interim from when this maybe started on the boards and changes architects and has come down with reduced density, you also mentioned the general plan. Now, the general plan --

Jason Morris: Mixed use.

Mayor Ortega: Was adapted by us calls high density up to 25 units per acre. So that's what is reflected in the high -- in the general plan. In my interpretation.

Jason Morris: And I think that is the key. I think that is the key phrase. It is your interpretation.

[Time: 01:37:47]

Mayor Ortega: And that's why it's important. Before there was no definition of high density, or even highest density, but in particular, it does call for high density of cap of 25 in the non-core growth areas. So I'm making that point because also, again, it's where lawyers and architects split hairs right? So let me move on to Councilmember Milhaven.

Jason Morris: Just if you wanted me to address that because I think you have raised that in the past, that actually that's a parking provision. It's a not density cap and in terms of mixed use, this property with a mixed use general plan designation actually fits squarely as your staff reports lays out in the mixed use confines of your general plan, but you are right.

Mayor Ortega: I wasn't talking about mixed use.

Jason Morris: But that is what is shown.

Jason Morris: 20% in the parking category.

Mayor Ortega: I was talking about the definition of high density, which is defined in our general plan and the land use element 25 per acre is the cap. I'm not talking about mixed use of other commercial uses on a property. That's another subject. So I just want to clarify that. That definition was ratified by the people of Scottsdale.

Jason Morris: Right.

Mayor Ortega: And that comes closer to what -- what the expectations were of the neighborhood. Let me move on to Councilmember Milhaven, Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Milhaven: Before I start my remarks: I want to add this in if this was in conflict in the general plan, then it would be in the staff report and there is a different process that goes through that.

So it seems that while the mayor may think it's in conflict with the general plan, certainly the experts on staff do not see it that way. Also in terms of what is allowed is what this council decides whether or not this wants to approve this project.

Back to what I was going to say, I have been on council for 12 years and in 12 years, this is one of the finest projects I have seen. And in 12 years, I don't know that I have seen another project be more responsive to the concerns of the neighbors virtually everything the neighbors raised, they made changes to.

[Time: 01:40:08]

It may not have been everything that the neighbors would have liked to have seen but they made significant changes in response to virtually all of the neighbors' concerns. I think this is a wonderful, wonderful project.

One of the speakers talked about some of my colleagues campaigning on listening to neighbors and somebody else talked about quality development. I think what we learn when we sit in these chairs for the first time, yes our job is to listen and then our job is to really dig in and learn because there's 240,000 people sitting at home hoping that we're going to make the best decision for the future of our community.

And so while we need to listen to neighbors, it's -- we also need to learn and bring our best decision-making for greater good. We also learn that this' very little that we do here that everyone unanimously agrees with. It seems no matter how we vote and no matter when we do, someone isn't going to like what we did and so that also challenges us when we say we want to listen from neighbors as we heard from some folks who say we elected you to listen to us, and we listened to everybody and there seem to be lots and lots of opinions on this project.

I hope that my colleagues will balance the need to listen with quality development.

You know this I think this project is really important. I know some of the speakers felt as though they were being threatened with self-storage or some other less agreeable use and I'm sorry that you see it as a threat but I think as the mayor said we need to be practical here. If we were going to do a three-story project, what you will get is a plain old stucco stick-built apartment building.

You are not going to get one level of retail with the apartments above it and I actually think this mixed use retaining the retail in this neighborhood is a huge benefit. It's much better than fewer smaller apartments and it's better than a failed shopping center, because if -- when the shopping center fails and the apartments are not going to be approved, the owner will have to do something with this, and so whether it's a church or a school or self-storage.

[Time: 01:42:27]

It's not a threat but a real practical implication of what could happen if this doesn't get approved. You know, when I look at what it does, it reorients to the greenbelt. So the greenbelt is not looking at the back of dumpsters and loading docks. There's more open space. There's more landscaping. I mean, I envision having dinner on one of the restaurant patios.

That will be part of this public space and enjoying a beverage and watching the sunset because it's such a beautiful community amenity. While I understand that folks are concerned about traffic, our traffic experts say the streets can handle it. They are changing the intersection to make it safer.

All of these things say I think that this will be a great amenity to the community despite folks' concerns about what that will do, I think it will be a much better. People talked about keep Scottsdale special. We all agree Scottsdale is a special place. We all want to keep Scottsdale special, but I think we have to think about, well, then what is that? This is a wonderful community to live in. There's a robust business community. The business community needs access to workers.

And when we talk about housing, it's about maintaining that balance in our community that says, we have a robust community. They have access to labor. We've got a variety of housing so the people who serve our community whether they work in the hospitals or police department have a police to live.

I loved into my neighborhood three 30 years ago and in the square mile where my house sits, there were -- they were apartments and there were townhomes and half acre lots and quarter acre lots and I thought what brilliant planning that anybody can live in this neighborhood, whatever your desire is for the kind of place that you want to live, you can live in this neighborhood and I thought that was brilliant planning that made it a richer community and I look at this in the same way.

We are -- and I have talked to many people in the industry, we have far more single family homes in ratios as far as other communities and so I think that we need to continue to approve good projects like this one. I have heard folks saying, yes, there's been 9,000 apartments approved but we also know we are four or five years behind being able to meet that and so while that may be a lot, it's not enough.

We need not to be wholesaling approving apartments but picking the really good projects one by one and so I think this is a wonderful project. I think this will be a big, bad, project. These are our neighbors coming forward. And I know my colleagues will have other things to say but I'm certainly supportive of this wonderful project.

[Time: 01:45:11]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Janik and Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Janik: If appropriate, I would like to make a motion.

Mayor Ortega: Sure.

Councilmember Janik: Do we have discussion after the motion.

Mayor Ortega: I would say the applicant can sit down. We have one more councilmember that raised his hand. He may have a question for -- but if you had a question of the applicant.

Councilmember Janik: No, I wanted to make a motion.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham, any question or comment that you had.

Councilmember Durham: No questions, Your Honor.

Mayor Ortega: Then at this point, yield to Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Janik: This is a very, very difficult decision. There are good arguments on both sides. There has been a lot of compromise from the point of the developer. And I'm going to be requesting that we get more compromise from him so that we make this the best possible development.

It is not I win a you lose, I lose, you win. It is about what thoughtful growth is, and to me, it is about what is best for Scottsdale. No ego involved. No name calling. Just what I believe is best for so I move that we adopt ordinance number 4522 approving a zoning district map amendment from planned neighborhood center planned community district, PNCPCD to planned unit development pud, including a development plan with amended development standards for building setbacks for a mixed-use center with 238 multifamily dwelling units and

approximately 29,000 square feet for commercial floor area on a plus or minus 7-acre site.

Number two, adopt resolution 12281 declaring the document titles greenbelt 88 development end quote to be a public record. Number three, adopt resolution number 12284, authorizing development, conditional zoning and reversion agreement number 2021-154-COS with Village Property Management LLC. Subject to the following stipulations and amendments. A, the maximum number of residential units shall not exceed 228. B, the fourth floor shall be reduced by an additional 30% from what is currently shown in the development plan with an emphasis for that reduction being along the frontage road along Hayden and Osborn Roads, with these amendments being made as required in the zoning case stipulations, the development plan, and the development agreement.

Councilmember Milhaven: Second.

[Time: 01:48:27]

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and a second. I now see three council people. Would you like to speak to your second or we'll go to Councilmember Durham, Councilmember Littlefield and Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Durham: Can I get some clarification from Councilwoman Janik on whether that was a repetition of the project on the table or is it an amendment?

Councilmember Janik: It's an amendment, and it turns out that currently we had 238 units. And now we will be down to 228 units, which is about a 25% reduction from the initial 300. Not 388, but 300.

It is an additional reduction again of 30% which is about a 60% reduction from the initial of 90,000 square feet and then 30% reduction from the 39,000 square feet. So it's a substantial reduction in the fourth floor space.

Councilmember Durham: Okay.

Mayor Ortega: Any other questions? I have Councilwoman Littlefield and Whitehead next. Did you have another comment?

Councilmember Durham: I wanted to speak to the original plan. Is that appropriate at this time?

Mayor Ortega: Yes, it is. Yes, it is.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. I'm in support of the original plan that's been placed before us and any decision of this importance, and it is important, I think, requires a full explanation. So please bear with me. We have a serious shortage of housing in Scottsdale, and I think it's even worse than what Mr. Morris indicated.

Last week the apartment list site indicated that there was a 31% increase in rental rates in Scottsdale over the last year. And that made us number three in the nation and we were number three and not number two, only because New York's rental decline at the beginning of the pandemic provided them more upside to increase rental rates faster than Scottsdale.

And when you are competing with New York, that's not good. There can't be a 31% increase in rental rates, unless there's a serious rental shortage here. Late last year, the -- the independent reported that 81% of Scottsdale workers don't live in Scottsdale. And Mr. Thompson has told us that 72% of city employees don't live in Scottsdale.

[Time: 01:51:15]

And I learned today that 16% -- only 16% of our police force lives in Scottsdale. And only 17% of our fire department employees live in Scottsdale. Now, many of them may have personal reasons for living elsewhere. But for many of them, I suspect that it's because they can't afford to live in Scottsdale and I think that's truly unfortunate when our fire and police employees can't afford to live here.

Now if people who work in Scottsdale don't live here, that means that the majority of them are going to be on the 101 every day. And we hear complaints about traffic all the time. And if women don't live here, that's going to contribute to higher traffic. So what are the consequences of a rental shortage?

Well, we have heard stories of seniors being evicted from apartments. Young people can't find a place to live here and start off their families and lives and workers must commute as I said. That adds more traffic, more traffic, more pollution. That means they are going to be on the 101 every day. Homelessness is another problem. We often hear people here say they don't to be like Los Angeles or San Francisco, but if you don't build enough places for people to live, we will be like Los Angeles or San Francisco.

And finally, it contributes to a worker shortage. If people can't live near where they work, that's going to contribute to a shortage of workers here in Scottsdale. So I received a number of emails asking that we not allow any more apartments but some of these same emails have asked that we do something about high rental rates. And the only thing we can do about high rental rates is to judiciously allow some growth in apartments. Arizona doesn't allow rent control and even if it did, I think it's a bad idea that I wouldn't allow here.

So one of our sources of our housing problem is undoubtedly the high number of short-term rentals that we have here. And all of us wish we could do something about it. It leads to high prices as investors step in, high prices for those investors increases the overall price of property here. It increases rental rates.

We know that we have about 5,000 units in short-term rentals and if we didn't have those, we

would have much more reasonable rents. Unfortunately, those 5,000 units are a reality that we have to recognize and so as long as the state legislature acts the way it does, we have a hard time doing anything about that. So my belief is that we need to increase the number of rental apartments here. That only creates the question. It only raises the issue.

[Time: 01:54:56]

We have to do that in a way that preserves our character, preserves our neighborhoods. As I have said before, I approach each case like this by asking a series of questions. The first one here, is this a good use for the property? I believe it is. I explained why we need apartments. This will increase retail, which will create spots for the current tenants and combined with new tenants, I hope it will revitalize this spot.

And the next question is, is this the right location for this project? I think it is. This mall has seen better days. This includes vacant spaces and retail trends are passing it by. In both the old and the new general plan approved the revitalization of older properties such as this one, and say that it's an apartment part of our long-term economic well-being.

And the new and the old general plan also recognized that we need diversity in housing. And as I said, we don't have enough of that diversity right now. And as for the project itself, I would not have approved it in its original form. But there have been many improvements, most of them due to the hard work of the residents would have worked on this for so long -- would have worked on this for so long and they should be congratulated for the improvements that have resulted.

This project doesn't front upon Hayden, so it doesn't create the kind of canyon effect that occurs in many places. Fourth floor has been pulled back, preserving views along the greenbelt, preserving views from Hayden and other areas. The density has been reduced. There's an increase in larger apartments. This is not a high raise apartment -- high-rise apartment, three and a half stories is not a high-rise.

Please remember two or three years ago, this council was discussing 15-story building and now we are discussing three and a half story buildings. This will not turn this into Los Angeles or New York. It does not set any form of a precedent. Each case is unique, at least as I view it and it does not include any precedent for any other projects or any other places.

And this project, I think creates public benefit. As Councilmember Milhaven has mentioned, many some other of the witnesses in too many places the buildings turn their back on the greenbelt. And this will provide an opening to the greenbelt and engagement of the greenbelt with surrounding neighborhood, especially with artwork and land scaping and I hope that it's rejuvenated retail will benefit the neighborhood.

As for neighbors, some are opposed to this project and some are in favor. I heard all the criticisms and I listened to all of them. Many people have claimed that these apartments are not

affordable or workforce housing, and that's certainly true. I'm not under any illusions about this being affordable housing. But the only way of increasing or decreasing or holding back apartment rents is to increase the supply. And economists tell us that new apartments, even luxury apartments applied downward pressure on older and less expensive apartments that either reduces rental increases or keeps rents stable.

And several people mentioned there are many apartments in the pipeline and that's true. That's certainly true. But for the reasons I have described, I think we need more apartments to fight rental increases. And if this particular project is not needed five years from now, or whenever construction might start, Mr. Silver is a smart man. He's not going to build apartments that are aren't necessary or aren't needed as he may rejuvenate the mall. He won't build apartments that are not necessary.

[Time: 01:59:49]

I think that these likely will be necessary, and if we don't plan ahead, shortages will continue. Many people have brought up the issue of water, but we are not in danger of running out of water in the near future. Although we should continue to be careful. Some of the smartest people I know are working on the water issue. Both at the city level and at the state and the regional level.

So it's an issue of concern, but it's not something that should stop this project or others. And, of course, apartments are more efficient users of water than single family housing. Now, many people have raised the issue of density, including the mayor. And this is an unusual piece of property with an unusual shape.

I think the reason we have density limits is that we don't want over massing of projects and I agree with Mr. Morris that to the eye, this one feels different, and I think that's because of the unusual shape of this piece of property and that it doesn't get to claim some of the outside acreage as part of the density calculation.

As Mr. McLaren has pointed out, the gentry is a much denser development than this one. On infrastructure, our city staff tells us that we have the infrastructure to support this project. I listened to both sides on this issue. I tried to do what is best for the citizens of Scottsdale overall, but I think that in our role on the council, I think we need to be leaders in figuring out what is best for the future and for those reasons, I would support the project as it's currently proposed. Thank you, mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. We have Councilwoman Littlefield, Councilwoman Whitehead, Vice Mayor.

I want to point out that if there is a counter offer or whatever, at some point it would seem as though there would have to be an acceptance if that were to ensue. So I will move to the city attorney and then go to Councilwoman Littlefield.

City Atty. Scott: Thank you, Mayor. And you are correct. For the record, it would be a good thing for us to get the applicant's reaction to the proposed amendment, and just to clarify for everyone, that proposed amendment is to approve with a maximum number of units going from 238 currently proposed to 228, and also with an additional 30% reduction of the fourth floor which is the top floor, with an emphasis along the frontages of Hayden and Osborn Road.

[Time: 02:02:58]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. So I will recognize the applicant.

Jason Morris: Thank you, mayor and council. Councilmember Janik's motion addresses the two items that frankly have been lingering in this case and have been a topic of conversation from the outset and we believe we made great strides in addressing those issues.

But we also recognize, and I think I alluded to it during my presentation, no -- no proposal is perfect. And if with that amendment there is support from this council, and that is an additional consideration and compromise to the neighborhood, and to those few who may still be concerned, the applicant will accept that, and would hope to move forward with a strong project. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. We will continue with Councilwoman Littlefield, Councilwoman Whitehead, and Vice Mayor Caputi.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. You know, I have seen many designs of this -- and pictures of this project going forward it's changed and morphed and it's evolved in an attempt to modify the neighbors and it's a mixed use development and it would be good to the neighborhood.

To date, I don't think that's worked. The petition that we have all received that had almost 1,000 signatures from neighbors, asking us to deny this request, I haven't seen anyone take it back. Almost 1,000 neighbors don't want this in their neighborhood. If you doubt this is the case, go back and reread the email that we received from safeguard Scottsdale. 2-3-22, that was the state of the email. A couple of days ago.

It details out the two to three years that our citizens have been working together to try to keep their neighborhood and this shopping center protected and the time and money that they had to spend on this project. I find it sad that they have so little trust in the city council and in our processes that they find it necessary to do.

This they are still fighting for their neighborhoods and they rightly expect the city to listen and to protect their homes and the quality of life and it is our responsibility as a council to do that. I am very, very familiar with this shopping center. I was here when it was developed. I grew up here.

I know when it was new and it's -- it's -- it was a beautiful project. I agree the big boxes are outdated and they are not coming back any time soon. Let's get rid of them. Let's put something else in, retail. The property is still too dense. 34 dwelling units per acre is above the 20 to 24 in the area already.

It's a high density area that they live in. This area is one of the highest residential density areas in Scottsdale. And we need to take that into consideration, the streets are old. They need to be repaired if we are going to up this density to this extent, we need to up the street's ability to handle the cars. That's why you have the garage. They will have cars. They are not going to ride their bikes everywhere.

And creating a high density residential apartments on this site will dramatically increase the traffic. And on both sides, Osborn and Hayden and this in turn will greatly decrease the livability of those living in their homes in this area. The overall community quality of this is minimal compared to the massing and the heights of the building and the additional traffic and the reason I say that is community benefit lies in the retail and the open space.

They are closing some of that open space and adding retail. It's -- it's -- most development -- or they are adding residential, excuse me. Most of the development plan is the creation for large residential units, and it could it's expense of the commercial and the retail areas. That's what it is. South Scottsdale needs more retail, not less.

[Time: 02:07:45]

We heard this over and over and over for years as we have built up south Scottsdale and not put in the retail area. If the owner would take even some portion of the amount we want it invest in apartments and put it towards upgrading some of the retail space into smaller retail spaces, units, and stores, desirable tenants would come calling.

In fact, some already have and have been turned away. This -- turned away. If it isn't residents will shop elsewhere if we don't make the commercial space available to them, the retail space. They will go elsewhere, because they have to find a place to shop and that means Scottsdale loses that retail business.

They will go to Tempe Market, they will go to Phoenix, they will go to the reservation, all of these places are adding retail and we need to do that too. If we are adding people, we need to add retail, because they need to shop. One resident wrote, no new paint for the shopping center. Minimal repairs to the building that the tenants have requested. No signage. No upgrade for the tenants. It almost sounds like the shopping center has been purposefully allowed to fall into disrepair over the years. We as a city council should not allow that to happen and we should not allow it to influence our decisions by someone who uses these tactics.

Lastly, I know we have a water shortage here. We all know that. We are telling Rio Verde residents that we can no longer supply water to them on an ongoing basis. They have to find

water elsewhere. Currently citizens of Scottsdale have been asked to reduce their water usage by 5%, and if the current drought continues, that number will go up.

So this asks Scottsdale to ask for a fairly large increase in water for bathing and washing machines and at the same time, we are asking current residents to limit their water usage. To me, this is contra to what we need to be doing. Not that we don't want to increase apartments. We are increasing apartments. We have almost 10,000 apartments on the books already approved for development that have not yet been developed and we have to have the water for those folks too.

A resident -- for me a resident of Scottsdale for most of my life, I am very familiar with drought conditions and water shortages in cities. This is an unrealistic response to a very real problem that we're all having right now in this valley. And we need to take a real good look at it. No answers to this has been offered. What will we do with kind of thing? Where will we have come up with the water?

The citizens don't want to have this dense property to block their views. Tearing down the buildings because the big block stores don't work anymore, that's not the answer to add retail and to add that kind of business that the citizens need to have to shop. We're looking at taking too much needed retail space away from our current residents and they need more, not less in the way of stores, shops, restaurants and all of that kind of good stuff.

[Time: 02:11:36]

We should be asked -- be taking from them the promise, open air access the greenbelt. The sidewalk which is touted as open space, which I guess it is open space in that you can see the sky, to the -- may be available to the public, but it's really a sidewalk and it's a sidewalk for residents of the apartments to reach their front doors. And that is not a welcoming green open space for the residents. Need to say, I will be voting against this project.

I would like to work with the developers and make this more amenable to the residents. We need an attractive and usable retail center. We needed it for a long time. Retail is what adds the value to the current residents, not more apartments. I urge you the owner to make this a viable retail center with apartments but there's too many apartments on this.

A suggestion for approval more apartments, that that will lower the rents is not supported by evidence. Right now, in addition to the thousands of apartments already built, and the thousands more that are currently under construction or approved for construction, there are 10,000 of those already for Scottsdale alone. Rents are still rising. Why in simple greed, perhaps that's part of it.

How many apartments do we have to build in order to lower the rents? How many places do we have to destroy to buy more apartments to lower the rent? These are the things that we should be considering. You know, if we built 20,000, 30,000 more, what will that do to our city? What

will that do to our quality of life and to the future of Scottsdale? This is going at this from the wrong end, and I won't be supporting it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead, and Vice Mayor Caputi.

Councilmember Whitehead: I have some questions for Mr. Morris. Thank you. Thank you. So the flex space, I believe that right now, it could be used for an apartment function or we could -- or retail; is that correct?

Jason Morris: The flex space is in addition to the 25,000 square feet that are guaranteed, but I believe that we have agreed that that flex space would be nonresidential. It couldn't be used for additional units.

[Time: 02:14:33]

Councilmember Whitehead: Right, but it could be used -- I guess my question is, could we lock that in? Do you think your client would be open to locking it in as a retail space versus possibly like a gym for the residents or an apartment use? Would that be something --

Jason Morris: Mayor, councilwoman, at our last meeting and I had an opportunity to discuss this with the project architect, because of the redesign, that was the result of some of the things that were asked for from the community, that space is actually much more viable as retail space than it was originally planned.

I'm going by Mr. Brand's comments but I do think that, you know, if there was support for that and that was the key to, you know, making the council comfortable, I believe, that there is belief that that is true retail space. I will let Mr. Brand address that as well.

Jeff Brand: Yes, I think -- mayor and council, sorry. Think originally when we drew up the plan, that is designated flex space, it was deemed as not great retail because of the lack of frontage on there.

It's -- I think in the current form, it's envisioned as possibility of retail, hopefully that the restaurant activity takes off, and that it can be filled with retail, but nonetheless, it will not be residences because it doesn't add to the visible engagement of the plaza. If it's not retail, we would want the flexibility to have as a creative office or some type of office use that's also commercial but I don't know that I would support -- as just someone who has worked on the project I would support mandating that it's retail because given the location, nobody wants to see blacked out retail, like empty retail because it doesn't have any frontage.

I would think that you want some flexibility so that you have a use that informed and engages the public space and makes it better instead of one that could potentially detract from it. That's why there's some need for flexibility in not dedicating solely to restaurant or retail or some other commercial or office use.

Councilmember Whitehead: I appreciate that and we have talked about this. I think one the comments that I heard is this idea of having your neighborhood shopping center and you and I, Jeff, have talked about a possible market of sorts. Even though a restaurant might need frontage, I wonder -- there's a market in there now, and that's why I'm asking. As opposed to -- as opposed to a gym for the residents or something that's not a public use. I guess I wouldn't mind some flexibility, but a public use versus a use for just the residents.

[Time: 02:17:19]

Mayor Ortega: I see the question here. We have a motion on the table, and we're interjecting another discussion -- I say that because if you got another point. I believe it's defined in the current motion as 29,000 -- 20,000 -- I might make a friendly amendment if council woman Janik would consider that. So that's why I'm asking this question. Would that be okay?

Mayor Ortega: I hear that as a request. I don't know if there's a second on that.

Councilmember Whitehead: I haven't made it. I've got more to ask.

Mayor Ortega: If you have more, then let's hear it.

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. Thank you so much, mayor. Anyway, so you can contemplate that as I go to my next question, and we're doing a lot of things from the dais and that is actually what we're supposed to do. We listen to each other.

For those would don't know, we don't get to talk to each other because of open meeting laws. So we listen to each other up here. Can you talk about that performance that's 5.5 years out?

Jason Morris: Mayor, councilmember, the 5.5 years, really emanates from two different sources, one, that this council approved a separate agreement on another project, that had, I believe, a five-year tail to it. Typically an historically zoning had not had an end date. There was essentially zoning in place and if you took advantage of it, it stayed.

This council has looked to ensure that things get built, if that zoning takes place. So there was a previous project with a five-year limit. That was suggested with one of the early agreements of the with the city. The owner of the property was looking at the longest term lease on site along with any extension of lease. And that turned out to be 5.5 years.

Councilmember Whitehead: Do you think there's any flexibility on that. Pretty much what we have heard from every single person that we have spoken is we have a housing crisis today and I have a lot to say about that. But one thing to make that more helpful is to shorten that to three years and built pretty quickly.

Jason Morris: I don't know if that's possible. I don't know if that's feasible but I will certainly

address the question with the project ownership. I understand there's a desire to get this done because of the leases in place. That's really the only thing stopping this obviously, the applicant has gone through this diligently for two years, and they have no hesitation doing it immediately, but for the leases. The hope was we would love to do this within your time frame but we have to abide by about what we signed up for.

[Time: 02:20:36]

Councilmember Whitehead: That makes sense. He do want to talk about some of the comments that have been made. I have spent an awful lot of time, not on social media, checking to see would said what, but with residents. This is a tough case.

This is the toughest case that I heard and I really commend my colleague, Councilwoman Janik for her motion that I didn't see coming to address many of the resident comments that I heard. What I have heard over and over again, from residents who weren't here, is that the -- that fourth floor -- every project is just a little bit more aggressive, a little bit more dense, and it changes the nature of this extremely residential area.

Gentry on the green was brought up a few times. That's a very different area. That's a multifamily area. This area is a beautiful residential area. I feel with Councilwoman Janik's -- and I credit the citizens, not just the ones that are here.

I spoke to a lot of people that don't know the residents that are here before us. I spoke to many residents would aren't involved -- who aren't involved, but it's through their input that we are where we are today, and not only that, you know, what a shame that it took -- I mean it did take a new council to make it so that open space is a priority.

Many items here are as a result of your trust in us and the dedication to this project. I would like to make a -- I wanted to just touch on the housing shortage and I don't know if Ms. Sturgeon is still here, but she head -- whatever the hammer on the head of the nail. You know, when I was a young professional, I bought a house. And I bet you that's true with every single person on this dais. Oh, there you are, Ms. Sturgeon.

I am not satisfied with this notion that we can't do anything about short-term rentals. We don't have a shortage of housing, frankly, in this area. We do have a shortage of housing that's available for long-term rentals and for people to purchase without having to compete against cash buyers who quite frankly, aren't Arizonans half the time. Aren't even Americans part of the time. So this is a real issue and I think that people who are here today telling us to approve this project because they care about forwardable housing, please spend some time at the legislature.

I do think with the current proposal, though, it fits with the -- with Hayden road, and it will bring value. I would like to make a friendly amendment that the flex space be a public space. I will let Councilwoman Janik --

Jason Morris: And if I can interject just to address your original question. In speaking with Jeff, I think we have the same understanding, the idea and I think your concern, mayor and councilwoman, was that this would somehow become space specific to the residence and your idea is you wanted it as public space.

If it can't be retail space, there can be the opportunity for small office spacing or artist space and some other options. I think that's what your point was getting at in making it public space, and that's acceptable. And in terms of -- hopefully that addresses your question.

[Time: 02:24:29]

Mayor Ortega: May I just suggest this, that could you look at the amendment and look at some wording and I will get right back to you on that, because -- it's a direct statement, and I will let Vice Mayor Caputi speak next and I will come right back to you. So look at the wording that makes sense to you without just the conversation and we'll get back to you.
Vice Mayor Caputi.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Thank you, mayor. Well, I haven't served on this council quite as long as Councilwoman Milhaven, following three years on the review board. I don't think I have seen a project go through so much vetting in my years up here, which is really interesting.

So last week, this council sat in a neighborhood outreach meeting on the site, of this -- of this particular project, in a space that had been vacant for eight years. We all sat in there, in the middle of a failing retail center, with two anchor stores that have both given notice. The site was originally zoned in 1974 and as we have all heard tonight, the world has changed no.

Amount of wishful think will bring retail back to this plaza. It cannot be redeveloped into a small strip center. It's economically unfeasible. The laws of supply and demand are not suspended in the city of Scottsdale. All we are creating is a place for the homeless to occupy, which is happening right now. We have to activate this area. It's already failed. This particular project is the poster child of how our process works so well and it's incredibly rigorous. It's gotten better continually with all of this resident input. We have all been looking at it for literally years.

I can't even count any more how many times I have sat in neighborhood outreach meetings or meetings with the developer or one or two other councilmembers revising the projects, drawing the plans again, bringing it back as was noted our planning review board and our planning commission has moved this forward.

It's an opportunity corridor that encourages redevelopment, revitalization and a diversity of housing. I think if we reject the project at this point, or radically redo it, that basically means that we have no faith in this process and neither will future investors.

How many people could possibly afford to hold the parcel vacant this long unless it was an

owner of 18 years? This owner has addressed every request that has been brought forward from the residents. Maybe not giving them exactly what they wanted but addressed every single point over two years.

In my opinion, fair negotiation means everyone compromises a little bit. It can't just be all one-sided demands and then continually moving the goal post. So while I appreciate that there's another amendment up here, a motion and I will consider that in a minute, I do think that, you know, again, the builder has given everything, and it's been very one sided.

I'm not sure why we are continually renegotiating. So I will try really hard not to repeat what others have said already. To me, the main complaints were about traffic, too high, too dense, and for some reason people don't seem to want housing but all retail.

Really quickly in terms of infrastructure and traffic, our traffic department has actually concluded for us that Hayden Road from McKellips is overbuilt. We are considering decreasing this from six lanes to four. It's built to excess capacity. I don't think we have a problem with stressed out infrastructure in this part of the city.

[Time: 02:28:37]

I actually think we have built very wisely and planned very carefully. And I also want to just make the point that being scared about traffic at this particular intersection seems really strange to me. The center is dying. If there's anything we need more of in this particular part of our city, it's probably more cars and more people, not less.

The applicant has reduced the height from 45 feet, all the way -- I'm sorry, down to 45 feet now and has removed most of the fourth floor. So the majority of the height is already at 36 feet which is what it's currently zoned for. There's no residential structures within hundreds of feet of this project. And I can't see that any particular views are obstructed. They brought the density down 20%. And they have increased open space two and a half times which has been amazing. In terms of water being again, infrastructure we have a world-class water department in Scottsdale.

They have carefully reviewed this project and they have found the resources to be more than adequate. We have a very careful long-term plan for water. We all heard the presentations many times up here and a water savings account in Scottsdale. We actually recycle all of our sewer returns. We treat the water to drinking standards and return them to the aquifer for future use. We have a sophisticated water treatment plant up in the north.

There is a huge demand for housing in the valley. Prices are being driven up. We are over 30% increase this year with no end in sight. We have almost no housing stock across all types and income levels and it's becoming unaffordable for pretty much all of us. I think most of us if we had to go back and buy our houses right now, we might not be able to afford them.

As was points out in the presentation, we have more retail per capita than any other city in Arizona. Multifamily housing is at 96% occupancy. We don't need more retail. I completely disagree with that. The economics are what they are. We need housing. We do not need retail. We did desperately need the housing. The population is getting older and older. We have no young families and we can't provide housing for our own employees. It's not a sustainable model.

So I agree with councilman Durham. If you believe that we are here to make decisions that are the best for our city, then it's imperative that we approve this project as it's been presented. It checks all the boxes for quality, thoughtful development, and resident input. If you are more worried about responding to loud voices, then you will vote no. I enthusiastically support this project as councilman Durham so wisely said, voting in fear is not leadership and we were elected to lead. So I don't think -- you didn't make a motion, Tom, right? To approve as is, we only have the one motion on the floor? Okay. Then I guess we will continue with the conversation.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 02:32:00]

Councilmember Whitehead: I appreciate all of us up here really care about Scottsdale, but the vitriol against our resident needs to be addressed. The loud voices is the reason why we have a project that could be a top-notch project. There's people up here who would have approved the original project. It's not about being loud.

It's about coming forward and saying, is this really good enough for Scottsdale? And I think all of you and most of you aren't here -- I thank all of you for helping me bring the project, make this project better. And I thank the owner for listen to us. And welcome flexible and not putting every dime in front of what is best for this community. So I want to just thank the loud voices. They weren't loud. They are persistent. They worked hard and they did the research and they are the reason why this is a good project today. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: So at this point, I see no other comments. You may sit down. No more questions at all. We are at deliberation, actually. Everyone got to speak and we thank you. Normally we don't have applicants, but we will be responding own several motions. There's three things I ask on a project, one is, is it mixed use?

True mixed use and is there a balance so that a project because is this zoned essentially commercial property. And Scottsdale has 1% of the land c1, c2, c3. So when a rezoning case comes forward, that tries to displace that limited commercial property with 100% residential, I push back. And I will continue to push back. In this case, I pushed for a 20% to retain some commercial and they made an attempt, they came maybe halfway or so and that's part of the dialogue that I had.

Because what we would have is essentially small apartments with people with nowhere to go. If we erode and allow that to erode our area and in essence, they would have to jump in a car to drive somewhere and enjoy a restaurant and so forth. So mixed use is important to me. It's pretty vital.

The other question has to be -- has to do with density and I led out with that question because I do respect the vote of the people. I do respect the general plan and, remember for -- the only plan that we had was a 2001 version of the general plan, which the definition of high density was anything over 8. There was no definition. And the city did not have a general plan in 2010, 2011, and we corrected that in the general plan 2035.

[Time: 02:35:43]

And that definition is found in the glossary and it says high density outside of the -- in this area in particular should be at 25. There's another -- so that a new rule for me. That's not an interpretation. Before we had no guideline, no rail, because the only criteria was anything over eight can be high density. It could be 88. It could be 108.

There was no -- there's no rhyme or reason to it. And, of course, our obligation is to see that in my opinion, I value the voters' criteria. It did not change the plan. It just said the land use plan it called for that maximum density of 25. Now, I noted at one point, they asked for 55 units.

This is before I came on board as mayor, and wow, before we had the guardrails of the general plan and the voice of the people. The other factor has to do with infrastructure and we can talk about water, and this entire council in mid-April is going to be looking at substantial water increases due to preparation for stage two. I know that because we're -- I have already asked that question. We cannot deny that. And that is due to this truth of a water drought and even our SRP reservoir is below where it was last year. So this is a whole depletion of water resources.

We can say we save, we can draft, we can reuse it, but the fact is explosive growth has to be sustainable and this will be a question that we'll all answer and we'll all have to account for. I happened to look ahead because I'm on the board and I see that coming and it's very realistic for the -- for us today.

We have some pressure by saying, geez, Scottsdale needs to catch up on housing. And I won't be on the past councils and the past mayors and the past decades when Scottsdale was importing workers. It's not something we can turn around 12 months and it's our problem, that we caused that trend. That has been the practice and now the view point is, well, you've got to catch up now because we were in they had been inadequate, no we are not. We are confronting the shortages and the other areas that matter.

So the guideline for me, I cannot support the motion, because it -- it exceeded the speed limit, the density limit that we should live by. And before, with the old general plan, 2001, people say,

well, there's no -- there's no cap or limit on that. And that's not -- I have to be responsible to people in -- who not only elected the body up here, but also voted for the general plan. And there was some pushback from a lot of multi-families or whoever was trying to kill the general plan so there was no guideline.

That is a workable guideline and under that guideline, if I were to look at this project, it would have 175 units. That happens to be about what the Miller has by the way. So when they at the sprouts mall, for instance. It's not that they can't manage 175 unit apartment complex, because they are doing it in other properties as well.

[Time: 02:40:05]

So guideline of the pressure that we are receiving because of the panic buyer here, right, investor buying, it's not going to overweigh me in saying, gee, we will exclude or override our voice of the people. It's true that in the past, at one point, and probably before the last election, this project wanted to put 55 units per acre. And they said that and they downsized, downsized, and they haven't reached the point that I could accept it, because I have to stand at the next. I have to stand at the next project and say, make sure you have true mixed use, when they are trying.

I admire that, but they knew from the beginning when I took office, I said this is the standard. And they chose to continue to press and we -- I think it will be a doable project and we can -- there's so many architectural things that I think are desirable in terms of facing the -- the green belt and so forth. But it exceeds the density limit.

So at this point, we will call for a vote on the motion, which I would prefer that we read the motion back. I know -- there was a way to have that in writing, I would love to have that handed out to all of us, but as it stands, let's reaffirm of what was read.

Councilmember Whitehead: Would Councilwoman Janik speak to my friendly moment.

Mayor Ortega: You have to speak it.

Councilmember Whitehead: I would like an amendment to the plan to make the flex space, limited to public space so it cannot be used for the exclusive use of the apartment tenants.

Mayor Ortega: I'm going to refer to the attorney. I don't know if you meant the community room or whatever?

City Atty. Scott: Yes, thank you, mayor, and councilwoman Solange, it's my understanding that you are stating that the flex room should be open to the public and not just limited to the residents; is that correct?

Councilmember Whitehead: That's correct.

City Atty. Scott: Currently the development agreement indicates that the flex use is an accessory use with the residential component and it's my understanding that you are not requesting that that be changed at all, just that the flex use would be open to members the public?

[Time: 02:43:20]

Councilmember Whitehead: It sounds to me, when I read that, like it is a game room for the residents. I'm not trying to make the residents have less space. What I'm asking for is a public space so it could still be a game room and members of public could access it, and it's a public space versus a space for the apartments. A private apartment space, just like we have public open space and then there's private open space. I'm asking that this be public.

Councilmember Janik: If I may, is the term that we do not want it to be exclusively for residential use? Is that the proper terminology?

City Atty. Scott: Yes, what we are struggling with from a staff point of view is how do we enforce that stipulation but we could try to work through that, and I see the applicant nodding their approval to that request for a friendly amendment that it would simply be an amendment that that area would not be for the exclusive use of the residents. We would have to work further with the applicant on those details.

Councilmember Whitehead: Perhaps Mr. Morris can get up and suggest some language?

Jason Morris: Mayor, council, I think the city attorney is actually stated it quite well in terms of what we are trying to accomplish. And Councilwoman Janik's terminology actually referenced the fact that the idea -- this is the 4,000 square feet. It's adjacent to the promenade and we were showing it as something that could be retail.

This next space that could be retail and I think Councilmember Whitehead, what you are saying is your concern is if it's not retail, you want to ensure that it doesn't become exclusively for the use of the residents the building.

So Councilwoman Janik, that it's not used exclusive for the residents of the building. Our hope is that that particular space will be retail space, if it's not retail space, it may be flex office space or art space, but under no circumstances will we make that exclusively work out room, an amenity exclusively for the residents. So I think we are all on the same page.

Councilmember Whitehead: So attorney Scott has gotten -- oh, she's being --

Mayor Ortega: And there may be a stipulation b. So we have a, b, maybe c after that, or a change within the document itself where it occurs to add a phrase or two. Go ahead, city attorney.

City Atty. Scott: I'm sorry. So maybe I missed it, but did the motion get amended and did the person who seconded the motion agree to that amendment?

Mayor Ortega: no we are trying to clarify what the motion is, that's why I have asked to localize it, wherever it should occur.

City Atty. Scott: Certainly so c would simply be that -- that the flex space would not be exclusively available to residents. And then what you are concerned with mayor is addressed in the very last sentence with these amendments being made in the zoning case stipulations and development plan and development agreement.

So in the council approves this case as amended, with a, b, and c, which we have discussed verbally, then staff will go back, look at the minutes and make these amendments to the actual documents.

[Time: 02:47:25]

Mayor Ortega: So I think that's the best advice we can get, and if I -- and this was requested as a friendly amendment, and I -- I would address then to Councilwoman Janik and the second on the motion to see if that's acceptable.

Councilmember Janik: It's acceptable. And I guess I can second it, I don't know if I can.

Councilmember Milhaven: Mr. Morris is it acceptable you to?

Jason Morris: It is.

Councilmember Milhaven: Okay. Then I agree. Yes.

Mayor Ortega: So what we have is a single motion which is up here with the addition of item c, excuse me, to be stipulated as discussed. Any other further discussion? Okay. All those in favor -- or excuse me, please register your vote. Okay. It does carry 5-2. Thank you very much, and good luck with your project.

Okay, next we will go to -- so we have concluded with our regular agenda. At this point, we are open for public comment. Public comment is an opportunity for any Scottsdale citizen to come forward and discuss any topic that is not on the agenda and I have received none. So I will close the public comment. And we will move on to the citizen petition, which is listed as item 19. There is none. So we duly note that.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ITEM

[Time: 02:49:27]

Mayor Ortega: Moving on to the mayor and council item 20. Item 20 pertains to the boards and commissions and a task force recommendations. At this point, we will only -- excuse me.

Councilmember Whitehead: I do I have mayor council item. I'm so sorry.

Mayor Ortega: We can take mayor and council items -- excuse me, go ahead, Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Thank you, mayor. So in 2025, the first of the two preserve sales taxes will expire, and I would like to propose or make a motion that the council put on a future agenda within four weeks a council discussion and possible action to appoint a citizens committee to consider a continuation of the .02 preserve tax that will be expanded to include perpetual maintenance funds for the McDowell Sonoran Preserve and the greenbelt and parks and possible other city feeds.

Councilmember Littlefield: I will second that.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. There's limited need to discuss this. So it was reviewed at some work study, and some direction, but we will vote on the motion as presented, please register your vote. Thank you.

That passes for future agenda item. And closing comment on that, we -- we will also be looking for the McDowell Sonoran Preserve commission recommendations as well. At this point, we will move to boards and commission and task force recommendations. We're not going to be voting on in I particular candidate, but we will be looking at nominations and then the selections at a future date. I will now turn the meeting over to Vice Mayor Caputi for boards, commissions and task force nominations.

ITEM 20 – BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, AND TASK FORCE NOMINATIONS

[Time: 02:51:50]

Vice Mayor Caputi: I thought we were going to get a break. Let's roll right in. Thank you, Mayor.

This evening, the City Council will be nominating Scottsdale residents interested in serving on citizen advisory boards, commissions, and committees. The Scottsdale City Council is responsible for establishing City policies and enacting laws In support of those policies.

The Council relies on volunteer, citizen-based boards and commissions to research issues and make recommendations in support of the Council's mission and goals. The information and

recommendations provided by Council-appointed advisory boards is a valuable tool in helping Councilmembers in their deliberations. Appointments for these positions will be made at a Special City Council Meeting on Tuesday, March 1st. So let's get started.

First we have the building advisory board of appeals. Two current openings. Existing vacancies from 2020 and 2021. There are two vacancies and two applicants. The applicants are: Quentin Augspurger, Greg Barker. I will now entertain nominations for the Building Advisory Board of Appeals. Each Councilmember can nominate two applicants. I will start with myself, we have two applicants. So Quinten Augspurger and Greg Barker. I don't think we need any additional; is that correct?

Mayor Ortega: That's correct.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Moving on.

Citizen's bond oversight committee. Terms for Alex McLaren and Douglas Reed expire in February. Both are ineligible for reappointment. There are two vacancies and three applicants. The applicants are: Harry Clapeck, Michael Hinz, Mary Jane McCart. I will now entertain nominations for the Citizens' Bond Oversight Committee. Each of us can nominate two.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Harry Clapeck and Mary Jane McCart.

Councilmember Milhaven: Michael Hinz.

Mayor Ortega: No additional.

Councilmember Littlefield: No additional.

Vice Mayor Caputi: I think we are all set.

[Time: 02:53:59]

Next we are on at environmental advisory commission. There are special qualifications. As specified in the Scottsdale City Code, the membership of the Board shall reflect both scientific and non-scientific interests. Walter Cuculic's term expires in February. He is eligible for reappointment and has submitted an application for consideration. There is one vacancy and 14 applicants. Shall I read them all?

Councilmember Milhaven: No.

Councilmember Milhaven: Walter Cuculic.

Mayor Ortega: No additional.

Councilmember Littlefield: Gina Wickersham.

Councilmember Janik: No additional.

Councilmember Durham: I would nominate Sotiria Anagnostou. I was hoping you would name the candidates first. I hope I got her name right.

Vice Mayor Caputi: I nominate Walter Cuculic. I'm sure I'm pronouncing that wrong.

Councilmember Whitehead: No additional.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Great. Are we good there?

Historic Preservation Commission. SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS: As outlined in the Scottsdale City Code, each member shall have demonstrated special interest, knowledge, or experience in at least one of the following: Building construction, history, Architectural history, real estate, historic preservation law or other historic preservation related field.

The current opening on the commission is from an existing vacancy from 2021. There is one vacancy and two Applicants. The applicants are: Gerald Conover, Brin Sherrin. We can start with you, Mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Brin Sherrin.

Councilmember Littlefield: No additional.

Councilmember Janik: Gerald Conover.

Councilmember Durham: No additional.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Okay. I have no additional. We're good.

Rommel Cordova: We can move on.

[Time: 02:56:06]

Vice Mayor Caputi: Okay. Loss trust fund board. Special qualifications, as specified in the Scottsdale City Code, the City Council shall appoint five joint trustees, of whom no more than one shall be a member of the City Council and no more than one trustee may be a City Employee.

Suanne Welch's term expires in February, and she is ineligible for reappointment. There is one vacancy and one applicant. The applicant is: Jacob Seltzer. Councilwoman Littlefield, I will give you the honors.

Councilmember Littlefield: I think I will nominate Jacob Seltzer.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Lovely, Jacob Seltzer has been nominated.

Parks and recreation commission. Ron Lehman resigned from the commission in November 2021. There is one vacancy and six applicants.

Councilmember Janik: Judy Weiss.

Councilmember Durham: No additional.

Vice Mayor Caputi: I nominate Kristen Parrish.

Councilmember Whitehead: No additional.

Councilmember Milhaven: No additional.

Mayor Ortega: Judy Weiss again.

Councilmember Littlefield: No additional.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Thank you. Are we good with that one?

Rommel Cordova: Thank you, Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Caputi: And finally, transportation commission. Has one opening; however, no applications have been received at this time. As such, we will move on to the next commission. The Veterans Advisory Commission advises the City Council on veteran programs, policies and practices and serves as a community connection point for veterans and the community where they live.

Deborah Dominick resigned from the commission, effective February 3rd. There is one vacancy and one applicant. The applicant is: Andrew Edwards. Councilwoman Janik, who would you like to nominate?

[Time: 02:58:00]

Councilmember Janik: Andrew Edwards.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Fantastic! This concludes our nomination process this evening. Individuals nominated will be contacted by city staff with additional information. I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank all who applied to serve on a citizen advisory board or commission.

Even if you were not nominated, your application will remain on file for one year for consideration at a future date if there are additional vacancies. Back to you, Mayor.

[Time: 02:58:27]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much, and there again, I will note the mayor and council items which were covered just before the nominations. At this point, I request a motion and a second to adjourn.

Vice Mayor Caputi: So moved.

Councilmember Littlefield: Second.

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and a second. Please register your vote. Unanimous. Good night, everyone!