

March 2, 2022, Neighborhood Meeting Summary for Montecito PAD Amendment

Case No. 21-200-00010

The neighborhood meeting for the Montecito PAD Amendment (“Project”) was held at 6:00 p.m. on March 2, 2022, at the Starpointe Residents Club, 17665 W Elliot Rd, Goodyear, AZ 85338. The development team arrived at 5:00 p.m. and the first attendees arrived at 5:30 p.m. A list of approximately 30 attendees is attached in Appendix A.

Members of the development team present included:

Andrew Yancey – Bergin, Frakes, Smalley & Oberholtzer (“BFSO”)

Lauren Trobaugh – BFSO

Caleb Weeks – BFSO

Pete Teiche – Brookfield Properties

Christian Passalacqua – Harvard Investments

Amy Weidman – Silver Fern Companies

City staff present:

Alex Lestinsky – Senior Planner, City of Goodyear

The meeting began at 5:30 when the first attendees arrived. Mr. Yancey began walking the attendees through the plans for the Montecito PAD amendment. Presentation boards were provided describing existing Montecito zoning and development, proposed redistribution of lot sizes between parcels within Montecito, a comparison of existing and proposed development standards, and the proposed alignment of park timing with plans for surrounding development.

The presentation highlighted and explained the key components of the application. Mr. Yancey explained that the application’s proposed reduction of lot widths within parcels 9.7, 9.18, 9.21, and 9.42 (“Amendment Parcels”) would balance out underdevelopment in other parts of Montecito. In particular, Parcels 9.22, 9.24A, 9.24B, and 9.31 were entitled for a total of 460 lots with 50’ width, but they were developed with only 156 total lots with widths of 65’. Mr. Yancey explained that the proposed change was a density shift in the overall community that allowed for a reconfiguration of lot sizes while maintaining Montecito’s overall density cap and, in fact, only added one more lot than currently permitted on the Amendment Parcels. Mr. Yancey continued the presentation with a discussion of the proposed development standards in comparison to the current standards allowed within Montecito. The presentation also included a discussion on the timing of the construction of a 12-acre park on Parcel 9.23. Attendees were informed of the application’s proposal for the park to be completed and dedicated to the HOA no later than January 1, 2026, in order to align with the projected timing of adjacent residential development. The proposal would assist in preventing unnecessary maintenance costs, provide sufficient population to make use of the park, and avoid security concerns by adding surrounding development and “eyes on the park.” Throughout the course of the meeting, Mr. Yancey and members of the development team walked the attendees through the application, listened

to their comments, and answered their questions about the Project. A summary of the citizens' questions and the development team's responses is below.

Citizen Questions:

Citizens asked questions about the decision to develop larger lots and fewer units than entitled on Parcels 9.31, 9.22, and 9.24A/B.

Mr. Yancey explained that the zoning sets minimum requirements, and a builder is allowed to exceed those minimums; therefore, no additional entitlements were needed for development of Parcels 9.31, 9.22, and 9.24A/B with larger lots. The development team also noted that the undeveloped portions of Estrella had changed ownership since those parcels were developed.

Citizens asked what type of home product will be permitted in the Amendment Parcels.

Mr. Yancey explained that they would be single family detached homes, and specific product lines would be selected by builders.

Citizens expressed concerns about the 47' and 50' lot width being too small. Some expressed concerns that the homes would be too close to each other and that there would be small side yards that would not allow for building outdoor sheds. There were concerns about reducing home values.

Mr. Yancey explained that Montecito is a master planned community with a variety of lot sizes to create housing diversity and appeal to various market segments. He noted that smaller lots are attractive to many home buyers and that builders find that even 40' wide lots are very popular in the Valley. He described the market forces that were pushing both builders and buyers to decrease linear front footage distance to limit unnecessary costs. He further explained that the proposed 5' side yard setbacks are the same as currently allowed for the Amendment Parcels.

Citizens expressed concerns that 47' and 50' lot widths on the Amendment Parcels would look like the court home development near Bougainvillea Park and create issues with street parking.

The development team explained that the court homes would not be allowed in the Amendment Parcels.

Citizens expressed concerns about multi-family housing being allowed in Montecito.

The development team explained that multi-family is permitted on certain parcels within Montecito under the existing zoning and that the current application would not add any multi-family and would not impact the existing multi-family parcels.

There were questions raised about circulation and emergency exits from Montecito and from the Estrella Community as a whole. There were specific questions about utilizing Rainbow Valley Road as a secondary access road to the community.

The development team explained that the proposed amendment would not impact the overall circulation pattern, because it only modifies lot sizes on the Amendment Parcels while maintaining Montecito's overall unit cap and circulation pattern, and it also clarifies timing for development of a park. The development team also noted that development of the

Amendment Parcels along with other planned development in Montecito would complete the W. Calistoga/W. Mountain Road loop connecting Estrella Parkway to Willis Road via a circular pattern internal to Montecito. The development team further noted that the Amendment Parcels would not be adjacent to Rainbow Valley Road.

There were questions regarding the school sites in Montecito and whether there would be a high school built in the community.

The development team explained that there is a parcel zoned for a school south of the Presidio, but that some consideration was being given to an alternative location within Montecito. That site would be used for an elementary school; no high schools are planned in Montecito.

Some attendees had questions on the timing of subsequent Planning and Zoning Commission and Council hearings and what type of notice would be provided.

Mr. Yancey explained the process and timeline to the attendees, stating that the date of Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was not yet set, but he expected it to be at least a month away. He explained that notice of those meetings would be communicated in the same manner as the neighborhood meeting notification.

Citizens asked for clarification on when the park will be developed under the current zoning.

Mr. Yancey explained that the language in the current zoning approval was unclear regarding the timing of park construction and referred to it being in conjunction with infrastructure development. He explained that the language proposed in the amendment was meant to provide clarity and ensure that the construction of the park would be coordinated with the development and occupancy of the neighboring parcels on all sides with a proposed completion date of January 1, 2026.

There were questions raised by attendees about water supply – for residents and for landscaping and parks. Some residents raised concerns about the future water supply for Montecito.

The development team explained that the proposed amendment remained within the overall unit cap for Montecito and would not increase the number of units using water in this community over what was initially planned. It was also explained that the City tracks water usage for new development in Estrella to ensure it does not exceed available supply. The development team further noted that landscaping irrigation would be done with reclaimed water.

Citizens expressed concerns about dust, aesthetics, and safety for the undeveloped park space on Parcel 9.23 and suggested dust suppression and removal of the rock stockpile on the park site.

The development team noted these concerns from the attendees.

Several citizens asked about market data supporting home buyers desiring smaller lots.

Mr. Yancey explained that many builders throughout the Valley are seeing this trend. He explained that the smaller lots provide advantages for certain home buyers, including decreased home price and limited yard maintenance. The development team explained that

while some home buyers and existing homeowners may desire larger lot width, other buyers have different preferences, and that as a master planned community Montecito is intended to appeal to multiple home buyer preferences with a diverse selection of lot types.

One citizen had concerns with placing smaller lots next to larger lots.

The development team explained that the community had been master planned for many years and that because certain parcels had recently developed with larger lots than their entitlements required, the proposed amendment would maintain a balance of lot types within Montecito. The development team also clarified that the “development parcels” referenced in the zoning are not the same as individual parcels owned by homeowners and that the development parcels would contain approximately 75-150 individual parcels.

A citizen asked if a builder could build larger lots than the minimums permitted under the new zoning.

Mr. Yancey explained that the zoning sets minimum requirements for lot widths and would not preclude a builder from specifying larger lots during the platting process.

Citizens asked about programming for the park at Parcel 9.23. One citizen suggested a dog park. One citizen noted that there were previous plans for an aquatic center in Montecito that had since been abandoned.

Mr. Yancey explained that specific programming had not been determined and that amenity preferences would be considered at a later time and would take into account the existing amenities within the community.

Citizens expressed concerns about losing open space.

Mr. Yancey explained that the existing zoning sets minimum open space requirements and that the proposed amendment would not modify that standard.

Some citizens expressed concerns over the projected cost of HOA maintenance fees of the park.

The development team explained that there were projected costs of \$10,000/month based on an estimate provided by the HOA in 2018. They explained that these costs may have changed since then and may change in the future depending on the realized programming within the park. It was further explained that while the PAD amendment does not address maintenance costs of the park, but that setting a park completion date of 1/1/2026 would better align it with projected development so that the park would be able to serve a critical mass of residents in the close proximity by the time the HOA took on those costs.

Some citizens had questions regarding how existing trails would be treated with the new development in Montecito.

The development team explained that the amendment would not impact trails. They explained that some trails had occurred on parcels that have been planned for development, but the developer desires to maintain trail connectivity throughout Estrella where possible.

Citizens expressed concerns that parking would be an issue with smaller lots and referenced other areas within Montecito where on street parking is difficult due to smaller lot size. Citizens complained that people in these communities leave their trash cans out and it makes parking on the street hard.

The development team explained that the CCRs will not change, and any new development within Montecito would be subject to the same HOA rules that governs the current residents.

Several citizens asked how their input would be considered and whether they would impact the development plan.

Mr. Yancey explained that the development team would consider the concerns raised at the meeting, and that members of the development team were taking notes and would be preparing a report documenting concerns and comments raised at the meeting. He noted that the report would be provided to City staff and would become part of the public record presented at a future Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and City Council meeting.

Citizens expressed concerns over builders going bankrupt during construction along with the quality of construction of the homes and community walls.

The development team explained that the PAD amendment would not impact any portions of Montecito that had already been developed. They further explained all development proposals are reviewed by City staff and must meet zoning standards and Building Code standards.

The meeting ended at 7:15 p.m. as the last citizens left the venue.