

## Attachment G

**Sofia Mastikhina**

---

**From:** Jean Spaulding <jeancspaulding@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 1, 2021 7:51 PM  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina; PDD Camelback East VPC  
**Subject:** Opposition for Case Z-16-21

Dear Sofia and Council,

Please be advised that I along with my fellow neighbors strongly oppose the Paisley Project and request the Camelback East Village Planning Committee and the City of Phoenix to decline the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I do not support the rezone nor the request to build a 24 unit three story townhome community. The previous proposal had 34 units, which was absolutely atrocious and the new proposal of 24 units is still disheartening. My husband and I moved into our home (located on Weldon Ave, 3 homes down from the lot) just two years ago. When buying, we took the empty lot into consideration and were relieved to learn it is zoned for 7 single family homes. We looked forward to being a part of a growing neighborhood with the potential for new single family homes at the end of our street - NOT an overpopulated, multi-level structure bringing transient neighbors. Additionally, my husband and I are expecting our first child next month. We do not support the increase in traffic (both car and foot) that these units will bring in front of our home.

It pains us that this development will jeopardize the peacefulness and safety of our up-and-coming neighborhood. We understand there are other townhomes and apartments in this area, but we do not support adding more. Please help us preserve our neighborhood by not supporting the rezone and the request to build the townhomes.

Sincerely,

Jean Spaulding

## Sofia Mastikhina

---

**From:** Zachary Spaulding <arizonazachary@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 1, 2021 8:13 PM  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina; PDD Camelback East VPC  
**Subject:** Case Z-16-21

Sofia & Council,

A brief summary of my opposition to the planned development of case Z-16-21

1. The Development is still too large
2. Does not "Thread Needle" into matching existing neighborhood as much as a "split" lot (multi dwelling units to the north of the lot, single family homes to the south). This is truly a better compromise than the existing plan.
3. Disadvantages existing neighborhood and current owners
4. Housing options in area are already diverse enough. Plenty of apartments, condos, patio homes, and standard single family homes available in area.
5. Phoenix originally envisioned this neighborhood to be single families, lets keep it this way. Plenty of other opportunities to infill in other areas not as saturated.

These are the general points I will touch on in tomorrows meeting.

Though I am just a single voice, I represent many people who share these concerns and a myriad of others.

Sincerely,

Zach Spaulding. Home Owner and long term resident.

**Sofia Mastikhina**

---

**From:** John McCullough <jamccullough57@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 1, 2021 9:47 PM  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina  
**Subject:** Paisley Project - Camelback East Village Planning Committee meeting, Tuesday, November 2.

Dear Sophia Mastikhina,

I live on the north side of Clarendon, in one of the patio home units, known as the Woodside Village, just west of 32<sup>nd</sup> St. I've lived there since 1984.

I wrote an objection regarding the Paisley Project in early September. Please reference that communicate along with this letter in the upcoming Camelback East Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 2.

I adamantly do not want to see any multi-story complex, such as now proposed as a compression of 24 residences in multiple 2-story buildings, where only seven homes were originally intended, which are even still too many for that small area, including street width on 31st St.

I do not want more traffic to contend with when backing out of my drive onto Clarendon.

There are no known neighbors to me that want to see and deal with any multi-story complex in that small space, especially those right across the street from it. Not a very friendly situation! It is just too many people and too much traffic, not to mention other infrastructure aspects, added to the neighborhood - my neighborhood too.

Please, will the Camelback East Planning Committee and City Council support the neighbors' wishes to stop this multi-story project?

Sincerely,

John McCullough

## Sofia Mastikhina

---

**From:** Marialice Haney <mahaney55@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 1, 2021 9:51 PM  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina  
**Subject:** Village Planning Committee

Dear Ms. Mastikhina:

I would like to express my concerns regarding the PUD for the 31st Street Clarendon location. Living catty-corner to the development. My bedroom window is approximately 20 feet from the street. Already, I can hear drag racing and gunshots during the night. Helicopters circle over our streets at night because of the Q-T on Indian School. I understand the traffic study was not even accessed for Clarendon. Clarendon is a direct route from 32nd to 24th street and carries more traffic in the neighborhood than the others and surprised there none performed.

In addition, from the last meeting promises were made regarding the CC&Rs, addressing concerns of the neighborhood. Living in a condominium for the last 35 years, I know you have no control, or can guarantee their concerns will be considered.

This neighborhood is struggling to stay family-friendly, adding 26 homes to a small area of land does not generate that kind of environment.

Thus far the landlord of the property has shown no respect for the neighborhood by not doing an honest traffic study. At the intersection of Clarendon and 31st where a tree is blocking a clear view of traffic traveling west on Clarendon and north 31st.

Not impressed with them and do believe their multiple units will destroy the neighborhood. As seen in nearby communities.

Marialice Haney  
3030 E Clarendon Ave

**Sofia Mastikhina**

---

**From:** M Lambert <lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 2, 2021 11:17 AM  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina  
**Subject:** The Paisley: Planned Unit Development Case No. Z-16-21-6

Sofia,

I am a resident on one of the streets affected by The Paisley proposed project.

I am opposed to this 2-story 24-unit project.

As it is, this neighborhood is already saturated with 2-story town homes/condominiums/apartments.

I have concerns regarding the additional traffic in this neighborhood and on-street parking. There are speed humps on Clarendon to slow down the speeding motorists. Those speed humps are non-effective. There are stop signs on 31st Street and Clarendon and down the street on 30th Street and Clarendon. Does everyone stop at the stop signs? No. And with increased residents and vehicles there will be an increase in runned stop signs and speeding thus increasing the chances of vehicular and pedestrian accidents. A lot of residents in this neighborhood walk their dogs, ride their bikes, jog, walk with their children.

Parking is an issue. The minimum required guest parking is 6 and the site plans show 12 units. The garages are for two vehicles. Is that 2 compact size vehicles, 2 medium size vehicles, etc.? Many homes with garages these days are small and cannot accommodate larger vehicles. Where do those large vehicles go? In the guest parking or out on the street? The units along the exterior of the property with their patios facing the street encourages on-street parking from guests and residents. Currently on Clarendon Avenue, there is on-street parking on both sides of the street from the town homes on the north and south side of Clarendon. This on-street parking has reduced portions of Clarendon to basically a one-lane street. And on trash pick-up days some vehicles block the cans and garbage is not picked up.

Waste pickup. I may have missed it while perusing the site plan but I did not come across waste removal/pickup and did not see on the drawing where garbage dumpsters would be located on the property. The question is: will there be the large community dumpsters within the project property? Or, will each residence have individual garbage cans? If individual garbage cans, are they placed out on the property within the project area for pickup? I don't see any space for accommodating that? So, does that mean individual garbage cans will be brought out onto 31st Street? If that is the plan, that would mean a total of 48 cans (green cans for garbage and blue cans for recycling) lined up probably along 31st Street.

I look forward to this evenings virtual meeting.

Mary  
[lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com](mailto:lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com)

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Marialice Haney <mahaney55@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, November 26, 2021 8:51 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission; ronda@btlegalsolutions.com; ChristinaEinAZ@gmail.com; wmf@tblas.com; blake@skybrideco.com; Lee Miller; anye@trammellcrow.com; Barry Paceley; Linda Bair; george@miraclemiledeli.com; djsharaby@gmail.com; Jay Swart  
**Subject:** 31st St & Clarendon

To whom it may concern:

Even though the developers have reduced the size of their project, does not change the fact that they have not been operating in good faith.

The Paisley Project refers to the property at the southeast corner of 31st Street and Clarendon and yet their traffic study was based on Weldon. Clarendon is a thoroughfare between 32nd Street and 24th, and the build would have a greater impact. They seem to be proud they will be widening the small portion of Clarendon east of 31st, however, with the extra traffic not to mention the overflow from their development would be flooded with vehicles parking on the street. No longer can you rely on an average of 2 cars per home, with unfordable housing more adults are living in one home which increases the number of vehicles for each home.

This neighborhood is already overrun with townhomes, apartments, and condos squeezed into small areas. As it is, my home of over 30 years has turned into a land of crime, theft, and helicopters flying overhead. More people squeezed in smaller places do not make our neighborhood any safer.

I understand 3 homes could be built on the property. Must excess greed take over and squeeze 40% more people in the same space?

Seems to me if this passes, not only are the current owner(s) of the property don't care about the neighborhood but neither do the city planners who indulge in this kind of infrastructure. The original city planners would never have stood for these sorts of commune living within single-family home neighborhoods.

Respectfully,

Marialice Haney

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Jean Spaulding <jeancspaulding@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, November 29, 2021 4:15 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Opposition for Case Z-16-21 (Item 18)

Dear Council,

Please be advised that I along with my fellow neighbors strongly oppose the Paisley Project and request that the Phoenix Planning Commission declines the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I do not support the rezone nor the request to build a 24 unit three story townhome community. The previous proposal had 34 units, which was absolutely atrocious and the new proposal of 24 units is still disheartening. My husband and I moved into our home (located on Weldon Ave, 3 homes down from the lot) just two years ago. When buying, we took the empty lot into consideration and were relieved to learn it is zoned for 7 single family homes. We looked forward to being a part of a growing neighborhood with the potential for new single family homes at the end of our street - NOT an overpopulated, multi-level structure bringing transient neighbors. Additionally, my husband and I are expecting our first child around Christmastime. We do not support the increase in traffic (both car and foot) that these units will bring in front of our home.

The developer has NOT taken our feedback or concerns into account. We, as a neighborhood, have worked hard to voice our opinions on this matter to our Village Planning Committee. They did pass the vote 6-10, but the 6 who voted with us have great reasons to not support the project. As was made very obvious during the final Village Planning Committee meeting, there is a large amount of distrust with this project and the people behind it. We ask that you please consider our concerns (as the homeowners in this neighborhood) before making any decision regarding our community.

It pains us that this development will jeopardize the peacefulness and safety of our up-and-coming neighborhood. We understand there are other townhomes and apartments in this area, but we do not support adding more. Please help us preserve our neighborhood by not supporting the rezone and the request to build the highly dense townhomes.

Sincerely,

Jean Spaulding

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Ray Ban <rbzj12@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 11:26 AM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Case Z-16-21 (Item 18)

Dear Council,

Please be advised that I, along with my fellow neighbors, are strongly opposed to the Paisley Project and request the Phoenix Planning Committee and the City of Phoenix to decline the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I do not support the rezone nor the request to build a 24 unit two story townhome community. The developer and its representatives have repeatedly shown that they are uninterested in working with the neighborhood to come to a compromise, and will employ shady tactics (like including letters of support that originate from sources outside of the neighborhood).

The size and scope of the project is totally unacceptable, out of touch, and antithetical to the surrounding community.

Please consider keeping the current R1-6 zoning in place.

Concerned neighbor,

Zach Spaulding



**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Zachary Spaulding <arizonazachary@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 11:28 AM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Case Z-16-21 (Item 18)

Dear Sofia and Council:

Please be advised that I along with my fellow neighbors are strongly opposed to the Paisley Project and request the Camelback East Village Planning Committee and the City of Phoenix to decline the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I do not support the rezone nor the request to build a 24 unit two story town home community.

The size and scope of the project is totally unacceptable, out of touch, and antithetical to the surrounding community.

Please consider keeping the current R1-6 zoning in place.

Sincerely,

Zach Spaulding

**From:** dredmac@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 2:37 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Opposition to Application #Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

Dear City of Phoenix Planning Commission,

I am writing to voice my **continued opposition to rezoning** requested by the Paisley PUD project (Application #Z-16-21-6). You will find two previous letters from me in the documentation provided to the Commission. I am in favor of developing the property in a way that enhances the ambiance and safety of the neighborhood and mitigates the heat island effect through adequate green space and green technologies. The plan as presented to the Commission does none of those things. **I urge the Commission to vote no on the present proposal** so that ongoing neighborhood concerns regarding development may be adequately addressed.

I urge the Commission to decline the proposal for the following reasons:

1. **Density:** The proposed development of 24 units is too dense for an interior piece of land with access from small neighborhood roads rather than a major artery. This will have the effect of increasing traffic on small residential streets and adversely affect the **safety of current residents and a preschool at the Methodist Church**.
2. **Heat Island Effect:** The proposed development does not address mitigating the heat island effect called for in the City of Phoenix Climate Action Plan. To do so would require the plan to increase green space, reduce density, and include green technologies in construction. Such considerations were part of the Blue Skye development one block to the south. I urge the Commission to call for all developments under consideration to demonstrate how they contribute to the goals of the city's Climate Action Plan.
3. **Undesirable street appearance:** The number of waste and recycling cans on the street twice a week and the likelihood of guests and residents parking on the street will detract from the desirability of the neighborhood.
4. **Misrepresentation of facts in the presentations:**
  - a. Traffic impact – While the developer presented a report concluding that there will be minimal impact, the traffic study was done on only one of the three access roads to the property.
  - b. Supposed neighborhood support for the project – At the November meeting of the Village Planning Committee, the developer's attorney spoke about receiving seven letters in favor of the development. Village Planning Committee staff had not included these letters in the packet of documents given to Committee members. Under questioning from a Committee member, staff did supply the letters during the meeting and it was discovered that the support letters came from outside the neighborhood. This action broke any level of trust the neighborhood might have had for the integrity of the developer.
  - c. Purported "concessions" – The developer claims to have listened to the community. Actions over the past months make this claim appear to be disingenuous. Given misrepresentation "b" above, it is easy to suspect that "plan B" (24 units rather than 36 units) prepared in advance so that the developer could be publicly represented as "listening." Once "Plan B" was presented the developer stopped listening. Concerns raised by the neighborhood about "Plan B" are not reflected in the proposal now before the Planning Commission.
  - d. History of "non-development" – The proposal has been framed as developing a piece of land that has "never been developed." This does not accurately represent the situation. For years, there was a home on the land. It is visible in pictures supplied in the documentation. The owner sold the land and the buyer did not go ahead with plans for building a group of single family dwellings. The existing house was torn down, the land was cleared, and is now vacant. It was subsequently sold to the current owner who has presented new plans. I urge the committee to disregard the developer's promotional spin on the history of the property and treat the situation for what it is – what is the best way to improve this vacant property? My views on appropriate development are in the opening paragraph of this letter.

The developer takes the position that "There are other high density developments in the area. We want to add one more and improve the neighborhood." **Please consider a different approach:** "There are enough high density developments in this neighborhood. This is an opportunity to improve an interior vacant piece of land with modern

residences, green space and green technologies contributing to the value of existing homes and the climate action plan of the city of Phoenix.”

Thank you for taking on this important work on behalf of the residents of Phoenix.

Sincerely,  
Edward D McCallum  
3001 E Clarendon Ave  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Amy Notbohm <amy@dayspring-umc.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 3:59 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Paisley PUD - #Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD) Public Comments and Request to Speak

To whom it may concern:

My name is Amy Notbohm, and I am the Community Curator for Aldersgate United Methodist Church located at 3530 N. 32nd St. Phoenix, AZ 85018.

I would like to request to speak to this application for the Paisley PUD #Z-16-21-6 at the December 2nd, 6pm meeting.

Additionally, my written comments are as follows:

This PUD application has potential to increase housing stock, advance the City Climate Plan and be a benefit to the neighborhood in ways that are not currently addressed with the current proposal. With the PUD (which I understand to usually be reserved for combining lots with varying zoning ordinances) being used in a creative manner for this development, the city and the developer have the opportunity to aggressively advance the city's climate and heat mitigation goals in better ways. I would suggest that a 12-14 unit development (which is still twice the current zoning density) would provide a development with generous space to create green space to address heat related issues, have room for mature-tree shade cover in excess of minimum guidelines and also double the housing stock that is currently zoned.

The neighbors have consistently showed up the meetings held by the developer, the Village planning meetings, and held our own forums for discussion throughout this months-long process. We have consistently spoken to our understanding that although the current single-family zoning would best meet the desires of the neighbors, there is also room for improvement to meet developer, city and neighborhood goals through adjustment to this current plan. A planned development of 12-14 units could address virtually all of the neighbors concerns and city goals. Our suggestions for improvement center around ensuring safety for pedestrians, bicyclers and drivers of all ages in the area around the proposed development as well as meeting the goals of the city to provide additional housing options and heat mitigation strategies.

Our suggestions include:

- More interior parking and side walks from the interior parking spaces to the front doors to reduce on-street parking (eg - divide 7-unit blocks into smaller buildings with a sidewalk between)
- Provide more space between east-most buildings and adjacent property to allow for mature shade trees
- Provide interior trash collection to eliminate trash and recycle pick up on street.
- More green space for trees/ground cover

My impression of the process has been that the developer originally shared a 3-story plan with the neighbors and quickly backed off of this overly aggressive proposal that would not have maintained the character of the neighborhood. Since that adjustment which came before the first Camelback East Village Planning Committee meeting, to my understanding there have not been ANY adjustments made to consider the neighborhood input despite our concerns and ideas being raised consistently through this feedback process. Including the 2nd developer conducted neighborhood meeting. It's concerning to me that we are leaving an opportunity on the table to advance the city goals by not asking for additional changes from the developer.

Additionally, I would add 2 more points of clarification for the record. One Village planning committee member said that the church would want to buy the home on the SE corner of Weldon and 31st if given the opportunity. In fact, the church already owns that property. Secondly, a committee member stated something to the effect that the church is on 32nd St. and shouldn't care about Weldon. Actually, all of our entrances are on Weldon, and we have elderly congregants and preschool families who use Weldon and will be significantly affected by this development, therefore we do have a vested interest in this development.

I implore you to consider if there is some solution to this development that is something less than the current 24 units, but more than the current single family zoning that will address our hope for a development that meets the needs of all parties.

Thank you,  
Amy Notbohm

Amy Notbohm  
Community Curator  
Phone: (480) 302-1768  
[Email: amy@dayspringumc.org](mailto:amy@dayspringumc.org)

**From:** M Lambert <lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 4:58 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Application #: Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

City Planning Commission,

For your consideration at the December 2 hearing regarding The Paisley project, I submit the following concerns on this project and the effect on the neighborhood I have lived in for almost 20 years.

I am a resident on Clarendon Avenue, one of the streets affected by The Paisley proposed project.

I am opposed to this 2-story 24-unit project. An acceptable number of units would not exceed 12. This is twice the current zoning capacity. I am also opposed to a 2-story structure. There are 2-story apartments behind me and tenants look directly down into my yard. The thought of someone being able to watch me is unsettling. I can understand the opposition of the residents on Weldon, especially the owner of the property right next to the proposed project.

As it is, this neighborhood is already saturated with 2-story town homes/condominiums/apartments. It seems like every time I drive on a street I haven't been on for a period of time I see new construction of multi-story living facilities going up. At the November 2 meeting representatives for The Paisley brought up several times how Phoenix needs affordable housing. The Paisley touts their project as "luxury" housing (first paragraph of August 20, 2021 letter from Gammage & Burnham). Luxury housing is not affordable housing.

I have concerns regarding the additional traffic in this neighborhood and on-street parking. There are speed humps on Clarendon to slow down speeding motorists. Those speed humps are non-effective. There are stop signs on 31st Street and Clarendon and on 30th Street and Clarendon. I have seen many drivers disregard the speed humps and stop signs in this neighborhood. When driving on Clarendon I slow down to almost a stop to make sure drivers going north/south stop before I proceed. With increased residents and vehicles there will be an increase in runned stop signs and speeding, thus increasing the chances of vehicular and pedestrian/animal fatalities. A lot of residents in this neighborhood walk their dogs, ride their bikes, jog, walk with their children.

Parking is an issue. The minimum required guest parking is 6 and the site plans show 12 units. The garages are for two vehicles. Is that 2 compact size vehicles, 2 medium size vehicles, etc.? Many garages these days are small and cannot accommodate larger vehicles. Where do those large vehicles go? In the guest parking or out on the street? The units along the exterior of the property with their patios facing the street encourages on-street parking from guests and residents. Currently on Clarendon Avenue, there is on-street parking on both sides of the street from the town homes on the north and south side of Clarendon. This on-street parking has reduced portions of Clarendon to basically a one-lane street. And on trash pick-up days some vehicles block the cans and garbage is not picked up.

Waste pickup. I may have missed it while perusing the site plan but I did not come across waste removal/pickup and did not see on the drawing where garbage dumpsters would be located on the property. The question is: will there be the large community dumpsters within the project property? Or, will each residence have individual garbage cans? If individual garbage cans, are they

placed within the project area for pickup? I don't see any space for accommodating that? So, does that mean individual garbage cans will be brought out onto 31st Street? If that is the plan, that would mean a total of 48 cans (green cans for garbage and blue cans for recycling) lined up probably along 31st Street. At the November 2 meeting a representative for The Paisley indicated there would be individual cans, with pick up twice a week, and that the cans would be on the three streets bordering The Paisley. Will there be access to Weldon and Clarendon for the tenants to bring their cans to the curb? If not, that means all residents will have to bring their cans to 31st Street and more than likely will not bring the cans onto the street their unit faces.

Sidewalks: For safety reasons, the sidewalks should be detached. With additional traffic, safety for pedestrians is of the utmost importance. This is an old neighborhood and at the time sidewalks were put in the area did not have the traffic it currently has.

Mary  
[lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com](mailto:lambert2bxrs@yahoo.com)

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** John McCullough <jamccullough57@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 4:58 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Application # Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

Dear Phoenix Planning Commission,

I have lived in the referenced project's neighborhood, only a hundred or so yards away, since 1984.

I have presented my adamant objections to this project from the start. It will be an eyesore, height wise, to say the least - too condensed for the small property on which it is planned, which was originally zoned to be 7 homes, much like Woodside Village, which I live in - one of 7 homes.

Perhaps the business that purchased the property should have considered that when purchasing it, instead of trying to cram so many units, originally 34, into such a small space and trying to make a killing at the continuous objections of all the neighbors known to object. There are NO neighbors known who favor the project that I am aware of. It is misleading to grossly convey that there are favorable neighbors. If there are people in favor, they probably have an outside vested interest, which would make me angry that a non-neighbors would get priority over neighbors in shaping our neighborhood.

I feel betrayed by the Camelback East Village Planning Committee's approval of this project. Who are they voting for, big business, investors, or their own residents who they should be supporting?

To me the project has yet to clearly define acceptable street parking, trash collection and traffic issues, not to mention how they can justify cramming 23-24 units into a most objectionable two-story complex right across from four single family homes. It's a dangerous and unacceptable situation in several respects: walking, especially for children, bicycling, and driveways opposite each other – 23-24 residents vs 3-4. Is that good safety on a narrow street where single residents' cars have to back out of blind driveways?

Additionally, who is going manage the long-term aesthetics of these individual homes in this large complex?

Included in the following are my two previous letters of objection sent to the Camelback East Village Planning Committee in September and November. Other viewpoints are mentioned. Please consider them in your review also.

Please DO NOT APPROVE this project.

Sincerely,

John McCullough



(602) 677-8550

## Enclosure - September

---

Jv\$g >John McCullough <jamccullough57@hotmail.com>  
Wirx>Monday, September 6, 2021 3:03 PM\$  
Xs>Sofia Mastikhina <sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov>\$  
Wyfng>Paisley Project - Camelback East Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday, September 7

Dear Sophia Mastikhina,

I have at times participated, when available, with other neighbors' concerns regarding the Paisley Project.

I live in one of the seven single story patio homes on the north side of Clarendon between 31<sup>wx</sup> and 32<sup>rh</sup> Streets, known as Woodside Village. I've lived here since 1984. I haven't seen this little area grow but hardly at all in all these years.

Although with the advent of the Quik Stop (?) gas station on 30<sup>xl</sup> and Indian School, some traffic did increase, along with speeding cars. Thus, we residents had to add speed bumps to Clarendon to try and slow down the speeders.

Unfortunately, because Phoenix has really grown in the years I've been in this spot, the traffic on 32<sup>rh</sup> Street has grown more so, making it harder and sometimes dangerous to get onto 32<sup>rh</sup>, especially turning left. Sometimes from my home I can hear cars, trucks and motorcycles racing down 32nd.\$I have this year started going west on Clarendon to find a safer route to start my travels than at 32<sup>rh</sup> St and Clarendon. And there have been accidents right there at that intersection over the years, not to mention at 31<sup>wx</sup> and Clarendon also.

Now, I'm concerned about the added traffic on Clarendon with 23-24 new resident units all crammed into the space where originally only 7 homes were expected, not even a block down the street from me. It kind of makes me angry that the city would allow this to happen in this relatively subdued nice neighborhood, especially to those neighbors having to deal with it right in their face.

Noting that a study was done on Weldon's traffic, a short street, why wasn't a study done on Clarendon, I think a lot busier than Weldon.

Ultimately, I'm really opposed to any multi-story building on that small space, for the aesthetics, as well as the increased traffic. Why is the city allowing this to happen when the neighbors don't want it? Why is the city NOT supporting its neighbors' wishes?

Please address my concerns at the upcoming meeting.

Sincerely,

John McCullough

## Enclosure - November

---

Jv\$g >John McCullough <jamccullough57@hotmail.com>  
Wirx>Monday, November 1, 2021 9:47 PM\$  
Xs>Sofia Mastikhina <sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov>\$  
Wyfng>Paisley Project - Camelback East Village Planning Committee meeting, Tuesday, November 2.

Dear Sophia Mastikhina,

I live on the north side of Clarendon, in one of the patio home units, known as the Woodside Village, just west of 32<sup>nd</sup> St. I've lived there since 1984.

I wrote an objection regarding the Paisley Project in early September. Please reference that communicate along with this letter in the upcoming Camelback East Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday, November 2.

I adamantly do not want to see any multi-story complex, such as now proposed as a compression of 24 residences in multiple 2-story buildings, where only seven homes were originally intended, which are even still too many for that small area, including street width on 31st St.

I do not want more traffic to contend with when backing out of my drive onto Clarendon. There are no known neighbors to me that want to see and deal with any multi-story complex in that small space, especially those right across the street from it. Not a very friendly situation! It is just too many people and too much traffic, not to mention other infrastructure aspects, added to the neighborhood - my neighborhood too.

Please, will the Camelback East Planning Committee and City Council support the neighbors' wishes to stop this multi-story project?

Sincerely,

John McCullough

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Sue Nelson <azsue03@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 5:06 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Opposition for Case: Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

November 30, 2021

Dear Council:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Paisley Project. I am requesting that the Camelback East Village Planning Committee, and the City of Phoenix, to decline the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone the property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I have lived in my home since 1981 and this proposed development would be detrimental to this area. Residents in our neighborhood are completely opposed to the addition of a 24 unit, multi-family housing development that will cause severe traffic and safety problems, and potentially lower the property values of the existing community.

Then there is the issue of congestion of not just vehicles, but garbage/recycle cans. We're talking 48 containers (2 per unit) all lining street. *A development of this magnitude does NOT belong in this area.* In part of the description by the developers they also mention 'helping blighted areas', well this is NOT a blighted area!

I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning, and from recent meetings and discussions with my neighbors, I know my opinions are shared by many who have not managed to attend meetings or write letters and emails.

Thank you for your continued service and support of our community.

Best regards,  
Sue Nelson  
3116 E. Weldon Ave.  
Phoenix 85016

## Racelle Escolar

---

**From:** Bette DeGraw <bette.degraw@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 5:37 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Fwd: Paisley Project - Opposition for Case Z-16-21

Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission,

I am writing in continued opposition to the zoning change requested for the Paisley Project, located at the southeast corner of East Clarendon Avenue and 31st Street. This is the third letter I have written in opposition and I have attached my previous letters because the developers have failed to address these concerns and the concerns of my neighbors in any meaningful manner. I realize the need for more housing in the city, especially affordable housing, but this project is not envisioned as affordable housing and it is too dense for this area.

You may have read that the developer compromised with the neighborhood by backing off the original proposal for a 3 story, 36 unit project. While the 24 unit proposal that is before you is a reduction from the first proposal, the speed at which that happened strained credibility as to the seriousness of that first proposal. (While reading up on other zoning cases before the Camelback Village Planning Committee, I saw similar instances from other developers. It made me wonder if this is a pattern all over the City). Since that initial change, the developer has not responded in any meaningful way to the concerns of the neighborhood. Suggestions have been made by neighborhood members about how the proposed development could be altered to fit in better with our neighborhood but these suggestions have been ignored, as have our overall concerns about the project. For example, it's been suggested by neighbors that building heights could be varied so that the 2 story units could be built on Clarendon and one story units could be on the rest of the property, thereby cutting the density in half and addressing most of our concerns.

Six members of the Camelback East VPC were not persuaded that the project should move forward so I encourage you to read the discussion at that meeting on November 2, 2021. It was mentioned at that meeting that some 33 letters of opposition had come in from neighbors, but that the letters of support appeared to be template letters from individuals who are not local to the neighborhood. I assume all the letters are in your meeting materials and I encourage you to read them.

The primary reason for my opposition is that the proposed density of 24 homes on 1.5 acres will have a negative effect on our neighborhood, especially with increased traffic on Clarendon and 31st Street. Let me explain in more detail about my concerns and also, in an attempt to correct the record as put forward, share with you some of the misrepresentations that have been made along the way.

- **Scale and Density:** The developer and the Camelback East VPC staff have stated that the scale and density of this 24 single family attached project are compatible and consistent with the neighborhood. This is not accurate. The maps and overlays shared with the Camelback East VPC focused on the immediate properties surrounding the site, but if you look carefully at the neighborhood, you'll see that the overall character of the area is single family homes zoned R1-6 and R1-10. It is true that the area north of Clarendon is more densely populated as that area is closer to Indian School Road. But south of Clarendon and over to 28th Street, it is overwhelmingly one story, single family homes until you reach the north side of Osborn. The multifamily unit just to the east of the project is a fairly small one compared to the size of the Paisley proposal. With the exception of that small unit, all the other homes that surround the property to the east, south and west are single family homes. The developer's proposal is an interior oriented development being plunked down in the middle of an existing neighborhood that will overwhelm the existing one story single family homes.

- **Traffic Impact:** The most negative traffic impacts will be felt on Clarendon. An initial traffic study on the one block of Weldon that dead ends into 31st Street was done by the developer, but after neighbors pointed out the speedway that Clarendon has already become, an additional traffic study was done. I don't pretend to be a traffic expert, but I can assure you that the traffic on Clarendon has increased to an amazing level. Crossing the street or getting out of my garage is often quite a challenge. If you look at the map, you'll see that Clarendon is the only through street between Indian School to Osborn and 32nd to 24th Streets. Others have figured this out and have been using the

street as an alternative to the very busy traffic on Indian School Road. If anyone in the proposed Paisley project would want to head west, north or south, they will most likely choose to drive west on Clarendon to get to SR51. To suggest that this development will not have an appreciable traffic impact on Clarendon, as the report suggests, is not credible. Those of us who walk or bike the neighborhood will certainly feel the increased traffic as yet another challenge to our safety. As for 31st Street and Weldon, the increased traffic there will undoubtedly cause similar safety issues as well. Street parking will also undoubtedly increase adding to the safety issues.

- **Trash and Recycling:** Further complicating the traffic and safety issues is the current plan for trash and recycling pickup. Rather than have internal trash and recycling bins, the developers have opted to have the residents use the regular city bins. Because of the proposed layout of the development, it is reasonable to assume that all the bins will wind up on that 1 block stretch of 31st Street between Weldon and Clarendon on trash and recycling days. What a challenge that will be for folks living or driving on 31st on those days.

Just as an aside, the parcel in question has been described by the developer as a decades-long vacant lot that blights the neighborhood. While it is vacant now, it was formerly the home of one of our neighbors who had horse privileges, hence the south side of Clarendon was never paved. The house was torn down several years ago. I don't know when the developer bought the property, but the current state is a more recent occurrence as the trees and shrubs on the property were left to die.

I am not a zoning expert, so I do not understand fully the implications of a PUD vs a zoning change or variance. I've read that a PUD should provide benefit to the community, and in this case, for the reasons above, I cannot foresee that the community will realize any significant benefit from this project. Instead this project will overwhelm rather than enhance our neighborhood. Further I understand that a PUD gives the developer more flexibility in order to achieve the character desired by the community, although they still have to comply with basic city zoning requirements. I question the need for that flexibility given that the developer has not been receptive to the concerns of the immediate neighbors. In this case, the staff report says the developer has to comply with the standards of single family attached development options of R3-A where the PUD is silent. Based on my understanding, I question why the developer should be granted a PUD for such a small 1.5 acre parcel when other similar sized developments seem to have been given R3 or R3-A designations. I strongly urge the Commission to consider whether that is a wise decision given how this particular zoning request has been handled.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Bette DeGraw  
3007 E Clarendon Ave  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
[bette.degraw@gmail.com](mailto:bette.degraw@gmail.com)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Bette DeGraw <[bette.degraw@gmail.com](mailto:bette.degraw@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Paisley Project - Opposition for Case Z-16-21  
**Date:** September 3, 2021 at 8:11:55 AM MST  
**To:** Sofia Mastikhina <[sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov](mailto:sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov)>, [camelbackEastVPC@phoenix.gov](mailto:camelbackEastVPC@phoenix.gov)

Dear Ms. Mastikhina and Committee Members,

I am writing in continued opposition to the zoning change requested for the Paisley Project for the property located at the southeast corner of E. Clarendon Avenue and 31st Street. I wrote to you in opposition to this project in June and despite some concessions in unit numbers and height proposed recently by the developer, I continue to believe this parcel should remain zoned as R1-6. I have attached my letter from June because my views on the points raised remain the same.

The developer is now proposing 24 two story units on this 1.5 acre site, creating almost as much density as originally proposed. While the exterior look is improved from the original, the ensuing traffic and safety issues remain, as well as the impact on the character of our neighborhood. The negative effect is even greater on the single family homes adjacent to this site to the west and south, especially on Weldon and 31st Street.

The developer submitted a traffic study to support the contention that the project would have a minimal effect on traffic in the neighborhood. I encourage you to read it carefully because it highlights a day's study of traffic on Weldon, which is only a block long at the site of the proposed project. Increased traffic on Weldon is a safety concern for homeowners and their children and for the church at 32nd Street and Weldon because of the children involved in church programs. However the study ignores the already dangerous traffic and safety situation on Clarendon and the impact the project will have as cars spill out onto 31st Street and Clarendon. Since Clarendon is already being used as a faster alternative to Indian School Road, the number of units proposed for this project will only make matters worse. Further, you might consider the impact on trash day when this small block and a half at 31st Street and Clarendon will have 48 trash and recycling barrels lining the sidewalks.

One more thing I might add concerns the scheduling of the Committee meeting on Tuesday, September 7. The developer presented the revised proposal at a neighborhood meeting on August 30, thereby not allowing much time for neighbors to talk to neighbors about the changes. We were not allowed to present our issues at the July meeting when the developer suddenly pulled the request from the agenda and now we are being given only a week to consider the revisions. Further complicating the timing is the Labor Day holiday on Monday, as well as the Jewish holiday of Rosh Hashanah on the day of the Committee meeting. Several interested neighbors are unable to participate because of this timing. That is disappointing. I am out of the country on Tuesday so I will also not be able to participate, so I wanted to share my concerns with you directly.

I do not support this rezoning request.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Bette DeGraw  
3007 E. Clarendon Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
[bette.degraw@gmail.com](mailto:bette.degraw@gmail.com)

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Bette DeGraw <[bette.degraw@gmail.com](mailto:bette.degraw@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** June 26, 2021 at 9:35:06 PM GMT+2  
**To:** [sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov](mailto:sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov), [camelbackEastVPC@phoenix.gov](mailto:camelbackEastVPC@phoenix.gov)  
**Subject:** Opposition for Case Z-16-21

Dear Ms. Mastikhina and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my opposition to the rezoning request from the developers of the Paisley Project, Case Z-16-21. Along with my neighbors, I am strongly opposed to the Paisley Project and request the Camelback East Village Planning Committee and the City of Phoenix to decline the request from the developers of the Paisley Project to rezone the property at the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues from R1-6, Single Family to a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

I live at 3007 E. Clarendon, just to the west of the proposed development. I have lived in this house since 1972 and have seen the neighborhood grow and develop into the diverse and friendly place it is today. However, there are already some threats to the safety of our area, especially on Clarendon. The traffic on the street is already at increased levels, with drivers using Clarendon as an alternate to more heavily traveled E. Indian School. There are no stop signs between 32nd Street and 28th Street, so cars move rather quickly right past my house even now. Cars and various trucks often park along my street, and this combined with the increased number of vehicles using Clarendon, make backing out onto Clarendon from my garage a more dangerous activity with each passing day. To add 34 new homes to such a relatively small parcel will dramatically increase density and adding 34-68 new vehicles to the traffic each day will create even more safety issues both for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles.

That parcel has been R1-6 for over 50 years, as long as I have lived here, and should remain so to be in keeping with the character of our neighborhood. New development should complement the character of our neighborhood, not overwhelm it! While there are some two story condos set back along the north side of Clarendon, and a small two story condo unit just to the east of the target parcel, if such a large number of multi-story homes are built on this site, they will create a canyon feeling along Clarendon and 31st Street and dominate the single story homes that predominate now in our neighborhood.

I do not support the rezoning request and am especially opposed to the request to build a 34 unit multi-story townhome community on this site.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Bette DeGraw  
3007 East Clarendon Ave  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
[bette.degraw@gmail.com](mailto:bette.degraw@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Natalya Ter-Grigoryan <[natalyatg@gmail.com](mailto:natalyatg@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 6:17 PM

**To:** Sofia Mastikhina <[sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov](mailto:sofia.mastikhina@phoenix.gov)>; PDD Camelback East VPC <[camelbackeastvpc@phoenix.gov](mailto:camelbackeastvpc@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 1 PCC <[council.district.1@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.1@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 2 PCC <[council.district.2@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.2@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 3 PCC <[council.district.3@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.3@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 4 <[council.district.4@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.4@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 5 PCC <[council.district.5@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.5@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 6 PCC <[District6@phoenix.gov](mailto:District6@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 7 PCC <[council.district.7@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.7@phoenix.gov)>; Council District 8 PCC <[council.district.8@phoenix.gov](mailto:council.district.8@phoenix.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: Opposition to Paisley Project Rezoning

I inadvertently omitted the application number from my email. It is **Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)**.

Thank you,  
Nataya

On Tue, Nov 30, 2021 at 6:14 PM Natalya Ter-Grigoryan <[natalyatg@gmail.com](mailto:natalyatg@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Mastikhina and City Council Members, I live within one mile of the proposed Paisley Project development that is contemplated to be built on the east side of N. 31st Street between E. Weldon and E. Clarendon Avenues. I strongly oppose the request to rezone this property from R1-6, Single Family Residence, to a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The developer has reduced the number of single-family attached homes from 34 to 24, but that is still a lot of homes to cram onto just seven parcels in an already congested area that is surrounded by tiny streets. The proposed development creates safety and congestion concerns, and is still significantly different from the one-story, single-family homes in the vicinity. Granting the application to rezone this property will give the developer free rein to build 24 town homes in an extremely condensed land area that would otherwise support just 7 single family residences. Building an additional 17 adjoining homes on this property seems to be motivated by financial considerations as opposed to the issues that will result if the re-zoning application is approved.

Other neighbors share my concerns that the proposed re-zoning is extremely disconcerting, and not the best use of the 7 parcels of land. This property should be developed in a manner consistent with the current zoning and the surrounding properties. While the developer has somewhat reduced the number and height of the structures that are proposed to be constructed, the proposed development remains inconsistent with the zoning in the area, and is contrary to the interests of our community. I do not support this rezoning application, and respectfully ask that it be denied.

Sincerely,  
Natalya Ter-Grigoryan



**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** nan.mccallum@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 30, 2021 10:06 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Paisley Project Application #: Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

Racelle, I hope this can be added to the letters from the neighborhood.

Thank you if it is possible to do so

November 30, 2021 Application #: **Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)**

Dear City of Phoenix Planning Commission,

I do appreciate that the developer will extend the section of Clarendon Ave between 30 and 32<sup>nd</sup> Streets that isn't the full width. Very needed to help road safety. Putting sidewalks on the three street sides of the property is the other plus of this plan. Whatever is put on this property needs to require these two elements. But I am opposed to the rezoning requested by the Paisley PUD project (Application #Z-16-21-6). I have written and spoken to the Village Planning Committee about concerns I have about this project.

Have those making the decision for developing this parcel imagined what it will be like to live in this planned development? I have and my observations aren't favorable; I wouldn't want to live there. Having to put your garbage and recycling bins in your garage – not appealing odors especially in the heat. Not having sufficient places for guests to park. Community building will be challenging as there is a very small area around the pool. People will pull into their garage and lower the door and never see their neighbors. Those parking on the streets may be seen by neighbors! But is the plan that the perimeter streets turn into Paisley's planned extended parking? Some neighbors will talk across their front patios but a gated pony wall communicates don't come to my front door. No place for children and/or adults to play catch or put out a basketball hoop. And sadly no room to have a community garden on a property that used to be a farm.

This plan is not following good architectural design principles that takes into consideration the impact on the immediate neighbors. The home to the southeast of the property will majorly be impacted by the back side of the two-story building five feet from the lot line. Paisley was more considerate to the town homes on the northeast side, why is that?

Both my husband and I are very concern that Commissions that should and could be helping to reduce the heat island issue of Phoenix; isn't applying the truths that are expressed in climate goals documents needful and desirable? We can't afford to have shortsighted thinking and planning impact our livability in the years to come.

The developer's lawyer and Sofia often stated that this is one of the last chunks of undeveloped land in the area. Why can't it be used for single family homes? There are many new high-density options in the area. There are not new single-family housing going in other than Blue Sky in the immediate area. Based on seeing how fast houses sell in the area, the demand for single family homes is high. My realtor sends me regular emails to sell the home I have only lived in for 23 months as buyers outweigh sellers, pushing prices up. This is an area need.

At the Village Planning Committee meetings about this project, the neighborhood had much less input time and no time to directly ask questions to the presenting lawyer. Ideas that the neighbors had were not addressed. I remember attending such meetings at the Los Olivos Community Center where questions could be heard and addressed.

Thank you for considering the views of the neighborhood as well as the developer.

Nancy McCallum, 3001 E Clarendon Ave, corner of 30<sup>th</sup> St. Phoenix, AZ

**From:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition for Case: Z-16-21-6 (The Paisley PUD)

November 30, 2021

Dear Council,

My name is David Fraijo and I have lived in my home for over 45 years, which is located at 3110 E.Weldon Ave. As to how the negative aspects this project would be to this entire community, I will be affected with this the most as I am the only residential property that sits next to this proposed development.

In previous meetings, the Paisley Project has stated their communication with the community. I have not been contacted by anybody from this organization. I find this odd and disingenuous. Representatives of this project have lied about their contact with the neighbors.

The plans of the project as it is proposed has the consensus from all of us that reside here that is a poorly representation of the feel or energy that we have created here.

I didn't want to belabor the obvious profoundly negative aspect, being the density, 24 units and the height of three stories. The flowery language by the developers used to describe the design and colors to be used will not fix these aspects. In another part of the description, speaks to helping blighted areas, well our neighborhood is not.

The rezoning of this proprietary is out of line and totally against what we believe is best for our future neighborhood. *Even the cities response to the developer plan states that this is too big for this area.*

I am in favor of a development, it's just what they are considering here is not positive for those of us that choose to live our lives out here in the homes we have created. Part of my choosing to stay in my home was the idea that the value of this home would continue as the property next to me would help me and others. What they are considering will not do this. Do not rezone this property. Limit the height and volume of units.

I would be more in favor of much less units, than is being proposed, as to resolving parking, congestion, and trash/recycle pick-up.

I'm requesting that your council will limit the information given by the representatives of the Paisley Project to not go on for 30-40 minutes belaboring what they ARE NOT going to do. To talk about original 34 unit plan is a waste of our valuable time. So let's talk about less than 24 units now.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
David Fraijo  
Deck Services, Inc.  
(602) 956-2923 – office  
(602) 561-1503 – mobile  
[deckservices@cox.net](mailto:deckservices@cox.net)  
[www.deckservices.net](http://www.deckservices.net) [[deckservices.net](http://deckservices.net)]

*Angie's List - Yelp - Houzz - Home Advisor*

City of Phoenix Planning Commission  
The Paisley Project  
Public Hearing - Dec. 2, 2021

Opposition to the Zoning Request - Paisley Project

To: Members of the Planning Commission:

My name is Karen T. Scates and I live at 3033 E. Clarendon Avenue in the Santo Tomas homes, just West of the proposed development. I've lived here 32 years.

We all know there is pressure to increase housing stock for continued growth, but it should be in harmony with the neighborhood. Accommodating new arrivals at the expense of an existing and diverse and maintained neighborhood is unacceptable. We want development that enhances — not overwhelms us.

The PUD (Planned Unit Development) is intended to create a built environment that is superior to that produced by conventional zoning districts and design guidelines, and tailored to the context of the site. In this case, potentially R3 would be more appropriate. This is merely a 1.5 acre site interior to an existing neighborhood.

A PUD has entitlements that favor the developer and perhaps was meant to incentivize aggregating multiple smaller parcels into something closer to ten acres. This PUD award has been creeping into neighborhoods and we feel this is an inappropriate use of the PUD.

Our active and cohesive neighborhood has been clear from the beginning that the original proposal and the revision have not adequately addressed the issues of safety, privacy, traffic or density.

In my view, the developer has been insincere in their representation of issues:

—They repeatedly referred to the empty lot as a reflection of a blighted neighborhood. The only blight is the neglect they have instigated. An example is the obliteration of the STOP sign on their property by an overgrown shrub. A call to Neighborhood Services provided a temporary fix with a smaller sign weighted down by sand bags.

—They claimed the property was never anything but an empty lot but that isn't true. There was a lived in residence.

—They presented an eyebrow raising original concept with ridiculous density, farmhouse design, and three/four stories that trashed neighbors privacy by looking over the walls of the Santo Tomas residents across the street. They revised the entire project in one month, cutting it by one-third, etc. and claiming they made concessions to the neighborhood. As more than one Board Member of the Camelback East VPC noted, it's a "disingenuous negotiating tactic" and the "oldest trick" to present their revision as a "concession."

—They presented a traffic study that only represented one small block that is not a through street, but Weldon on the south side of the property in front of the church. Nothing on Clarendon or 31st Street where they have all their traffic ingress and egress into the neighborhood.

—They presented seven letters of "support" for the revised project but on further examination, the letters were all the same template and from individuals who do not live in the neighborhood!

I would hope that integrity and trust in dealing with neighborhoods, and in requesting a favored variance for a new development, would be a consideration of the Planning Commission and City Council. There should be consequences, not rewards for bad behavior.

On another related issue I've spoken to before, is the request that you look at the impact on the surrounding neighborhood beyond the geographic boundary of the Paisley Project. There are other stresses that will generate more traffic and safety concerns,

Right now, Clarendon is the only East/West through street from 32nd Street to 28th Street between Indian School and Osborn — no lights and no Stop signs. In fact, it's the only through street to 24th Street, and with only one Stop sign.

With increased traffic on Indian School, some of the congestion is off-loading onto Clarendon.

With trucks and landscape and delivery vehicles, it can be a veritable raceway except for a couple of speed bumps.

Clarendon narrows to one lane starting West of 31st Street. A huge safety hazard that has to be addressed.

And, except for Santo Tomas development, there are basically no sidewalks on the North side of Clarendon.

Guest parking blocks the curbs and on our side of Clarendon, the extra vehicles create a danger by blocking sight lines backing out of our driveways.

This volume of traffic will only be compounded by the density of the Paisley Project in addition to the parking and safety issues.

Members of the Commission,  
Thank you for the opportunity to share my comments.

Karen T. Scates  
3033 E. Clarendon Ave.  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
ktscates@gmail.com

November 30, 2021