

ATTACHMENT E

From: Warren Norgaard <warren.norgaard@fluentascension.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 12, 2026 11:50 AM
To: Racelle Escolar; Matteo Moric
Subject: Public Comment for Z-82-25-5 (Canopy at the Trails PUD) – Request for Inclusion in Case Record

Dear Racelle and Matteo,

I am writing regarding Z-82-25-5, the Canopy at the Trails PUD application, recently heard by the Maryvale Village Planning Committee. As you may know, the committee voted 7 to 4 to recommend approval. I was among those who voted in opposition, and I would like to respectfully outline the substantive planning concerns that informed my vote as the case moves forward to the Planning Commission.

5 and throughout Phoenix. Increasing pathways to ownership is an important public goal. However, this request is not necessary to allow ownership. The existing development could be sold as condominiums under current zoning without any rezoning or PUD. The purpose of the PUD is instead to grant townhome classification and associated regulatory relief to a project that was designed, entitled, and constructed as a multifamily rental development.

The staff report confirms several key facts that raise concerns about this request.

First, the proposal is inconsistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Map designation. The site is designated for Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre, while the proposal allows a density of up to 14 dwelling units per acre. The report acknowledges this inconsistency and explains that a General Plan Amendment is not required only because the site is under ten acres. This is a procedural exemption, not policy consistency. Approving rezonings that conflict with adopted plan designations risks undermining the long-range planning framework intended to guide land use decisions.

the already permitted and built project, and further confirms that the site has already been constructed and issued Certificates of Occupancy. In other words, the requested zoning is not guiding development. It is being used after construction to retroactively adjust the regulatory framework governing that development. This sequencing raises important policy questions about precedent and the integrity of entitlement process.

Third, the proposal does not merely tailor standards. It removes or relaxes multiple requirements that would ordinarily apply to townhome developments, including modifications to cluster design standards, driveway length, parking requirements, access widths, and certain siting and design elements. In some

instances, standards are proposed to be removed entirely. This represents a substantive modification of development rules after the fact.

Fourth, the public benefit asserted in support of the request appears limited relative to the regulatory relief being sought. The report repeatedly states that the project will add to the mix of housing types and support housing goals. While additional ownership opportunities can be beneficial, ownership housing is already permitted on the site through condominium conversion. The PUD does not create ownership. It changes the regulatory classification of the existing units. That distinction is significant because townhome classification typically carries higher valuation, broader financing access, and greater marketability than condominium product, even when the physical structures are identical. The record does not clearly demonstrate how the public benefit of that reclassification outweighs the precedent implications of granting post-construction regulatory relief.

I would also like to note a procedural concern that arose during the Village Planning Committee hearing. After the applicant completed their presentation and after extensive questioning, a committee member asked how the proposed change might affect existing tenants, including whether residents would have an opportunity to purchase their units, whether leases could be renewed, and whether tenants might ultimately be displaced as units are sold. Only at that point did the applicant produce and read into the record a letter from the developer dated the day prior that addressed these issues. This information was not included in the presentation materials or disclosed proactively. The fact that it was introduced only after the question was asked raises concerns about whether all relevant information has been fully and transparently provided to reviewing bodies.

Finally, I respectfully ask that the Planning Commission consider the broader precedent implications of this case. If a PUD can be used to reclassify a project after construction in order to obtain the benefits of a different housing category without meeting the standards that category would normally require at the entitlement stage, it may encourage future applicants to pursue a similar sequence. That possibility has broader policy implications beyond this single site.

Racelle, I respectfully request that this correspondence be shared with the Planning Commission in advance of its hearing on Z-82-25-5 and that it be included in the official case record as a public comment for this application. Please confirm that this correspondence has been added to the case file.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

All my best,
Warren Norgaard
Vice Chair, Maryvale Village Planning Committee