

# Attachment F

Racelle Escolar

---

**From:** Olga Petkova <olgapetkova@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 11:47 AM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** In opposition/z-54-20-4

Dear members of the planning commission,

As of this morning at 11am May 6th, members of the opposition still have not seen the new site plans. We have asked for a continuance and we are surprised it has not been granted as of yet seeing how we are expected to take a stance at tonight's meeting. The PUD was remanded from City Council skipping normal steps (including Alhambra) which would have allowed us to have ample time to review the new site plans and documents. We have not asked for a single continuance up to this point.

We are hoping the PUD can work as it has the potential to benefit everyone including the city's vision of the Grand Canal-scape. As the PUD stands, it does not work for the neighborhood. It is still very close to the WU T5:5 in density, vehicles, units, height of the parking garage, and lack of appropriate parking spaces.

Trinsic has gained 45 units from the R3/R5. They have gone from 218 to 210 with 165 being the maximum are R5 would allow. That is not a compromise. They have gained a 56 foot parking structure but they have REDUCED the number of parking spots since the City Council Meeting from 303 to 292. At 266 beds (210 units), that leaves 26 parking spots for couples and guests. That is unacceptable as this development is deep within our neighborhood. We agreed to 20 foot setbacks with the understanding we were gaining 8 to 10 feet in setbacks (north and west sides) from the previous rendering but this does not look to be the case based on a graphic that was sent to us a day ago. We need to see those site plans.

If you have not received ample letters of opposition, it is because we were trying to work with the PUD but at this point Trinsic is content with what they have and will not further reduce their density. The Dwelling Unit Density maximum for an R5 with bonuses is 52.20. Currently Trinsic is at a dwelling urban density of 63.63. In order for the Dwelling Urban Density to be at the maximum R5 with bonuses, Trinsic would have to bring their unit count down to 173.

210 units / 3.3 gross acres = 63.63 dwelling unit density  
174 units / 3.3 gross acres = 52.72 dwelling urban density

We are open to working with this PUD as we do believe it could benefit all parties involved, but as of right now it hurts the neighborhood and we are forced to look back at the R3/R5. If we could get further concessions on unit counts/ parking spots in the PUD we could come back to the table. Without seeing a site plan, you are allowing us to go into this blind.

Please give us our continuance,

Olga Petkova

Sent from my iPhone

## Racelle Escolar

---

**From:** Ivo Petkov <ivokpetkov@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 11:50 AM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** In opposition / z-56-20-4

Dear members of the planning commission,

As of this morning at 11am May 6<sup>th</sup>, members of the opposition still have not seen the new site plans. We have asked for a continuance and we are surprised it has not been granted as of yet seeing how we are expected to take a stance at tonight's meeting. The PUD was remanded from City Council skipping normal steps (including Alhambra) which would have allowed us to have ample time to review the new site plans and documents. We have not asked for a single continuance up to this point.

We are hoping the PUD can work as it has the potential to benefit everyone including the city's vision of the Grand Canal-scape. As the PUD stands, it does not work for the neighborhood. It is still very close to the WU T5:5 in density, vehicles, units, height of the parking garage, and lack of appropriate parking spaces.

Trinsic has gained 45 units from the R3/R5. They have gone from 218 to 210 with 165 being the maximum are R5 would allow. That is not a compromise. They have gained a 56 foot parking structure but they have REDUCED the number of parking spots since the City Council Meeting from 303 to 292. At 266 beds (210 units), that leaves 26 parking spots for couples and guests. That is unacceptable as this development is deep within our neighborhood. We agreed to 20 foot setbacks with the understanding we were gaining 8 to 10 feet in setbacks (north and west sides) from the previous rendering but this does not look to be the case based on a graphic that was sent to us a day ago. We need to see those site plans.

If you have not received ample letters of opposition, it is because we were trying to work with the PUD but at this point Trinsic is content with what they have and will not further reduce their density. The Dwelling Unit Density maximum for an R5 with bonuses is 52.20. Currently Trinsic is at a dwelling urban density of 63.63. In order for the Dwelling Urban Density to be at the maximum R5 with bonuses, Trinsic would have to bring their unit count down to 173.

210 units / 3.3 gross acres = 63.63 dwelling unit density  
174 units / 3.3 gross acres = 52.72 dwelling urban density

We are open to working with this PUD as we do believe it could benefit all parties involved, but as of right now it hurts the neighborhood and we are forced to look back at the R3/R5. If we could get further concessions on unit counts/ parking spots in the PUD we could come back to the table. Without seeing a site plan, you are allowing us to go into this blind.

Please give us our continuance,

Ivo Petkov

Sent from my iPhone

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** nancygmcmillan@q.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 12:25 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** RE: 3rd Av & Coolidge project

Sorry need to state need a continuance until we can see site plans and discuss with our neighborhood

---

**From:** nancygmcmillan@q.com <nancygmcmillan@q.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 12:20 PM  
**To:** 'pdd.planningcomm@phoenix.gov' <pdd.planningcomm@phoenix.gov>  
**Subject:** 3rd Av & Coolidge project

Team,

I hope all is well? I am writing regarding the project development on 3<sup>rd</sup> Av & Coolidge. We were unaware that if we opposed or approved that we were to email you all.

My name is Nancy G. McMillan and I live at 151 W Mariposa St, Phoenix, AZ 85013. While I appreciate the PUD recommendation from Laura we have some concerns.

I am in opposition for the following reasons:

- Have not seen plan or site plans after the original was declined
  - Things that were recommended we have no way to verify
  - For example we got some pictures of the new proposal, but there are no setbacks
- TRAFFIC
  - No traffic study done and this is a major concern
- Parking
  - While everyone says permit parking is going to be done this is the responsibility of the neighborhood not the developer and council
  - They have supposedly decreased parking which is unacceptable especially if a taller unit
  - Need to make sure they have plenty of visitor parking
- Setbacks
  - They are not shown in the pictures we have received
  - Setbacks should be 33' wide and grass over the 16'6" grassed over
- THIS IS NOT AN ARTERIAL ROAD
  - These size and types of apartments are appropriate for arterial roads not internal to a neighborhood
  - This should not be any higher than other apartments in the neighborhood

I think this is enough for now.

Nancy,



Virus-free. [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com) [avg.com]

[\[avg.com\]](http://avg.com)

## Racelle Escolar

---

**From:** Tania Bachelot <tania.bachelot@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 2:34 PM  
**To:** Racelle Escolar; PDD Planning Commission

Dear members of the planning commission,

As of this morning at 11am May 6<sup>th</sup>, members of the opposition still have not seen the new site plans. We have asked for a continuance and we are surprised it has not been granted as of yet seeing how we are expected to take a stance at tonight's meeting. The PUD was remanded from City Council skipping normal steps (including Alhambra) which would have allowed us to have ample time to review the new site plans and documents. We have not asked for a single continuance up to this point.

We are hoping the PUD can work as it has the potential to benefit everyone including the city's vision of the Grand Canal-scape. As the PUD stands, it does not work for the neighborhood. It is still very close to the WU T5:5 in density, vehicles, units, height of the parking garage, and lack of appropriate parking spaces.

Trinsic has gained 45 units from the R3/R5. They have gone from 218 to 210 with 165 being the maximum are R5 would allow. That is not a compromise. They have gained a 56 foot parking structure but they have REDUCED the number of parking spots since the City Council Meeting from 303 to 292. At 266 beds (210 units), that leaves 26 parking spots for couples and guests. That is unacceptable as this development is deep within our neighborhood. We agreed to 20 foot setbacks with the understanding we were gaining 8 to 10 feet in setbacks (north and west sides) from the previous rendering but this does not look to be the case based on a graphic that was sent to us a day ago. We need to see those site plans.

If you have not received ample letters of opposition, it is because we were trying to work with the PUD but at this point Trinsic is content with what they have and will not further reduce their density. The Dwelling Unit Density maximum for an R5 with bonuses is 52.20. Currently Trinsic is at a dwelling urban density of 63.63. In order for the Dwelling Urban Density to be at the maximum R5 with bonuses, Trinsic would have to bring their unit count down to 173.

210 units / 3.3 gross acres = 63.63 dwelling unit density  
174 units / 3.3 gross acres = 52.72 dwelling urban density

We are open to working with this PUD as we do believe it could benefit all parties involved, but as of right now it hurts the neighborhood and we are forced to look back at the R3/R5. If we could get further concessions on unit counts/ parking spots in the PUD we could come back to the table. Without seeing a site plan, you are allowing us to go into this blind.

Please give us our continuance,

Kind regards,

Tania Petkova Bachelot (Sevigne LLC)  
506 W Coolidge street, 85013 Phoenix

**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Adam Ghiz <a.ghiz@me.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 6, 2021 2:57 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Opposition to Z56-20-4 (3rd and Coolidge)

I'm writing to voice my opposition to the modified zoning request for z-56-20 3rd ave and Coolidge

This request was remanded down from city council to be modified into a PUD to try and work with the neighborhood to find a compromise.

It was to address four things, density, traffic, parking and setbacks. So far only one of these has been barely touched. The 20 foot setback is now being interpreted to be less than 20 feet from the curb to building, that aren't materially pushing the building back 20 feet from the curb. The intent of which was to aid in privacy of the neighboring single family homes. The units were reduced by 8 which is only a 4% decrease, again not a substantial change from the original plan. Also, apparently the parking has been reduced as well bringing the available parking percentage to nearly the same as the original design. All of this while the garage is still allowed to be 56 feet tall. I ask you, if they have reduced the parking available, why is the garage still higher than the building? Also, if parking concerns were an issue with the original design, why reduce the number of available spots even more?

The other issue with this is that these plans have not been revealed to the public yet and this meeting is today. How can input be given, if the changes have not been made public? We are losing normal steps in the PUD process here and by not giving access to the changes, we are further being infringed upon.

I feel that the neighborhood is asking for reasonable items and there is room to come to an agreement. I also feel that the spirit of the PUD is not being respected nor is it being used the way it was intended

I feel that this leads one to the conclusion that either this request must be extended to a future meeting where these issues can be address in the proper manner, or this must be denied.

Adam Ghiz  
302 W Hazelwood St  
Phoenix, AZ 85013