



Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary

Z-51-19-4

INFORMATION ONLY

Date of VPC Meeting	December 2, 2019
Request From	R-5 M-R (2.94 acres)
Request To	PUD (2.94 acres)
Proposed Use	Mixed-use
Location	Northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road

VPC DISCUSSION:

2 cards were submitted in favor, wishing to speak.

7 cards were submitted in opposition, not wishing to speak.

15 cards were submitted in opposition, wishing to speak. (5 people chose to donate their time to Robert Warnicke. 4 people chose to donate their time to Tom Chauncey.)

Mr. Jason Morris, of Withey Morris, PLC, reviewed the history of the project and explained that as a condition of approval for the rezoning case, they are required to file a PUD (Planned Unit Development). He shared the design principles for the project and that they have an architectural review committee of neighbors.

Ms. Ann Cothron requested the design elements to be read aloud and for the PowerPoint to be shared to the whole Committee.

Mr. Drew Bryck asked if the approved zoning (R-5 M-R) will be removed if the PUD is not approved.

Ms. Samantha Keating, staff, explained that the zoning does not revert if the PUD is not approved. A council action would be needed to revert to the original zoning.

Mr. Brent Kleinman added that a PUD is more restrictive, and if another developer were to take on the project they would be restricted by the terms of the PUD.

Mr. Morris agreed with the comment made by Mr. Kleinman.

Ms. Layla Ressler asked when the applicant will be back to present the case for action.

Mr. Morris responded that they still have two architectural review meetings in the future.

Mr. Rick Mahrle stated that parking is a problem and asked if the Phoenix Country Club will close for special events.

Mr. Morris responded that their project will create extra parking for the country club. He added that during construction, the country club will have to address their parking shortage.

Mr. Bryck asked what elements of the WU Code/Transit-Oriented Development they are incorporating into the project.

Mr. Morris responded that he would have to review the transects but that the project is pedestrian-oriented.

Ms. George asked who is on the architectural review committee.

Mr. Morris responded that he will provide the committee member names.

Mr. Tom Chauncey commented that the project is an abomination. He believes it does not belong outside of the Village core and Downtown core. He believes that the golfers should pay for their own golf instead of the Country Club selling parts of their property to meet their deficit. He commented that the pictures of the project changed from the first meeting.

Mr. Robert Warnicke, president of the La Hacienda Historic District, shared that the PUD is not for the benefit of the neighbors. He believes the applicant is asking for a reduction in open space from 30 percent required with the R-5 M-R zoning to 25 percent. He believes this will be a template for the next parcel sold off by the Country Club. He added that the proposal lacks specificity and the General Plan calls for specificity for neighbors. He shared that the PUD is supposed to be superior to conventional zoning but a reduction in open space is not a superior product.

Ms. Susan Edwards asked how many parking spaces will be displaced and how many parking spaces per unit are being provided.

Mr. John Graham responded that they have one parking spot per bedroom, guest parking and extra parking for the Country Club. He offered to provide more information on the parking amount at the next public meeting.

Mr. David Zacharias shared that he believes the project will add a lot of value to the community. He has a concern with the amount of parking available for members of the Country Club, and asked how many spaces will be left over from the required number of parking spaces for residents.

Mr. Keith Ritchie shared that the building will be for the benefit of the residents without regard for people on the outside. He added that many businesses do not stay in the area.

Mr. Neal Haddad of the Neighborhood Coalition of Greater Phoenix encouraged meeting attendees to review the minutes from the March 20, 2019 City Council meeting. He shared that Mr. Graham said they would work with neighbors to form an

architectural review committee. He continued that he thought Mr. Artie Vigil would be involved with the development group from the start.

Ms. Donna Reiner believes that the project does not look like mid-century architecture. She believes that the conceptual design should look better. She shared that the architectural review committee does not have a pedestrian in the group and urged the applicant to add a pedestrian to the committee to make the project more pedestrian-oriented.

Ms. Patience Huntwork shared that she is passionate about the project. She added that her historic neighborhood accepts change and commercial uses. She continued that as a result her street is one of the most beautiful streets in Phoenix. She shared that the future of the entire area is in the Committee's hands and if they turn down the PUD, other developers will shy away from investing in the area.

Mr. Bryck asked Mr. Warnicke what he wanted as an outcome for the project.

Mr. Warnicke responded that he prefers that the PUD does not get approved. He believes that if the Committee rejects the PUD the developer will be restricted to their original zoning and a 30 percent open space requirement.

Mr. Morris responded that he will provide the names of the members of the architectural review committee. He confirmed that they are providing 30 percent open space and that they are not asking for additional height. He suggested that the Committee stipulate that the building will not go above 110 feet in height. He continued that they are filing a PUD because they are required to do so. He shared that the PUD can provide detail and restriction to a project. He concluded that it is not an attempt to revisit the rezoning case, and that what was originally filed was a very different building.

Mr. Adams asked if the six people on the architectural review committee were volunteers.

Mr. Morris replied affirmatively.

Ms. Ressler asked if the Country Club will meet their parking requirements once the project is done.

Mr. Morris responded that they are required to provide 188 spaces. They are providing 267 spaces. He continued that 37 spaces are for the country club. He added that yes, the Country Club will meet their parking requirements.

Mr. Bryck asked if there was an update on the Streets study on reversal lanes for 7th Street.

Ms. Keating responded that she will get an update on that item.

Mr. Procaccini asked the applicant to provide more information on the open space being provided and if any discussions have been had about annexing the remainder of the Country Club property into the city.

Mr. Morris replied that the open space is the terrace. He agreed to address what they are including and excluding in their open space calculations in their updated proposal.

Mr. Procaccini asked if the golf course could have a historic designation, but recognized that a city designation would not be possible unless it pursued annexation.

Mr. Morris responded that it is county-owned land.