

Attachment B



City of Phoenix
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Staff Report: Z-41-18-4 September 4, 2018

Encanto [Village Planning Committee](#) Hearing Date September 10, 2018
[Planning Commission](#) Hearing Date October 4, 2018
Request From: [P-1](#) (2.94 acres)
Request To: [R-5 H-R](#) (2.94 acres)
Proposed Use Multifamily high-rise residential
Location Northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road
Owner Phoenix Country Club
Applicant AGS, LLC
Representative Larry S. Lazarus
Staff Recommendation Denial as filed, approval of R-5, with stipulations.
If approved R-5 H-R, an additional mitigating height stipulation is recommended.

General Plan Conformity			
General Plan Land Use Map Designation		Residential 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre	
Street Map Classification	Thomas Road	Arterial	Varies, 42- to 65- foot north half street
	7th Street	Major Arterial	Varies, 40- to 65- foot east half street
<p>CONNECT PEOPLE & PLACES CORE VALUE; CORES, CENTERS, AND CORRIDORS; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Locate land uses with the greatest height and most intense uses within village cores, centers and corridors based on village character, land use needs, and transportation system capacity.</p> <p>The request does not comply with this land use principle. The site is not in a village core, a village center, or in a corridor identified for greater height and intensity.</p>			

CONNECT PEOPLE & PLACES CORE VALUE; TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Continue the development of Central Avenue as the city's transit spine and the principal street of Phoenix, concentrating the maximum intensity of commercial office and retail uses downtown.

The request does not comply with this land use principle. The site is not on Central Avenue.

CONNECT PEOPLE & PLACES CORE VALUE; TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Develop land use and design regulations governing land close to transit centers and light rail stations, to maximize the potential for ridership.

The request does not comply with this land use principle. The site is not within the Midtown TOD District, is over one-half mile from a light rail station, and although there is bus transit on both 7th Street and on Thomas Road, the proposed design will not maximize the potential for transit ridership.

CONNECT PEOPLE & PLACES CORE VALUE; OPPORTUNITY SITES; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Support reasonable levels of increased intensity, respectful of local conditions and surrounding neighborhoods.

The R-5 H-R zoning district is not a reasonable level of increased intensity in this location; however, the R-5 zoning district provides a reasonable level of increased intensity for a subject site that is along two major thoroughfares and adjacent to a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route.

CELEBRATE OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS CORE VALUE; CERTAINTY AND CHARACTER; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Protect residential areas from concentrations of incompatible land uses that could change their character or destabilize land values.

The request does not comply with this land use principle. The request for this zoning at this location ignores policies which are designed to protect residential areas from incompatible land uses.

CELEBRATE OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS CORE VALUE; DIVERSE NEIGHBORHOODS; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: Include a mix of housing types and densities where appropriate within each village that support a broad range of lifestyles.

The subject site is appropriate for a mix of housing, such as multifamily residential development to support a range of lifestyles. The high-rise entitlement and density is not appropriate, but the R-5 zoning district is more appropriate as it is less intense, while still promoting a mix of housing types.

CELEBRATE OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS CORE VALUE; CERTAINTY AND CHARACTER; LAND USE PRINCIPLE: New development and expansion or redevelopment of existing development in or near residential areas should be compatible with existing uses and consistent with adopted plans.

The location of the proposed high-rise development is outside of the Midtown TOD District and the Central Avenue Corridor. The request for a high-rise entitlement on this site in no way furthers the certainty and character of the surrounding area.

However, staff's recommendation of R-5 on the site provides an appropriate density and intensity of multifamily residential that is compatible with existing uses and development in the area.

BUILDING A SUSTAINABLE DESERT CITY CORE VALUE; TREES AND SHADE; DESIGN PRINCIPLES: Integrate trees and shade into the design of new development and redevelopment projects throughout Phoenix.

The proposed development will incorporate a detached sidewalk with a double row of trees on each side of the sidewalk along Thomas Road and 7th Street, which, if properly planted and cared for, could provide ample shade for pedestrians.

Applicable Plans, Overlays, and Initiatives

[Complete Streets Guiding Principles](#) – See Item #13 in the Background/Issues/Analysis Section.

[Tree and Shade Master Plan](#) – See Item #14 in the Background/Issues/Analysis Section.

[Reimagine Phoenix](#) – See Item #27 in the Background/Issues/Analysis Section.

Surrounding Land Uses / Zoning

	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
On Site	Surface Parking Lot	P-1
North	Surface Parking Lot and Single-Family Residential	P-1 and R1-10
South	Office and Former Gas Station	C-O and C-1
East	Surface Parking Lot, Phoenix Country Club, and Single-Family Residential	P-1, R-5, and R1-10
West	Office and Commercial Use	R-5 and C-1

R-5 H-R (Multifamily Residence District, High-Rise) Planned Residential Development Option		
<i>*if variance required</i>		
<u>Standards</u>	<u>Requirements</u>	<u>Provisions on the Proposed site Plan</u>
Gross Acreage	-	2.94 acres
Total Number of Units	450 sq ft lot area/unit = 284 units	Met - 125 units
Density	145.20 du/acre	Met - 42.52 du/acre
Lot Coverage	50%	*Not Met - 53.5%
Maximum Building Height	250 feet	Met - 164 feet
<i>Minimum Building Setbacks</i>		
Front (Thomas Road)	25 - 35 feet	*Not Met – 25 feet
Side (7th Street)	25 feet	TBD
Rear	15 feet	TBD
<i>Minimum Landscape Standards</i>		
Street (7th Street)	Per 701.D.2.c.(3)., an area not less than five times the distance between the required front yard and the rear property line (in sq. ft).	TBD
Street (Thomas Road)	Per 701.D.2.a.(1), an area not less than five times the width of the front yard (in sq. ft.)	TBD
<i>Interior Landscape Standards</i>	5 feet, per 703.B.3.b	TBD

Common Areas/Open Space	Minimum 5% gross	*Not Met – 2.4%
Parking	1.5 spaces per 1 or 2-bedroom unit (50 2-bedroom units) 2.0 spaces per 3 or more-bedroom unit (75 3-bedroom units) Required: 225 spaces (for unreserved parking) Required if parking is reserved: 325 spaces	Unreserved Met - 234 spaces *Reserved Not Met – 234 spaces

Background/Issues/Analysis

REQUEST

1. This is a rezoning request for a multifamily high-rise residential development on a 2.94-acre site located at the northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road. The current zoning is P-1 (Passenger Automobile Parking, Limited) and is a surface parking lot for the Phoenix Country Club. The request is to rezone the subject site to R-5 H-R (Multifamily Residence District, High-Rise and High-Density District) for a multifamily high-rise residential development with a building height of 164 feet and 15 stories.
2. In 1964, the site was previously rezoned (Z-48-64) from R-5 (Multifamily Residence District) to P-1 (Passenger Automobile Parking, Limited) to allow for a parking lot to serve the Phoenix Country Club.

GENERAL PLAN

3. The site has a General Plan Land Use Map designation of Residential 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is not consistent with the General Plan Land Use Map designation; however, an amendment is not required as the subject site is less than 10 acres.


SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING

4. Located to the north is a surface parking lot for the Phoenix Country Club, zoned for P-1 (Passenger Automobile Parking, Limited) and single-family residential properties zoned R1-10 (Single-Family Residence District). To the south, across Thomas Road, is an office that is zoned C-O (Commercial Office), and a vacant gas station that is zoned C-1 (Neighborhood Retail). A surface parking lot, zoned P-1 (Passenger Automobile Parking, Limited), the Phoenix Country Club, zoned R-5, (Multifamily Residences District), and single-family residences, zoned R1-10 (Single-Family Residence District), are located to the east of the site. To the

west, across 7th Street, is a vacant commercial use that is zoned C-1 and an existing office that is zoned R-5 (Multifamily Residences District).

5. The site is located outside of the Midtown TOD (Transit-Oriented Development) District. The boundary of the District ends on the west side 7th Street and the subject site is located on the east side of 7th Street.

The Midtown TOD District is guided by the Midtown TOD Policy Plan. This Plan was developed as a part of the ReinventPHX process. ReinventPHX is a collaborative partnership between the City of Phoenix, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Arizona State University, St. Luke's Health



Source: Midtown TOD Policy Plan, page 3

Initiatives (now Vitalyst Health Foundation) and numerous other organizations committed to developing walkable, opportunity-rich communities connected to light rail. Reinvent PHX created action plans for districts along the light rail system. The plans establish a community-based vision for the future and identify investment strategies to improve the quality of life for all residents. This process establishes a new, transit-oriented model for more urban development concentrated along the city's light rail system.

The intent of the Midtown TOD Policy Plan is to encourage active uses and additional intensity and density within the light rail corridor, particularly along the quarter mile area around Central Avenue and have gradually less intensity of development toward the east to 7th Street and to the west to 7th Avenue (one-half mile distance from light rail).

The intensity and height proposed is not appropriate in this location that is located outside of the Midtown TOD District and the Central Avenue light rail corridor.

6. Prior to the adoption of the Transit Oriented Development Strategic Policy Framework in 2013, policy guidance for buildings greater than four stories outside of the downtown or a Village Core was quite limited. The General Plan advocated for greater heights and intensities near high capacity transit. There was no further distinction in terms of appropriate context for this one-size-fits-all policy. The Policy Framework utilized documented research and national best

practices to advocate for an urban form with an efficient, high performance growth pattern. The framework is intended to improve the investment environment around key nodes in the Phoenix transit network and guide sustainable urban development to benefit all residents. Smart decisions provide cost savings for both residents and government, stronger neighborhoods, improved health and new business opportunities.

The request for high rise development at the proposed location is in conflict with the careful work of the Strategic Policy Framework, whereby greater intensities are to be directed to develop in appropriate locations at context-appropriate heights. Additionally, the proposal is in conflict with the policies in the General Plan which direct greater heights to village cores.

6. The Transit Oriented Development Strategic Policy Framework is part of the city's General Plan which identified planning typologies to describe urban environments. The identified environment for the Central Avenue and Thomas Road light rail station area is Regional Center. A Center is a term used to describe a concentration of activity and intensity within the City. The Regional Center place type is characterized by high intensity with building heights typically from five to 10 stories with incentive heights of up to 20 stories.



Land uses may include office employment, industry cluster, high and midrise living and supportive retail. Greater heights and intensities are encouraged within the 1/4-mile area around the light rail stations and building height and intensity beyond the 1/4-mile area can be considered when it is at the lower end of the recommended building heights in the Regional Center place type.

However, the subject site is located outside of the 1/2-mile area of the light rail and therefore the proposed height of 164 feet and 15 stories is not appropriate at this location. This intensity and height is more appropriate along the Central Avenue light rail corridor.

7. The aerial photo below shows the current development patterns along Central Avenue, Thomas Road and between Central Avenue and 7th Street. The subject site is identified in the red square. The image shows that there is an intensity of high-rise buildings located along the Central Avenue light rail corridor between Central Avenue and 3rd Street. Building heights are reduced with proximity to single-family residential development, located toward the east.



Source: Google Earth, Planning and Development Department

8. There is one development, Crystal Point Condominiums, located north of the Phoenix Country Club that is an outlier in the area. The 18-story high-rise condominium development was built in 1990, but the zoning of the property to allow the achieved height was entitled in 1963 (Z-50-63), which was prior to the construction of the light rail corridor and prior the adoption of the Midtown TOD Policy Plan and the Transit Oriented Development Strategic Policy Framework. The Crystal Point development is not a valid basis for a precedent in support of approval of this request. In the intervening decades, planning policies have evolved to reflect sound planning principles for context-sensitive development, as well as the need for a development form which allows government to provide services in a much more cost-efficient manner.
9. The Transportation 2050 (T2050) Plan designates Thomas Road, from 44th Street to 91st Avenue, as a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route and will run adjacent to the subject site. With the addition of a BRT route along Thomas Road, some additional intensification beyond the current zoning of P-1 is appropriate. Therefore, staff is recommending approval of R-5 on this location, which would allow a height up to 4 stories or 48 feet and a maximum density of 52.20 dwelling units per acre, with bonus.

There have been other recent rezoning cases that have occurred just outside of the TOD Policy Plan areas (Z-69-16, Z-39-15, Z-127-14, and Z-38-15). The heights proposed in these rezoning cases that were greater than 56 feet were approved through a Planned Unit Development (PUD). The following table outlines the locations and maximum heights allowed in these rezoning cases.

Rezoning Case	Location	Approved Max. Height
Z-69-16 The Local PUD	Southwest Corner of Osborn Road and 7th Avenue	60 feet
Z-39-15 Alta Camelback PUD	Southeast Corner of 7th Street and Camelback Road	60 feet
Z-38-15 Peak 16 PUD	Approximately 99 feet east of the southeast corner of 16th Street and Colter Street	64 feet
Z-127-14 Crescent Highland PUD	Southwest corner of 16th Street and Highland Avenue	69 feet

The approved PUD's offered additional amenities and enhanced building form at the ground level, which activated the streetscape and pedestrian experience and warranted modest height increases beyond what is permitted in R-5 zoning.

The proposed development, in contrast, does not provide the desired form to activate the ground floor level nor does it contribute to the adjacent transit corridor. The approval of R-5 H-R on this subject site constitutes "spot zoning" as there is little adjacent context to support the height and intensity at this location.

10. Staff is recommending denial of the R-5 H-R (Multifamily Residence District, High-Rise and High-Density District) rezoning request.

However, staff is recommending approval of R-5 (Multifamily Residence District) with the stipulations (No. 1 through No. 16) that are described in this staff report. These stipulations provide guidance for compatible, pedestrian-scale development on the site.

In the event that the R-5 H-R rezoning request is approved, staff recommends that the stipulations (No. 1 through No. 17) apply in addition to a height mitigating stipulation (No. 18).

SITE PLAN / ELEVATIONS ANALYSIS

11. The site plan incorporates the surface parking lot located to the north of the site, however that area is not included in the rezoning request.

Vehicular access to and from the subject site are from two existing driveways, one on Thomas Road and one on 7th Street. In order to avoid additional driveways on the site, staff is recommending a stipulation that limits vehicular access to the existing driveways. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 1.



Source: Conceptual Site Plan provided by applicant

The development will have two stories of parking. There will be a pool deck on top of the 2nd level, located toward the west of the building and the 15-story high rise units located on the east side of the building. The site plan shows the lobby entrance will be accessed from the east side of the building.

12. The proposed building elevations are for a 164 foot, 15-story high-rise multifamily residential tower. The elevations that were provided do not include detailed plans regarding the design of the building; however, staff has recommended some stipulations to encourage pedestrian scale design to avoid blank building facades along the streetscape.



Source: Conceptual Elevations provided by applicant

Staff recommends that ground floor blank walls visible from the public sidewalk shall not exceed 20 linear feet without being interrupted by a window, door, or variation in building treatment or design.

In addition, staff is recommending that the building façades be designed to provide a sense of human scale at the ground level by providing clear architectural distinction between the ground level and all additional stories.

Reflective and mirrored glass is prohibited as it contributes greatly to the urban heat island and adversely affects the public domain where people will be walking.

These are addressed in Stipulation Nos. 2, 3, and 4.

COMPLETE STREETS GUIDING PRINCIPLES

13. In 2014, the City of Phoenix City Council adopted the Complete Streets Guiding Principles. The principles are intended to promote improvements that provide an accessible, safe, connected transportation system to include all modes, such as bicycles, pedestrians, transit, and vehicles. To this end, staff is recommending detached sidewalks along Thomas Road and 7th Street. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 5.

TREE AND SHADE MASTER PLAN

14. The provision of shade trees in the landscape area is an essential component for contributing toward the goals of the Tree and Shade Master Plan. The inclusion of trees increases thermal comfort for pedestrians and reduces the urban heat island effect. The proposed development includes landscape enhancements and a detached sidewalk along Thomas Road and 7th Street. There will be a staggered double row of shade trees planted on each side of the sidewalks, which, if planted and cared for properly, should provide ample shade for pedestrians. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 6.

In addition, staff is recommending a stipulation that a minimum of 75% of the sidewalk along Thomas Road and 7th Street be shaded by trees. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 7.



Source: Conceptual Landscape Plan provided by applicant

15. There is an existing fence located around the subject site and the entire Phoenix Country Club property.



Source: Google Maps, street view

To prevent the subject site from remaining isolated to the Country Club, staff is recommending a stipulation that no fence be placed between the streets (7th Street and Thomas Road) and the buildings. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 8.

16. To encourage connectivity to the sidewalks, staff is recommending a stipulation that a minimum of two building entrances, one on 7th Street, and one on Thomas Road, connect to the publicly accessible sidewalks. The pedestrian walkways to these building entrances should be made of decorative pavement. The pedestrian pathway from 7th Street should be connected from the bus stop location.

In addition, the pedestrian-oriented building entrances must be defined as such with a pedestrian scale and use of distinctive materials and architectural elements. These are addressed in Stipulation Nos. 9 and 10.

17. Staff is recommending that all loading, service, and refuse areas be located interior to the site and be screened with walls, trellises, planting, mounds, or by integration into the design of the building. These facilities can be located within the parking garage area. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 11.
18. The development is proposing a parking garage that will be visible from the public-right-of-way on 7th Street and Thomas Road. Therefore, staff has recommended a stipulation that any portion of the parking garage visible from the public right-of-way shall incorporate an art feature intended to screen the parking garage, while also providing an interesting and engaging feature at the ground level. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 12.

19. Providing secured bicycle parking for residents and parking for guests of the development is supportive of multimodal travel options. Secured bicycle parking can be provided in bicycle lockers or in locked bicycle rooms. The applicant will work with Planning and Development Department staff through the site development review process to determine locations for both types of bicycle parking as well as the manner in which the secured parking will be provided. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 13.



Secured bicycle parking can be accomplished through the use of individual lockers and/or the establishment of secured bicycle rooms.

COMMUNITY INPUT

20. At the time this staff report was completed, there have been 20 letters submitted in opposition to this rezoning request and no letters in favor of the request. Eighteen of the letters are from residents, one is from the Phoenix Historic Neighborhood Coalition, and one is from the La Hacienda Historic District.

Community concerns include the following:

- High-rise buildings should be along the Central Avenue corridor, within the TOD Policy Plan district, and it is an inappropriate height for the area.
- Increased traffic along Thomas Road and 7th Street
- Changes the character of the adjacent single-family residential neighborhoods
- Privacy concerns with adjacent single-family residences
- The design does not interact with the public right-of-way at the street level
- The design does not contribute to transit ridership
- Concern for increased flooding because of overbuilding
- Lack of affordable and inclusionary housing options in Phoenix

The list above is a summary of the community concerns; however, the letters that were received are attached to this staff report.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

21. The City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department has determined that the developer must submit a Traffic Impact Study to the Street Transportation Department. No preliminary approval of plans shall be granted until the study is reviewed and approved by the City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 14.

22. The City of Phoenix Public Transit Department has the following comments regarding the request:
- Public Transit Department will require dedication of right-of-way, bus stop pad, and bus bay on northbound 7th Street, north of Thomas Road. The bus bay shall be compliant with City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1256.
 - Bus stop pad shall be compliant with City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1261 with a depth of 14 feet.
 - Bus stop pad and bay shall be placed from the intersection of 7th Street and Thomas Road according to City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1258.
 - Reconstruction will be required if any of the aforementioned items are not in compliance with the specified standard details.

These are addressed in Stipulation No. 15.

23. The City of Phoenix Aviation Department has noted that the property is in the Public Airport Disclosure area. This area may be subject to overflights of aircraft operating at the Airport. People are often irritated by repeated overflights regardless of the actual sound level at the overflight site. Therefore, a Notice to Prospective Purchasers, which follows policy regarding properties in the City of Phoenix underlying the flight patterns of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport, is required. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 16.
24. The Water Services Department has noted that based on existing/known conditions, there are no water or sewer infrastructure concerns with the proposed zoning.
25. The City of Phoenix Floodplain Management division of the Street Transportation Department has determined that this parcel is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA), but is located in a Shaded Zone X, on panel 2205 L of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) dated October 16, 2013.
26. Fire prevention does not anticipate any issues with this request. The site or/and building(s) shall comply with the Phoenix Fire Code. However, the water supply (gpm and psi) to this site is unknown. Additional water supply may be required to meet the required fire flow per the Phoenix Fire Code.

OTHER

27. As part of the Reimagine Phoenix initiative, the City of Phoenix is committed to increasing the waste diversion rate to 40 percent by 2020 and to better manage its solid waste resources. Section 716 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance establishes standards to encourage the provision of recycling containers for multifamily, commercial and mixed-use developments meeting certain criteria. The provision of recycling containers is not addressed in this development.
28. The site has not been identified as being archaeologically sensitive. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, all ground disturbing activities must cease within 33-foot radius of the discovery and the

City of Phoenix Archaeology Office must be notified immediately and allowed time to properly assess the materials. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 16.

29. Development and use of the site is subject to all applicable codes and ordinances. Zoning approval does not negate other ordinance requirements. Other formal actions such as, but not limited to, zoning adjustments and abandonment may be required.

Findings

1. The proposal is not consistent with the General Plan Land Use map designation of Residential 1 to 2 dwelling units per acre.
2. The proposed rezoning is not in conformance with the multiple General Plan goals and policies adopted to guide development intensity and height, and constitutes spot zoning.
3. The proposed development is outside of the Midtown TOD District and located outside of the Central Avenue light rail corridor and therefore is inappropriate in this location.
4. The site is along a future Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) route, therefore, intensification to R-5 zoning is appropriate.

Stipulations

1. Access to the site shall be limited to the existing driveways from Thomas Road and 7th Street, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
2. Ground floor blank walls visible from the public sidewalk shall not exceed 20 linear feet without being interrupted by a window, door, or variation in building treatment or design, per Section 1305.2.a(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
3. All buildings over four stories in height shall be designed with a base that is differentiated from the remainder of the building in order to relate to the street. The base may be between one and four stories in height, and shall be scaled to the immediate context, per Section 1209.A.7.a of the Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
4. Mirrored and reflective glass is prohibited.
5. The sidewalks along Thomas Road and 7th Street shall be detached with a minimum five-foot wide landscape strip located between the sidewalk and back of curb, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.

6. A double row of trees (a minimum of 50 percent 2-inch caliper and 50 percent 3-inch caliper) spaced 20 feet on center shall be provided along Thomas Road and 7th Street, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. The rows shall be placed parallel on either side of the sidewalk and shall be staggered to provide maximum shading. The trees planted along Thomas Road shall be consistent with the tree species that currently exist along the street, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
7. A minimum of 75% of the sidewalk along Thomas Road and 7th Street shall be shaded at tree maturity per the requirements of Section 1304.F.1 in the Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
8. There shall be no fence placed between the streets (7th Street, Thomas Road) and buildings, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
9. The developer shall provide a minimum of two building entrances, one on 7th Street and one on Thomas Road, that directly connects to the publicly accessible sidewalk adjacent to the street. All pedestrian entrances shall be defined by pedestrian-oriented scale and the use of distinctive materials and architectural elements per Section 1305.3.a in the Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
10. The developer shall provide two pedestrian walkways, comprised of decorative paving: one that connects the sidewalk at the transit stop on 7th Street to a building entrance, and one which connects the sidewalk along Thomas Road to a building entrance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
11. Loading, service, and refuse areas shall be located to the interior of the site and shall be screened from view with walls, trellises, planting, mounds, or by integration into the design of the building. Decorative elements, variation in materials, and articulation shall be used, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
12. Any portion of the parking garage visible from the public right-of-way shall incorporate an art feature(s) intended to screen the parking garage, while also providing an interesting and engaging feature at the ground level, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
13. The developer shall install secured bicycle parking at 0.25 spaces for each residential unit and a minimum of four inverted U-bicycle racks for

guests located near entrances to the building, installed per the requirements of Section 1307.H.4 of the Zoning Ordinance, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.

14. The applicant shall submit a Traffic Impact Study to the City of Phoenix Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department prior to preliminary site plan review. The applicant shall be responsible for any dedications and required improvements as recommended by the approved traffic study, as approved by the Planning and Development Department and the Streets Transportation Department.
15. The developer shall dedicate right-of-way and construct a bus bay (City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1256) and bus pad with a minimum depth of 14 feet (City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1261) along northbound 7th Street, north of Thomas Road. The bus stop pad and bay shall be placed from the intersection of 7th Street and Thomas Road according to City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1258, as approved by the Public Transit Department.
16. The property owner shall record a Notice to Prospective Purchasers of Proximity to Airport in order to disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport (PHX) to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been viewed and approved by the City Attorney.
17. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.

If R-5 H-R is approved, the following height mitigating stipulation is also recommended to the above stipulations.

18. The maximum building height shall be 60 feet.

Writer

Hannah Bleam

September 4, 2018

Team Leader

Samantha Keating


Exhibits

Sketch Map


Aerial

Staff Report: Z-41-18-4
September 4, 2018
Page 18 of 18

Site Plan date stamped June 18, 2018
Elevations date stamped June 18, 2018
Conceptual Landscape plan date stamped June 18,
2018 Community Input (70 pages)



APPLICANT'S NAME: AGS, LLC		REQUESTED CHANGE:	
APPLICATION NO. Z-41-18	DATE: 7/12/2018 REVISION DATES:	FROM: P-1 (2.94 a.c.)	
GROSS AREA INCLUDING 1/2 STREET AND ALLEY DEDICATION IS APPROX. 2.94 Acres	AERIAL PHOTO & QUARTER SEC. NO. QS 15-29	ZONING MAP G-8	TO: R-5 H-R (2.94 a.c.)
MULTIPLES PERMITTED P-1 R-5 H-R	CONVENTIONAL OPTION N/A 284		* UNITS P.R.D. OPTION N/A N/A
* Maximum Units Allowed with P.R.D. Bonus			



MARICOPA
COUNTY



Feet


250 125 0 250

ENCANTO VILLAGE

CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT: 4



City of Phoenix
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT



APPLICANT'S NAME:

AGS, LLC

APPLICATION NO.

Z-41-18

DATE:

7/12/2018

REVISION DATES:

GROSS AREA INCLUDING 1/2 STREET
AND ALLEY DEDICATION IS APPROX.

2.94 Acres

AERIAL PHOTO &
QUARTER SEC. NO.

QS 15-29

ZONING MAP

G-8

REQUESTED CHANGE:

FROM: P-1 (2.94 a.c.)

TO: R-5 H-R (2.94 a.c.)

MULTIPLES PERMITTED

P-1

R-5 H-R

CONVENTIONAL OPTION

N/A


284

* UNITS P.R.D. OPTION

N/A

N/A

* Maximum Units Allowed with P.R.D. Bonus



PROJECT DATA:

ADDRESS: 2901 N. 7th Street

PROPOSED SITE ZONING: P-1, R5 (REFER TO CONTEXT PLAN)

EXISTING SITE ZONING: R-5 HR

PROPOSED SITE ZONING: R-5 HR

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROPOSED SITE AREA: 94,995 NET S.F. (2.167 NET ACRES)

PROJECT DIRECTORY:

APPLICANT

ARCHITECT

LANDSCAPE

Civil

WOOD/PATL

COLLECTIV

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

SUITE 200

KEYED NOTES:

1. RECONFIGURED PARKING LAYOUT AT EXISTING PARKING LOT

2. PROPOSED BOUNDARY LINE - SITE TO BE REBUILT, REFER TO A103 FOR LOT DIMENSIONS

3. EXISTING PROPERTY LINE - REFER TO A103 FOR LOT DIMENSIONS

4. LINE OF BUILDING CONDOMINIUM TOWER FOOTPRINT, FLOORS 2-15

5. LINE OF BUILDING GROUND FLOOR FOOTPRINT

6. EXISTING DROP-OFF CANOPY AT PHOENIX COUNTRY CLUB

7. EXISTING PHOENIX COUNTRY CLUB CLUBHOUSE

8. EXISTING PARKING LOT TO REMAIN

9. EXISTING DRIVE LOCATION TO REMAIN

10. LINE OF EXISTING CLUB AND GUTTER TO REMAIN PLANS LOT1

11. LANDSCAPED AREA - REFER TO CONCEPTUAL LANDSCAPE PLANS LOT1

12. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT

13. EXISTING BUS BAY

14. TRUCK TURN RADIUS - 28' INTERIOR RADIUS, 44' EXTERIOR RADIUS

15. 25' SETBACK

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

THE PHOENIX COUNTRY CLUB CONDOMINIUMS, LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF 7TH STREET AND THOMAS RD., ON THE SITE OF THE HISTORIC PHOENIX COUNTRY CLUB, WILL BE A BEACON OF GROWTH AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE BUCKINGHAM VILLAGE. IT IS A 15-STORY, QUALITY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WHICH WILL BE THE APPROXIMATELY 125 UNITS OR LESS WILL BE BUILT UPON A 20'-0" PARKING PODIUM, WITH ONE HALF-LEVEL ABOVE GRADE, AND ONE HALF-LEVEL BELOW GRADE, WHICH WILL PROVIDE 224 SPACES FOR THE CONDO RESIDENTS USE. THE CONDO RESIDENTS WILL BE PROVIDED WITH A ROOFTOP RECREATION DECK AND POOL, WILL BE PROVIDED AS WELL THE RESIDENTIAL TOWER WILL BE AN ARCHITECTURAL LANDMARK DESIGN, WITH HINTS OF MODERNISM WHICH RELATE TO ITS HISTORIC CONTEXT.

SHEET INDEX:

A100 - CONTEXT PLAN (EXISTING)

A101A - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A101B - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A101C - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A101D - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A102 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A103 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A104 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A105 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A106 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A107 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A108 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A109 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A110 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A111 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A112 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A113 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A114 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A115 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A116 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A117 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A118 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A119 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A120 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A121 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A122 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A123 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A124 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A125 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A126 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A127 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A128 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A129 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A130 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A131 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A132 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A133 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A134 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A135 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A136 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A137 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A138 - SITE PHOTOS (EXISTING)

A

CITY OF PHOENIX

JUN 1 8 2018

Planning & Development
Department



05 SOUTH WEST VIEW

N.T.S.




04 SOUTH EAST VIEW

N.T.S.



03 NORTH EAST VIEW

N.T.S.



02 EAST ELEVATION

1'-0" = 1/32"



01 SOUTH ELEVATION

1'-0" = 1/32"

Hannah Bleam

From: Kristy Brown <kristybrownaz@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2018 3:16 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Fwd: Case number Z-41-18

Hello,
I sent the email below but I inadvertently forgot some very important information. Could you **PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE?**

Thank you,
Kristy Brown

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Kristy Brown** <kristybrownaz@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 26, 2018 at 3:12 PM
Subject: Fwd: Case number Z-41-18
To: kristybrownaz@gmail.com <kristybrownaz@gmail.com>

To: <hannah.Bleam@phoenix.gov>

Hello,
I am writing to let you know of my strong opposition to rezoning Case Number Z-41-18. I live just south of the project at 921 E. Cambridge Ave. I am staunchly opposed for the following reasons:

1. Increase in traffic along already extremely busy streets. Seventh street cannot handle more traffic.
2. Outside the light rail zoning district. Walking to light rail from 7th street is not an option for at least 4 months of the year due to weather (and practically even more months than that). High rise buildings should be built closer to Central where the light rail is easily accessible. Also, they should be built close to grocery stores so that walking to get basic necessities is easy and convenient.

3. PARKING will be a issue. Parking in central Phoenix is already an enormous problem. There might be enough parking for residents but what if they invite guests over. Where will the guests park?

My husband and I moved to this neighborhood after living in a midrise on Central (Tapestry) for a couple of years. That experience has been the foundation for my strong views now. We loved living on Central because we could stay away from 7th Street and 7th Avenue. We avoided those streets at all costs due to the massive traffic snarls. When we moved to 9th street, I thought that we would still use the light rail even though it might not be as convenient as previously. I was wrong. We don't use the light rail anymore as it is just too far to walk comfortably. In addition, parking at Tapestry was always problematic if we invited friends or family over. We had 2 spots in the garage but my husband could not park his truck there as the spaces were too narrow and small. He always had to find street parking, as did the guests we invited over. The proposed complex will not have any street parking options for those who have large vehicles or want to have guests over. There were a handful of visitor spots at Tapestry but they were always taken. I do not feel the proposed complex is a good fit for the corner of 7th Street and Thomas.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for listening to my concerns.

Kristy Brown
921 E. Cambridge Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85006
480-861-6404

Hannah Bleam

From: Carol Carpenter <pianocarol@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2018 7:04 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Cc: Robert Warnicke
Subject: Phoenix Country Club Rezoning Case #Z-41-18 Northeast corner of 7th Street / Thomas Rd

Ms. Bleam:

I live within a stone's throw of the Phoenix Country Club and stand in firm opposition to the above referenced rezoning.

The Phoenix Country Club is experiencing financial distress. Their model of exclusionary membership is no longer relevant. This proposed project is simply wrong for this location; it's totally incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and needs to be on Central Avenue and the Light Rail Corridor. If approved, the building height will open the flood gates to developers to throw up other high rises wherever they can get city approval and financing. What a hodgepodge of a city plan that will create, making one wonder why we need a Village Planning Committee?

Years ago the City of Phoenix was all about dubbing Verde Lane and Catalina Drive between 3rd and 7th Streets as La Hacienda Historic District. Now it looks like they're interested in selling us out. The only people this proposed project benefits is the Phoenix Country Club, which doesn't even pay property tax, and its developer. Homeowners in this neighborhood are threatened by a ridiculously-tall monstrosity looming over our yards, compromising our property values, and creating a cement eyesore.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Carpenter
374 E Verde Lane
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Tom Chauncey
66 North Country Club Drive
Phoenix, Arizona 85014
tom@tomchauncey.com
602-254-7457

August 31, 2018

Via Email

Encanto Village Planning Committee
c/o Hannah.Bleam@phoenix.gov

Re: Opposition to High Rise High Density Zoning District: Z-41-18

Dear Committee Member,

My home is at 66 North Country Club Drive. As many of you know, I have lived and worked in “down town” Phoenix since the early 1970’s and my family has owned and developed land throughout the Valley.

I have great respect for Larry Lazarus as a very skilled land use attorney hired on behalf of the Phoenix Country Club and its developer partner. That this Application’s Narrative reads so well for something so inappropriate is a testimony to his skill.

I also have great respect for John Graham, the president of the developer. He is a friend, a force not only in business, but in his commitment to charities and our community.

The leadership of the Phoenix Country Club contains well known and respected members of the community.

However, no matter how well connected the PCC is, and no matter how skilled Larry is, and no matter how much I like and respect John, those are not reasons to permit High Rise zoning where it does not belong. As others have pointed out, the Phoenix City Zoning Code provides that High Rise zoning belongs in only a “few areas” of our City that “by their strategic location and intense land use, generate exceptional amounts of activity of a commercial nature.” This language from the High Rise zoning ordinance does not describe the corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road.

I am impressed by that the visuals that others have put together in their letters in opposition that show in graphic detail and in true scale how this project is about ½ mile east of where it belongs, which is along the light rail corridor. We do not deserve to have our City allow a Developer to erect a 175-foot building among our residential neighborhoods. We have been repeatedly told that height and density will be in the City core, the Village Cores, or along the light rail/central corridor where tax dollars have been invested. 7th Street and Thomas Road is not the City Core, not in the Encanto Village Core, and not near Central Avenue. We don’t need another Crystal Point, and current zoning and urban planning do not condone such a project on our corner.

While it is true that Club's parking lot is potentially an infill district, the multifamily Phoenix zoning ordinance that allows more height and density in infill areas does not apply, as that boundary ends at the south side of Thomas Road, and even if it applied, the additional height allowed is only 65 feet. Zoning Ordinance Section 630 Residential Infill R-1 District – Multifamily Residential states:

***] The District can only be combined with land already designated as residential R-3, R-4, R-4A and R-5 zoning districts within the area bounded by 19th Avenue, 24th Street, Thomas Road and Harrison Street (Railroad).

A. Permitted uses. The permitted uses are as provided in the district with which the R-1 district is combined.

***]

4. Building height shall be as required in the district with which the R-1 district is combined except that with the R-4A and R-5 district, no building shall exceed a height of six stories, not to exceed sixty-five feet."

It is clear from the language of Section 630, that even with an Infill designation the maximum height of the subject site should be limited to **65 feet**, a full 110 feet below that being sought by the Applicant. This is why the Narrative describes this property as infill, but the zoning district being sought is High Rise High Density. Please do not let the word "infill" confuse the issue, this is not an infill zoning district matter, it is a High Rise High Density Zoning issue, and "infill" zoning does not permit the type of height sought here.

As a resident who will be sharing vehicle access out of the neighborhood on North Country Club Drive and East Country Club Drive, I have closely examined those parts of the Narrative related to traffic and parking. As a result, I have concerns about how the proposed project is going to impact vehicular access and parking that my neighbors to the east of 7th Street and south of Thomas Road have not raised.

I am troubled by statements in the Narrative that outright state and others that suggest that traffic issues related to the new project have been determined by an expert, CivTech, not to exist. The Narrative attaches CivTech's report on traffic. The report concludes:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the above, the following can be concluded:

*The Phoenix Country Club proposes a 15-story condominium composed of approximately 125 proposed multi-family dwelling units (DU). Access to the site is provided by two (2) existing access points, one on Thomas Road and the other on 7th Street.

*The trip generation results show that the proposed development could generate 704 daily trips, with 48 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 51 trips occurring during the PM peak hour.

As you can see, no other expert traffic opinion was given beyond details of the tower, the number of traffic access points, and projected number of additional daily vehicle trips.

Despite the narrow expert opinion, the Narrative makes a number of broad statements based on expert conclusions, including:

In addition, as indicated in the Traffic Statement prepared by CivTech, the existing single-family residences would not be impacted by increased traffic along local neighborhood streets as a result of the condominium having direct vehicular access to and from both 7th Street and Thomas Road.

Narrative at 13. **CivTech did not provide an opinion about whether any existing single-family residence would be impacted.** The Narrative also represents:

As noted in the enclosed Traffic Generation Statement, AGS's traffic engineer has analyzed the Property and surrounding streets and determined that the Project will not generate any adverse effect on traffic. In particular, the traffic engineer has determined that, although the intersection of Thomas Road and 7th Street experiences certain delays during peak commuting hours, the Project will not contribute to any meaningful reduction in service levels.

Narrative at 17. **CivTech did not determine that there would not be any adverse effect on traffic.** Finally, the Narrative falsely claims:

The traffic engineer has determined that circulation within the PCC/Project site will function appropriately and that the maintained driveways are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service

Narrative at 17. **CivTech did not determine that circulation would function appropriately or make any statement about the acceptable levels for driveways.**

Unfortunately, *everything* in the Narrative about traffic beyond the total number of vehicle trips, 704, and morning and afternoon peak vehicle trips, 48 and 51, is not expert opinion, it is pure speculation. CIVTech did not perform any analysis of potential delays when the new traffic is added to the existing traffic attempting to gain access to 7th Street or Thomas Road. There is no analysis of whether statistically the number of potential collisions will rise for vehicles attempting to enter 7th Street or Thomas Road. There is no analysis of what the additional vehicle trips will mean at the uncontrolled intersection of North Country Club Drive and 7th Street with the unusual feature of the reverse lane. There is also no analysis by the expert about the fact that the East Country Club Drive entrance to the Club off of Thomas Road is gated, and that the Club closes that gate at some times of the day. The expert report and the narrative do not even acknowledge that the Club closes the gate on Thomas Road at the East Country Club Drive intersection.

The Narrative is entirely unreliable in its representations about what the traffic study concluded. My opinion is that 704 vehicle trips, including 99 peak hour vehicle trips, when added to the normal traffic generated by our homes and by the Club's typical commercial activity, will have a significant negative impact on our neighborhood every single day. This

impact will be even greater because the Club's gate limits access onto and off of Thomas Road, and 7th Street has reversal lanes. As a result, this new daily traffic is likely to cause a measurable daily unreasonable increased risk of collisions. Based on my over 40 years of using the access points, my opinion is that any application for entitlements on this parcel must include traffic controls on either, or both, Thomas Road at East Country Club Drive and on 7th Street and North Country Club Drive. With all due respect for "experts," I submit my opinion should carry an equal weight as that expressed in the Narrative, and at the very least I am being honest in telling you the foundation of my opinion, and not falsely claiming it is some expert's opinion.

As to parking, the Narrative claims that the revised surface parking does not require any rezoning, and that it will providing ample parking for PCC and the Project's guests. Narrative at 14. The *Parking Memorandum for Phoenix Country Club– Phoenix, Arizona* conclusions are poorly written. The expert concludes that there are currently 446 spaces and that the condominium will have its own 234 spaces. The report's analysis shows that after the project the Club will have four lots with 66, 160, 31, and 45, for a total of 302 spaces. The report concludes, *based on three days in May*, that the Club never needs more than 240 spaces.

Their parking opinion, like their traffic opinion, cannot be relied upon being based on something other than the real world. At your meeting, if permitted, I will play a 15 second video trip thru the parking lot taken last week at 9am.

My experience is that the Club frequently needs almost all of the spaces that is currently has, and that by losing at least 144 spaces the Club is going to have a parking problem, which means the neighbors are going to have a parking problem. I also don't believe that parking surveys performed on three days in May, when many of the Club's members are out of town, is representative of the maximum number of parking spaces that the Club actually utilizes on a regular basis when the daily temperatures are not reasonably expected to be 100 degrees or more.

I suspect that is also significant that neither the Narrative nor the expert report identify just how many parking spaces the Club is supposed to have. Surely, they have identified the number of parking spaces that the Club is required to have, and I have to wonder why we aren't being told. I believe that the Narrative raised more questions about parking than the expert report purports to answer.

In addition, be it an effort to confuse or blur the parking or entitlement issues, the Applicant states the project involves from 2.16 to 4.28 acres:

- The "Application Information Form" says **2.16 gross acres** and **2.16 acres** At page 1 and page 2 of its Legal Description. (Package at pages 3 & 5);
- The "Rezoning Application Narrative" says **4.28 acres**. At page 2. (Package at 14);
- The "Site Plan" says **2.167 net acres** and **2.85 gross acres**. At page 1. (Package at page 45);
- The "Lot Dimensions" says **2.167 acres**. At page 1. (Package at page 52);
- The "Context Plan" says **2.167 net acres** and **2.85 gross acres**. At page 1. (Package at page 53);


- The "Ownership Authorization Form" says **2.167 acres** and **2.16 acres** At page 1 and page 2 of its Legal Description. (Packages at page 60 & 62);
- The "City of Phoenix Planning Division Pre-Application Notes" says **3.32 gross acres**. At page 1. (Package at page 70).

There is simply no way to tell from the entire Application package whether the requested rezoning will be for just over two acres to almost twice that at over four acres. That is a ridiculously wide range of error. While at the time of vote you may know how many acres is really at issue, the public will have no way of knowing in advance based on these documents. Like the expert opinions on traffic and parking, this Application suffers from a lack of credibility.

The requested High Rise zoning should be denied. The height is not appropriate for our neighborhood, and the area is not where High Rise zoning is even authorized under the code. The Narrative has also proven to be unreliable on simple issues related to traffic and parking, which raises concerns about what else the Narrative glosses over, including the actual size of the rezoning case. I ask you to deny the Application even though Larry and John are good people whom we all like.

I thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,



Tom Chauncey

Hannah Bleam

From: Carol Crockett <carol.crockett204@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 12:02 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Z-41-18

I'm writing in opposition to the rezoning Case Number Z-41-18 for the following reasons:

- Seventh Street is already a high-volume north/south axis that is dangerous due to the middle lane that's used for alternate traffic flow both north-bound and south-bound depending on the time of day. Additional traffic on 7th will be result from an approved re-development of Third Street, now a reliever for 7th Street traffic from Indian School Road south.
- Neighborhoods like Willo are cut off from eastern access to central Phoenix by large apartment/condo complexes and commercial buildings, and I am opposed to that happening in the Coronado district.
- The language of the proposed change states, "(proposed condos) will serve as a stimulus for further redevelopment and quality renovation of vacant and underutilized properties in the area," suggests the development of high rise buildings along 7th street, blocking residential access to 7th street and adding to existing 7th street congestion. **I am completely opposed to this concept. And I am shocked at the statement written on the plans that this will be a standard of future development in the area.**
- The proposed building concept is in direct contrast with the existing Phoenix Country Club architecture. The Club, historic in nature, has been a big part of Phoenix culture and neighborhood for many years and to add the condominiums as described is not in keeping with the current look of the club and surrounding neighborhood.
- Increased traffic from such a large project will create an additional burden on 7th street and a potential traffic hazard on Thomas where school children cross the street just a few blocks away.

- The building's architecture is ill conceived, with a 15-story concrete view from the street and neighborhoods, massively too high, and in contrast to the surrounding community and neighborhood.
- Finally the proposed building will create a traffic burden on the neighborhoods south, Country Club Park and Coronado. There are young children in the neighborhood and their safety is paramount.

As a resident of the Coronado Neighborhood for 18 years and a Phoenix resident since 1949, I am dismayed the Phoenix Country Club would even consider such a proposed structure, and very concerned that the builder sees it as a new standard for the area. **Please do not grant this zoning request.**

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Respectfully,
Carol Crockett
717 E Granada Road
Phoenix, AZ 85006
602-527-5180

Hannah Bleam

From: bahney dedolph <bahneydedolph@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 7:28 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: public hearing on 8/28

I am interested in more information about the proposed development on 16th Street and Palm--there is a public hearing on 8/28, but i am not able to attend.

I live in Coronado and am worried about population density. We have huge developments being built all around us in Coronado. Traffic on major streets has become very congested. Will this development contribute to further traffic problems?

I am also worried about ground water absorption and increased flooding because we are allowing overbuilding on lots in my neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods. we need to have green space available for ground water absorption and recreational opportunities. It appears to me that the city is not taking this into consideration when approving renovations and new building.

i am also concerned about the lack of affordable and inclusionary housing opportunities in Phoenix. Many other large cities are requiring new developments include affordable housing units. We have a serious problem with homelessness in Phoenix that can only be addressed by creating affordable housing options for low wage workers and their families.

Are there plans available for this proposed project that we can review? If so, how would i access them?

Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions.

Bahney Dedolph
2525 North 13th St
Phoenix, AZ 85006

Hannah Bleam

From: Adrian Fontes <adrian.fontes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 7:57 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Opposition to Z-41-18

To: Encanto Village Planning Committee
Re: Opposition to Z-41-18

I am writing in opposition to case number Z-41-18, which would make the northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas a High Rise and High Density District property allowing buildings up to 250 feet in height.

I have been a resident of the best neighborhood in the Nation since 2003. Coronado is particularly unique and special because of its diverse architecture and friendly atmosphere. But our diversity is more than just buildings, it's people.

Even if the owner of the subject of this inquiry stipulates to a maximum of 175 feet for their project, the tower would drastically change the character of the neighborhood. 175 feet is just too much.

I do not oppose development that is smart, and that promotes human interaction. However, the renderings I've seen for this project raise a solid concrete wall against the street at 7th and Thomas (barely hidden by trees)...how does this make the area more walkable? Unwelcoming and cold are better words when the new residents are literally shielded from their neighbors.

A design that actually welcomes interaction, a height that does not burden nearby neighbors, and an attitude of inclusiveness would be much more welcome than a giant parking garage barely, if at all, hidden by a few trees.

Thank you for forwarding this respectfully submitted objection to the committee. Have a good day.

Adrian Fontes
1230 E. Windsor Ave.
Phoenix

Hannah Bleam

From: Joe Franquero <jmfco@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 8:02 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Cc: Robert Warnicke
Subject: Z-41-18. 7th Street and Thomas Rd.

9/3/18. Mrs. Hannah Bleam.
Encanto Village
Re: Case Z-41-18

We are summarily opposed to this change in zoning. Using a word from the zoning application, the entire application is inimitable in that as fiction, it is unique.

1. The only example of this scale of project outside of the designated corridor is Crystal Point. Since when should one mistake made in 1960 serve as license to make another bad decision.
2. I read the parking analysis included in the application which purports that this project will have no noticeable impact on traffic in the area. This analysis lends credence to the fact that with enough money, one can purchase an expert opinion to support any position. If in fact the land is now underutilized, how does the addition of 125 units not add to traffic in the vicinity?
3. The minimal setbacks relative to the height and scale add nothing to this neighborhood. It also adds nothing to the aesthetics of the intersection in that it dwarfs all other structures in the vicinity. The wall structure basically barricades the project from the corner on both 7th Street and Thomas Roads.
A good designer would characterize this project as insensitive to the neighborhood.
4. If this project, with all of the dubious conclusions in the application is approved, why have City Planners enlisted the public's help for so many years to develop the Central Corridor and Transit Overlay Districts? This project negates what City Planners have told the residents is acceptable to this area as it grows and evolves.

In conclusion, I have read a number of such applications and I have never been asked to believe such obtuse reasoning in support of a really bad proposal.

Joe & Catherine Franquero.
307 E. Catalina Drive

Sent from my iPad

Hannah Bleam

From: kathy gorman <gorman_kathy@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 5:39 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Case Number Z-41-18

Dear Hannah,

I am a long time resident of the Coronado Historic District and I am completely opposed to the rezoning Case number Z-41-18 for the following reason(s):

- * High rise Height is outside the Central Corridor It is a bad precedent for properties along 7th Street North & South as well as properties on Thomas Rd.
- * Project does not represent a true revitalization of this corner, since plans show it will be "Walled Off" with no retail/commercial space
- * [Project](#) does not promote a "walkable city plan" for it is outside the zoning district for the light rail

Also this project will have [a](#) major negative impact on the traffic flow in an [area that is](#) already high traffic [and](#) congested.
It is not suitable for this location or the surrounding neighborhoods.

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE COMMITTEE.

Respectively,

Katherine Gorman

2521 N. Richland St

Phoenix AZ 85006

Hannah Bleam

From: John Grimmer <thingscouldbegrimmer@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2018 7:07 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Cc: jeanneyawger@yahoo.com
Subject: High rise

Hannah Bleam, I'm writing to you to voice my opposition to the zoning change and subsequent high rise that is planned. I can't think of one positive force that would come from this build. While the negative side of this tally sheet seems to be endless. From added congestion (it doesn't mention or show any street enhancement on either Thomas or 7th st to accommodate the est 500+ occupant and service vehicles entering and exiting the property) to the absolute unsightly addition of a large box with people in it looking directly into my and hundreds of others backyards. The corridors were set 3rd ave to 3rd st and until now everyone has deemed that as proper. They have been building many buildings, apartments, condo plexus within the corridor boundaries, with plenty of open land for more. Even some on 7st. What makes this one wrong is the 15 stories. All of the others stayed within the guides of the corridor and the verticals of 50ft. Which is what makes this proposal absurd. Not only are they out of the corridor but they want it 15 stories and by the time you add A/C units and cooling towers, satellite dishes wi-for antennas etc. you can add another couple of stories. This is not a new appt complex, this is a BANK BUILDING. The builders don't live here, we do.

All that being said, do I think my objection to this is going to be read or make anyone or anything change, NO. I believe that time has come and gone. Why else would laz, sil, & bangs pc send out a notice inviting everyone to attend a neighborhood open house on July 18th at Emerson school, and have it reach me a week after the meet.

I object to this hole thing and have to close. I have to go mow my lawn.

John F. Grimmer
2798N Dayton
Phoenix, AZ85006

Sent from my iPhone

Hannah Bleam

From: thaines18@cox.net
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2018 2:56 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: High rise Density Zoning District

Dear Ms Bleam,

I live in the La Hacienda Historic District very close to the proposed high rise development at the Phoenix Country Club.

I am opposed to the development because of the inevitable increase in traffic at the intersection of 7th Ave. and Thomas Rd. That location already experiences significant congestion and adding a residence so close to that location will no doubt create greater risks for both pedestrians and vehicle traffic.

Also high rise development should be concentrated closer to Central Ave. What we are seeing is an increasing 'creep' of high rise construction in this area which negatively affects the quality of life for those of us who have been living here in some cases for decades. Issues such as traffic noise and speeding cars and trucks driving down Verde Ln. between 3rd St and 7th St [seeking to avoid traffic build up on those two streets] are now constant reminders of the effects of this overcrowding.

I hope you will consider these concerns in a serious manner .

Respectfully,

Tom Haines

thaines18@cox.net

Hannah Bleam

From: Mary Horton <msh1601@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 25, 2018 1:18 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Opposition to rezoning case Z-41-18

I am totally opposed to the rezoning case Z-41-18. My address in Country Club Park is 822 E. Edgemont Ave. The building height restriction of 48 feet protects the value of property in the historic neighborhoods near 7th Street. A 15 story high rise will negatively impact the value of my home. Nobody wants a high rise looking down into their front yard and backyard. There is a high rise corridor in Phoenix and this is outside of it. Because 7th Street is used as an unofficial part time expressway 5 days a week, there is a lot of traffic congestion. People cut through my neighborhood in order to avoid the traffic at 7th Street and Thomas Rd. Most of the streets in Country Club Park have no sidewalks, which means that people have to walk their dogs in the street, push baby strollers in the street. The teenagers walk in the street to get to and from North High School.

Please see that a copy of my opposition to the rezoning case Z-41-18 is given to each and every member of the Encanto Village Planning Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully,
Mary S. Horton

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Hannah Bleam

From: Debra Lyman <dl@udallshumway.com>
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2018 3:45 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Opposition to Case No: Z-41-18 OPPOSITION

Dear Ms. Bleam:

My name is Debra Lyman and I live at 855 E. Windsor Avenue, Phoenix, 85006, which is just south of the rezoning project (Z-41-18) of a 175 foot office building to be built in/on/around the parking lot at Phoenix County Club at 7th Street and Thomas. I am totally opposed to this project because of my reasons stated below. My biggest concern is precedent it sets for future high rise buildings that exceed the height restrictions if the zoning restrictions are changed to allow the building to be constructed. Apparently, the developer will be able to construct a 175 foot building in a zone or area that is currently limited to 48 building height. Of course this will lead the way for future high rise buildings to be constructed around my neighborhood causing many changes to the community I live in. Other reasons include:

- 1) We have a walkable district south of Thomas Road and 7th Street. Although 7th Street is busy and at times congested there is a feel of a neighborhood more than a business even though city buildings are just a few blocks west to Central Avenue. If you continue toward my neighborhood east of 7th Street on Windsor you will run into a circle park that has houses surrounding it and many lovely streets lined with old houses and refurbished houses, a lot of them being constructed in the 1940's. The park and my neighborhood are neighbor-friendly, walkable, and despite 7th Street traffic that flows into the area on workday mornings and evenings, it does not feel claustrophobic and congested like downtown traffic or the traffic near the Light Rail and Central Avenue and Thomas. I have lived on Windsor for 6 years and love my home, the feel of the park and community in the area and surrounding streets. I believe that with the construction of the 175 foot high building on Thomas and 7th Street, that will change and 7th Street and Thomas will slowly and surely become another Central Corridor. This will be the only building in the area that looms over the rest of the buildings in the immediate area and will create a certain eye sore, planted in the middle of the parking lot of the Country Club with no aesthetic or design enhancement to make it appear attractive and pleasing to the residents. It will be a tall building on top of the Phoenix Country Club with a wall surrounding it and block out the many palm trees that currently surround the Country Club.
- 2) The construction and commercial residents that will probably fill the building once it is constructed, will cause a lot of traffic in and around the area including vehicles crossing through the local streets south of Thomas to avoid construction. This will continue and change the current traffic situation which is okay.

- 3) Simply put its become personal. I can look out my living room, across the park, in and around the trees and see sunrises and sunsets. I can also see a couple buildings far in the distance. I love the view and I don't want that to change. With the construction of the 175 foot building, it will start the end of my view out my window and those who live in my neighborhood. Especially those that look toward Thomas and who will view the building directly in front of their windows. I want to preserve the scenic value of my neighborhood.
- 4) I don't understand why the building is being considered and zoning restrictions changed for this project. This concerns me because I thought the current building height restrictions were put in place so that high rises would not be built in the area and outside the area of the Central Corridor. I do not think that the restrictions should be waived or changed for one building that is not in sync with the zoning restrictions in place, the community, walkability and away from areas that are reserved for high rise buildings like the Central Corridor.

I hope that you my comments below will be considered along with the other letters and notices of opposition to Z-41-18.

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER TO EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Thank you to you and all members of the Encanto Village Planning Committee for your attention.

Respectfully,

Debra Lyman
623 703 5858
855 E. Windsor Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85006

The information contained in this e-mail message is attorney privileged and confidential information, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone 480-461-5300 or reply by e-mail and delete or discard the message.

Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free of any virus or other defect that might affect any computer system into which it is received and opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free and no responsibility is accepted by Udall Shumway PLC for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use. Thank you.

Hannah Bleam

From: Brendan Mahoney <bnmlaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2018 10:42 AM
To: Hannah Bleam
Cc: Gordon Street III
Subject: Phoenix Country Club high rise development

Dear Ms. Bleam:

The following are comments I would like incorporated into the record before the Encanto Village Planning Committee and Phoenix Planning Commission regarding the proposed development of a high rise on the northeast corner of Thomas and 7th Street within the Phoenix Country Club.

I and my husband own a home at 2617 North 8th Street, about 2 blocks south of Thomas. Generally speaking, I support increased density for inner city development. However, this particular project is inappropriate for two main reasons. First, scattershot density does nothing to help and probably hinders the goal of dense development in the central city. Phoenix initially zoned downtown for density, and when high rises were zoned along Central Avenue, dense development stopped -- for more than 50 years. When Phoenix next began permitting dense development in the Camelback/24th Street area, dense development along Central Avenue stopped for 30 years (and only light rail has rekindled residential, but not commercial development). Phoenix now has three areas zoned for dense development that are making a fragile comeback. Rezoning another are for dense development will only work to stall the comeback of the existing three areas. We already have three major areas zoned for high rise as well as TOD along the light rail. The Phoenix Country Club high rise development does not further dense development already planned under the current zoning ordinances and the General Plan.

Second, the high rise overlooks historic neighborhoods. The City needs to be very careful to protect the integrity within and adjacent to the limited historic neighborhoods. Country Club Park, to the immediate south, was an FHA model neighborhood planned in the late 1930s and early 1940s. It was not designed to have high rise occupants peering down into the homes and yards.

Any change in zoning to permit a high rise at 7th Street and Thomas will undermine the recovery of urban development just beginning to take hold in Phoenix and will adversely affect the adjacent historic neighborhoods. Both these issues are inconsistent with the General Plan. Therefore, the rezoning request should be denied.

Thank you.
Brendan Mahoney
2617 N. 8th Street
Phoenix AZ 85006
602-690-4594

bnmlaw@gmail.com

--

Brendan

Note my personal email address is bnmlaw@gmail.com.

Hannah Bleam

From: Susan Montgomery <smontgomery@milawaz.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 12:00 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: URGENT - Case Number Z-41-18 - Opposition to rezoning for High Rise Development

Ms. Bleam:

I have been a resident of the Country Club Historic District for 17 years. I love my neighborhood. However, I am strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning referenced above, which would allow for a high rise development at the Phoenix Country club directly adjacent to my neighborhood. While my concerns are numerous, I am particularly concerned as follows:

- Out of Character for our Neighborhood. It is inappropriate to develop this high-rise multi-family building next to a purely residential neighborhood – one that is a recognized historic district under the National Historic Preservation Act and applicable State Law.
- Traffic. There is no doubt this development will substantially add to an already existing traffic problem, which in many instances in the winter times, makes getting through any of the intersections near 7th and Thomas both time consuming and dangerous. Furthermore, I am worried about increased cut through traffic. This is already a problem particularly during rush hour when many of us in the neighborhood are walking our dogs (and we do not have sidewalks). I have almost been hit several times by cut through traffic and the additional residents will no doubt increase this problem.
- Precedent. Once a decision is made to allow the above referenced development, it will not only irreparably change the character of our area, but it will set a precedent for future developments.
- Privacy. The nature of this high rise will allow its residents to have a close up view of many of my neighbor's back yards and houses. This seems inappropriate for a residential neighborhood.
- Noise and Air Quality. The increase in traffic will result in an increase in ambient traffic noise, which further degrades the quiet enjoyment and character of our neighborhood. The traffic increase will also impact air quality.
- Property values. It is very likely the presence of this high rise, and potentially future high rise developments that it will pave the way for, will impact property values in our area, particularly near the high rise(s).
- Blight. Finally, if the houses near the proposed high rise become disfavored by dedicated home owners due to the concerns noted above, this will undoubtedly result in those houses being sold, and perhaps turned into rentals, Airbnb or other uses, whose owners will not maintain the character, integrity and safety of the neighborhood like committed homeowners would. This too is concerning.

I hope you will consider these concerns and the concerns of others at the upcoming hearing on this zoning request. The request should be denied.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly at the number shown below.

Susan B. Montgomery
Resident – 2602 N. 10th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85006

602 885 0941

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Regards,

Susan B. Montgomery, Esq.

MONTGOMERY & INTERPRETER, PLC

3301 E. Thunderbird Rd.

Phoenix, AZ 85032

Ph: (480) 513-6825

Fax: (480) 513-6948

www.milawaz.com

NOTICE: This message is for the designated recipient only and contains confidential, attorney-client privileged information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.

Hannah Bleam

From: KATHERINE PANKOW <katherinepankow3287@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2018 3:20 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Phoenix Country Club Condominiums Case # Z-41-18

Dear Ms. Bleam:

I am writing in strong opposition to the proposed development of the northeast corner of Thomas Road. and 7th Street.

The developer states that the project is an "architectural landmark design" with a relationship to historic context, however this project has no architectural relationship to the adjacent Phoenix Country Club and the historic neighborhood to the south, Country Club Park.

All High Rise development must be contained in the corridor between 7th Avenue and 7th Street, west of 7th Street is not in this area.

This High Rise will be an eyesore due to its proposed height and will allow more traffic into a problematic situation with the reverse lanes along 7th Street.

I have owned a home in Country Club Park for almost 40 years. Improvements are certainly welcome along 7th Street. However, if completed to the height requested, this will only stick out like the proverbial "sore thumb".

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Sincerely,

Kathy Pankow
801 E. Windsor Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85006

602-717-7674

Phoenix Historic Neighborhoods Coalition



HISTORIC FRANKLIN SCHOOL

Via Email

Encanto Village Planning Committee
C/O Hannah.Bleam@phoenix.gov

Re: Case No. Z-41-18: H-R at the Northeast Corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road

Dear Encanto Village Planning Committee Members,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Phoenix Historic Neighborhoods Coalition. We are a coalition of people who live throughout the historic neighborhoods within the City of Phoenix. We come together because we value the history of Phoenix and we seek to share our love of our City's historic neighborhoods to preserve not only the buildings but to also help stabilize and build strong communities.

We are distressed to witness the Applicant's entitlement overreach outside of the City core, the Central corridor, and outside the Midtown TOD Policy Plan. The Applicant relies on zoning entitlements from the 1960's to justify High Rise (H-R) High Density zoning on the northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road. Although the applicant maintains that the property will only be redeveloped to a height of 175 feet, we have little confidence that such a stipulation will not be altered at a future date.

There are a significant number of single-family homes in the shadow of the proposed H-R zoning: to the North across a parking lot (homes on North Country Club Manor), South across Thomas (homes in the Country Club Park neighborhood), East across another parking lot (homes on East Country Club Drive) and West across 7th Street and some commercial uses (homes in La Hacienda Historic District). Although the Applicant's proposal is detrimental to these homes, the real issue is the 2018 rezoning precedent that will be created. We will have cast aside decades of planning, decades of assuring neighbors that they can rely on planning policy, to return to the wild west of zoning entitlements that were handed out in the 1960s, such as the entitlement for Crystal Point that the Applicant relies on. Since the 1960s, Phoenix has designated the city core for H-R development, it has designated the Central Corridor for H-R development, and the MidTown TOD Policy Plan provides for more dense development near the light rail stations.


The Phoenix City Code provides that H-R zoning districts only belong in a “few areas” that “generate exceptional amount of activity of a commercial nature”.

631 High-Rise H-R District—High-Rise and High Density District

The High-Rise H-R is intended to be a special district to allow greater building height and density within those few areas of the City that, by their strategic location and intense land use, generate exceptional amounts of activity of a commercial nature. Within these areas of greatly intensified activity the H-R districts may be combined with the R-4, R-4A, R-5, C-O, C-1, C-2, C-3, A-1, A-2, P-1 or P-2 districts and shall control in those requirements which it sets forth.

There is no dispute of fact that the corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road is not one of our city's few areas that generate an exceptional amount of activity of a commercial nature.

The MidTown TOD Policy Plan identifies and demonstrates distances to the light rail stations.



MidTown Policy Plan TOD page 3. The map shows that the North East Corner of 7th Street and Thomas is not within a quarter mile radius of a light rail station where the high density is to be

encouraged. The project is not even with the half mile radius. Furthermore, where the MidTown TOD Policy Plan describes Walkable Urban Code zoning, the height and intensity decreases the further from the central corridor, with the most height and intensity specified for along the light rail line, typically reducing in proximity to single family homes.



MidTown TOD Policy Plan at p. 103.

MEDIUM INTENSITY DISTRICTS

T5:5 T5:6 T5:7

Characterized by a broad mix of buildings types that integrate retail, offices, and residential units adjacent to the Light Rail Corridor, averaging 56 to 100-feet in height.

Setback standards provide a buffer when adjacent to single-family residential or Historic Preservation districts. Maximum Height: 56-feet (T5:5), 80-ft (T5:6), 100-ft (T5:7)

HIGH INTENSITY DISTRICTS

T6:7, T6:15 & T6:22

Characterized by high rise buildings adjacent to the Light Rail Corridor with the highest intensity of mixed uses. Development may incorporate forecourts and open spaces available to the public.

T6:HWR - A high intensity, height waiver district to ensure equivalent entitlement

Walkable Urban Code, at p. 2. The MidTown TOD Policy Plan does not specify any intensity district east of 3rd Street.

The City of Phoenix General Plan promises to stakeholders a level of certainty and reasonable expectations as to living in our city, and these promises will be broken by approving High Rise (H-R) High Density zoning districts throughout parts of the city where the plans do not permit it.

CERTAINTY & CHARACTER

What makes a city a great place to live are its robust vibrant neighborhoods. *There is a level of certainty one expects to have and quality of life one expects to maintain while living in a great city. The goals and policies that are outlined in the General Plan were created so residents have a reasonable expectation and level of certainty while living in our great city; certainty in regards to quality of life and compatibility.* The success, stability and certainty our neighborhoods can provide only strengthen our city and region's vitality and prosperity.

At p. 107 (Italics emphasis added).

*Every neighborhood and community should have a level of **certainty**.*

At p. 107 (Italics emphasis added).

Furthermore, the General Plan assures residents that the goal is to:

Create new development or redevelopment that is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhoods and incorporates adequate development standards to prevent negative impact(s) on the residential properties.

At p. 107 (Italics Emphasis added).

This project is an assault on the certainty that the existing plans and zoning provide to neighbors and as a rezoning opportunity, it is completely out of scale with the surrounding area. Only by looking back toward the high rises in the Central corridor and up to Crystal Point project, which is based on outdated 1960s entitlement planning, can the Applicant show any existing high-rise development within a mile.

Finally, the Applicant absurdly attempts to urge that its suburban designed high rise meets the goals of the MidTown TOD Policy Plan and the Walkable Urban Code. The proposed building does not: the parking structure is not lined with outbuildings, the project does not face 7th Street or Thomas Road, the project does not encourage the use of public transit because it makes the walk to transit as long as possible, the project contains more parking space than mandated by the code, and the project has no interaction with the public right of way at the street level anywhere near the corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road. The proposed site plan actually distances the tower and its future residents from the very corner that the Applicant claims the project will revitalize.

The H-R zoning at the northeast corner of Thomas and 7th Street is inappropriate, whether 175 feet or 250 feet, because the project will be damaging to existing neighborhoods and open the floodgates to similar inappropriate applications outside of the City core, the Central Corridor, and the MidTown TOD Policy Plan. These neighbors

should not have a high rise approved on the northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road. We ask you to reject rezoning application case number **Z-41-18**.

Sincerely,

Opal Wagner
Vice President

Hannah Bleam

From: Tom <tomisreally@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 03, 2018 5:03 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Z-41-18

Encanto Village
c/o Hannah Bleam

I have several concerns about the project proposed at 7th Street & Thomas Road as currently designed:

- A 15' + blank wall along Thomas & 7th St instead of providing quality mixed-use development encouraged by the zoning examples they are citing.
- A project that is too high for our neighborhood – heights that are appropriate for Central Avenue and not transition zones to our existing neighborhoods.
- Reliance on landscaping as an “urban element” – a short drive around the Country Club will show you the complete disregard for maintaining the existing landscape along both 7th St. & Thomas. There is no reason to believe the proposed landscape will be maintained over the life of the project.

Cherry-picking the requirements of the adjacent the Midtown TOD & WU Codes to justify additional height is an unreasonable argument for a building that will be out of scale with the citizen backed vision for this neighborhood.

Please help us protect our neighborhood, my family did not move here four years ago to live in a bedroom community. Help us encourage quality mixed-use projects that don't tower over our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time helping us make our community a better place.

Tom Reilly
359 East Verde Lane
Phoenix, AZ 85012
602.717.9444

Hannah Bleam

From: Linda Richmann <lrichmann@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 1:07 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Case Number Z-41-18

To: Encanto Village Planning Committee

I am opposed to the fifteen story condominium tower that is planned for the northeast corner of 7th Street and Thomas.

I live off Virginia and Richland Street, half a mile from the proposed site. I have lived there for over thirty years. A tower that size and in that location is inappropriate for the surrounding established historic neighborhoods. It will reduce the quality of life for a large number of residents in order to create an elite enclave for 125 units in a gated community. It would create **more** traffic problems on 7th Street, a reverse traffic lane. If one were to project the amount of cars for a 125 housing unit, at two cars per unit, any person who is familiar with that intersection, would realize what a colossal traffic debacle that would create. With increased cars, the proposed project creates more air pollution and traffic noise (pollution). That doesn't even take into account the visual and light pollution from that corner that myself and neighbors are suddenly forced to view. I do not oppose the building of high-rise structures, but they should be built in the correct location—they should adhere to existing zoning codes restricting towers to the Central Avenue corridor.

- no to 15 story high-rise outside of Central Avenue corridor in Midtown Phoenix
- will reduce quality of life for surrounding neighborhoods
- increase air pollution
- increase traffic and traffic noise

Sincerely,
Linda Richmann

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE. THANK YOU.

Sent from my iPad

Hannah Bleam

From: Ron Warnicke <warnickelaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 9:27 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Case No. Z-41-18

Encanto Village Committee

Re: Case No. Z-41-18

My wife and I have lived at 355 E Catalina for more than 30 years and ask that you reject the planned tower at the corner of 7th Street and Thomas that is near our home.

Allowing the tower to be built so high outside the Central corridor conflicts with the planning that has been so important in recent years to build a stronger downtown. One exception gives rise to the next applicant as I suspect the argument that the tower on Osborn Road ease of 7th St somehow justifies and exception. Granting this application would justify future requests; BUT, the tower on Osborn was before the plan. Don't invalidate the careful planning by creating a valid argument for future exeptions.

Moreover, proposed structure is ugly placing blank concrete walls at street level compounding the insult to the neighborhood of allowing a violation of decades of planning. It will likely increase traffic issues very close to a corner essential to move traffic in the central corridor.

The proposed density should be within the corridor and closer to the light rail, not half a mile's walk away.

Ronald Warnicke

Ronald Warnicke
355 E. Catalina Drive
Phoenix, 85012

602 363 5117

warnickelaw@gmail.com

Hannah Bleam

From: James Shea <jimmshea@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 22, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Z-41-18

I am very dismayed of the proposal to build yet another apartment complex in an already overcrowded array of complexes in the Central Phx area. I live just east of the high school and travel thru the 7th St. and E. Thomas intersection 3-4 times each day especially on Mon-Fri. The traffic is now unbearable during the morning and afternoon rush hours. For example going west on Thomas in the afternoon the traffic is backed up from 7th St. to the red light on 12 St.. Also so much traffic cuts through the residential streets to avoid the heavy clogged traffic. I do this myself.

Just imagine hundreds of more people with autos on top of the present ones causing a gridlock during rush times. There is no CONCERN for quality of life for the residential taxpayers and voters in the surrounding area and drivers of autos.

In addition the residents of the immediate area have lived in their homes for decades and decades and deserve the respect of a peaceful privacy. The construction of a 15 story building, for profits of people who have no concern for others, is an invasion of respectable home owners who have been responsible for their community.

Hannah Bleam

From: j47switzer <j47switzer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 5:33 AM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Case Z-41-18

Dear Hannah,

Thank you for reading this email.

I am writing about the high rise that is proposed at 7th St. and Thomas Rd. It doesn't fit the neighborhood. It is too high. It belongs with other buildings that are higher than those that are here. Those buildings are near the light rail. The city promised us that buildings like these would not be built unless they were close to the light rail.

One of the goals for Phoenix is to have a walkable city. This project would not be in line with that goal. The wall around it would create an uncomfortable, heat island that would serve no one. It would even make the people living in such a building think twice about going for a walk.

Please think about what would be best for Phoenix. This project, if approved, would create many consequences that would make it difficult for our neighborhood (and for other neighborhoods around Phoenix like ours) to preserve what we love about our way of life and what brings value to our homes.

Let's stick to the city's plan for a greater Phoenix and abandon this self serving project.

Thank you,
Jean Switzer
369 E. Catalina Dr.
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy Tab® S

Hannah Bleam

From: Trin Tan <trinmtan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 12:00 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Case Number Z-41-18

To Ms. Bleam & committee,

I'm writing in complete opposition to the rezoning Case Number Z-41-18 for the following reasons:

1. Invasion of our privacy and views. My house and windows face north and it would be direct view of the proposed 15 story high-rise at 7th St. & Thomas Rd. Also, this giant multi-story building would block my view and be an "eyesore" when looking north.
2. Traffic would increase at the intersection of 7th st. & Thomas Rd. causing even more traffic to cut through our quiet residential streets.
3. This new modern structure will take away **value** from our "historic preservation" in our "historic districts". **Gentrification** is all ready overtaking our historical homes and neighborhoods in downtown Phoenix. Fewer home buyers have an appreciation for historically preserved homes and its neighborhoods.

I am a native of Phoenix. Myself and my family have lived in Country Club Park historic district (directly south of PCC) for almost 15 years. I love my neighborhood and it's historical charm. Thank you for listening.

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Respectfully,

Trina Mendoza
833 E. Windsor Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85006



Warnicke Law PLC
Robert C. Warnicke
2929 North Second Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85012
602-738-7382
Robert@WarnickeLaw.net

August 29, 2018

Via Email

Encanto Village Planning Committee
C/O Hannah.Bleam@phoenix.gov

Re: Opposition to Z-41-18: H-R, Northeast Corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road

Dear Encanto Village Planning Committee member,

We ask you to reject the Application in zoning case number Z-41-18 for the Northeast Corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road.

I write to you on behalf of my family and as president of the La Hacienda Historic District. Our homes are on the first two blocks north of Thomas between 3rd Street and 7th Street. Many of our homes are among the closest to the subject property's location, just beyond commercial lots on the west side of 7th Street. My home is at 506 East Catalina.


1. Inappropriate Height for the Surrounding Area

The High Rise High Density Zoning District requested just to the East of our Historic neighborhood is inappropriate according to the General Plan of the City of Phoenix 2015 and the MidTown TOD Policy Plan, which both focus high rise and high density much closer to Central Avenue where public funds have established the light rail infrastructure. To grant the application would be a breach of the certainty and reasonable expectations that we have for living and investing in our homes in this city. With every plan, whether the General Plan or the MidTown TOD Policy Plan, the City has assured us that the high rise and high-density zoning in our area will be focused on the Central Corridor, and not randomly scattered through neighborhoods like was done decades past.

The 250-foot zoning district height requested (perhaps a maximum of 175 feet by stipulation) pursuant to the proposed H-R application a half mile away from Central Avenue is nothing more than the resurrection of poor urban planning designs that were abandoned in the 1960s. The Application repeatedly points to Crystal Point and its entitlement history that was from **1963**, and even quotes from those planning documents that are some 55 years old. The vision of the city of Phoenix from the 1960s has been

reimagined and updated, and few zoning entitlements from that era far from Central Avenue have ever been utilized to their full extent.

The map of existing buildings does not support imposing the proposed High Rise High Density Zoning District to the east of La Hacienda Historic District, and even to the east of 7th Street, on Thomas Road.



Looking southeast, there is nothing remotely this monstrously tall *anywhere* nearby. This Google Earth rendering shows that it will stick out like a sore thumb dominating the skyline in our neighborhoods.

An overhead view further shows how urban planning design *steps down* from the High Rise High Density Zoning District along Central Avenue travelling east along Thomas Road. The following examples were taken from reference in Application, their position and height are in red boxes.

Crystal Point 1040 E. Osborn
 Financial Center 3343 N. Central
 One Lexington 3225 N. Central
 CBIZ Plaza 3101 N. Central
 Copper Point 3030 N. 3rd Street
 Phoenix Corporate Tower 3003 N. Central
 Phoenix Plaza II 2929 N. Central
 Phoenix Plaza 2901 N. Central
 Century Link 20 E. Thomas
 2800 North Central 2800 N. Central
 2600 Tower 2600 N. Central
 Regency on Central 2323 N. Central



The High Rise High Density Zoning District requested in the Application (white 175 on the black box) is an outlier, just like the poor urban design of Crystal Point near the northeast corner. The blue boxes are the Cigna and First Place buildings, both believed to be under 60 feet, and they are largely a result of a High Rise High Density Zoning District entitlement from decades ago, and *replacing* an approximately 130-foot building. We supported variances for the four story First Place project; we are not opposed to additional residential density of an appropriate scale. We have also supported two other 5 story multifamily projects nearby on 3rd Street (Alta Thomas and Crescent Midtown) having arrived at compromises with those applicants that protected neighborhood values.

Everything currently existing in the transparency area on the east side of 3rd Street, *except Crystal Point*, is believed to be under 48 feet, and continues off the page for almost two miles north until the new Alta Camelback at perhaps 70 feet, east to almost the Piestewa Parkway where Phoenix Children's Hospital has a high-rise tower, southeast all the way to the hospital tower on McDowell for Banner Samaritan, and then south all the way to the City Core.

Looking at the project from a northly direction shows the building just plopped down among neighborhoods and sticking out like a red sore thumb (so I colored it red).



The map demonstrates that the requested height is not appropriate for the existing conditions.

2. Current City Planning Does Not Support the Requested Height

Notably, the Application references several buildings that are approximately 175 feet that are all *also* along Central Avenue among the 200+ foot towers, and it is along Central Avenue that the High Rise High Density Zoning Districts belongs in this area. The reason for this is driven by the City Code which provides:

631 High-Rise H-R District—High-Rise and High Density District.

The High-Rise H-R is intended to be a special district to allow greater building height and density within those few areas of the City that, by their strategic location and intense land use, generate exceptional amounts of activity of a commercial nature. Within these areas of greatly intensified activity the H-R districts may be combined with the R-4, R-4A, R-5, C-O, C-1, C-2, C-3, A-1, A-2, P-1 or P-2 districts and shall control in those requirements which it sets forth.

The Application cannot demonstrate that this is one of the “few areas” that has an exceptional amount of commercial activity that it should be allowed High Rise and High

Density Zoning District combined with R-5. The subject property is *outside* the Encanto core which ends at 3rd Street.



Excerpt from: https://www.phoenix.gov/pdds/PlanPHX_Village_Cores.pdf

The concept of focused redevelopment is described in the General Plan:

Locate land uses with the greatest height and most intense uses within village cores, centers and corridors based on village character, land use needs, and transportation system capacity.

Promote development in compact cores, centers and corridors that are connected by roads and transit, and are designed to encourage walking and bicycling.

General Plan, at page 62. There is no mistaking that the subject property is outside of the Village Core.

The City promises Stakeholders in the General Plan:

CERTAINTY & CHARACTER

What makes a city a great place to live are its robust vibrant neighborhoods. *There is a level of certainty one expects to have and quality of life one expects to maintain while living in a great city. The goals and policies that are outlined in the General Plan were created so residents have a reasonable expectation and level of certainty while living in our great city; certainty in regards to quality of life and compatibility.* The success, stability and certainty our neighborhoods can provide only strengthen our city and region's vitality and prosperity.

At page 107 (Italics emphasis added). The General Plan assures residents that the goal is to:

Create new development or redevelopment that is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhoods and incorporates adequate development standards to prevent negative impact(s) on the residential properties.

At page 107 (Emphasis added).

The Application also involves property that is also outside of the MidTown TOD Policy Plan, which ends on the west side of 7th Street. The MidTown TOD Policy Plan promotes the most density and height close to the light rail stations. The subject property

10000 BLOCK OF CENTRAL AVENUE

OSBORN RD.

E. Osborn Rd.

THOMAS RD.

E. Thomas Rd.

3RD ST.

7TH ST.

E. Oak St.

VIRGINIA AVE.

E. Meadowell Rd.

10000

10001

10002

10003

10004

10005

10006

10007

10008

10009

10010

10011

10012

10013

10014

10015

10016

10017

10018

10019

10020

10021

10022

10023

10024

10025

10026

10027

10028

10029

10030

10031

10032

10033

10034

10035

10036

10037

10038

10039

10040

10041

10042

10043

10044

10045

10046

10047

10048

10049

10050

10051

10052

10053

10054

10055

10056

10057

10058

10059

10060

10061

10062

10063

10064

10065

10066

10067

10068

10069

10070

10071

10072

10073

10074

10075

10076

10077

10078

10079

10080

10081

10082

10083

10084

10085

10086

10087

10088

10089

10090

10091

10092

10093

10094

10095

10096

10097

10098

10099

10100

10101

10102

10103

10104

10105

10106

10107

10108

10109

10110

10111

10112

10113

10114

10115

10116

10117

10118

10119

10120

10121

10122

10123

10124

10125

10126

10127

10128

10129

10130

10131

10132

10133

10134

10135

10136

10137

10138

10139

10140

10141

10142

10143

10144

10145

10146

10147

10148

10149

10150

10151

10152

10153

10154

10155

10156

10157

10158

10159

10160

10161

10162

10163

10164

10165

10166

10167

10168

10169

10170

10171

10172

10173

10174

10175

10176

10177

10178

10179

10180

10181

10182

10183

10184

10185

10186

10187

10188

10189

10190

10191

10192

10193

10194

10195

10196

10197

10198

10199

10200

10201

10202

10203

10204

10205

10206

10207

10208

10209

10210

10211

10212

10213

10214

10215

10216

10217

10218

10219

10220

10221

10222

10223

10224

10225

10226

10227

10228

10229

10230

10231

10232

10233

10234

10235

10236

10237

10238

10239

10240

10241

10242

10243

10244

10245

10246

10247

10248

10249

10250

10251

10252

10253

10254


T6:7, T6:15 & T6:22

T6:HWR - A high intensity, height waiver district to ensure equivalent entitlement

T5:5	T5:6	T5:7
------	------	------

Setback standards provide a buffer when adjacent to single-family residential or Historic Preservation districts. Maximum Height: 56-feet (T5:5), 80-ft (T5:6), 100-ft (T5:7)

Perhaps recognizing the failure of the property to be in the Village Core or even in the MidTown TOD Policy Plan, the Application briefly describes a “Thomas Corridor”, however, the proffered property design itself concedes that this project is not part of any grand “Thomas Corridor” in this Village. The Application offers Thomas Road nothing more than a fifteen-foot high concrete wall:



These concrete walls are a strange way to continue a supposed “Thomas Corridor”. Furthermore, there is no large commercial building complex on Thomas Road within a quarter mile of the project. Central Avenue is a long way to the west and immediately to the east are residential neighborhoods and North High School. The proposed tower is even set back away from both Thomas Road and the corner on a parking podium:



As shown below, the Applicant also intends its project to interact exclusively with the Phoenix Country Club’s clubhouse to the northeast, not some newly envisioned Thomas Corridor.



The only way to accurately describe this requested High Rise High Density Zoning District is to say that it runs counter to the “compact core” principle in the General Plan and that it is requested in a place that is not one of the “few areas” where there is an “exceptional amount of commercial activity”. The Application contains numerous photos that demonstrate that Thomas Road and 7th Street is not one of the “few areas” creating an “exceptional amount of commercial activity” as required to impose a High Rise (H-R) High Density Zoning District. The Applicant even goes to great pains to argue that the nearby area is “underutilized” and needs the “revitalization”, which is contrary to when a High Rise High Density Zoning District may be entitled. Ironically, the Application urges that this H-R rezoning would somehow provide benefits to the corner of 7th Street and Thomas by interacting with the corner in the most limited way possible, fifteen-foot high concrete walls enclosing parked cars.

The Application pays lip service to the Walkable Urban Code, describing several sidewalk, landscape and shade offerings, but it is clear this is not a walkable project. The

concrete walls and orientation of the proposed building, away from the corner, are not consistent with a walkable building. In addition, *more* parking spaces that the code requires are being built. *This Application is, perhaps, the worst walkable building claim ever made.* Higher density and height is supposed to be focused within a ¼ mile from the light rail stations, a five-minute walk. This project is at least a ½ mile, meaning a ten-minute walk, however, the reality is that the walk from the northeast side of the building that faces the entrance of the Phoenix Country Club clubhouse, and the barrier of 7th Street, means a much longer potential walk to the light rail. The higher density, height and intensity are supposed to leverage the nearby billion-dollar public investment made in mass transit. It is shocking to see the Applicant claim this project is consistent with any current urban planning goal. The Applicant might as well describe Crystal Point the epitome of the new urban style walkable building.

3. Don't Support the Application to Save the Golf Course

The Application describes the great value that the jealously guarded green space that the Phoenix Country Club's golf course provides to the City, and gently suggest that approval of project is necessary to save the golf course. The Applicants suggestion is consistent with rumors over the years that the Phoenix Country Club has an extremely high debt load. The Applicant soft pedals this issue in its explanation of how the protection and continued existence of a private and exclusive 105 acre golf course in the midtown area of Phoenix contributes to a "sustainable" city (it is heat sink/air refresher):

It has been widely reported in the last decade that golf courses throughout the Valley are struggling to survive, threatening existing open space amenities which are important contributions to residential neighborhoods.

Application at page 22.

Maintaining PCC's vitality, and thereby the golf course, will preserve the golf course's cleansing effects on the environment well into the future.

Application at page 22.

PCC has been proactively attempting to reposition the strength and health of its golf course and club amenities.

Application at page 22.

The quality condominium development is the latest measure PCC is promoting as a significant means of preserving and enhancing the golf course and club amenities which form this one-of-a kind urban oasis in the City.

At 23. So, the soft pedal pitch is that the City should approve the entitlement to save the golf course.

This argument should be rejected, as it requests a permanent entitlement, High Rise High Density Zoning District where it does not belong, in exchange for a temporary

benefit, the possible continued existence of the golf course. In addition, the very idea that the Club should get a handout from the City to maintain private green space that directly benefits its well-off members because it has the most indirect of benefits for the plebes is ridiculous. Furthermore, the Club maintains the entire golf course as a county island and, at a minimum, does not pay the same 2.17% property tax to the City that the rest of us pay for our property in the City. And yet the Club comes forward demanding another give and offers nothing.

The permanent grant of an entitlement by the Application to save the green space does nothing to ensure that the Club will make a permanent commitment to preserve green space: reading between the lines of the Application, the golf course may well be on its last days, and in return for a permanent entitlement the City gets nothing to ensure the Club will (or can) maintain the green space the Applicant asserts is so good for the City. If the Applicant hopes to prevail on this argument, the Club should commit to bring the golf course into the city *and* provide a deed restriction on any redevelopment in exchange for reasonable entitlements on the corner. Of course, it will not, as the Club is too greedy to give up the tax break and future property value: temporary promises are being made for permanent entitlements. The City is being gifted, and they hope you won't notice.

Conclusion

The General Plan and the MidTown TOD Policy Plan do not support granting the Application, the height and density are not to be promoted outside of Central Corridor with the light rail, the City Core, or the Village Cores. The existing map of building heights show that a height of 175 feet (or 250 feet) do not belong on the corner of 7th Street and Thomas Road. Additionally, Thomas Road is not a corridor for high rise redevelopment, and the proposal shows the Applicant intends to turn the project's back on Thomas and the corner. All of the flowery words and nice descriptions in the Application cannot change the fact that the Application relies on planning decisions from the 1960s that did not work, were bad for neighborhoods, and have been abandoned. High Rise High Density Zoning Districts are permitted by the Phoenix Zoning Code only in the "few areas" in the City with "exceptional commercial activity": this does not describe 7th Street and Thomas Road. The General Plan assures stakeholders that they can have certainty as to their living conditions, and the current Application is an assault on the certainty.

Please vote to reject Z-41-18.

Sincerely
Robert C. Warnicke
Robert C. Warnicke

William L. White M.D.
William.white@barrowbrainandspine.com
Nancy L. White NP
Nancylavignewhite@gmail.com
36 N. Country Club Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85015

August 26, 2018

Hannah Bleam:
Encanto Village Planner

Re: 15 Story High Rise at 7th St. and Thomas Rd.

Dear Hannah and the Encanto Village Planning Committee:

We would like to briefly discuss the primary reasons we are concerned about the proposed 15-story High Rise in the Phoenix Country Club parking lot at the corner of 7th St. and Thomas Rd.

1. It just doesn't belong there. Phoenix Country Club owes a large debt from upgrades made many years ago. Some members of the Country Club have proposed this condo project as a means of improving the Country Club's finances. We are told that the club will be paid 5 million dollars, of which 2 million will be applied to the debt. We are not informed as to the developer's expected potential profit and are also not aware of any bidding process in determining the price of the land. We are concerned that the developer(s) may be club members and their opinions may be biased by potential personal gain.
2. The high rise changes the atmosphere from a single-family, quiet community with charisma and charm to a Yuppie beehive. We are the first home on North Country Club Drive. We are not thrilled with the thought of such an albatross looking down on our back yard.
3. We have lived here for 40 years and it is unfair to have the codes changed for profit motivated by developers.
4. We understand the codes already allow high-rise buildings along the Central Corridor between 3rd Ave. and 3rd St. An editorial in the newspaper today reports a downturn in the housing market. We are also aware that there are many new condos/apartments that are not being sold /occupied downtown.

If over building continues and this high rise fails, what happens to our neighborhood then?

5. The high rise, if successful, will undoubtedly increase the traffic at the corner of 7th St. and Thomas Rd. We have been told that statistical studies have shown the increase in traffic will not significantly impact our neighborhood. Statistical studies are strongly affected by the bias of the investigator (design of the study) as well as the bias of those interpreting the studies. Intuition and common sense, would tell us otherwise. If there is an increase in number of residents, it will increase the number of automobiles (2 per condo). We only have one entrance to Thomas Road and one entrance to 7th St. to provide ingress and egress. It is difficult enough now trying to get out during high traffic hours and will become a more dangerous nightmare.
6. An increase in population results in an increase in crime.
7. This project can only result in a tremendous decline in the atmosphere and decrease in quality of life for our historic neighborhood and the Phoenix Country Club.

We are strongly opposed to a change in building codes that would allow this monstrosity to be built. It would be unfair to have this forced upon our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

William L. White M.D.
Nancy L. White NP

Hannah Bleam

From: SUZANNE WISE <smillsw@cox.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2018 4:48 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Cc: smillsw@cox.net
Subject: Z-41-18

Ms. Hannah Bleam

Encanto Village Planning Committee

hannah.bleam@phoenix.gov

Dear Ms. Bleam:

Every morning I have the pleasure of watching airplanes, on their final approach into Sky Harbor Airport, from the window at my kitchen table. Throughout the day, the neighborhood streets are a happy buzz of folks exercising and walking dogs. When the sun sets, it is beautifully outlined by the palm trees in the Phoenix Country Club Drive and parking lot area (where a high rise is proposed to be built).

This is our community and we love it. It is also an historic neighborhood, an asset to the city, that should be appreciated, protected, and preserved for many years to come for the beauty and the quality of life it offers.

A rezone that would allow a high rise out of the central corridor, and a behemoth of a structure, would greatly, negatively impact our community with unnecessary and unwanted LIGHTS, NOISE, and TRAFFIC. I can't express enough the negative impact that would occur or deny enough the flight of fancy that imagines ANY benefit to it's neighbors by allowing this project to go forward.

Keeping high rises in one, already designated area, allows the city to better plan for the public transportation, no car zones, etc., that would make a more beautiful and functional city, through a well thought out, cohesive plan.

I am opposed to rezoning, the case number is Z-41-18, at 7th Street and Thomas in Phoenix. Thank you for taking this under consideration. Our community needs your help! If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to mail or call.

PLEASE SEND THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Wise

825 E. Edgemont Ave.

Phoenix, Arizona 85006

602-265-4265

Via Email

Encanto Village Planning Committee

% Hannah Bleam hannah.bleam@phoenix.gov

Re: Opposition to Case No. Z-41-18

Dear Encanto Village Planning Committee Member,

As long time residents in Country Club Park Historic Neighborhood, my husband Joe and I are **totally opposed** to the rezoning of 2+ acres located at the NEC of 7th St and Thomas Rd and part of the Phoenix Country Club parking lot. The applicant is requesting to change the zoning from **P-1 to R-5 H-R (Multi-family Residential, High Rise/High Density)**. Below we have outlined some of our reasons why the rezoning request (Case No. **Z-41-18**) should be **denied**.

1) The proposed **15** Story Condominium Tower of **175 foot height** (up to a possible 250 foot height with H-R) is ridiculously **excessive** for the area of 7th St and Thomas Rd. The present building height along 7th Street is **48** feet, approximately 4 stories in height. A 4 story building **towers** over any nearby single story residence, not to mention what it would be like to have a **15** Story **Monster** towering over nearby single story homes. The residents within the Country Club, residents west of 7th St, and residents south of Thomas are all negatively impacted by **King Kong** towering over their properties. This is **egregious** and **unacceptable**.

2) This High Rise/High Density project falls **outside** the city's Central High Rise Corridor, and **outside** the Light Rail Corridor and Transit Overlay District. It belongs between 3rd St and 3rd Avenue and closer to Central Avenue and the Light Rail, not 4 blocks away. It does **not** belong on the east side 7th St and does **not** belong outside of Phoenix's **planned** Central Corridor. Stick to the plan!

3) Approval will set a **bad precedent** for further High Rise development along 7th St, as well as East of 7th St. Keep High Rises between 3rd St and 3rd Ave, and within the Central High Rise Corridor, and where they are within **reasonable** walking distance to the Light Rail. No one East of 7th Street walks to Central Avenue to take the Light Rail. And anyone living East of 3rd St is hard pressed to walk to Central to use the Light Rail. Seven to eight months out of the year Phoenix is **not** a walkable city. No amount of dreaming or scheming is going to make it so. Residents of high end condos are not going to walk more than a block away for anything and this location offers no amenities worth walking to.

4) The project design with its 2 story concrete walls along 7th St and along Thomas Rd surrounding the parking garage in **no way** fits nor promotes the **city's walkable urban plan**. These concrete walls will be **unwelcoming** and are not a destination on the corner for pedestrians. The proposed 15 foot concrete walls will be less

beneficial for the corner than the existing metal fence and vines. The concrete walls will likely be a new venue for graffiti artists. The imposing walls are likely to reflect sound, light, and heat back at pedestrians. The only significant open space anywhere near the corner is an elevated amenities deck that is for residents only, and yet we are to approve the project because of the 105 acre golf course green space. The corner gets the concrete and not the green space which remains private and hidden. Our city deserves better on this corner than a 15 story tower built over a parking podium with 2 stories of **unforgiving** concrete walls.

5) The increase in density on that corner will have a negative impact on the already **heavy traffic** in the area of Thomas Rd and 7th St. You do not need a traffic study of the area to know the impact of an additional 200 plus vehicles in and out of the Club's 2 entrances on to two of the city's busiest streets. Just drive through that intersection any time Monday through Friday, and especially after 2PM. Let's not forget the negative impact on the residents within the Country Club having to share their ingress and egress with an additional 200 plus vehicles. What about 3rd St traffic that will be forced to take another route soon with the 3rd Street Promenade project? That traffic will flow over to an already congested 7th St. The applicant admits that there will be another **704** vehicle trips, with **99** of those during **peak hours**. This is putting at least **99** more cars into the mix every day at **uncontrolled** intersections on to the north and east of this hugely congested corner, and factor in the added difficulty of the reverse lane on 7th St. It will not be safe, and it will be putting us all at more risk, especially pedestrians waiting for buses that could end up sharing the sidewalk with spinning cars.

6) Another **traffic issue**: Country Club Park Historic Neighborhood is already plagued with **cut through traffic** on our surface streets, thanks to the reverse lane on 7th St, the traffic heading west on Thomas Rd and backing up to 11th St and beyond, and student drop off traffic related to North High. More traffic in the area means more cut through traffic within Country Club Park, i.e. Windsor Ave, 8th St, 10th St, and Dayton. There are **no** sidewalks within 2/3's of this neighborhood, and the streets are shared by both pedestrians and vehicles. Any increase in traffic escalates an already **unsafe** situation for residents and pedestrians.

7) Phoenix should **reject** this 15 Story High Rise project and the rezoning request as it is merely a bandaid on the Country Club's financial problems. It is a temporary fix at the **expense** and to the **detriment** of the surrounding **historic** residential neighborhoods; Country Club Park (and Coronado) to the south, La Hacienda to the west, and Country Club Place within the Country Club to the north and to the east. Selfishly, the Country Club is the only one to benefit from this High Rise. The project provides absolutely **no** benefit to the neighborhoods surrounding 7th St and Thomas Rd. It is a complete **NO WIN** situation for everyone but the Club.

We are not opposed to the area around 7th St and Thomas Rd being developed. We welcome it. However, this High Rise project is **all wrong** for that location. Let's not ruin these three historic neighborhoods.

Respectfully,

Jeanne Yawger (Resident since 1995, Property Owner since 2005)

Joseph Every (Property Owner since 2005)

818 E. Edgemont Ave

Phoenix, AZ 85006

P.S. Our property backs to Thomas Rd and this **Albatross** will be hovering over our backyard. Imagine this happening to you and your neighbors. Say goodbye to your privacy, quiet enjoyment, property values, existing views, etc.

It is egregious and totally unacceptable.

Hannah Bleam

From: Mary Zulli <mzee@theriver.com>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Zoning Change Request Z-41-18 Hi-rise at Phoenix Country Club

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Ms Bleam,

I am a resident of Country Club Terrace, writing in opposition to the request for a zoning change for the parcel at the northeast corner of Thomas and 7th Street from P-1 to H-R. This proposal is for a 15 story high-rise building comprising 125 units on 4.28 acres (over 29 units/acre) in what is currently the main parking lot for Phoenix Country Club (PCC).

The proposed development is highly inappropriate for the area and for Phoenix. Pages 10-11 of the proposal narrative (http://www.savephoenixhomes.com/pdf/PCC_App.pdf) tell the story very well. The list of "nearby" properties intended to support the development includes only one that is not along the Central Corridor, where mixed-use high-rise development is a logical component of the high intensity light rail and commercial infrastructure in that area. Residents on and near Central have easy access to multiple transit options, as well as pedestrian access to amenities like restaurants, gyms, financial services, and offices/workspaces. Many residents there will have no need to own or use an automobile due to the proximity of a complete range of commercial, recreational, and personal services in their own and in adjacent properties. Additionally, the Central Corridor properties offer public access to most ground floor spaces, encouraging pedestrian access even by non-residents, who are free to enjoy the same businesses and office space as the residents.

This contrasts significantly with the only listed "nearby" property that is not on the central corridor, Crystal Point, a gated 11 acre enclave north of PCC. The absurdity of its situation is nicely illustrated by the photo at the top of page 11 of the narrative, showing how isolated and inappropriate it is in relation to its neighbors. In contrast to properties along and adjacent to Central, Crystal Point contributes nothing to the neighborhood, no publicly accessible amenities, doing nothing more than interrupting the regular rhythm of single family and low rise buildings for miles around it. Crystal Point creates a "pedestrian desert" where walking is unpleasant and even dangerous because no one on the 15th floor can hear you scream!

We should consider Crystal Point as a trial run that clearly failed the city of Phoenix, and promise to never repeat that mistake. The goal of the city is to create a community, not a series of isolated human filing cabinets designed to exclude the neighbors and prevent their residents from ever coming into contact with other citizens. Residents who demand this kind of isolation do not make engaged and contributory citizens. Such residents do not patronize local small businesses, do not support local arts organizations, insist on driving everywhere, and do not support public amenities like public schools, public transportation, community policing and the like. Phoenix needs more engaged citizens, not more transients.

Sadly, the proposed development at PCC is modeled after Crystal Point, and not the mixed-use properties along Central, showing the level of disrespect the management and residents of PCC feel for their neighbors. The PCC has been an indifferent neighbor for a long time: the blank walls and poorly maintained plantings along Thomas Rd., 7th St., and Osborn Rd. are a signal to all that we are not welcome there. The walls interrupt potential pedestrian and bicycle routes around the area and create pedestrian deserts where safety is compromised.

The current proposal is a continuation of the perceived disrespect for neighboring communities. Rather than supporting a mixed use development, with ground floor pedestrian access to residents and non-residents alike, the proposed building will present a monolithic, blank, 20 foot tall concrete wall with little setback and no public access. This wall will radiate summer heat well into the night, making walking along the narrow (36" wide in each direction) sidewalk extremely unpleasant. Residents will enter and exit the building toward the club house building, not toward the street, where they might access public transport and neighboring businesses. Rather, they are likely to drive, insulated from contact with non-residents. The increased traffic will make an already dangerous area even more so, putting residents and North High School students at increased risk. The relationship between the proposed high-rise and its surroundings will actively discourage additional commercial development in the surrounding area, as that development would require participation by the high-rise residents, who are discouraged from leaving the PCC grounds by design.

The proposal asserts that the development will assure the continued success of the Phoenix Country Club and preservation of its open space, but there is no guarantee. The PCC is perfectly able, once this building is complete, to dissolve the club and demand even more high density development, including the area encompassed by the golf course. Any rezoning must be made contingent on memorializing all promises in covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) in the rezoning ordinance.

The photo on page 10 of the narrative indicates the paucity of development between Central and 7th St, or even 3rd St. The vast expanses of parking lots and low density construction in this area discourage pedestrians and provide few additional residents to support businesses along Central. The Central Corridor requires support from developments within walking distance to Central, developments designed to attract the kind of residents who enjoy urban life, not those who demand isolation from it. If PCC members from across the valley wish to have easier access to the PCC, they should consider building urban-friendly residences there, where I'm sure we would welcome them as neighbors and fellow Phoenixians.

In summary:

- 1) The proposed development will contribute nothing to the revitalization of the character and identity of the 7th Street and Thomas Road intersection. It will, in fact, discourage pedestrian friendly development of the surrounding area by overwhelming infrastructure, failing to provide customers for businesses in the area, and creating a pedestrian desert that will discourage potential customers from accessing neighboring businesses from the north or east.
- 2) The great distance from and disdain for public transportation options will encourage greater automobile use and increase risk for pedestrians trying to access the corner and adjacent businesses.
- 3) The purported benefit of ensuring the golf course as a cooling feature for the surrounding area is not assured by the proposed development. This can only be assured if any rezoning is attached to CC&R's memorialized in the rezoning ordinance requiring the continued preservation of the open space for a period of time, preferably in excess of 50 years.
- 4) This development is more easily characterized by what it is not. It is not pedestrian friendly, it is not urban, it does not integrate into the neighboring areas, and in fact, deliberately isolates itself from them.
- 5) The city should encourage more urban-friendly mid-rise development closer to Central to support Central Corridor success.

PLEASE DELIVER THIS LETTER IMMEDIATELY TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE ENCANTO VILLAGE PLANNING COMMITTEE.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mary R. Zulli
1325 E. Verde Ln.
Phoenix, AZ 85014
(520) 850-3032

From: [David Urbinato](#)
To: [Racelle Escolar](#)
Cc: [Maja Brkovic](#)
Subject: FW: I Support Country Club High Rise Project (Z-41-18-4)
Date: Monday, October 01, 2018 10:09:24 AM

Looks like this is going to PC on Thursday.

David Urbinato
Management Assistant II
Phoenix Planning and Development Department
602-534-3630

From: Council District 3 PCC
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 9:19 AM
To: David Urbinato <david.urbinato@phoenix.gov>
Subject: FW: I Support Country Club High Rise Project (Z-41-18-4)

Rose Ferguson
Adm. Assist 1
Councilwoman Debra Stark
Council District 3
602-262-6275
Monday – Thursday 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.

From: Elizabeth Maupin [<mailto:emaupin@alcocklaw.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2018 7:30 PM
To: Mayor Williams <mayor.williams@phoenix.gov>; Council District 2 PCC <council.district.2@phoenix.gov>; Council District 3 PCC <council.district.3@phoenix.gov>; Council District 4 <council.district.4@phoenix.gov>; Council District 5 PCC <council.district.5@phoenix.gov>; Council District 6 PCC <council.district.6@phoenix.gov>; Council District 7 PCC <council.district.7@phoenix.gov>; Council District 8 PCC <council.district.8@phoenix.gov>
Subject: I Support Country Club High Rise Project (Z-41-18-4)

Good morning:

My name is Elizabeth Maupin and I live at [801 E. Edgemont Ave Phoenix AZ 85006](#). I am a 34 year old native Arizonan and local attorney. I own my designated historic home that was recently remodeled. I am active with my neighborhood communities (Country Club Park and Coronado). Edgemont Avenue is the street nearest to Thomas Rd. My home is on the corner lot of 8th Street and Edgemont Avenue, very close to the project.

I am surprised that this multi-million dollar project has not been recommended by the Encanto planning commission. Unfortunately, supporters of the project didn't turn out to the meeting. Our neighborhood had a meeting at my home to discuss the project. Many neighbors

attended and we didn't take a formal vote but neighbors were both against and for the project. Those excited for the project and those against were mixed and one didn't outnumber the other. We worked through it and supported one another's views. Many of the neighbors are excited about the likely rise in home values. Many supporters just assume this multi-million dollar project would be a no brainer and go in. So many supporters would not feel the need to attend these meetings. Again, I was surprised by the results of that meeting, which unfortunately I did not attend.

I strongly SUPPORT the proposed high rise project. Several of my neighbors that also reside very close to the project support and are excited for this venture. We feel that this proposed luxury high rise is exactly what our area needs. My home is completely remodeled and I am very tuned in to rising and falling property values in this area. I strongly feel this would make a positive fiscal impact to the city and the many neighboring home values.

It would bring in professionals to the area with high disposable incomes (I believe about 120 high net worth families). It would encourage walkability and positive urban sprawl to the area. It would encourage the development of more upscale local businesses to cater to the increased disposable income. It would encourage Phoenix to grow and become more urban in a positive way like NYC, LA, Boston, etc. I am especially pleased that the project would contain high value luxury condos and not be a common low cost apartment complex often seen around Phoenix (that build out not up!). The high rise condos already built in downtown Phoenix have truly transformed those areas and are starting to make the area look and feel more like a real downtown area.

Other neighbors also brought to my attention that the Phoenix Country Club, an asset to our community, may be struggling financially. Should this project not go in they could face financial hardship or bankruptcy. That is a terrible possibility. Our city would surely suffer should we lose this historical asset. I feel lucky to live so close to the country club and encourage more upscale and/or urban development.

The city should not turn away from such a high dollar project. The increased tax money this project would bring to the city for years to come is something that needs to be strongly analyzed. Property taxes (to the county and the city) from not only the project but surrounding raised home values and sales tax earnings in the area would be astounding.

These are the reasons I strongly SUPPORT this project and hope the rezoning will be approved.

Let's make Phoenix, AZ the thriving urban downtown city that it can be!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Maupin
801 E. Edgemont Ave.
[Phoenix, AZ 85006](#)
[602-702-3959](#)

THIS EMAIL MESSAGE AND ANY ATTACHMENTS CONTAIN INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHOM IT IS DIRECTED. IT MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS CONFIDENTIAL AND PROTECTED BY ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE, ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT

DOCTRINE AND OTHER APPLICABLE PRIVILEGES UNDER BOTH FEDERAL AND STATE LAW. ANY DISSEMINATION, DISCLOSURE, DISTRIBUTION, OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS MESSAGE AND/OR CONTENTS BY AN UNINTENDED RECIPIENT IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR AS AN UNINTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE DIRECTED TO CONTACT THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY VIA TELEPHONE AT (602) 404-6000 OR REPLY EMAIL, THEN PERMANENTLY DELETE THIS MESSAGE AND ANY ATTACHMENTS FROM YOUR INBOX, EMAIL SERVER, AND/OR COMPUTER HARD DRIVE.

From: [David Urbinato](#)
To: [Racelle Escobar](#)
Cc: [Maja Brkovic](#)
Subject: FW: Letter in support of the proposed condo development at the Northeast corner of 7th st and Thomas
Date: Monday, October 01, 2018 10:10:06 AM

David Urbinato
Management Assistant II
Phoenix Planning and Development Department
602-534-3630

-----Original Message-----

From: Council District 3 PCC
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 9:08 AM
To: David Urbinato <david.urbinato@phoenix.gov>
Subject: FW: Letter in support of the proposed condo development at the Northeast corner of 7th st and Thomas

FYI

Rose Ferguson
Adm. Assist 1
Councilwoman Debra Stark
Council District 3
602-262-6275
Monday – Thursday 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.

-----Original Message-----

From: Christopher Simmers [<mailto:simmersfamily@me.com>]
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2018 5:15 PM
To: Hannah Bleam <hannah.bleam@phoenix.gov>; Mayor Williams <mayor.williams@phoenix.gov>; Council District 2 PCC <council.district.2@phoenix.gov>; Council District 3 PCC <council.district.3@phoenix.gov>; Council District 4 <council.district.4@phoenix.gov>; Council District 5 PCC <council.district.5@phoenix.gov>; Council District 6 PCC <council.district.6@phoenix.gov>; Council District 7 PCC <council.district.7@phoenix.gov>; Council District 8 PCC <council.district.8@phoenix.gov>
Subject: Letter in support of the proposed condo development at the Northeast corner of 7th st and Thomas

Hello,

My name is Chris Simmers and my wife Sarah and our 3 young children live in the Los Olivos historic neighborhood on E Monte Vista Rd between 7th and 3rd streets. I wanted to send a letter to convey our support for the proposed condo tower development at the northeast corner of 7th street and Thomas.

As a young family living in the area we welcome this kind of development and would be very excited to see what kind of transformation a project like this could bring to 7th street in that area. We enjoy riding our bikes as a family in the area and always stay clear of that area due to the blight and questionable characters and businesses that tend to frequent that area.

I know there has been some objection to the project specifically in regards to the height but when we chose to live in a midtown area in one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the country I expected and hoped that projects growing up instead of out would happen. It does not seem feasible as this growth continues to limit higher heights to the central corridor. We would also fully support such a building right next to us on 3rd street!

Thank you for your time,

Chris Simmers
332 E Monte Vista Rd
480-235-2366

From: [David Urbinato](#)
To: [Racelle Escobar](#)
Cc: [Maja Brkovic](#)
Subject: FW: Phoenix Country Club High Rise Proposal
Date: Monday, October 01, 2018 10:09:50 AM

David Urbinato
Management Assistant II
Phoenix Planning and Development Department
602-534-3630

From: Council District 3 PCC
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 9:02 AM
To: David Urbinato <david.urbinato@phoenix.gov>
Subject: FW: Phoenix Country Club High Rise Proposal

David: good morning. FYI

Rose Ferguson
Adm. Assist 1
Councilwoman Debra Stark
Council District 3
602-262-6275
Monday – Thursday 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.

From: Four AllTheRest [<mailto:fouralltherest@outlook.com>]
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2018 9:44 AM
To: Hannah Bleam <hannah.bleam@phoenix.gov>; Mayor Williams <mayor.williams@phoenix.gov>; Council District 2 PCC <council.district.2@phoenix.gov>; Council District 3 PCC <council.district.3@phoenix.gov>; Council District 4 <council.district.4@phoenix.gov>; Council District 5 PCC <council.district.5@phoenix.gov>; Council District 6 PCC <council.district.6@phoenix.gov>; Council District 7 PCC <council.district.7@phoenix.gov>; Council District 8 PCC <council.district.8@phoenix.gov>
Cc: Four AllTheRest <fouralltherest@outlook.com>
Subject: Phoenix Country Club High Rise Proposal

My wife and I have lived in this neighborhood for 25 years and we are excited to hear that a high end high-rise is being considered on the current Phoenix Country Club parking lot at 7th Street & Thomas Rd.

We know there is opposition and respect those concerns but, we feel the projects positives outweigh the negatives. I fear that if this project does not happen, the Country Club may have to close the golf course and sell parts of the land to smaller projects. This is a great opportunity for the

PCC to generate revenue that is very much needed and will assist in saving the historical country club.

Although we will not be speaking at the meeting, we will be there to show support.

Scott and Donna Lehman

838 E Edgemont Ave

AND

843 E Edgemont Ave

From: [David Urbinato](#)
To: [Racelle Escolar](#)
Cc: [Maja Brkovic](#)
Subject: FW: Phoenix Country Club Residences
Date: Monday, October 01, 2018 10:22:29 AM

If you don't need me to forward these, just let me know...

David Urbinato
Management Assistant II
Phoenix Planning and Development Department
602-534-3630

From: Council District 3 PCC
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2018 10:21 AM
To: David Urbinato <david.urbinato@phoenix.gov>
Subject: FW: Phoenix Country Club Residences

FYI

Rose Ferguson
Adm. Assist 1
Councilwoman Debra Stark
Council District 3
602-262-6275
Monday – Thursday 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.

From: Elaine Walter [<mailto:ewalter01@cox.net>]
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Mayor Williams <mayor.williams@phoenix.gov>; Council District 2 PCC <council.district.2@phoenix.gov>; Council District 3 PCC <council.district.3@phoenix.gov>; Council District 4 PCC <Council.District4@phoenix.gov>; Council District 5 PCC <council.district.5@phoenix.gov>; Council District 6 PCC <council.district.6@phoenix.gov>; Council District 7 PCC <council.district.7@phoenix.gov>; Council District 8 PCC <council.district.8@phoenix.gov>; Racelle Escolar <racelle.escolar@phoenix.gov>
Cc: Krista Bilsten <kmbilsten@yahoo.com>; Elizabeth Maupin <emaupin@alcocklaw.com>
Subject: Phoenix Country Club Residences

I am a 20 year resident of Country Club Park and reside at 855 E Edgemont Ave (one block south of Thomas). I am in full support of the 15 story high rise structure proposed for the Phoenix Country Club parking lot at the corner of 7th St & Thomas. There are a number of high rises already visible on the skyline, we do live in midtown/downtown area and no homes need to be destroyed to make an exception for this unique situation.

I am convinced that we will see a rise in home values, improvements in some of the less desirable locations nearby, specifically the other 3 corners at that intersection, increased tax

base for the City and Schools and I believe the density impact of this high rise on traffic is far less than the 4/5 story apartments rising everywhere.

While the Planning Commission declined as a number of land use principles are not met by the development which seem to be tailored towards driving development to the Central Corridor for light rail, it seems extremely unlikely that residences of the high rise would be utilizing that mode of transit anyway. In addition, I recently drove Central north from Roosevelt to Indian School and saw only two vacant fenced lots, a couple of concrete parking lots and a closed fast food restaurant. It appeared to me there are few options on Central.

Thank you,

Elaine Walter
855 E. Edgemont Ave
Phoenix, AZ 85006

602-326-3470

From: [David Urbinato](#)
To: [Racelle Escobar](#)
Cc: [Maja Brkovic](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning Case No. Z-41-18: residential high-rise at the corner of 7th Street and Thomas
Date: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:39:25 PM

One more.... (phoenix country club)

David Urbinato
Management Assistant II
Phoenix Planning and Development Department
602-534-3630

From: Council District 3 PCC
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:30 PM
To: David Urbinato <david.urbinato@phoenix.gov>
Subject: FW: Rezoning Case No. Z-41-18: residential high-rise at the corner of 7th Street and Thomas

Afternoon.

Rose Ferguson
Adm. Assist 1
Councilwoman Debra Stark
Council District 3
602-262-6275
Monday – Thursday 8 a.m. – 4 p.m.

From: James R. Huntwork [<mailto:jrh@slwplc.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 1:14 PM
To: Hannah Bleam <hannah.bleam@phoenix.gov>; Mayor Williams <mayor.williams@phoenix.gov>; Council District 2 PCC <council.district.2@phoenix.gov>; Council District 3 PCC <council.district.3@phoenix.gov>; Council District 4 <council.district.4@phoenix.gov>; Council District 5 PCC <council.district.5@phoenix.gov>; Council District 6 PCC <council.district.6@phoenix.gov>; council <district.7@phoenix.gov>; Council District 8 PCC <council.district.8@phoenix.gov>
Subject: Rezoning Case No. Z-41-18: residential high-rise at the corner of 7th Street and Thomas

Ladies and Gentlemen, I am writing in support of the referenced rezoning case. I have lived at 374 East Monte Vista Road, ½ mile south of the proposed development, since 1977. During that time, there has been a slow and steady decline along the heavily travelled 7th Street corridor between Palm Lane and Osborn Roads. This corridor could provide a dynamic economic engine for surrounding neighborhoods and the City as a whole, but instead it is a veritable Sargasso Sea of run down properties with random architecture and uses, the flotsam and jetsam of urban decay. Thousands of Phoenicians rush through this area every day at harrowing speeds to escape the dismal street scape en route to more attractive venues to the north and south. The Phoenix Country Club itself, despite all it contributes from the broader

perspective, exacerbates this problem, with its vast open parking lot dominating the major intersection at the epicenter of the underutilization. Before this project was proposed, there was no reason to believe or hope that the situation will be better 40 years from now than it is today or was when I moved to this neighborhood 40 years ago. This project could be the spark, indeed the bolt of lightning, that we have been waiting for to jump start the process of revitalization, and the time for bold action has come! I ask you to seize this opportunity and not be deterred by those voices that oppose change even to escape from the cycle of stagnation and decay.

Hannah Bleam

From: Beau Lane <beau.lane@laneterralever.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 10:22 AM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Phoenix Country Club Condominiums

Dear Ms. Bleam –

I am contacting you to express my strong support for re-zoning case #Z-41-18 pertaining to the proposed condominium development at the Phoenix Country Club. As a long time homeowner (15 East Country Club Drive) and Club member I see tremendous benefit to the proposed high end residential tower at the corner of 7th St and Thomas. Besides the obvious economic impact for the City, the development will transform and revitalize one of the most blighted intersection on 7th Street and provide an unique new residential option for the central city area. It will also permanently secure the preservation of the Phoenix Country Club footprint as one of the largest greenbelts in Phoenix.

Thank you for considering my point of view and please share this email with all members of the Encanto Village Planning committee.

Beau



LANE | TERRALEVER Beau Lane | CEO
602.258.5263 | 645 E Missouri Ave, Ste 400, Phoenix, AZ 85012

Hannah Bleam

From: Perry Petri <perrypetri@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 10:10 AM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Residences at the Phoenix Country Club

Dear Hanna,

I am a resident of Country Club Park historic district directly south of the Phoenix Country Club. I am unable to make the meeting this evening, but I wanted to express my full support of the development of the Residences at the Phoenix Country Club. The corner of 7th Street & E Thomas Road needs development. There is an aging Circle K, a vacant gas station and a vacant commercial building on that corner. I think this development would encourage businesses to put roots down on those vacant properties. I also think it would be a great shot in the arm for all of the business owners of Country Club Park and Coronado neighborhood. There are a lot of restaurant owners, coffee shops, various retailers that would benefit from having more residents on that corner. It would likely discourage the homeless that gather their panhandling as well. I see absolutely no negative side to this development.

Hannah Bleam

From: Elaine Walter <ewalter01@cox.net>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 1:28 PM
To: Hannah Bleam
Subject: Condo Hi Rise 7th St/Thomas

Hannah,

I am in favor of the proposed project. I believe it will be an improvement to the area and that this a unique situation. There was a lot of discussion last week in the meeting regarding walkability. In twenty years I have never seen a neighbor walking on Thomas and I am one block south and am on Thomas Rd at a minimum of twice a day. Hopefully the improvements in walkability will keep the high school kids on Thomas as opposed to cutting through on Edgemont. Thank you.

Elaine Walter

Elaine Walter

SAM & ANITA MEANS

380 E. Monte Vista Rd

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

September 27, 2018

Dear Mayor Williams, Councilwoman Laura Pastor, Members of the City Council and Planning Commission, and City Staff,

I am a resident of a mid-town historic district bordering 7th Street (Los Olivos, between 3rd and 7th Street on East Monte Vista Rd.). I write to **wholeheartedly support** the proposal in Rezoning Case No. Z-41-18 for a residential high-rise at the corner of 7th Street and Thomas.

Sincerely yours,

Sam & Anita Means

sam@hellomerch.com

(480) 203-9198