



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

March 16, 2020

Via Email

mavor.gallego@phoenix.gov
council.district.1@phoenix.gov
council.district.2@phoenix.gov
council.district.3@phoenix.gov
council.district.4@phoenix.gov
council.district.5@phoenix.gov
council.district.6@phoenix.gov
council.district.7@phoenix.gov
council.district.8@phoenix.gov

RE: Opposition to Z-51-19 Phoenix Country Club PUD

Dear Mayor and Councilmember,

I am president of La Hacienda Historic District, and live at 506 East Catalina Drive. With this letter, please find **241 petitions** signed by nearby neighbors and citizens across our city that are all concerned by a PUD that violates the promises made in the General Plan. The General Plan says (emphasis added):

- Vacant and underdeveloped land in the older parts of the city should be developed or redeveloped in *a manner that is compatible with viable existing development and the long term character and goals for the area.*

At 65

- Promote and encourage *compatible infill development* with a mix of housing types in neighborhoods close to employment centers, commercial areas, and where transit or transportation alternatives exist.

At 65

- **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 107

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

At 107

- *Locate land uses with the greatest height and most intense uses within limits based on village character, land use needs, infrastructure and transportation system capacity.*

At 107

- 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.*

At 107

- *Protect and enhance the character of each neighborhood and its various housing lifestyles through new development that is compatible in scale, design, and appearance.*

At 107

- Provide high quality urban design and amenities that reflect the best of urban living at an *appropriate village scale.*

At 107

- 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 107

- Enhance the compatibility of residential infill projects by carefully designing the edges of the development to be *sensitive to adjacent existing housing*. Create landscape buffers and other amenities to link new and existing development.

At 107

- *Protect the neighborhood's views of open space, mountains, and man-made or natural landmarks.*

At 107

- *Promote neighborhood identity through planning* that reinforces the existing landscaping and character of the area. Each new development should contribute to the character identified for the village.

At 107

- *Dissimilar land uses often require additional separation* or other measures to achieve compatibility.

At 107

- *Require appropriate transitions/buffers* between neighborhoods and adjacent uses.

At 107

- *Traffic, noise or other factors should not negatively impact* adjacent residential areas.

At 107

- Ensure new development and infill that is *responsive to the historic surroundings* and is *compatible in size, scale, massing, proportion* and materials.

At 110

- *Appropriateness of a specific use must be judged in accord with the character of the surrounding area, parcel size, access and other factors.*

At 192

There are five issues that demonstrate this rezoning application should be denied as presented:

- 1) Height at **110 feet** outside the Village Core and ½ mile from the Light Rail;
- 2) A **two-story parking podium/garage, entombing the corner in concrete** and where the project **turns its back to the corner** supposedly being revitalized;
- 3) **Reduction in open space** required by M-R zoning from 30% to 25% (and the "open space" is primarily on an elevated deck).
- 4) The PUD does not incorporate, require, authorize, empower, or even discuss the presence or function of an architectural committee as required by the ordinance passed last year.
- 5) This PUD violates the criteria for every PUD, as it failed to:

- result from “a collaborative and comprehensive approach”. Phoenix Zoning Code §671(A);
- place appropriate limitations based on the “character and intensity of permitted uses to promote neighborhood compatibility” Phoenix Zoning Code §671(A)(1);
- provide “development standards” that “complement the dimensions and physical features of the site and the character of the neighborhood” Phoenix Zoning Code §671(A)(2);

Request

It is not our desire to prevent reasonable redevelopment by the Phoenix Country Club. We believe that a PUD can be proposed that will provide product “superior to that produced by conventional zoning districts and design guidelines.” Phoenix Zoning Code §671(A).

We request denial of this case *or* stipulations to require:

- maximum height of **85 feet**;
- **underground parking**; and
- **30% ground level open space**.

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert C. Warnicke
Warnicke Law PLC