

RE: Case # Z-51-19-4

Here is a summary of items or stipulations included in your March 20, 2019 motion for Case # **Z-41-18-4** in order to **placate** and **appease** residents in the neighborhoods closest to the Phoenix Country Club Tower project, and basically included to **mollify** all the Phoenix area residents who were opposed to the project. These were to be a part of the new PUD filing, Case # **Z-51-19-4**, and **most are not**. (Nearly all are “other” than the stipulations from Planning & Development, as recorded in a March 22, 2019 document, Ordinance G-6525.)

- a) **Building height capped at 110 feet, and could be lower than 110 feet.** Yes, we would like the height of the building lower, **85 feet**. Several ideas have been given to the Developer...Make changes to the amenities deck that sits on top of the parking podium: move it to the top of the building, have 2 smaller ones. By moving the amenities area, the actual footprint of the tower that sits on the parking podium could be enlarged, at the same time the height of the tower could be brought down all while maintaining the same number of condominium units (125). OR, get rid of the parking podium, and put the parking underground...Yes, we know that suggestion costs the developer more \$.
- b) Require **ground level activation**. The PUD application states that there is *potential* for or the *possibility* of activation on the ground level. That is HOGWASH! There is **NO** possibility for ground level activation along 7th St or Thomas Rd. How do you “activate” the concrete wall of a parking podium? Bring in a hot dog cart? Another option: do away with the parking podium and put the parking underground. Then activation on the ground level would be possible.
- c) Require **staggered building heights, to lower levels as they move closer to the curb**. How is this being accomplished with a Condominium tower sitting on top of a parking podium. The conceptual drawings look remarkably similar to the original design from last year’s 15 story tower and where the height is not staggered.
- d) **Form an architectural design committee**. Prior to the PUD submittal in September 2019 (Case # Z-51-19-4), there had been **no** neighborhood outreach nor in-put, **no** effort to contact the neighborhood leaders (Robert Warnicke, Tom Chauncey, or Jeanne Yawger), **AND no architectural design committee**. An architectural committee was pulled together after the PUD submittal and included only people who were in favor of the original 15 story Tower. The developer’s representative said... ***Why would they want anyone who was opposed to the original project on the committee?***
- e) **Create a PUD that builds upon the character of the area, and adjacent neighborhoods**. A tower sitting on top of a parking podium does not reflect the character of the older, historic neighborhoods surrounding 7th St and Thomas Rd., nor the residential properties within the Country Club.
- f) **Streets to explore how to prematurely, and permanently remove the reverse lanes on 7th St from Osborn to McDowell Rd through an extensive, comprehensive usability study**. It’s been a full year since the March 20, 2019 motion and this has not been done and it has not even been started. Seriously, will it ever? 7th St and Thomas area is a nightmare due to the amount of traffic, the suicide lane, and a nightmare for pedestrians. What will it be like once construction begins and ultimately with the addition of 125 new residences on that corner (125+ cars in the area).

- g) **Streets to conduct an assessment on the need for a new traffic signal at the 7th St and Earll intersection.** (Not enough pedestrian traffic to warrant a Hawk light.) Again, it's been a full year since the March 20, 2019 motion and this has not been done and it has not even been started. Will it ever? Ingress and egress from the Country Club's property on 7th St is complicated now due to the amount of traffic and the suicide lane. Construction in the area will make it more difficult, and ultimately so will the addition of 125 new residences on that corner (125+ cars in the area).
- h) **The Club leadership to consider applying for historic preservation status.** Are they considering it? If not, why not?
- i) **The Club to prevent spillover parking to adjacent residential neighborhoods.** The Club does very little now in preventing spillover parking into the Country Club Park historic neighborhood, just south of the Country Club. There were over 65 cars parked down 8th St during the November golf tournament. The Club is giving up over 2 acres of their parking lot to this Condominium project. How is the Club going to prevent the spillover from occurring in the future, during construction, and after the Condominium tower is completed? A couple large events like the golf tournament is one thing. Losing 2 acres of parking means that smaller Club events and gatherings will undoubtedly have spillover parking. This is not acceptable. How do you enforce the Club to manage this issue? Why should the adjacent neighborhoods have to deal with this? **A related question: What is the minimum number of parking spaces the City requires the Club to have for its members and guests and will the Club have that required minimum once they sell the 2+ acres to the developer? This is important and needs to be addressed prior to any City Council vote!**

Respectfully submitted by:
Jeanne Yawger
One of the Neighborhood Leaders