



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

March 2, 2020

Via Email

Samantha.Keating@phoenix.gov

cc: michael.petersen-incorvaia@phoenix.gov; council.district.4@phoenix.gov

Phoenix Planning Commission

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

Dear Commission Member,

I am president of La Hacienda Historic District, and live at 506 East Catalina Drive. There are three categories of issues, Fundamental, Architectural, and Legal.

- The **Fundamental issues** are:

- 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).

- The **Architectural issues**, that can be addressed, regardless of the unreasonableness of the PCC's position on the **Fundamental issues**, include:

- 1) The tower should have less than 40% glass, steel or other reflective surface.
- 2) The tower should be clad in a stone or similar material to match the predominately Adobe, Spanish Colonial and Mediterranean Revival style homes in the area (adjacent to the golf course and La Hacienda. The neighborhoods are predominately Period Revivals, not mid-century and not modern).
- 3) The tower should incorporate Spanish type accents and roofing.
- 4) The tower should have decks within the structure, not projecting outward.
- 5) The tower should be made from simple materials and have a more simple form.

Resolving the **Architectural issues** will not change our position on the **Fundamental issues**.

- The **Legal issues** contrary to the ordinance passed on Council Woman Pastor’s motion and the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance are:

- 1) The PUD does not incorporate, require, authorize, empower, or even discuss the presence or function of an architectural committee as required by the ordinance.
- 2) The PUD was filed months before neighbors were contacted and we were not worked with at all, as PPC was specifically directed to do.
- 3) Opposition neighbors were excluded from the unauthorized architectural committee, until we objected an Artie Vigil was belatedly added: the committee was formed by PCC with people who don’t care what tower looks like as they think anything new is good, which is plainly not the case and not what the Council Woman directed.
- 4) The unauthorized architectural committee never had anything specific information other than vague renderings, and had no input on the tower itself, which is not what the Council Woman directed.
- 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);
 - provide “design guidelines” that reflect compatible and innovative architecture” Phoenix Zoning Code §671(A)(3);

Request

It is not our desire to prevent reasonable redevelopment by PCC. 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 a recommendation of denial to the City Council in this case, or, stipulations to require:

- maximum height of **85 feet**;
- underground parking;
- 30% ground level open space; and
- architecture that contains design elements more consistent with our historic homes.

Sincerely,

/s/ Robert C. Warnicke
Warnicke Law PLC