



August 16, 2019

Mr. Steven Methvin
Chief Operating Officer
City of Tempe
31 East 5th Street
Tempe, AZ 85282

Dear Steven:

On behalf of Arizona State University (ASU), we appreciate the City of Tempe's (City) continued interest in seeking input from ASU regarding the City's draft Urban Core Master Plan. As we have noted in prior discussions with City staff, Andrew Ching and the Tempe City Council, ASU takes great pride in the planning and design of our great city and how the Tempe Campus integrates into the entire fabric of Tempe. When we consider the Tempe Campus environment, we envision not just the core campus, but also the areas that are adjacent to the Tempe Campus. As the City continues to move the Urban Core Master Plan through the public process, we think it is important to reiterate some of our continuing concerns related to the draft plan's increased height and density entitlement for parcels in the downtown.

The purpose of this written input is to help ensure that the future development immediately adjacent to the Tempe Campus is both consistent and compatible with the character and functionality of the campus. Over the last several years, we have been working in partnership with the City to ensure the safety of students, faculty, staff, operations and community members at large as they travel around and through the campus. For example, the purpose of the joint Small Area Transportation Study commissioned by the City and ASU, at the request of the Mayor, was to determine the types of future roadway and other transportation infrastructure that may be needed to accommodate the growth and development in downtown Tempe and on the Tempe Campus. Infrastructure options outlined in the study included, among other items, more pedestrian bridge crossings and improvements at the Loop 202 and Rural Road and at the Loop 202 and McClintock. While the Urban Core Master Plan addresses some of the recommendations of the Small Area Transportation Study, it does not outline how the recommended infrastructure will be funded and by whom.

The new height and density entitlement appears to be placed on various parcels without a full consideration of the impact on the surrounding parcels or the roadways. In order to protect the frontages around the Tempe Campus, we feel very strongly that new development adjacent to the Tempe Campus along the frontages of College Avenue, north of University Drive, on University Drive, and on Rural Road should have a 90' maximum height and a setback of least 50-60 feet deep from the pedestrian way. In addition, the setback should include a maximum setback for a minimum ten (10') foot-wide pedestrian area and a landscape buffer from the street edge. This is a similar buffer to what the plan proposes for Mill Avenue between University Drive and 3rd Street, and adjacent to the residential neighborhoods.

As ASU continues to develop, the University has financially contributed to positive transportation solutions not only by funding a joint traffic study with the city, but also as part of the development of ISTB7, ASU is paying for the first new pedestrian bridge over University. The University also is contributing to the cost of the modern streetcar, and has contributed land to new traffic lanes in key areas of downtown adjacent to and on the Tempe Campus.

If the City is going to give additional density and height to these properties, the properties also should contribute to pedestrian safety and traffic solutions. During the entitlement process for NOVUS, in order to achieve certain heights and density in NOVUS, Catellus was required by the City to outline the types of infrastructure and/or mitigation measures the developer would be required to install in order to achieve the specified height and/or density. If the City is allowing this type of additional density in the downtown and Apache area, we would like the City to state in the plan that in order to achieve this height and density, the landowner also must contribute to the infrastructure and public safety services requirement in the area.

As the City increases in density and intensity, the City must also provide for the design and transportation mitigation measures that will ensure a safe and enjoyable pedestrian environment. Over the last several years, the City and ASU have engaged in conversations related to the "big ideas" that should be implemented in the future. This Urban Core Master Plan gives the City the opportunity to include all the property owners in a conversation to implement the big ideas. Through the draft Urban Core Master Plan, it appears the City is considering giving new height and density entitlement to various property owners in the downtown area without requiring them to contribute to the transportation or public safety infrastructure necessary to accommodate this increase in height and density. As part of the conversation with property owners, the City should require that property owners who benefit from height and density also should contribute to the big ideas and plans that ASU and Tempe have discussed over the last two years.

The Urban Core Master Plan also should provide for a comprehensive, effective circulation system around the Tempe Campus and the Downtown Area that serves both vehicles and pedestrians. The City should not encourage intensity without also outlining a specific plan to mitigate and address the intensity. We believe it is imperative the Urban Core Master Plan implement the key findings from the joint traffic study. We would like to see more emphasis placed on congestion mitigation and pedestrian safety in the Urban Core Master Plan.

Together, ASU and the City have a unique opportunity to plan a pedestrian-scaled community amongst the height and density that has developed within the City of Tempe's urban core. The massing, scale and pedestrian emphasis that ASU supports is not unique to our area. There are many successful, pedestrian scale urban cores, for example Denver, which emphasize variation in building heights and relief from the taller buildings. We believe it is important that this Urban Core Master Plan emphasize a positive, safe pedestrian experience and maintain an active environment for all of the various users of downtown Tempe.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments. We urge the City to review the recommendations of the Small Area Transportation Study and think about how all property owners can contribute to developing a safe, pedestrian scale downtown. We appreciate your attention to our concerns and we look forward to working with you, City Manager Andrew Ching and the Tempe City Council through this process.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Morgan R. Olsen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "M" and "O".

Morgan R. Olsen
Executive Vice President, Treasurer and CFO

Cc: Andrew Ching

Levesque, Ryan

From: matt@colabstudio.com
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2019 4:34 PM
To: Adhikari, Ambika
Cc: Levesque, Ryan; Weaver, Chad; 'Philip Amorosi'; 'Kevin Moore'
Subject: RE: Declined: FW: Development Bonus Program for TOD and UCMP - Discussion with Developers, Architects and Zoning Attorneys

Ambika-

I've been a proponent of the UCMP process. I want to see this be very valuable for our city, the planning staff, developers, and the community. Right now the documents, as presented, are causing big concerns from everyone.

I have not had the time to go through all the documents carefully, though I find what seem to be errors in the places I look. This may actually be a lack of understanding the purpose of the various documents. If that is the case, I doubt I'll be the only one misinterpreting the documents, which is problematic for everyone moving forward.

So- having said all of that these are my comments:

1. I spoke to Ambika on the phone about the entire UCMP effort, and have a better understanding of the three parts of this effort. Per my conversation, this is my understanding (I hope I have it right- or at least close to correct):
 - a. The new TOD, called something akin to "Urban Code District," creating new standards for various properties that people can choose to opt in or opt out of when they make changes to their properties. And that the Option is due to prop 207. Makes sense.
 - b. UCMP is the property-by-property master plan of the area to show developers which properties follow which densities- to make it clear where the big densities are and where they aren't. Also Makes sense.
 - c. General Plan Amendment, which allows the UCMP standards and densities to govern moving forward. Sure- an amendment has to happen to make it cohesive, so this makes sense.
2. Before I get into specifics, I should say that there is inadequate explanation as to what the various documents are and how they will be used. That Ambika had to describe the above three sections to me verbally is not a good sign. There really should be a document on the website (right now) that describes the above. THAT document should then provide the links to the various parts.
 - a. The documents "Ordinance with Attachments" and "Resolution with Attachments" have no summary at the beginning as to their purpose except legal language ordinances that are not adequate to explain what they are- only what city staff need to see.
 - b. "Ordinance with Attachments" goes from the legal language of the ordinance directly into 60 pages of property addresses. Many people would never bother to get past those pages to see the documents that follow. These should be an addendum at the back of the document- not at the front.
 - c. The maps up front are a good idea on and "Resolution with Attachments"- but without any explanation of the three sections Ambika explained to me, one is left wondering what the different maps in the two documents mean and how they will be used. I honestly thought they were different ways to describe the same information. This was confusing because what appear to be the same maps in the two documents show different density information at the same properties. Which, even with the idea of the three documents purposes, is still confusing and misleading. Again- I didn't have a chance to read through carefully- but I shouldn't have to do that to understand the purposes, should I? Shouldn't there be something up front that describes this sort of information? Planning documents need to start off with an overview of the documents involved and the purpose/function of what one is about to review. When

you have THREE efforts going on simultaneously- there should be three times the effort to make everything clear to the public.

- d. Both of the two documents I reference above “Ordinance with Attachments” and “Resolution with Attachments” have no title to them. They both start off with “Resolution No. R2019.xx” and then have different legal language. Then there are maps with no real tie to how they are meant to be used. THEN, later in the documents...
 - i. “Attachment C; Final Draft, Zoning and Development Code.... Part 5a-special district” And I’m on page 66. Why on page 66 do I find out what I’m reading? As I give other comments I’m going to call this document: “Zoning Code” just to make it easy on my typing hands.
 - ii. “Tempe Urban Core Master Plan; draft August 2019” is on page 11. Better, but not enough to understand what I’m looking at after the maps. And then on page 1 of the actual plan it starts to lay out what the objectives were/are. But, again, nothing describing how it will be used adjacent to the other document. I’m going to call this document: “UCMP”
3. In my first viewing I found what appeared to be errors between maps because the same properties had different densities shown on them between 5A-100-5, Figure 5A-102A shows UC-5 along Hudson Manor’s neighborhood’s entire northern border, which is clearly different from Figure 13 on page 36 of the UCMP, which shows much higher density, including marking several single-family home lots as high density. That last part has to be an error, right? Why would anyone mark those four single-story, single-family homes to have a max height of 55’?
 - a. At the meetings I attended, I spoke to the SOM planner, Chris, and Ambika about the height limits in the orange UC-5 areas on Figure 5A-102A map and was assured they met the same standards of the General Plan: 25 Du/Acre and 45’ building height. But in the description from the “Zoning Code” it states 60 feet. This is unacceptable to me as a representative of CVAC, and will be very problematic to the cultural resource neighborhoods (CRN’s) such as Hudson Manor and Borden.
 - b. Why would there be a map (Figure 13 & Figure 14) that show different standards for properties (I’m using the example along Hudson Manor’s north edge) that have different properties than the map in 3.a above? This is really confusing. Understanding the opt-in/opt-out issue, this makes more sense- but this was never made clear in the meetings I attended. Phil agrees that he never heard the opt-in/opt-out process in the presentations he attended.
 - c. Phil kept saying, “there’s an error on this map because you are showing too much density on this map on single-family properties” talking about Figure 13. It never got addressed. And no one ever, apparently, explained why it was showing different densities on FA-102A. Very confusing.
 - d. So- let’s assume that the Figure 13 & 14 are the opt-in scenario and FA-102A is the “opt-out” scenario. Do I even have that right? Not sure. Assuming it is correct- with the UCMP attempting to get into detail down to each property- why would any map show 6-8 stories next to CRN’s? That type of height is WAY to high to protect the CRN’s, no matter what the developers offer for bonus heights.
 - e. Even the 60’ building height shown in the “Zoning Code” for UC-5 is too high. It should be sticking to 45’ height against these neighborhoods.
4. The step-back rule is totally unclear. What I gathered from looking at the table 5A-105A in the “zoning code” on page 15, was that there was no step-back required for UC-5.
 - a. Sure there is a footnote #1 for building height. But when I was looking for step-back, it appeared it wasn’t required.
 - b. Why increase the height from 30’ (old step-back rule) to 40’? Our neighbors will totally reject that increase.
 - c. And why not have the table show that there is a step-back depending on the surroundings? Footnote #2 for step-back says it only pertains to Mill Ave area. So- again, when I’m looking for the step-back rules, why is it only in a footnote? That is confusing and will cause problems down the road. It should be more clear.
5. I’ll state this clearly: There should not be any option against CRN’s that allows for higher building height, higher height for step-back provisions, or greater density than what we have been dealing with through the General Plan. 25 DU/Acre, 45’ building height, and 30’ high start to the step-back.
6. On one hand, I don’t really mind the opt-in choices- more ways to ‘skin the cat’. But, coming at it from the developer/architect’s standpoint, you just doubled my reading/drawing/discussion/planning time along with

adding a lot of complication in figuring out pro-formas and what not. Now- having said that, we LOVE having options as architects and developers. But when clients are looking over sites and ask me to give them options, there are two ways these things happen:

- a. Most of the time, architects do this type of work on spec, meaning they won't get paid for it unless the project actually gets past the DRC. And this process just doubled their working time, meaning they can only chase half the projects they used to. The developer doesn't mind it because it's free to them. But he does have to do double the pro-formas to see which option has the most value.
 - b. Sometimes the architects get paid. The developer now has to pay twice the fee for the architect's time. Plus he has double the pro-formas.
 - c. So I'm worried this will chase away developers from Tempe's process. There are already developers that, as one put it to me, "wouldn't bother building an outhouse in Tempe" because of how difficult and complicated the process is right now- before the UCMP and new district option.
7. I'm torn on how this effort will effect things. Phoenix and Mesa's form-based codes worked out pretty well. Though they went through really difficult first year or two to smooth out the issues. Is Tempe working with those cities to determine how to trouble-shoot our plan before it gets approved? I sure hope so. Seems a smart way to limit the fallout. Maybe late-now is better than never if it hasn't started.

In closing, the way the information has been presented is already causing confusion, anger, and anxiety. I'm not sure these emotions can be fixed prior to the October vote to approve these measures. And if it isn't fixed, people will have it set in their mind this effort is very bad for them/Tempe and will fight every proposed development even more emotionally and strenuously- which makes everyone's job more difficult:

The developers
The architects
The city planners & staff
The DRC
City Council
Neighborhood community populous
And last but not least: CVAC

So: yikes. Please get this right and get it done right quick or we all have more problem on our hands.

Thank you for your attention to my comments.

m

Matthew Salenger, AIA

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] 85281

[REDACTED]

matt@colabstudio.com

www.colabstudio.com

The logo for COLAB, with 'CO' in a smaller font and 'LAB' in a larger, bold font, all in a light gray color.

From: Adhikari, Ambika <Ambika_Adhikari@tempe.gov>

Sent: Thursday, August 15, 2019 10:22 AM

To: matt@colabstudio.com

Cc: Levesque, Ryan <ryan_levesque@tempe.gov>; Weaver, Chad <Chad_Weaver@tempe.gov>
Subject: RE: Declined: FW: Development Bonus Program for TOD and UCMP - Discussion with Developers, Architects and Zoning Attorneys

Matt

Many thanks for your e-mail and for your support of the UCMP.

Can you pls send us list of issues , comments, and suggestions you have on the plan.

We have DRC meeting on the 26th, and the documents needs to be finalized and uploaded to the web next Tuesday.

If you can send your comments to us by COB Friday, or early Monday, that will be greatly appreciated. We would like to address your comments on the draft.

Thank you.

Ambika



Ambika P. Adhikari, AICP
Principal Planner | Long Range
Community Dev | Planning Div.
31 E 5th St | Tempe AZ 85281
480 350 8367 | ambika_adhikari@tempe.gov

-----Original Appointment-----

From: matt@colabstudio.com <matt@colabstudio.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 14, 2019 6:12 PM

To: Adhikari, Ambika

Subject: Declined: FW: Development Bonus Program for TOD and UCMP - Discussion with Developers, Architects and Zoning Attorneys

When: Thursday, August 15, 2019 2:30 PM-4:30 PM (UTC-07:00) Arizona.

Where: Don Cassano Rm, Tempe Transportation Ctr., 200 E 5th St., Tempe

I did know about it, Ambika, but I have a prior business engagement at that time. Thank you so much for thinking of me, though. I do really appreciate it.

I've been a big supporter of the UCMP effort, as you know. I like what the goals have been. There are a LOT of issues with the current draft of the UCMP. Its problematic. I'm spending a lot of time considering writing a letter saying there should be a delay on a council vote until the errors are fixed and some of the major questions are ironed out.

Subject: FW: HP in the UCMP

On Tue, Aug 13, 2019 at 1:07 PM s siefer <stu_siefer@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hello Ryan,

Thank you very much for forwarding the revised UCMC. I was very pleased to see the modifications that you have made in the document in response to our recommendations with regard to:

1. Adding some of our requested language putting a firmer emphasis on historic preservation;
2. Identifying the "Historic Core" on some of the maps.
3. Adding Chapter 1.4 on Historic Preservation Guidelines to be applied to existing and new projects in the Historic Core.

With regard to building heights, we understand and appreciate the constraints imposed by the TOD and the existing Zoning Ordinance, however one of our major concerns is that buildings of up to 90' high will be permitted along the entire length of Mill from Third Street to University, including the Historic Core. Most would agree that buildings of this size along the street would greatly detract from, if not destroy the historic scale and character of the "Core". If we are unable reduce these height requirements due to zoning restrictions, we would like to make sure that any tall buildings be stepped back substantially to not interfere with the historic streetscape. Twenty foot step backs have been proposed, however a 90' building hovering over our 20'-35' high historic buildings will be overwhelming even with a 20' step back and would be inconsistent with the Historic Preservation Guidelines which are part of this document which state:

"When feasible, heights of new buildings should generally be consistent with the heights of existing buildings in the historic district, block or adjoining buildings."

It would therefore be our recommendation that on page 30, bubble 7 "Shape Infill Redevelopments on Mill Avenue, South of 3rdSt, after "Maintain and preserve the character and scale of" add: *"the Historic Core by limiting the building heights along Mill Avenue and side streets to no more than 45' for the first 30' of depth, after which heights may increase to those allowable in the district with additional step backs in accordance with the Design Guidelines."* Reference to these requirements should be made at the bottom of Figures 3, 5 and 11. Other reasonable proposals to accomplish this outcome would be considered.

We would like to make a few other points:

1. The Historic Core is not yet referenced on Figures 6 and 11.

2. Stipulate height regulations at bottom of all height maps for Historic Core
3. Page 3. Note typos after “Territorial Period...”
4. Page 29. After “Respect Heritage Sites... should read “west” of Ash, not ‘east”.
5. I failed to mention this earlier, but I would suggest identifying the following projects as part of Historic Core on the height maps: Hayden House, Hayden Flour Mill, Casa Loma and Olde Towne Square.

Don't let any of these comments diminish our appreciation for all you have already done to protect our historic resources in the UCMP update. Your changes certainly go a long way to assure that the historical roots and character will continue to remain a key part of the growing downtown fabric.

Do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions on this letter.

I am planning to appear at the DRC hearing this evening to discuss these points.

Sincerely,
Stu Siefer
Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation

From: Levesque, Ryan <ryan_levesque@tempe.gov>
Sent: Friday, August 9, 2019 4:25 PM
To: s siefer <stu_siefer@hotmail.com>; Methvin, Steven <Steven_Methvin@tempe.gov>; Aaron, Robbie <Robbie_Aaron@tempe.gov>; Smith, Alex <Alex_Smith@tempe.gov>; Southard, John <John_Southard@tempe.gov>; Weaver, Chad <Chad_Weaver@tempe.gov>
Cc: Dawn Hart <Dawn_Hart@gensler.com>; Joe Nucci <joenucci@gmail.com>; Karen Adams <KLAdams@asu.edu>; Darlene Justus <d_justus@cox.net>; Karyn Gitlis <karyn.gitlis@gmail.com>; Adhikari, Ambika <Ambika_Adhikari@tempe.gov>
Subject: RE: HP in the UCMP

Hi Stu,
Thank you for following up with us!
In the fever of finalizing the documents for the Urban Core Master Plan and TOD related ordinance amendments, we forgot to circle back to the group.

Thursday morning, the final public draft documents have been loaded to the website, and links available to the August 13th Development Review Commission hearing (the first of 4 hearings).

We had the chance to incorporate two pages into UCMP plan draft, focused on Historic Preservation Guidelines. I am attaching a memo sent to the Historic Preservation Commission and the attachment of the new pages related to preservation. We hope the document added pages is well received. The UCMP maps reflect the defined area of the Downtown's "Heritage Core", continuing the verbiage that developed out of the Downtown Community Design Principles, Height Study (Thank you Mark Vinson).

We look forward to the public hearing process and any further input on the plans and draft ordinance.

Ryan Levesque
Deputy CD Director - Planning
City of Tempe, Community Development

From: s siefer <stu_siefer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2019 3:30 PM
To: Methvin, Steven <Steven_Methvin@tempe.gov>; Aaron, Robbie <Robbie_Aaron@tempe.gov>; Levesque, Ryan <ryan_levesque@tempe.gov>; Smith, Alex <Alex_Smith@tempe.gov>; Southard, John <John_Southard@tempe.gov>; Weaver, Chad <Chad_Weaver@tempe.gov>
Cc: Dawn Hart <Dawn_Hart@gensler.com>; Joe Nucci <joenucci@gmail.com>; Karen Adams <KLAdams@asu.edu>; Darlene Justus <d_justus@cox.net>; Karyn Gitlis <karyn.gitlis@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: HP in the UCMP

Hi Steve, Chad et al,
I'm checking to see if you had a chance to respond to our requests regarding the UCMP regarding: 1. language modifications; 2. inclusion of "Historic Core" into UCMP maps and 3. Reference to *Secretary of Interior Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings*. We were hoping to receive some direction prior to the DRC hearing on Tuesday.

Sincerely,
Stu Siefer
Tempe Historic Preservation Foundation
[REDACTED]

From: Methvin, Steven <Steven_Methvin@tempe.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2019 2:12 PM
To: Joe Nucci <joenucci@gmail.com>; Stu Siefer <stu_siefer@hotmail.com>; Aaron, Robbie <Robbie_Aaron@tempe.gov>; Karen Adams <KLAdams@asu.edu>; Karyn Gitlis <karyn.gitlis@gmail.com>; Darlene Justus <d_justus@cox.net>; Levesque, Ryan <ryan_levesque@tempe.gov>; Smith, Alex <Alex_Smith@tempe.gov>; Southard, John <John_Southard@tempe.gov>; Weaver, Chad <Chad_Weaver@tempe.gov>
Cc: Dawn Hart <Dawn_Hart@gensler.com>
Subject: RE: HP in the UCMP

Thanks Joe

From: Joe Nucci <joenucci@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2019 11:57 AM
To: Stu Siefer <stu_siefer@hotmail.com>; Aaron, Robbie <Robbie_Aaron@tempe.gov>; Karen Adams <KLAdams@asu.edu>; Karyn Gitlis <karyn.gitlis@gmail.com>; Darlene Justus <d_justus@cox.net>; Levesque, Ryan <ryan_levesque@tempe.gov>; Methvin, Steven <Steven_Methvin@tempe.gov>; Smith, Alex <Alex_Smith@tempe.gov>; Southard, John <John_Southard@tempe.gov>; Weaver, Chad <Chad_Weaver@tempe.gov>
Cc: Dawn Hart <Dawn_Hart@gensler.com>
Subject: HP in the UCMP

Thanks to each of you for your interest in including the Preservation perspective in the current landuse planning process. As discussed today the UCMP develops several planning contexts in detail and provides guidelines to communicate the issues specific to Urban Design, Development, Public Realm, and Sustainability. As an aid to bringing historic preservation into focus at the Historic Core, I urge inclusion of the Secretary of the Interior's *Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings* attached hereto.

The Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings were initially developed in 1977 to help property owners, developers, and Federal managers apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation during the project planning stage by providing general design and technical recommendations. Unlike the Standards, the Guidelines are not codified as program requirements

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation/rehab/entrance01.htm>



Virus-free. www.avast.com

APACHE PARK, LLC

██████████
Tempe, AZ 85281

T: ██████████
F: ██████████

August 22, 2019

Ryan Levesque, Deputy Com. Develop. Director
Community Development Department
31 E. 5th St.
Tempe, AZ 85281
T: (480) 858-2393 / Ryan_Levesque@Tempe.gov

Re: C.O.T. 2040 PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS
N.E. CORNER OF APACHE AND PRICE

Dear Ryan;

Please consider this request and also please forward to the Development Review Commission for the August 26, 2019 hearing.


I am recommending a high density designation for the N.E. Corner of Apache and Price. This includes Parcels: #135-41-035H, #135-41-035G, #135-41-045, #135-41-24A, #135-41-25B, #135-41-036A, #135-41-024C, #135-41-025C, #135-41-025E.

These represent all parcels west of the C.O.T. property, and total approximately 4.44 acres. The owners have a common vision of assembling those parcels into a high density mixed use proposal. This is an immediate project which is in the conceptual stage at this time.

Currently, the south half of all the parcels is proposed for high density, and the north half of all the parcels is designated as "Cultural Resource Area" (C.R.A.). This represents a superficial boundary that cuts east-west through the middle of these common ownership parcels. We are requesting to be excluded from the C.R.A. designation. All of the parcels are vacant; therefore, no persons or structures need to be disturbed or relocated. Further, the C.O.T. will not receive any complaints from any owners. An approval of this request will provide McArthur Dr. as a more logical, physical transition boundary between high density and single family uses. McArthur Dr. is also the northern border of the "urban core" district.

We hope you can see the value of this proposal which would help to achieve the long term goals of development along the VMR corridor.

Thank you for your consideration.


Sam Hanna, PE
Managing Member
Apache Park LLC

T: ██████████

sam@hannadevelopment.net

The UCMP is a rush to a no take-backs disaster

The urgency to approve the Urban Corp Masterplan is disgraceful. This plan is a rush to take property rights away from citizens without adequate input through a proper planning process. The process conducted by corporate stranger/big guns from LA was an extraordinarily expensive and out of touch with the realities on the ground in Tempe process. Realities include a just about due legitimate process (as opposed to totally top-down) renewal of the General Plan. The UCMP abrogates the rights of Tempe citizens regarding the General Plan they previously voted to approve. City staff, and I fear City Councilmembers, are pushing this process to increase development rights they are already unconscionably cavalier about. Higher and denser should not be approved without the care that goes into the creation of a new General Plan, which is due way too soon to summarily approve this document. Is the City Council really ready to go forward with a plan that is despised by many Tempe residents? I am thinking here especially of those living in the area and bemoaning the lack of affordable housing and being priced out of the neighborhoods. Many see this as a bald attempt to increase the densities in and around the downtown without any consideration of the traffic nightmare and the infrastructure strain that already ensue. I believe it is up to the City Council to slow down this train until a more holistic planning process, i.e., the General Plan Process, can be put into place. Between the ASU Novus plans and COT Staff intent to allow 90 feet in height on Mill Avenue we are looking down the road at growth that will be neither sustainable nor livable.

Karyn Gitlis, August 13, 2019