



Your Property
Your Neighborhood
Your Association

La Cañada/Magee Neighborhood Association, Inc.
~ serving the area since 1977 ~

BOARD MEMBERS

January 15, 2018

Stephen Hildebrand
President 2011-present

To be transmitted by email to the Clerk of the Board for distribution to addressees and copied County recipients:
Julie.Castaneda@pima.gov

Eric Thornton
Vice President

Ally Miller, Supervisor District 1

(vacant)
Executive Secretary

Sharon Bronson, Chair, Pima County Board of Supervisors, Supervisor District 3

Karen Sonnek-Cañez
Treasurer & Coordinator
Acting Recording Secretary

Ramón Valadez, Supervisor District 2

Steve Christy, Supervisor District 4

Kathy Gatto
La Cholla Hills Area Rep

Richard Elías, Supervisor District 5

130 W Congress 11th Floor

Peggy Gerba

Tucson, AZ 85701

Lee Harbers
Liaison, Section 26 Area Rep

RE: January 16 2018 Agenda Item #15: P17RZ00004 North La Cholla Boulevard Rezoning

Donna Heidinger
Liaison, Section 34 Rep
Corresponding Secretary

Dear Honorable Supervisors,

(vacant)

Subsequent to the November continuance, LCMNA members, residents proximate to the subject property, and I have continued to attend the meetings with the developer.

(vacant)

(vacant)

(vacant)

EX-OFFICIO
BOARD MEMBERS

The final meeting between the residents and the developer was held last week on Wednesday evening, January 10. On Friday January 12, I contacted The Planning Center with items I wanted to clarify prior to writing this letter (see attached). The Planning Center, not wanting to speak for the developer, forwarded my request. At this moment (7:30 PM Monday Jan 15) I have had no response from Mr. Arnold.

Gary Bram - consultant

Max Cañez - consultant

David M. Davis, 2009-2011
President Emeritus

Phil Perkins,
Legal Counsel

1. Equestrian Crossing The developer has agreed to consider the safety and well-being of both equestrians and horses at the designated equestrian crossing at the La Cholla/McCarty intersection because slow, noisy, heavy construction vehicles and equestrian crossings are not compatible uses. Equestrian crossings are designated locations that are designed to accommodate the equestrian community. The developer has agreed to mitigate this conflict and ensure the safety of both user groups by utilizing the access granted to his property further south on La Cholla for heavy construction vehicles, if not all construction vehicles.

Betsy Sandlin
Section 27 Area Rep

Stephen W Sisson 1999-2009
President Emeritus

Mike Treece - consultant

Tom Unger - consultant

Peter Vokac, 1980-1998
President Emeritus

2. Traffic The residents have been consistent in their concerns about the residential roadways and the impact of additional traffic. The roads, due to a longtime lack of general maintenance, are in deplorable condition. Residents have little hope of seeing these roads

JAN 16 18 AM 08:12 PC CLK OF PD

repaired or resurfaced any time soon. Because traffic backs up at the La Cholla/McCarty intersection (and in the stacking lane where one can execute a U-turn) causing an interminable wait to go south (especially during peak hours), residents admit to traveling through the residential neighborhood to access La Canada to make a quick right-hand turn and head south from there. New residents will figure this out. Therefore, the residents have asked repeatedly if the developer would be so kind as to move the access for his SFR subdivision to the same access that the apartments will use on La Cholla, thereby reducing the chances of increased traffic on the needy residential roadways. School traffic (buses and cars) also places an unintended load on these inner streets. The people that live there know what the neighborhood traffic is.

To my knowledge, the developer has not acknowledged this concern nor made any effort at mitigating it.

3. Density and established use and ambiance The developer has agreed to CR-4 in lieu of CR-5 because he can do his very same footprint with a CR-4 rezoning, which changes nothing. Section 27 in this part of Pima County is horse property, primarily zoned CR-1 or SH, with several SR parcels remaining. The infill rezonings in this section have been somewhat denser, but none of it accesses the interior roadways of the neighborhood (see attached Section 27 map2). The rezoning to the north of the subject rezoning application is CR-3, with the area adjacent to McCarty Rd remaining CR-1 for two large lot SFR residences. It is not surprising that the residents from Highgate have no concerns with this proposed development because they are not impacted. Their private street leading to their gated community is about 700 feet along McCarty Rd from La Cholla Blvd, and goes nowhere (see attached map1). Highgate residents are in no danger of extra traffic. It is another 400+ feet to the hazardous three-way intersection of Dawn/McCarty, where stop signs are customarily ignored, and further still to the subject property. Of the CR-5 rezonings that have been approved for the northeast corner of La Cholla and on Old Magee Trail, Club Carmel (now Tierra Vida) posed a terrible impact on the adjacent SR parcel, causing the property owner to move her horses. This semi-rural neighborhood is impacted by the denser rezonings. The residents had asked for a CR-2 or CR-3 rezoning. The residents would very much like to have no vehicular access onto McCarty Rd, i.e., a solid wall around the development along McCarty Rd, perhaps eliminating SFR Lot 17 for an access road into the SFR subdivision from the La Cholla access.

Please do not approve anything denser than a CR-4 rezoning, and add a special condition to this rezoning which requires the developer to use his own access on La Cholla for all construction vehicles as well as SFR access, and a solid wall along McCarty Rd.

Thank you very much for your kind attention and consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,



Donna Heidinger, LCMNA Liaison

Subject: Kachina development
Date: 1/12/2018 2:06:14 PM US Mountain Standard Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: bunderwood@azplanningcenter.com
Bcc: [REDACTED]

Hi Brian,

I want to include in my letter to the Supes the mitigation that the developer has offered.

I think I recall that it was stated that he would keep all heavy construction vehicles off of McCarty & that they would use the La Cholla access only, but construction-related p/u trucks and cars, comparable to regular traffic, would still use McCarty. Or is it that ALL construction vehicles will use the La Cholla access?

Was there anything else?

I realize that the rep from Highgate opposed the suggestion of an all apartment development, but they are pretty far away, there will be the Bowers development between them and Kachina, they have their own little road to their gated development, Kachina is already partial apartment, and I am not certain of Kachina's impact on them.

Would the developer consider the all-apartment development option with no access to McCarty Rd?

Thanks for your help.

I want my letter to accurately reflect the developer's effort to mitigate the residents' concerns so that I represent everyone fairly. I'll copy you. Sorry I am not perfectly on top of this but I've been distracted by a death in the family back home. Hopefully my letter should be in by the start of Monday morning.

Donna

Sent from my iPad

Subject: RE: Kachina development
Date: 1/12/2018 4:02:33 PM US Mountain Standard Time
From: bunderwood@azplanningcenter.com

To: [REDACTED]

Hey Mike, how do you think we should respond to Donna?

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

From: Donna Heidinger [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 2:06 PM
To: Brian Underwood <bunderwood@azplanningcenter.com>
Subject: Kachina development

Hi Brian,

I want to include in my letter to the Supes the mitigation that the developer has offered.

I think I recall that it was stated that he would keep all heavy construction vehicles off of McCarty & that they would use the La Cholla access only, but construction-related p/u trucks and cars, comparable to regular traffic, would still use McCarty. Or is it that ALL construction vehicles will use the La Cholla access?

Was there anything else?

I realize that the rep from Highgate opposed the suggestion of an all apartment development, but they are pretty far away, there will be the Bowers development between them and Kachina, they have their own little road to their gated development, Kachina is already partial apartment, and I am not certain of Kachina's impact on them.

Would the developer consider the all-apartment development option with no access to McCarty Rd?

Thanks for your help.

I want my letter to accurately reflect the developer's effort to mitigate the residents' concerns so that I represent everyone fairly. I'll copy you. Sorry I am not perfectly on top of this but I've been distracted by a death in the family back home. Hopefully my letter should be in by the start of Monday morning.

Donna

Sent from my iPad

Subject: RE: Kachina development

Date: 1/12/2018 4:04:17 PM US Mountain Standard Time

From: bunderwood@azplanningcenter.com

To: [REDACTED]

Sorry Donna, I'm sort of the middleman here so I don't want to overstep and say something that Mike wouldn't agree with so I'm forwarding your email on to him.

Be in touch soon,
Brian

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

From: Brian Underwood

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 4:02 PM

To: 'Donna Heidinger' [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Kachina development

Hey Mike, how do you think we should respond to Donna?

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

From: Donna Heidinger [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, January 12, 2018 2:06 PM

To: Brian Underwood <bunderwood@azplanningcenter.com>

Subject: Kachina development

Hi Brian,

I want to include in my letter to the Supes the mitigation that the developer has offered.

I think I recall that it was stated that he would keep all heavy construction vehicles off of McCarty & that they would use the La Cholla access only, but construction-related p/u trucks and cars, comparable to regular traffic, would still use McCarty. Or is it that ALL construction vehicles will use the La Cholla access?

Was there anything else?

I realize that the rep from Highgate opposed the suggestion of an all apartment development, but they are pretty far away, there will be the Bowers development between them and Kachina, they have their own little road to their gated development, Kachina is already partial apartment, and I am not certain of Kachina's impact on them.

Would the developer consider the all-apartment development option with no access to McCarty Rd?

Thanks for your help.

I want my letter to accurately reflect the developer's effort to mitigate the residents' concerns so that I represent everyone fairly. I'll copy you. Sorry I am not perfectly on top of this but I've been distracted by a death in the family back home. Hopefully my letter should be in by the start of Monday morning.

Donna

Attachments: 3

Email thread with Brian Underwood at The Planning Center (3 pages)

Map1 – immediate area of rezoning

Map2 – Section 27

C: C H Huckelberry, Pima County Administrator

Chris Poirier, PCDS

Rick Ellis, PCDOT

Brian Underwood, The Planning Center

LCMNA Board of Directors



