

**From:** Bill Stockton

**Date:** September 11, 2013, 4:19:29 PM MST

**To:** <[District1@pima.gov](mailto:District1@pima.gov)>, <[District2@pima.gov](mailto:District2@pima.gov)>, <[District3@pima.gov](mailto:District3@pima.gov)>, <[District4@pima.com](mailto:District4@pima.com)>, <[District5@pima.com](mailto:District5@pima.com)>

**Subject:** Sabino Canyon rezoning project

Dear Supervisors,

We are writing regarding the proposed zoning change on Sabino Canyon between River and Cloud Rd. We

are not opposed to change or growth, but do feel that it is being considered for too many rental units. The area is amazing congested at this point and nothing has been built. Another thing to factor into this is the 39(appx) homes that are being constructed at this time north of St. Alban's Church on Sabino Canyon.

The traffic reports that we have seen show that Sabino Canyon is at it's max now and River is very close. It is our feeling that additional traffic studies need to be done before this can be rezoned.

We live on Winslow Dr which is a posted no thru traffic street between River and Cloud. We are getting traffic now and this will increase. The bridge on River has a posted weight limit and trucks use Winslow now to avoid the bridge.

We realize that this is a major decision for the Board, many against and some in favor. We hope that you will consider further lowering the units that can be built.

Thank you for your time and service to Pima County.

William and Susan Stockton  
3431 N. Winslow Dr  
Tucson, AZ 85750  
298-4374

09/12/2013 04:19 PM  
DISTRICT 1  
DISTRICT 2  
DISTRICT 3  
DISTRICT 4  
DISTRICT 5  
PIMA COUNTY  
CLERK'S OFFICE  
M

**From:** pippersam!  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 08, 2013 6:14 PM  
**To:** District1; DIST2; District3; District4; District5  
**Subject:** co7-13-01

Dear Supervisors

The rezoning applicant has, in their presentations, used large photos of their existing complex at Tanque Verde and Pantano to show us, what to expect their planned project to look like, under the guise " Growing Smart Infill".

Here are the facts of that project:

- \* 85 linear and plain apartment units on about 6 acres.
- \*16 detached single car garages for 175 vehicles +/-
- \*7 trees in the interior open spaces over 6 feet.
- \* total landscaped interior open area approximately 1500 s.f.
- 7 feet between buildings and 8 foot backyards

Just imagine what 150-195 of these units would look like with only 32+/- detached garages for 300-390 vehicles with scorched earth landscaping at the gateway to our great resource, Sabino Canyon.

Please take a drive and see this for yourself!

Also please read about infill below

Please deny this  
38 year Sabino Vista resident  
S. O'Shaughnessy  
S.V.T.A .H.O.A.

SEP 12 12PM 0141 POUKED



Example of an urban infill site-- Wikipedia

In the urban planning and development industries, infill is the use of land within a built-up area for further construction, especially as part of a community redevelopment or growth management program or as part of smart growth. It focuses on the reuse and repositioning of obsolete or underutilized buildings and sites. This type of development is essential to renewing blighted neighborhoods and knitting them back together with more prosperous communities.[1] Redevelopment or land recycling is development that occurs on previously developed land. Infill buildings are constructed on vacant or underutilized property or between existing buildings.[]

## Urban Infill: Overview By Sustainable Cities Institute



S.

Urban infill is defined as new development that is sited on vacant or undeveloped land within an existing community, and that is enclosed by other types of development. The term "urban infill" itself implies that existing land is mostly built-out and what is being built is in effect "filling in" the gaps. The term most commonly refers to building single-family homes in existing neighborhoods but may also be used to describe new development in commercial, office or mixed-use areas.

**From:** David P.Kelly  
**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2013 7:18 PM  
**To:** District1  
**Subject:** My Opinion

Dear Ms. Miller,

As one of your constituents who attended the 8/28/13 meeting on the future of the Cloud Road/Sabino Canyon Road parcel I noted that in the overflow crowd only 1 person approved of the plan. I was not that person.

Here are my specific concerns, quoting from your own Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Report on the project.

TRAFFIC. The DOT says this section of Sabino Canyon Road is already at overcapacity. ~~River Road is at capacity.~~ In addition, these are the primary routes to Sabino Canyon, a major Tucson destination. I surely doubt that Sunrise is way below capacity.

Cloud Road is still under capacity - for now - but more than 6,000 people live up and off Cloud Road and that intersection is their only access to the rest of the world. This includes Canyon Ranch.

The developer suggests Sun Tran might expand its route on Sabino Canyon Road to accommodate the new renters. Wishful thinking or just delusional? People buying "luxury" do not use Sun Tran.

WATER. P & Z's report says in several places - there is not a sufficient water supply. Period.

PROPERTY VALUES. The developer says all this new construction will not affect existing property values. Do you personally really believe that? I certainly don't, nor do my neighbors. How could more congestion be neutral?

BUT MOST IMPORTANT IS - can we trust our elected government officials to stand up for us? This property is zoned for 2 or 3 dwellings per acre. That's what the developers bought. Now they ask (originally) for a 400% increase. Why should our elected representatives not say "No way. Maybe 3-1/2 per acre but no more. You made the deal - live with it". KEEP THE ORIGINAL ZONING DENSITY INTACT. You saw the public opinion for yourself at the meeting. Why would you side with a developer instead of the overwhelming majority of your constituents? Please re-think your support of this project. You'll be happier at the next election.

So my final question to you is this: During the next election cycle, if your opponent put up signs along Sabino Canyon and Cloud reading "This construction brought to you by Allie Miller" would you say "Thanks for the credit" or "Dirty politics"?

David P Kelly  
8201 E Placita Del Oso  
Tucson, AZ, 85750

**From:** Barbara Kelly  
**Sent:** Monday, September 09, 2013 12:43 PM  
**To:** District1  
**Subject:** Re: Co7-03-01 Sabino Canyon and Cloud

Dear Ms. Miller,

I was among the many taxpayers who attended the 8/28/13 meeting on the future of the Cloud Road/Sabino Canyon Road parcel. The overflow crowd for a minimally-publicized meeting during a workday demonstrates the level of opposition to a project of this density on this parcel. Since literally thousands of your constituents are affected, I hope you will consider our concerns.

You asked for specifics. I offer the following from your own Planning and Zoning Commission Staff Report on the project.

1. TRAFFIC is the main problem. The Department of Transportation (pp 6 and 7 of the Staff Report) says this section of Sabino Canyon Road is already overcapacity. River Road, one block up, is at capacity. Cloud Road is still under capacity, but this development's additional traffic would substantially change that.

It's important to note that Cloud Road is the only access to Sabino Canyon Road and the rest of Tucson for thousands of residents who live off Cloud and off Larrea Lane all the way up to Canyon Ranch. Fruchthendler School adds to the volume.

The developer suggests Sun Tran might expand its route on Sabino Canyon Road to accommodate the new renters. That seems unlikely, as is the idea that people who

SEP 12 13 PM 01:41 PM CLK OF BO

12/13

have to get to work and own a car would spend literally hours changing buses to get to other parts of Tucson.

2. WATER. We are all aware of Tucson's serious water issues, underlined by this year's drought. The P and Z report, on pages 5 and 6, states that the development "will likely end up increasing water demand," that the "site is in a "groundwater dependent ecosystem," that "groundwater levels in the area have been declining," and the site "does not have access to renewable and potable water supply".

3. LOCAL RENTAL MARKET. The applicants claim a demand for "luxury" rental housing such as they propose, although Mr. Gugino pointed to 800 rental units a couple of miles north around Kolb and Sunrise. He failed to mention that they generally offer free rent and other incentives to fill their spaces. He also stated that they are adjacent to "million dollar homes," which is untrue.

4. PLANS AND ZONING. The developers acquired the Sabino Canyon/Cloud property knowing it is zoned for up to 3 residences per acre. The applicants have provided no good reason, other than their desire to increase profitability, to change that. It's hard to imagine that they couldn't make money with the current designation.

But other taxpayers in the area also purchased homes based on current zoning of this parcel, and adding so many units would harm them. I can't prove how it affects home values, but can be sure that it will change the look and feel of the neighborhood and make it harder to sell adjacent properties in the future. The fact that Aerie developments set their walls right at the road, with no setback, adds to the negatives.

The P&Z document notes that there are townhomes adjacent but that they are at a density of 2.06 to 4.39 residences per acre. The only one that's more is the one just approved by the Board for a development by this same applicant.

There seems no valid reason to favor this applicant by changing the plan and zoning for this parcel. Because you represent all the people in this district, not just the developers, I urge you to vote against this change.

Barbara Kelly  
8201 E. Placita Del Oso  
Tucson 85750

**From:** pippersam  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 11, 2013 11:27 AM  
**To:** District1; DIST2; District3; District4; District5; Chuck Huckelberry  
**Subject:** CO7-13-01

Co7-13-01  
Sabino Canyon and Cloud Roads

Present LIU zoning allows

- \* 45 new typical Sabino Vista area Homes with attached 2 car garages of 2500-3000 S.F.
- \* Average annual R.E .tax on each home approximately \$2000-2300
  - o Total Tax to Pima County is **\$ 90,000 - \$100,000** annually
  - o Total square footage of new homes with garages is 140,000s.f.+/-
  - o This square footage represents a building to land ratio of about **20%**  
***All vehicles are inside garages***

Applicants requested MHU zoning allows

- \* 195 nonconforming single story apartments with no attached garages of 700-1100 S.F.@
  - o Average annual R.E .tax on each apartment approximately \$500-\$600
  - o Total Tax to Pima County is **\$ 100,000 - \$110,000** annually
  - o Total square footage of new apartments without garages is 200,000 s.f.+/-
  - o This square footage represents a building to land ratio of about **35%**  
***400 vehicles +/- are parked in the open.***

Why, Why do we want to destroy the suburban way of life that 3000 families have enjoyed for years.

I cannot believe the little extra tax money is enough incentive.

Sherrill Stanlg

SEP 12 13 PM 01:41 PM  
CHUCK HUCKELBERRY



Sabino Vista resident since 1975

---

**From:** Michael Berren  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 12, 2013 11:44 AM  
**To:** Joseph Cuffari  
**Subject:** Sabino Canyon Plan/Rezoning

Dear Joseph

I was introduced to you the other day by Mr. Carroll, in the lobby of the Supervisor's offices. Recognizing that Supervisor Miller is quite busy and unable to meet with constituents prior to the next board meeting I thought I would send you an email in the hopes that you will read it and pass it along to her.

Having lived in Sabino Vista Knolls for nearly 30 years I obviously have a vested interest in the area. And my concerns go far beyond what might be referred to as NMBY concerns. Specifically there are four issues I would like Supervisor Miller to think about:

1. Where does she stand on homeowner rights when the issue revolves around the rights of hundreds of neighbors vs. the rights of a developer who has purchased a piece of property with the expressed intent of upzoning his parcel in a manner that is inconsistent with surrounding developments?  
If the proposed development comes to pass potential renters will have freedom choice as to whether or not they want to live in the development. Some will choose to rent and trade off amenities of the development for crowded housing. Others will not want to make that trade off. Still others will choose to rent and at the end of their lease, move on.  
Unfortunately, if the development comes to pass, neighbors who have lived here for decades will have not have that same freedom of choice. We will be forced to drive by this eyesore every day as we leave and enter our neighborhood.
2. I am very supportive of a free market. That being said, the ROI argument of the developer is based on a false premise. Like all property, this piece of land has no inherent "god given" value. It is worth what it is worth. Just because a property owner wants a certain amount of money for the land and a developer was willing to roll the dice and pay that amount .... (based on an anticipated rezoning) does not mean the land is worth the amount paid. I wish my house was worth \$500,000. I wish I had a million dollars in the bank. But it isn't and I don't. And just because a developer might have overpaid for a parcel of land does not mean that the county is responsible for defacto subsidizing the purchase by agreeing to a radical rezoning. If the land would have been purchased for what is worth based on development consistent with the current area, then there would likely be a good return on investment.
3. Is the supervisor aware that protocol suggests that the other four supervisors will not oppose land use issues that are supported by the supervisor of the district where plan and zoning changes are being requested? (At the River Road library meeting the other day Ms. Miller indicated that she is only one of five votes. Given protocol, however, that statement is really not the whole story. The other Supervisors will defer to Supervisor Miller. She is really far more than just one of five vote.)  
While I will not be able to attend the Board of Supervisors meeting when this issue is addressed, I will be hosting a "viewing party" at my house. A number of neighbors will be coming over for a pot luck, to discuss the rezoning and watch an online replay of the web based proceedings.

Please let the Supervisor know that we are hoping that she will represent her constituents on this issue.

Thanks so much

Mike Berren