

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, February 17, 2014 8:32 AM  
**To:** COB\_mail  
**Subject:** Fwd: Co7-13-06 Proposed Amendment of Comprehensive Plan (W. Hardy Road)

**Importance:** High

----- Original message -----

**From:**  
**Date:** 02/15/2014 11:08 AM (GMT-07:00)  
**To:** District1 ,DIST2 ,District3 ,District4 ,District5 ,Robin Brigode ,Arlan Colton  
**Subject:** RE: Co7-13-06 Proposed Amendment of Comprehensive Plan (W. Hardy Road)

February 15, 2014

Re: Co7-13-06 Proposed amendment of Comprehensive Plan ( 3400 Block West Hardy Road)

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I live next door to Jim Mazzocco and requested assistance from him last summer regarding the contesting of a proposed amendment to change the current zoning of a large undeveloped desert area south of W. Hardy Road between Maya Court and Sunnyvale Drive. I have good friends and family members who live on Maya Court and who's property abuts the undeveloped acreage. I recently saw a letter that Mr. Mazzocco wrote to the board dated November 14, 2013 and felt compelled to respond, since I brought him into this discussion.

Mr. Mazzocco nor I really have a dog in this fight. Neither of us lives close enough to the area in question to be affected by a rezoning decision however, I have been closely involved with my friends and family, listening to the discussions and watching them having to jump through the bureaucratic hoops in their attempts to express their objections to the county government and having to attend numerous county hearings and neighborhood meetings over this proposed rezoning. Obviously Mr. Mazzocco would like to see Hardy Road be opened between Thornydale and Shannon Road. I respect his opinion and his right as a citizen of Pima county to voice his opinion but I respectfully disagree. I have no problem with Hardy Road not being connected. It hasn't been connected for many years and as far as I know has not been a problem for law enforcement or fire departments because they are very aware of which roads go through and which do not. I know this because I am a retired Tucson police officer and worked in areas of Tucson that had only one access point. Also, by allowing the Maya Court development to have an additional lot on the north end of Maya Court, I find it hard to believe that a two lane road could be constructed, without moving utility lines and purchasing private adjacent land to accommodate the width necessary to provide an adequate buffer for the house on the southwest corner of Maya and Hardy.

A few of Mr. Mazzocco's comments bothered me. First, he states, "I'm sure there are neighbors who live near the closure point that want it to remain closed. That position is self-serving and unreasonable." I think the people who live near the closure have a right to be self-serving. They are the ones most affected by putting a road right next to their home. Furthermore, I don't find that unreasonable in the least.

Secondly, if Hardy Road were to be opened up it would no longer be "lightly travelled" as Mr. Mazocco stated.

I don't know who Joe Murray is, although based on Mr. Mazocco's description I would assume he was a pain in your collective necks. Nevertheless, that was then and this is now. The county approved a comprehensive plan back in the day and most of the people that invested their hard earned income knew what that plan entailed. There are approximately 50 homes that surround the desert in question and if you approximate the capital investment these folks made (based on \$250,000 per home), I estimate their expenses to be about 12.5 million dollars . Do you really think it's fair to these people who invested, knowing that the land would be developed at one home per 3.3 acres, for you to side with developers and let it be changed to medium density? If you do, you should be ashamed. If you do, you don't represent your constituency. Your voters invested, based in part on a plan that you, the elected officials approved and now they are, " the new Joe Murray's" and are self-serving? I think not. I think you should take a little ride out to this area and really give careful consideration to what is being proposed. Even if you just look on a map you will see this area of the county has plenty of medium to high density housing. Allowing the current plan allows for a wildlife corridor for numerous species of animals that currently inhabit this area. Furthermore, I think you should have enough respect for these residents to properly represent them and vote no to this change.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Robert Huff  
3211 W. Picasso Place  
Tucson, AZ 85742

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Monday, February 17, 2014 6:58 PM  
**To:** COB\_mail  
**Subject:** Fwd: Co7-13-06

----- Original message -----

From: "Dr. Campbell"  
Date: 02/17/2014 3:38 PM (GMT-07:00)  
To: Robin Brigode  
Subject: Co7-13-06

February 16, 2014,

Dear, Robin Brigode

I am again writing an e-mail in protest of the proposed amendment to the Pima County Comprehensive Plan with regard to Co7-13-06. This property was zoned Suburban Ranch for multiple reasons. The properties just to the north are 3.3 acre lots and the folks who purchased that land were asked to hand clear their lots preserving plant and animal species. There has been no evidence presented by Mr. Portner, Red Pointe, or the Zoning Commission that reveals any pressing need for higher density housing and the destruction of this habitat. If this property were developed at one home per 3.3 acres, this could be a win win win situation. Mr. Portner et al make a profit, more revenue is produced in taxes and our investments continue to be assets. Why should we help Mr. Portner et al maximize their profits at our expense?

One of the unique aspects of Co7-13-06 is that there is no road access to it. The other properties being discussed have major thoroughfares running alongside them. Hardy Road was closed and the property has been sold including the right of way of the road. No one has any desire to give up property they have purchased and invoking eminent domain would be the only way to augment ingress or egress.

Mr. Portner has stated that Co7-13-06 would be the easiest (least costly to the builders) to develop. While taking a full course load in college and veterinary school I worked full time in human hospitals. These critical care patients were strangers to me, but they could have been you, your friend or your loved one. I cared for them and their well being and did everything in my power to advocate for them, make them comfortable and help them become whole again. I put myself at risk in many ways. I do the same with your precious animals. I have witnessed progress and it warms my soul. Easy is no excuse to line one's pockets at the expense of others.

What will occur if the Comprehensive Plan is amended is not progress. It will only encourage and embolden people with a misplaced sense of power to cheapen others' lives for their own self-serving motives.

Ann Campbell, DVM  
8761 N. Maya Ct.

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 18, 2014 7:44 AM  
**To:** COB\_mail  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition to Co7-13-06 HARDY-THORNYDALE I ASSOCIATES, ET AL. - W. HARDY ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT to be considered for a zoning change from the current Low Intensity Urban 0.3 (LIU 0.3) to Medium Intensity Urban (MIU).

Robin Brigode  
Pima County Clerk of the Board  
130 W. Congress St., 5<sup>th</sup> Fl  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
(520)724-8449

---

**From:** Gilbert Williams [mailto:  
**Sent:** Monday, February 17, 2014 4:46 PM  
**To:** Robin Brigode  
**Subject:** Opposition to Co7-13-06 HARDY-THORNYDALE I ASSOCIATES, ET AL. - W. HARDY ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT to be considered for a zoning change from the current Low Intensity Urban 0.3 (LIU 0.3) to Medium Intensity Urban (MIU).

Dear Ms. Brigode,

Can you please make sure Ms. Miller and the other Supervisors get the following letter. I did send it to their individual e-mail addresses earlier.

Thank you very much,

Gilbert Williams

February 17, 2014

Ms. Ally Miller  
Supervisor, District 1  
Pima County Board of Supervisors  
130 W. Congress, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Tucson, Arizona 85701-1317

Dear Supervisor Miller,

I am writing to reiterate our opposition to the request from Mr. Portner, representing Red Point Development, to amend the Pima County Comprehensive Plan, allowing the property referenced as Co7-13-06 HARDY-THORNYDALE I ASSOCIATES, ET AL. - W. HARDY ROAD PLAN AMENDMENT to be considered for a zoning change from the current Low Intensity Urban 0.3 (LIU 0.3) to Medium Intensity Urban (MIU).

Allow us to recount the following compelling facts:

- In 2002 similar proposals (Co7-02-12 & Co7-02-13) were successfully opposed.
- On September 25, 2013 the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to deny Mr. Portner's request to amend the Pima County Comprehensive Plan with respect to 4 properties and forwarded the resultant recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Votes were tallied on these 4 properties individually. The vote to deny the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan associated with the 30 acre parcel adjacent to our home (Co7-13-06) was a resounding 6 – 1.
- Numerous letters and overwhelming public comments protesting this amendment have been shared with the Board of Supervisors before, during and since the November 19, 2013 Public Hearing.
- A petition with over 60 signatures protesting the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan was submitted to Board of Supervisors.
- In spite of the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning commission, the written and verbal protests from us and our neighbors, the Board of Supervisors continued the discussion of Mr. Portner's proposed amendments until January 21, 2014. This continuance was offered along with a charge to Mr. Portner of meeting with the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection. In fact, my wife and I, along with a number of our neighbors, left the November 19th hearing with the understanding that we would be invited to participate. To our knowledge no such meeting took place.
- On January 21, 2014 Mr. Portner requested and was granted yet another continuance of the discussions on all of these properties until February 18th. Only then did Mr. Portner arrange a meeting with neighbors.
- We, along with a number of our neighbors attended the "Comprehensive Plan Amendment Neighborhood Meeting" on January 30, 2014 described as "a conceptual exercise and public review process that is required before we can ever proceed with any future detailed plans."
- At the outset of this meeting, Mr. Portner resurrected the concept of joint consideration of all four properties on which he is working. This concept had been put to rest in previous meetings of both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. In fact, the agendas for all of the meetings associated with these proposals, including that planned for tomorrow (February 18, 2013), have included these as separate and distinct agenda items.

We protest vehemently the idea that the property adjacent to our home be considered a bargaining chip in the overall consideration of the four properties in question.

We are tired of this process. It has not been fair, with shifting sands, ignoring of requests, and reversion to discarded ideas.

What has been steadfast has been the opposition to this proposal and good faith on the part of us and our neighbors... your constituents. We continue to come to meetings, many folks taking time off of work, some actually paying others to take over in their absence. We came to the last meeting only to be surprised by the automatic granting of a continuance without even the possibility of input.

Please understand that our opposition to the proposal to alter the Comprehensive Plan does not deny the opportunity for the current or future owner of the land in question to proceed with

development. We purchased our property with full knowledge that the parcel behind our home was zoned to allow 3 homes on each 10 acres (LIU). Although not our dream, we can live with this.

We expect Pima County to honor its Comprehensive Plan. It is your plan and it is our plan. It is what your constituents use to assess what the future will hold for their own neighborhoods and neighborhoods they buy into. Please vote to oppose the proposal to amend it.

Sincerely,

Gilbert and Izabel Williams  
8747 N. Maya Court  
Tucson, Arizona 85742

Phone:

E-mail:

Copies sent to

- c Ramón Valadez, District 2
- Sharon Bronson, District 3
- Ray Carroll, District 4
- Richard Elías, District 5