

**From:** Patty Dean

**Date:** August 30, 2013, 1:32:07 PM MST

**To:** "district1@pima.gov" <district1@pima.gov>

**Subject:** Sabino Canyon rezoning

Dear Supervisor Miller,

I attended the meeting you held on Wednesday, August 28th, 2013 regarding the rezoning of the 15 acre parcel at Cloud and Sabino Canyon. Attached is my letter that I am sending to you regarding this matter.

I sincerely hope you will take my comments under advisement.

Patricia A Dean

SEP 12 13AM 10:40 PM CLK-L-BD

42

District 1 Supervisor Ally Miller

130 W.Congress 11<sup>th</sup> floor

Tucson, AZ 85701

August 30, 2013

RE: Rezoning Co7-13-01 Sabino Canyon Road Property

Dear Supervisor Miller,

I am writing to urge you to vote NO on the rezoning of the property located at the corner of Sabino Canyon and Cloud Road. I attended the meeting that you held on August 28<sup>th</sup> and you stated that you wanted to know how we the residents felt about this development. I can't imagine that after that meeting there is any doubt in your mind where the residents of Sabino Vista and surrounding neighborhoods feel. This proposal of 13 or more units per acre as requested by the developers is not in keeping with the current neighborhood.

If this parcel is to be developed ( and I believe it will be very soon) it should be in a way that is respectful to the current zoning. Mr Gugino spoke of the apartment complexes and high density housing dotting the Kolb and Sabino Canyon corridors to the north as a reason that his project should go forward . I do not believe that projects done in the late 80's and early 90's before the public's awareness of Sonoran Desert conservation and the increasing strain on our infrastructure is a valid reason to move forward with such a high density housing option. A project that would allow for extensive greenbelt areas on the perimeter of the property and well as lower density on the interior would be more appropriate for this corner and fitting for our established neighborhood.

I urge you to tour the Aerie projects that Mr. Gugino has already built, see the surrounding neighborhoods at his River project and the Thornydale and Ina project. You will see that those sites are very different from this Sabino Canyon site. A more thoughtful project can be done with these 15 acres but only if the Board of Supervisors demand it.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Dean

SEP 12 13 AM 10:40 HC CLK/D/ED

**From:** Janette Graunke

**Date:** August 30, 2013, 11:27:13 AM MST

**To:** Ally Miller <[District1@pima.gov](mailto:District1@pima.gov)>

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

**Subject:** Re-zoning

To: Pima County Board of Supervisors:

I have lived at 7125 East Sabino Vista Circle for 39 years. During that time many changes have happened. Sabino Canyon was widened to 4 lanes, a new and wider bridge over Tanque Verde Wash was built, and many more houses and a condominium complex were added to the community.

The traffic on both Sabino Road and Cloud Road is heavy now and adding units that would add 3000 or more people and their cars would add an unworkable congestion to the already burdened intersection and streets. River Road has more traffic now than ever and would be stressed to handle more. Also, an unbearable traffic congestion would develop at Sabino Canyon Road and Tanque Verde Road that now has been rebuilt to its maximum capacity.

A community that is similar to the other three built at the intersection of Sabino Road and Cloud Road would be welcome. I have always been aware that the vacant 15.14 acres would be developed, but have trusted that Pima County would want to keep the development in the Sabino Canyon area as a pleasing entry to the oasis that is Sabino Canyon. Sabino Canyon is a draw, therefore traffic, for residents of the greater Tucson area and for tourists.

I ask of you to deny the developer's request to change from Low Intensity Urban [LIU] to Medium High Intensity Urban [MHIU].

Sincerely, Janette Graunke  
7125 East Sabino Vista Circle  
Tucson, AZ 85750

**From:** KEVIN

**Date:** August 30, 2013, 9:16:28 AM 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.gov](mailto:District4@pima.gov)>, <[District5@pima.gov](mailto:District5@pima.gov)>

**Cc:** <[kevintrisha@comcast.net](mailto:kevintrisha@comcast.net)>, Trisha Mattocks <[emailtrisha@comcast.net](mailto:emailtrisha@comcast.net)>, <[bartelfie@yahoo.com](mailto:bartelfie@yahoo.com)>

**Subject:** Sabino and Cloud Development Reference Co7-13-01

To: Supervisor Ally Miller (Our Supervisor for District 1)

Cc: District 2 Supervisor Ramon Valadez; District 3 Supervisor Sharon Bronson; District 4 Supervisor Ray Carroll; District 5 Supervisor Richard Elias

From: Kevin Mattocks, Trisha Mattocks, Hunter Mattocks, Bart Stephens and Elfie Stephens

We moved to Sabino and Cloud for the QUALITY OF LIFE.

We STRONGLY OPPOSE the change from Low Intensity Urban 3.0 (LIU-3.0) to **Medium-High Intensity Urban (MHIU)**.

This will negatively impact our:

1. Property Values
2. Elementary School population
3. Create Increased Traffic on roads that are already crowded
4. Ground Water Levels { We already have a hard time with the wells right now running out of water)

The developer can use nice words "Casita Style residential rental community" or "Luxury Apartments", but it is still a volume of rentals with transient occupants. **At 24 residences per acre, that is a lot of people overloading this neighborhood.**

SEP 12 12:34:04 PM 2013  
K4

As I do the math that is 24 residences times 15 acres with 3-4 people minimum in each residence.

How would you like 1440 people moving in next door to you?? Yes that is over a thousand people with daily schedules that will affect us.

**THIS COMMUNITY WOULD LIKE TO VOTE FOR REPRESENTATIVES THAT PROTECT US FROM THIS DEVELOPMENT !!!!**

**Best Regards,**

**Kevin Mattocks, Trisha Mattocks, Hunter Mattocks, Bart Stephens, Elife Stephens**

**From:** bob yungert

**Date:** August 29, 2013, 3:35:15 PM MST

**To:** "district1@pima.gov" <district1@pima.gov>

**Cc:** "district2@pima.gov" <district2@pima.gov>, "district3@pima.gov" <district3@pima.gov>, "district4@pima.gov" <district4@pima.gov>, "district5@pima.gov" <district5@pima.gov>

**Subject:** Citizen Comment re. N. Sabino Canyon Rd Plan Amendment

**Reply-To:** bob yungert

Supervisor Miller,

Thank you for hosting the August 28 community meeting held at the River Road library, which I and my wife attended. We have lived in the Sabino Vista neighborhood for the past seven years. I know you will likely receive many emails and comments regarding these two projects, so I will be succinct with ours.

We object to the proposed "medium-high intensity urban" development of the 15 acres at the northeast corner of N. Sabino Canyon Road and E. Cloud Road. The primary reason for this conclusion is the visual incongruity of a neighborhood of 10+ homes to the acre bordering with other neighborhoods of established homes built 3 or 4 to the acre.

We do not object to proper development of this parcel. However, we feel the resulting overall "look" of combining this new proposed high-density development with the existing neighborhood will detract from its overall appeal to future buyers (might they wonder what happened to logic and reason in the Pima County planning process?). The two concepts are too vastly visually different to be compatible.

Perhaps a more acceptable alternative would be patio-home rentals (or something with less density per acre) that would present a more reasonable and appealing transition?

I listened carefully to the men representing the developers who presented at your meeting. I concluded the one gentleman's analogy of commercial and high density dwellings at other major intersections within the foothills area breaks down and loses

credibility as neither the intersections of Sabino Canyon Road with Cloud Road or River Road/Knollwood Drive can reasonably be considered comparable major intersections. He was attempting to compare apples to apples and did not make a credible argument.

A second significant concern and, until more specific and accurate information is available, basis for present objection is the incremental traffic, risk and safety issues that would develop along Sabino Canyon Road in that quarter-mile (maybe less?) between Cloud and River/Knollwood. Ingress/egress from Sabino Canyon Road into the new development of maybe 150 to almost 200 new dwellings must be wisely addressed. After yesterday's meeting, it's obvious that many folks from the existing neighborhoods seriously question if it can be without significant deterioration to the neighborhood's appeal.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to learning of your conclusions too.

Sincerely,  
Bob and Mary Yungert

**From:** Andras Gaspar  
**Date:** August 28, 2013, 8:27:55 PM MST  
**To:** District1 <[District1@pima.gov](mailto:District1@pima.gov)>  
**Subject:** Aerie Development

Dear Supervisor Miller,

My name is Dr. Andras Gaspar, and I am a resident in your district. My wife, our 18 month old daughter, and I have recently purchased our first home in the Sabino Vista community, just east of Sabino Canyon Rd, near the intersection with Cloud Rd.

I am a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Arizona, earning my PhD at Steward Observatory in theoretical astrophysics in 2011. My wife also teaches at the University while simultaneously pursuing a PhD in linguistics. A few years ago we would have never even imagined that we would be able to buy a home in one of Tucson's last remaining historic neighborhoods; a neighborhood that still carries the charm and comforting welcome of the 1960's and 70's. This is a place where we still see children ride their bikes on the streets; a few days ago we actually saw two boys building a soap-box racer. Here, cars are generally unlocked and people feel safe to push their strollers on the streets in the evenings. We also are able to observe an unusually abundant wildlife, commonly spotting rabbits, coyotes, road runners, and the occasional javelina. I guess this is really the american dream, to be able to achieve all this, if someone works hard enough for it.

I was saddened to learn that a new development is planned to be built on the corner of our neighborhood, with a rather large density of 10 units/acre. Currently that lot serves as a barrier, blocking our neighborhood off from the denser traffic of Sabino Canyon Rd, sheltering an abundant Sonoran wildlife, and embedding our charming neighborhood into the unique Sonoran landscape. Opening that lot for construction would wreak havoc of epic proportions. It would disturb the current balance of the wildlife, possibly forcing it to enter more into our urban area. We are also greatly worried about the limited water supply Metro Water is capable of supplying to our community. Our neighborhood school, Fruchtendler Elementary School, is one of Tucson's best elementary schools and we fear of the decreased quality of education the school would be able to provide for the large number of new students moving into the area. We understand that the developer is planning to

SEP 12 13M1040 PDLKFB

*km*



build "luxury casitas", but the truth of the matter is that at 10 units/acre, no casita will be really luxurious. We, as all of our neighbors, have invested in our properties and in our serene environment. The new development would decrease the values of our homes and definitely disturb our current peace. Last, but not least, such a development would be an eyesore, an architectural misplacement in one of Tucson's last remaining historic neighborhoods.

As our Supervisor, we would like you to represent us, to help us fight against this plan. Homes like these can be built on many other locations throughout town, where they would not cause harm and help increase the productivity and income of nearby business districts. As a UA Alumni yourself, I also sincerely hope that you will represent the interests of the large number of UA employees living in this area.

Respectfully,

Dr. Andras Gaspar

**From:** Hugh Mobasseri

**Date:** August 31, 2013, 5:19:26 PM MST

**To:** "[district1@pima.gov](mailto:district1@pima.gov)" <[district1@pima.gov](mailto:district1@pima.gov)>, "[District2@pima.gov](mailto:District2@pima.gov)" <[District2@pima.gov](mailto:District2@pima.gov)>, "[District3@pima.gov](mailto:District3@pima.gov)" <[District3@pima.gov](mailto:District3@pima.gov)>, "[district4@pima.gov](mailto:district4@pima.gov)" <[district4@pima.gov](mailto:district4@pima.gov)>, "[District5@pima.gov](mailto:District5@pima.gov)" <[District5@pima.gov](mailto:District5@pima.gov)>

**Subject:** Please Vote AGAINST C07-13-01, Sabino Canyon and Cloud Rds Parcel

**Reply-To:** Hugh Mobasseri

Dear Supervisors,

We respectfully urge you to deny the request, Co7-13-01, to amend the Pima County Comprehensive Plan for the parcel on the northeast corner of N Sabino Canyon Road and E Cloud Road. We do not object to housing on the parcel; we object to the density.

Our concerns are: compatibility with neighborhood density, traffic, water, education, quality of life, and property values. The Planning and Zoning Commission report dealt with most of these issues and discussed them in great detail. We hope you take that report very seriously.

There is an assumption in that report and the proposal that bus service will alleviate some traffic concerns. We think not. I commuted by bus to the University for 15 years, but had to switch to driving when the bus route changed from 9 to 37. Route 37 may be convenient for Pantano Rd use, but both the travel time and the transfer wait times to central and downtown are quite onerous.

The proposed density is not in keeping with the neighboring owned properties. Even the density – RAC 10 – recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission – is too high compared to the neighborhood. We would prefer to see about 5 or 6 units per acre developed. The result might be truly luxury rentals and grounds that are acceptable to the neighborhood.

We are not certain that the traffic studies cited represent the true situation. We encourage members of the Board of Supervisors to visit the area during rush hours and imagine the impact of an additional 500 or more cars on Sabino Canyon Rd in this

SEP 12 12:38 PM 10/40 HC CLK UT BD

area. Imagine a substantial line of cars waiting to enter Cloud Rd. Imagine the children crossing the streets to and from the greatly appreciated walkway to and from Fruchthendler School. And, finally, imagine the impact on the Tanque Verde and Sabino Canyon Rds intersection.

Our quality of life will definitely be negatively impacted by the density and traffic, by the increased use of water and imminent danger to the groundwater supply that is becoming lower.

Does it seem reasonable to expect new jobs will be created in the near future with salaries able to support the rents? We think not. What if units designed for 2 or 3 people suddenly have 10 people occupying them in order to meet the rent? Perhaps we will even have reason to be concerned about our safety.

Should businesses – both small and large – dictate the quality of life of an area? We think not.

What about the property values in the surrounding areas: Are they not likely to decrease? It will be only after the fact that we can see and document this outcome. The Developer's assertion that property values did not decline in the Sunrise/Kolb area is not a true comparison. Those are older developments built before the housing bubble burst. Also, there are business zones close to those developments; the four corners at Cloud and Sabino Canyon are all residences; the nearest commercial area is at Tanque Verde and Sabino Canyon.

Are a few more customers for local small businesses and the great profits the developer will realize worth the possible decrease in value of hundreds of existing homes? We think not. Is the great profit a large business would realize worth the decline in quality of life of current area residents? We think it is not and that this important issue should be part of the thinking of the Board of Supervisors. Should businesses – both small and large – dictate the value of our properties in this area? We think not.

Supervisor Miller states that she hears our concerns. Let us hope that she and the rest of the supervisors will act on them and truly represent the will of the voters in the area.

Bill Moyers in his August 23, 2013, essay about the federal government also expresses some of our concerns and the cynical expectation by some of our neighbors that because the developers and owners are wealthy and there will be tax revenue for the County, the approval is a done deal. He states: "We are so close to losing our democracy to the mercenary class .... " He goes on to quote William Greider: "no one can hope to understand what is driving political behavior without asking the kind of gut-level questions politicians ask themselves in private: "Who are the winners in this matter and who are the losers? Who gets the money and who has to pay? Who must be heard on this question and who can be safely ignored?" We hope this does not apply to Pima County and that the will of the citizens and taxpayers will be honored.

We appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Hugh and Judith Mobasseri  
7101 E Sabino Vista Circle  
85750

**From:** Deborah Davis  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 01, 2013 11:28 AM  
**To:** tsteller@azstarnet.com; District1; sabinovista.com@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Re: Tanguie Verde - Sabino Canyon Infill Arizona Star article August 30,2013

In reference to your infill article which reported on the Tanguie Verde -Sabino Canyon area, I attended that meeting. You did not report the majority concerns for this infill location. In fact, there was a raise of hands that showed only 1 person in attendance was in favor for the development, and you quoted his solution of extending bus service from Cloud to Sunrise.

Water and traffic are of a major concern. Lets focus on traffic since you chose to mention it in your article and it effects many commuters.

As was suggested, extending bus service from Cloud to Sunrise, would not mitigate the density effects, as traffic northbound from Cloud to Sunrise is not the major traffic flow direction of Sabino Canyon Road from Cloud. And, because the greater Tucson area is west and south of this location. Not North. In fact the traffic congestion is greatest at the area intersections of Tanguie Verde at Sabino Canyon Road as well as the intersection of River Road at Sabino Canyon. And, here lies the biggest of the traffic concerns. These two new developments are situated on both the east and west side of Sabino Canyon Road, between these two most congested intersections of Sabino Canyon Road.

Each development is to have an entrance road directly into the development off of Sabino Canyon Road. This will create further traffic problems which the Department of Transportation will then have to address and mitigate with potentially, another traffic light that would likely result with added traffic delays in an already backed up congested traffic line.

This is a proposed infill of 249 rentals on 21 acres. That is 11+ units per acre, and there obviously needs to be additional space for roads within these developments leading to these units. These are proposed to be both two and three bedroom rental units. With 3 people in a unit as an average, that would result in a minimum of 747 additional people. Yes, some may not drive, but even occupancy average of 2 could result in 500 potential commuters, or more likely a potential minimum of 300 cars. This is additional traffic not less.

It was presented that young professionals, and individuals over forty, are the individuals with an interest in renting. These were the profiles given that would be the likely occupants due to its being described as luxury

SEP 12 13 AM 10:40 PM CLK/D-10

(Handwritten initials)

rentals. There will be a limited area of garages built, later to be determined. There is to be just 8 feet between each of the units and 8 feet behind the units for a lawn. This may be considered a more walkable neighborhood, but I would suggest that this would allow you to walk 8 feet to your neighbors or take a park-like walk around the neighborhood, but no place else. There are no sidewalks that would make this a walkable neighborhood to anywhere else, and the distance of approximately a mile to the retail corner of Tangu-Verde and Sabino Canyon Road is not a safe walk.

Bus services only go south along Sabino Canyon Road towards the retail corners of Tangu-Verde, so the better access to businesses that a denser development is suppose to provide will not be available to easily access businesses located in the city. The bus routes are not direct and require too much time for a commuter. Therefore, more cars will likely be in use than the developer profiles. Denser development is suppose to, most of all, decrease urban sprawl. So, this proposal adds crowded congestion, packs the residents close together, seems to be increasing sprawl, by overcrowding with people and cars. This is not an urban area, it is a commuter area, located in the county and is towards the east outskirts of the city.

Additionally, Cloud Road is to also have an entrance for the projected development on the east side of Sabino Canyon Road. This is not a major thoroughfare, in fact, Cloud is a dead end street. It is a major exit for many streets and neighborhoods going to Sabino Canyon Road. But it does have an elementary school that it is located just approximately a mile from the entrance of Sabino Canyon Road. This increase of traffic will further add delays and congestions at both the Sabino Canyon Road intersection, as well as the schoolsite.

Tucson local government has endorsed an infrastructure that makes travel difficult in this city. It is creep and crawl, stop and go on our roadways. Traffic lights are numerous along major commute streets with no inner and outer loop to alleviate traffic congestion and help with traffic flow. Sabino Canyon Road is the furthest east side, north/south road from the north Ina/Sunrise or west River Road for travellers. Our roadways are not well maintained as evidenced by the news of potholes frequently reported. We have very high accident rates as reported by insurance companies. We have many vacant buildings and areas that need to be renovated with urban renewal in our city. (In fact, we have many unoccupied rental properties, as we do not have a strong employment opportunity here.) Tucson no longer makes the annual magazine lists for one of the great places to live or retire. The city has not recruited new businesses or encouraged growth of businesses in order to provide the type of employment opportunities that results in economic and employment growth as seen in Oro Valley and Marana, nor retain its college graduates or other professionals that are already here; especially for the potential renter the developer identified for this type of rental unit and/or cost. In fact, most area college graduates from here leave Tucson. They become the young professionals elsewhere. The city cannot retain them for existing local job opportunities. Many cities (Boston is one) have done studies and have identified and created programs to better retain their college graduates. These are known facts, constantly reported in our local media, and the local government asks us to share the burden and provide the data. Perhaps the local government could look at doing things differently than doing the same thing over and over...expecting a different result.

Infill is fine, but to crowd the property, to further congest and squeeze the areas so that road safety and neighborhood harmony is jeopardized -is not good planning. 249 rentals on 21 acres is nonsensical. This denser development is not meeting the defined criteria of what an infill is suppose to give us. It is not a walkable neighborhood, as it is surrounded by major roads without sidewalks, and has very limited transportation access to area and city businesses which therefore, will not result in less driving but more. Currently the public transportation is not only limited, but currently underutilized; as we see the all but empty buses on Cloud each day. Why the empty buses? We are too far away from businesses within the urban sprawl of Tucson. This proposal does not decrease urban sprawl in Tucson, it is in the county, and not an urban area. This proposed development can only add to overcrowding and more expenses for the additional roads and services.

As one woman said, she did not have a problem with development, she had a problem with a development that is not thoughtfully done. This has not been thoughtfully done as it does not meet the defined benefits of more walkable neighborhoods, better access to businesses, less driving due to public transit, and most of all decreased sprawl.

Where is the benefit for the community?

Deborah Davis

**From:**  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 04, 2013 11:46 AM  
**To:** District1; DIST2; District3; District4; District5  
**Subject:** A Really Important Board Meetin On Sapt. 17th

To: District1@pima.gov; District2@pima.gov; District3@pima.gov; District4@pima.gov;  
District5@pima.gov

Thank you in advance for hopefully looking at this work. T. Stangl

AUGUST 20,2013

A LAND DEVELOPERS REPORT, ANALYSIS,  
AND CONCLUSIONS ON RECENTLY APPROVED  
PIMA COUNTY PLAN AMENDMENTC07-13-01

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

An Observation, Analysis and a Commentary  
Regarding the Approved Rezoning Application C07-13-01 Sabino Canyon  
Road Properties LLC  
And the Staff Report from Pima County Planning and Zoning

Summarization of Applicants stated reasons for amending the  
comprehensive plan.



1. Applicant states Proposed plan would promote the “Growing Smarter Act “ ( GSA ) and is compatible with the Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Land System ( MMBCLS ).

These two programs were designed and enacted to oversee the complex development of major communities that would impact the very nature of the Sonoran Desert, which is the main topographical area of the Southwest in general and more specifically Pima County. The basic tenets of both these programs have far reaching social and cultural anthropological implications and guidelines. These programs have development guidelines and philosophies for major regional communities like Ahwatukee and Del Webb’s “Anthem”, in the Phoenix area and Pima County’s own Continental Ranch and Rita Ranch.

How to create large urban and suburban metropolitan areas with infrastructures, transportation systems, neighborhood complexes and regional impact areas, for sustainable living, are the cornerstones of these plans.

It would be a stretch to say that this 15 acre project and by the applicants own words “ **a dense development**”(See Underline Pg.17) would be sanctioned as a community to be compared to the above mentioned communities and as a reason to change the area’s local and longstanding low building densities.

The fact this site is not in the above designated areas should not give the applicant the right to expect we should abandon the legacies of the Gil Lambs, Pete Herders, Andy Arenas and Mel Zuckermans. These men/developers embraced the very concepts , years before, of the “ Growing

## Smarter Act” and the MMBCLS”

2.Applicant states “ Proposed site does not occur within any Maeveen Marie Behan Conservation Land System Category including important Riparian Areas” ( See Underline Pg 18)  
If this single story apartment project does not occur in the MMBCLS why are the applicants referencing their compatibility with the MMBCLS as a reason for approval?

3.Applicant states only “ important riparian area is located approximately 650' west of the project site in the Ventana Canyon Wash (See Underline Pg 18)  
The applicants Riparian map also shows the Tanque Verde Wash immediately to the south .  
It is also designated by the color blue as is the Ventana Canyon Wash

4.“ Proposed residential cluster design includes an active central recreation area and shared paths for walking”.((See Underline Pg1)  
The applicants submitted development plan shows no central park area , pool, rec center or walking paths. The plan shows extreme density regarding lots, streets, and alleys on which living units & detached garages will be built.

Pg 1

5. Applicant states project is “ Innovative community design” and “luxury rental homes with amenities”.  
The applicants “ **dense development**” site plan shows no community pool or rec house.(Pg 20)

There are no attached garages to the living units. This would not appear to be the definition of luxurious.

The plan does show, however a small park of approximately 4000 SF right at the corner of

Sabino Canyon and Cloud Rd.. This very location ,in and of itself, will abrogate any recreational use

as it will be at the crossroads of one of the busiest residential intersections in the Tucson area.

The P.C. staff's report says the average daily trip ( ADT ) on either side of this intersection

and park area is **38,600** ((See Underline Pg 7)

It would be hard to imagine any type of ball playing or little children running around in this traffic.

6.Applicant states project has” luxurious residences with 3 distinct building types” and

“varied roof heights of the buildings enhance the visual depth” and

“ awnings are provided to those buildings that are visible to vehicles and passers-by”

(See Underline Pg 16)

The applicant's submitted renderings (pg21-23) show and notate the same parapet height, 15'6” for all

3 units, with no visible awnings.

7. MEETING WITH NEIGHBORS – Pg 19

The tenor of statements made here,by applicant, indicates all is mostly well with the neighbors regarding this plan!

## **PIMA COUNTY STAFF REPORT**

1.Zoning policy states: ( (See Underline Pg 2)

“ Ensure that new or redeveloped mixed use or infill rezonings assess

the privacy and character concerns of existing neighborhoods in reviewing the location,  
density and character of the project “

A look at zoning maps or a drive around the Sabino Canyon/Cloud Rd. area would certainly indicate the density and character of applicants project design is not compatible with the low density and the southwest character of scenic Sabino Canyon Road.

2. Staff says “ Given the mass of residential uses in the area, a mix of office AND residential use for the site would be ideal” ((See Underline Pg 2)  
If given the choice a mixed use of LIU 3.0 and well designed offices would be far preferable

### ***3. BEWARE! THIS IS DANGEROUS***

**Page 3 - Entire 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. This is a recipe for disaster for the surrounding neighborhoods.**

Pg 2

4. Staff reports a zoning approval and more zoning requests on Sabino Canyon within a quarter mile of applicants project. ( (See Underline Pg 5)

\*Already approved- West side of Sabino just north of Cloud  
***100 more homes –200 more vehicles +/- - 600 Average Daily Trips +/- (ADT)***

\*New plan Amendment –East side of Sabino just north of Cloud - 43Acres MIU 13RA  
***559 more homes – 1118 more vehicles +/- -3354 Average Daily Trips +/-***

\*New Plan Amendment – West side of Sabino just north of Cloud 16.7 Acres LIU3.0

*50 more homes – 100 more vehicles +/- - 300 Average Daily Trips +/-*

Totals *709 more homes – 1418 more vehicles +/- - 4254 Average Daily Trips +/-*

All within one quarter mile of Sabino Canyon and Cloud Road.

5. Staff reports on traffic counts ( Average Daily Trips -ADTs ) (See Underline Pg 7)

River Road and Sabino Canyon - 25,000 ADT- 2013 Report-Traffic is *AT* capacity

– Now add in 4254 more ADT's

Sabino Canyon between River Rd & Cloud – 31,000 ADT Traffic is *AT* capacity

Now add in 4254 more ADT's

Sabino Canyon from Cloud to Tanque Verde – 35,300 ADT 2013 Report - Traffic is *OVER* capacity.

Now add in 4254 more ADT's

Cloud Road at Sabino - staff reports “the most recent traffic count is from ~~2010~~ “and it is a little UNDER capacity.

Now add in 4254 more ADT's

It is interesting to note that a critical ADT count, that is critical to this plans success at passing is 3 years old.

6. Staff reports that project is “ technically not in a growth area “( Pg 2 See Underline) “it is a

infill site with a quarter mile of the City of Tucson. where mixed use infill is encouraged”

Our issue is with Pima County and our neighborhoods in Pima County. It would also be a stretch of the definition of “ infill “ to consider plans with hundreds of homes as 'Infill”

Pg.3

### ZONING DENSITY ANALYSIS

Applicant has not forwarded any development plan that shows any number of units or any square footages of units. A

professional and experienced interpretation /assessment of this planned development would be as follows.

While giving the

Applicant the benefit of projected small unit square footages, which contributes to a lower density, these minimum size

units would stretch the definition of “ Luxury Rentals”

#### ESTIMATED UNIT SIZES

Duplex-2-1 BR Units @ 700s SF per unit =1400 SF \* 2 BR Units =1000 SF \* 3 BRUnits = 1200 SF

\*\*\*\*\*

MHIU Zoning Request by Applicant- 24 Residence Per Acre

15.14 acres ( 659,000 Total square feet ) X 24 units per acre = 363 Units

This rezoning is possible if MIU is awarded to Applicant

121 - Duplexes @ 1400 SF = 169,400 SF

121 - 2 B R units @ 1000 SF = 121,000 SF

121 - 3 B R units @ 1200 SF = 145,200 SF

Total S F of units 435,600 SF divided by total land area ( 659,000) = 66% *Density*

*Note: Add in the 60,000+/- SF of streets and the density is now 76%*

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

MHIU Zoning -13 Residences Per Acre

Applicant's Proposed Development

13 Residences Per Acre X 15.14 ( 659,000 SF Total) = 196 Units

65 - Duplexes @ 1400 SF = 91,000 SF

65 - 2 B R units @ 1000 SF = 65,000 SF

66- 3 B R units @ 1200 SF = 79,200 SF

Total S F of units 235,200 SF divided by total land area ( 659,000) = 36 % *Density*

*Note: Add in the 60,000+/- SF of streets and the density is now 46%*

\*\*\*\*\*

MIU Zoning -- Staff Proposal 10 Residences Per Acre

15.14 Acres ( 659,000 total SF ) X 10 Units Per Acre = 150 Units

50 - Duplexes @ 1400 SF = 70,000 SF

50 - 2 B R units @ 1000 SF = 50,000 SF

50 - 3 B R units @ 1200 SF = 60,000 SF

Total S F of units 180,000 SF divided by total land area ( 659,000) = 27 % *Density*

*Note: Add in the 60,000+/- SF of streets and the density is now 36%*

\*\*\*\*\*

Typical Communities Surrounding Applicant Property

i.e.. Sabino Vista Townhouses- S.E Corner of Sabino & Cloud 20 Acres ( 871,000 total SF ) Total of 50 Units  
Directly south and across Cloud from applicants project. Pg 12 Home to over 600 Native Mesquite Tree

0 - Duplexes @ 0 SF = 0 SF

15 - 2 B R units @ 1600 SF = 24,000 SF

35- 3 B R units @ 1800 SF = 63,000 SF

Total S F of units 87,000 SF divided by total land area ( 871,000) = 10 % *Density*

This 10% Density figure ( Building to land ratio ) is typical off ALL properties surrounding Applicants parcel.

\*\*\*\*\*

Unintended Consequences or Unmentioned Density--

The applicants site plan calls for detached single car garages. It is reasonable to assume at least one garage for each

apartment. ( Applicants possible MHIU- 363 Garages ( 72,600 SF.) or 196 garages ( 39,200 SF ) in applicant proposal.

Staff proposal would add 150 garages ( 30,000 SF ).

Given the national statistic that each family has at least 2 vehicles where do the applicants expect the other 150 ( Staff Proposal ) vehicles to park not to mention visitor parking. Where is it.?

There is no visitor parking lot on site plan submitted by applicant.

Pg.4

## CONCLUSIONS

### Applicant

It appears that virtually every statement made by applicant in support of their Plan Amendment

change is unsupported by fact, submitted designs, and recommendations.

One only has to look at the surrounding neighborhoods with their low density and architectural

compatibility with each other and their community recreational involvement to see the dichotomy

between applicants dense development of single story apartments with no open space, no attached garages and no community amenities.

This projects impact on neighborhood market values and an ever escalating traffic congestion problem will be devastating

Pima County Planning and Zoning Staff

It appears, to this person, that the very capable staff and professional P&Z staff are caught between an overly dense non-conforming neighborhood & community proposed plan “**ROCK**” and a municipalities need for increased revenue streaming “**HARD PLACE**” The staff uses frequently terms and statements such as “character concerns of existing neighborhoods”, “mixed office and residential use would be ideal”, local traffic “AT capacity” or “Over capacity”.

It is this writers belief that, at worst, this project is a case of sheer profiteering supported by the county's need for revenue. And, at best, this is the systematic and government support of the destruction of over half century of country living including, but not limited to, our decreased home market values.

It would be in the best interest of all the Sabino Canyon/ Cloud Rd/River Rd, neighborhood Associations to join forces and stop these inevitable rezoning assaults upon our neighborhoods.

This report prepared by:

The Author

A Really Disappointed & Concerned Neighbor



**From:** Leslie Grodzki  
**Date:** August 29, 2013, 8:57:12 AM MST  
**To:** <[district1@pima.gov](mailto:district1@pima.gov)>  
**Subject:** Comparable Market Analysis  
**Reply-To:** Leslie Grodzki

Ms. Miller,

As you can see, we have 145 currently active rentals in the zip code 85750 - what are the odds that they will all be filled by a 12 month lease over the next 6 months? Every day, more come up available, there is a huge supply/inventory that is never filled.

Follow this link to see the page:

[Click to view listing\(s\)](#)

This link will no longer be available after 9/28/2013.

SEP 12 13 AM 10:41 PC CLK/D/B

*PM*