

Attachment 10

Recent Resident Comments

Paul,

I know you responded to my e-mail below but I can't find it so I must have accidentally deleted it when I was deleting a bunch of files the other day.

I think you responded that both residential and commercial development could begin as early as **2017**. My memory was that it would be 5 years for residential and 10 years for commercial. Have the plans changed?

I just found the comment that you made on this topic in the past.

[August 13, 2014 Neighborhood Meeting:](#)

When a resident said that all the empty storefronts in town indicated that there is no need for any more commercial, you said that you didn't argue with this but that you were "thinking long-range, most likely 10 years from now."

That's a lot different than 2017. Can we get something in writing, added to the Special Area Policies, that promises that commercial won't be built until at least the year _____?

What year seems feasible to you?

Something should also be added to the SAP stating the earliest date that development could begin in the residential portion.

Please advise.

Diane Peters

From: Diane Peters [mailto:tucson_cowgirl@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 1:35 PM

To: Paul Oland; Zinkin, Mike; Garner, William; Burns, Brendan

Cc: Vella, Bayer; Daines, Chad

Subject: RE: Proposed Major General Plan Amendment SWC Naranja and La Cholla

Paul and Bayer,

Also, the below wording should be removed from the SAP:

"The ultimate alignment of subdivision access roads and use of proposed traffic control methods are entirely subject to Town Engineer review and approval."

REASON: If it is later determined that the proposed road will connect to CH Drive, this would "adversely impact...a portion of the community" and this does not meet the General Plan Criteria for approval.

A stipulation could be added to the SAP that the Town Engineer cannot connect a road to Canada Hills Drive without the approval of ____% of the residents of the Canada Hills HOA.

That percentage should be determined by CH HOA.

Since the Major GPA public hearing/vote has been postponed until May 6th, we consider the SAP to still be a work-in-progress!

Diane Peters

From: CALROZ@aol.com

Date: Tue, 14 Apr 2015 15:51:19 -0400

Subject: Re: Proposed Major General Plan Amendment SWC Naranja and La Cholla

To: gpoland@wlbgroup.com; mzinkin@orovalleyaz.gov

CC: bvella@orovalleyaz.gov; tucson_cowgirl@hotmail.com; sbetten@carondelet.org

Mike and Paul,

Appreciate the idea.

But the concept as shown would not work, since area residents would no longer be able to make a left hand turn from Canada Hills Drive south onto La Cholla Boulevard.

Rudy Roszak

calroz@aol.com

520) 297-0943

On Apr 11, 2015, at 11:08 AM, "CALROZ@aol.com" <CALROZ@aol.com> wrote:

Reference: Proposed Major General Plan Amendment at Northwest and Southwest Corners of Naranja and La Cholla (194 Acres)

Dear Council Member Zinkin:

I will cut to the chase.

The Canada Hills Drive Issue should be resolved before the GPA is considered and voted upon.

Otherwise we will be stuck with the old Concept Plan which is unacceptable by the majority of the Canada Hills residents we have spoken to.

Canada Hills Drive is a private street, maintained by the homeowners. Walkers, joggers, bicyclists, kids, parents with strollers, and golf carts use the street, with its 25 mph speed limit.

The proposed 500 to 570 new homes will generate approximately 1,000 to 1,200 additional cars and increased traffic on our local roads. This is unacceptable. The developer is obligated to find an alternate route for this proposed development.

We do not want the new development to hook directly into Canada Hills Drive, as shown on the present maps.

Period.

Rudy Roszak 10797 N. Glen Abbey Drive, Oro Valley, AZ 85737

520) 297-0943

calroz@aol.com

Paul,

The map that's included in the council packet for the April 15th meeting (attached) still shows the proposed road connecting to Canada Hills Drive.

Will this map be updated prior to the council meeting?

The concern is that passing the GPA with the map "as is" creates two problems:

(1) It leaves the residents of Canada Hills wide open for disaster in the future if the town decides to leave that road in the current location.

(2) The current location of the road does not meet the GP criteria below:

The amendment will not adversely impact the community as a whole, or a portion of the community...

We understand the caveat in the second half of that criteria...

...without an acceptable means of mitigating these impacts through the subsequent zoning and development process.

However, it's not fair to the residents of CH to have to wait until the zoning process to find

out where the road will be placed since the placement of that road could **adversely impact** their community.

This needs to be ironed out now. Otherwise, we're being asked to approve something when we have no idea of what we're actually approving.

Please advise.

Diane Peters

Dear Mayor and Council,

At the **December 10th** council meeting to vote on the LaCholla Major General Plan Amendment, a decision was made to continue the item for another time. It is now on the April 15th agenda.

Mayor Hiremath asked for a continuance for the following reasons:

- (1) He wanted clarification on the portion of the land that is owned by Casas Church that could still be used for church expansion.
- (2) Council wanted further discussion on commercial and the possibility of removing some of it from the plan as they were not convinced that market demand exists.
- (3) They wanted to research the timetable for the widening of LaCholla in this area.

*(Council Member Zinkin stated that the RTA is already discussing widening **Broadway** to only 3 lanes on each side rather than 4 lanes as was approved by the voters. Apparently the RTA is having revenue issues and they're considering a further increase in the sales tax in order to complete all the projects they promised. As such, the possibility exists that they will run out of money before they have widened LaCholla.)*

- (4) They wanted to further research and clarify overall construction density.
- (5) They wanted to further research market need for townhomes.

Have you researched the above issues? If yes, what was the outcome of each one?

Councilmember Zinkin asked for a continuance for an additional reason:

That the continuance also be based upon our citizens group conducting further negotiations with the applicant. **This issue has been addressed. Our CORE group met with Paul Oland in January, February, and March.**

Respectfully,

Diane Peters

Chair, Citizen Advocates of the Oro Valley General Plan

From: [K Stratman](#)

Sent: 4/10/2015 2:06 PM

To: [Vella, Bayer](#); [Hiremath, Satish](#); [Waters, Lou](#); [Burns, Brendan](#); [Garner, William](#); [Hornat, Joe](#); [Snider, Mary](#); [Zinkin, Mike](#)

Subject: Town Council Meeting April 15, 2015

Dear Mayor, Council Members and Town Staff,

Re; Major General Plan Amendment SW corner Naranja and LaCholla

AS stated on attachment 12 of agenda item 1, General Plan Amendment Evaluation Criteria Analysis, Section 22.2.D.3

1. The proposed change is necessary because conditions in the community have changed to the extent that the plan requires amendment or modification.

The very essence of the application for a Major General Plan Amendment to the SW corner of Naranja and LaCholla is based entirely on the funding and planned expansion of LaCholla Blvd.

As stated in the Staff Comment, "The funding of the planned expansion of La Cholla Boulevard to a four lane desert parkway is a change in conditions which support reconsideration of the planned density and intensity along this corridor."

Since La Cholla is still a two lane street, and ***does not have funding to date for an expansion***, if this motion is to pass, **please consider a condition of approval that the completion of this stretch of LaCholla to a four lane parkway starting from Overton Rd to Tangerine Road be complete prior to any rezoning.**

to my knowledge, Currently there is no complete funding nor is there any factual time frame for the expansion of La Cholla Boulevard to a four lane desert parkway.

Please consider adding this condition to the final approval. The safety of all our students who use this corridor, not to mention the citizens should be the number one priority.

La Cholla Blvd is not a four lane desert parkway yet.

Sincerely,

Karen Stratman

Citizen of Oro Valley, AZ

From: Diane Peters [mailto:tucson_cowgirl@hotmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 8, 2015 7:21 PM

To: Gustav Paul Oland

Subject: Mtg with Bill Garner

Hi Paul,

I spoke with Bill Garner about the offer you made on Tuesday.

Before I survey the citizens group on their preference, I need to make sure that I understand this properly.

Option A: The 12 to 14 lots on the southern portion of MDR on Lambert Lane would have a MINIMUM lot size of 8000 sf and other lots at 8500 sf.

Option B: The entire MDR portion would have an average lot size between 6000-7000 sf.

Is this correct?

If yes, what is meant by "an AVERAGE lot size between 6000-7000 sf?"

(a) NO lots would be below 6000 sf?

(b) The average would be 6000-7000, but SOME could still be larger or smaller than that.

The word "average" reminds me of the word "overall" and how it's very different than what people expect it to be. That's why I need clarification.

Thank you. Deep cleansing breath. We're almost done!

Diane Peters
