

George Burton

From: George Burton
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 11:34 AM
To: 'Geoffrey'
Subject: RE: 4474 E valley vista ln

Mr. Bingham,

Thank you for interest in this case.

As designed, the proposed lots are compliant with the Town's development standards (e.g. each lot meeting a minimum size of one net, compliant with the development standard of placing a 165' diameter circle in each lot, etc.).

However, the applicant is requesting a deviation for the use of a "hammer head" instead of a cul-du-sac on the proposed private roadway.

It schedule for Planning Commission work study review on Tuesday, January 22nd and public hearing review on February 5th.

You may also view a copy of the agenda and meeting materials from the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

The agenda for the January 22nd Planning Commission meeting should be posted on the Town's website by this Thursday afternoon.

After Commission review, the Town Council will review the preliminary plat and request to use a hammer head instead of a cul-du-sac on the proposed private roadway.

A copy of your email will also be included in the packet for Planning Commission review.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 480-348-3525.

Best Regards,
George Burton
Town of Paradise Valley
Planner
480-348-3525
480-951-3715 Fax
gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov

From: Geoffrey [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 10:03 AM
To: George Burton <gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov>
Subject: 4474 E valley vista ln

Mr. Burton,

I will not be able to attend the public hearing on this matter but please note my comments in you review. While I strongly support an individuals right to do as they please with private property I must insist that zoning laws be followed at least as intended and within reason. The parcel noted was originally planned as a single family home and purchased as such if my memory is correct. If the parcel is large enough (+/-

130,000sqft) to accommodate three R43 lots then it has my support. Otherwise it must be limited to two lots. I'm not sure how the access would affect the size of the lots in the view of the town. R43 Zoning is one of the major reasons I chose to purchase in PV and I believe that this zoning is key to supporting our standard of living and property values. As we see increased pressure for housing units due to the growth of the valley I see this push to subdivide only becoming more of an issue for PV. Every time the city agrees to break the R43 threshold that decision will be used to further support future weaking of our zoning rules. If my neighbor is allowed to create greater density on his/her R43 hillside lot then why can't I? This could create a costly future in court as the town finds itself defending such an approval for the lot in question and not every other lot over 43 but under 86k sqft.

Geoffrey Bingham

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]