

August 30, 2016

Mr. George Burton, Planner
Town of Paradise Valley
Planning Department
6401 East Lincoln Drive
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253

Dear Mr. Burton and PV Planning Commission:

The purpose of this letter is to express a collective view point in opposition to the Casa Blanca HOA's application for an amendment to the Special Use Permit for the Casa Blanca Estates subdivision. The application in question seeks the Commission's agreement to the addition of an egress gate at the Casa Blanca community drive and to remove the requirement to provide unrestricted public pedestrian and bicycle access.

It has become clear over the past few weeks that a substantial portion of Casa Blanca residents (we believe a majority) are not in favor of our HOA moving forward with the egress gate at this time. Several neighbors would like to ask our HOA to consider other options. Others have expressed a desire for a more inclusive vetting process for a change of this magnitude and still others don't see a need at all and remain in firm opposition to the gate. As such, we respectfully ask that the Planning Commission either reject or delay taking action on the current request until a more thorough review with all Casa Blanca residents is completed by our association.

As PV residents, we salute the Town's existing philosophy which encourages subdivisions like ours to provide free and open access to pedestrians & cyclists. As Casa Blanca residents, we support such access for our neighbors, friends and for ourselves. As the Commission is aware, current access to our community is substantially restricted by means of a full-time staff of guards and an entry gate which already cause substantial access complications. The existing apparatus results in daily backups and blockages as multiple vehicles are made to wait in queue for entrance. It is common for such backups to extend well onto Casa Blanca Drive (in both North and Southbound directions), impeding traffic and causing warranted frustration. Due to the regular stream of construction projects in our neighborhood, daily construction vehicle backups can involve 10-15 vehicles. Any effort to similarly restrict egress from our community can only result in a doubling of our current delays and frustrations.

Many of our residents take exception to our HOA's pursuit in this regard. Specifically, we take issue with the logic espoused by our HOA in its effort to justify the egress gate to both the Commission and to our residents. While the HOA has argued that the egress gate will provide additional safeguards against the potential for accidents between vehicles exiting the neighborhood and ongoing traffic, we firmly disagree. In order for the proposed gate to control the flow of exit traffic, it must, out of necessity, be positioned against the Northwest corner of our existing gatehouse. If a driver stopped at the proposed gate were to have a clear view to oncoming traffic (vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians) from the stopped position, then perhaps the gate might provide a small measure of incremental safety. However, since the proposed gate will lie approximately 25 feet from the actual street threshold, and because a driver's view in both directions is fully blocked to the left by the gatehouse and to the right by landscaping foliage, no such benefit will be provided. A gated driver will have to proceed an additional 25 feet beyond the gate (up to the access point of the cross-traffic) in order to gain an initial view to the oncoming traffic (as is the case today). In short, the addition of an egress gate will certainly succeed in slowing and frustrating the flow of traffic but will do virtually nothing at all to address any legitimate safety concerns.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission reject or at the very least delay taking action on our HOA's application until a more thorough and inclusive vetting effort is completed. We thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Mike & Theresa Crotty, Lot #25

Barbara Ball, Lot 24

Nadine Hart, Lot 20

Gordon & Ione Hakola, Lot 35

Robert & Kari Kling, Lot 29

Michelle Laurin, Lot 13

Patrick & Shelley McGinley, Lot 9

Mary Merkel, Lot 17

Paul Rhodes, Lot 45

Charlie & Mary Touche, Lot 33

George Burton

From: Michael Crotty
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2016 10:54 PM
To: George Burton
Cc:
Subject: Resident Feedback Regarding Casa Blanca Amendment Application (Egress Gate)
Attachments: Town of Paradise Valley.docx

Dear George,

Thanks again for taking my call last week. I appreciate your willingness to consider additional feedback from Casa Blanca residents who do not fully understand or agree with the current push to add an egress gate to our neighborhood. I've attached a letter which I hope does an adequate job of explaining the cause for our concerns—and we greatly appreciate your commitment to ensure the Planning Commission reviews these concerns alongside the Casa Blanca application on September 6.

As I mentioned to you during our call, if there's any guilt to be assessed with regard to this matter requiring the Commission's intervention, I know that the residents whose names appear on our letter (myself included) willingly shoulder it. Our Casa Blanca Board Members, some of whom I've copied on this email, did in fact create an opportunity for residents to learn about and provide feedback on this plan well in advance. For a variety of reasons though, the vast majority of our residents did not take that opportunity—and now regret it.

Regardless, the fact remains that many of our neighbors feel strongly against this plan which has obviously progressed rapidly to the Commission's attention. Upon receipt of the Hearing Notice from your office, a number of us decided we should make an attempt to be heard before its too late. Thanks again for your assistance—and for the Commission's consideration. If you have any questions we can help with, please feel free to contact me any time.

Best Regards,

Mike Crotty
Managing Consultant
602-770-1215
crotty@floodgateconsulting.com