

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:55 PM  
**To:** 'Lara Mulchay'  
**Cc:** Mimi Mulchay; Paul Mood  
**Subject:** RE: Valley Vista lot proposed changes

Dear Ms. Mulchay,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The preliminary grading plan does not show any fill added to the wash and the applicant is proposing to span the wash with a bridge to access Lot 2.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

If the subdivision is approved, the development of each lot will require Hillside Committee review and approval demonstrating compliance with the Hillside Code and compliance with all setback, height, and area regulations.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at:  
<https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Lara Mulchay  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 22, 2019 5:33 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Cc:** Mimi Mulchay  
**Subject:** Valley Vista lot proposed changes

Dear Mr. Burton-

My apologies for the last minute email, as I was hoping to attend the meeting tonight in its place.

I am writing to voice my concerns over the changes to the Sanctuary II lots.

I have looked over the proposed plans and supporting documentation and after walking and surveying the property yesterday, as well as speaking with the neighboring residents, I have doubts that this is a solid, well-planned proposal. I have concerns regarding the arroyos (at least one is missing entirely from the renderings) and would like to be ensured that the drainage in this neighborhood isn't compromised even more than it currently is. There is a history of flooding and any changes need to reflect concern for surrounding properties.

I am also concerned about the safety of the proposed access road needed if a hammerhead configuration is allowed. Admittedly, I am no expert, but while looking at the wash (arroyo) in conjunction with the plans submitted, it did not appear to me that it took into consideration the true depth and width. Will a combination of native & imported soil be used to fill in the natural wash in areas that it has historically run through? If so, have these changes been studied as to their impact on drainage and wildlife? Will building on these lots obstruct the natural views that the neighbors have enjoyed over the years? It's been my understanding that Sanctuary II was developed for 2 primary residences to keep with the natural beauty that Paradise Valley is coveted for. If approved, how will this affect future home values and not ensure that PV becomes denser and more urban than originally desired and preserved by current ordinances?

I would appreciate some assurances that this is a viable and reasonable course of action for this community and the Town of Paradise Valley in general.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Kindest regards,

Lara Mulchay

Sent from my iPhone

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:44 PM  
**To:** 'Richard Felker'  
**Subject:** RE: Tonight's study session regarding 4474 and 4490 E. Valley Vista Ln.

Dear Mr. Felker,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at:  
<https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Richard Felker  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 22, 2019 3:07 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Tonight's study session regarding 4474 and 4490 E. Valley Vista Ln.

George, I live at \_\_\_\_\_ which is across the street from the two lots in question.

I was the original developer of this subdivision.

The subdivision was developed as a hillside subdivision consequently all of the lots were sized to conform to the hillside ordinances. Lot size was and is important, both to maintain the character of the subdivision and to maintain values. These proposed lots would have the smallest building pads and be the smallest in the subdivision and could adversely affect the larger lots.

The lot split as shown places the houses very close together, contrary to the original concept for the subdivision. It also negatively impacts the adjoining lots in Villa Maderos del Cuesta to the North and lots in Camelhead Estates unit 2 to the East.

The original lot 15 (4474 E. Valley Vista Lane) was designed as a 2.194 acre lot to make it consistent with the sizes of lots 1, (1.66 acres) Lot 2 (1.73 acres) Lot 3 (2.44 acres) and lot 16 (2.14 acres) in the original sanctuary subdivision. This was done because of the wash and steep slope conditions of the above referenced lots.

As the original developer I was stipulated to certain standards and constraints by the town Paradise Valley. To ensure that those standards would be maintained a HOA was formed and a Declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions was recorded as instrument number 94-0332754 ,the CCRS recorded over the whole subdivision. They provide among other things that no lot may be subdivided or separated into smaller lots or parcels and no portion less than all of the large shall be conveyed or transferred by any order without the prior written approval of the architectural control committee and the homeowners association. No such approval has yet been granted by the HOA, but I personally am not in favor of this proposal. Please convey my thoughts to the study session this evening.

Richard Felker

Sent from my iPad



## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:42 PM  
**To:** 'Christy Wallace'  
**Cc:** Paul Mood  
**Subject:** FW: Agenda Item 19-024 for tonights Planning Meeting  
**Attachments:** Scan.pdf; google earth 4474 E. Valley Vista Ln. Three Drainage Paths (1).pdf

Dear Ms. Wallace,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

I've also copied the Town Engineer, Paul Mood, to provide input regarding the site drainage.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** Christy Wallace  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 22, 2019 12:38 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Agenda Item 19-024 for tonights Planning Meeting

Hi George,

My name is Christy Wallace and I recently purchased a home located at Paradise Valley, AZ 85253. I am writing to echo concerns that Sabra Wagoner writes about in her letter regarding the development proposal adjacent to our neighborhood.

In addition, it appears there are 3 pathways for water flow through the arroyo. I marked up a google earth image and attached it herein. It looks like the 2nd pathway for water flow is where the 2nd home is proposed for development. In the event my perspective of this 2nd waterway is accurate, I hope the city will review and study how developing directly over this waterway may impact the new home being proposed and how the water flow will be affected in the arroyo?

Thank you for your consideration and bringing these concerns up for discussion during tonights meeting.

Christy

This email may contain information that is confidential. The contents of this email are intended only for the recipient(s) listed above. If you are not the intended recipient you are directed not to read, disclose, distribute or otherwise use this transmission. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the transmission.

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:39 PM  
**To:** 'Peter Johnson'  
**Subject:** RE: CBN\_PlanningCommissionLetter.pdf

Dear Mr. Johnson,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** Peter Johnson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 22, 2019 12:17 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** CBN\_PlanningCommissionLetter.pdf

Peter M Johnson

To: George Burton and other member of the Planning Committee

From: Homeowners in Camelback North Estates

Subject: Application to create a subdivision with three lots

The person/s signing below are in opposition to a variance or plan that allows building on the island property located to the east of 4474 E. Valley Vista Lane and to the southeast of 4490 E Valley Vista Lane if it has a negative impact on the drainage arroyos or if it presents any fire/life safety risk due to its limited hammerhead access. The parcel proposed for development is surrounded by two deep arroyos. These arroyos play a critical role in preventing flooding in our neighborhood during torrential rains. **There is a third significant drainage path that dissects the property on the east side of the arroyo nearly in half. In the renderings this arroyo does not even appear.** Can you assure us there will be no impediments to its flow? Another wash in our neighborhood has serious drainage issues. We don't want a similar problem due to changes made to the flow of water or the arroyos. We also want assurances all emergency vehicles will have unrestricted access to the properties being proposed. The PV standard, full circle cul-de-sac, may be prudent for this purpose. This isolated island property will be dependent on its bridge for services.


As you are probably aware, the developer requesting the modification currently owns 4474 Valley Vista Lane which is a 2.19 acre buildable lot and requires no variance to develop. The lot was designed approximately 20 years ago when the Hunt property was broken up and Sanctuary II estate lots were created. Is building two homes in the space originally designed for one consistent with the Sanctuary II's master plan? The lots were designed with preservation of open spaces in mind where desert life could thrive and the arroyos could flow unimpeded. This application threatens both.

We treasure the open "countryside setting" the Town's founders envisioned. We are hopeful no variance will be granted. Once the desert is gone, it can never be replaced.

Sincerely,

Name

Address

  
PETER M. JOHNSON

PARADISE VALLEY, AZ 85253



## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:29 PM  
**To:** 'Richard Horn'  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Committee Meeting on January 22, 2019

Dear Mr. Horn,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** Richard Horn >  
**Sent:** Monday, January 21, 2019 7:42 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Cc:** Warren Wagoner <[sabra@resortretail.com](mailto:sabra@resortretail.com)>  
**Subject:** Planning Committee Meeting on January 22, 2019

Mr. Burton:

I am the President of the Camelhead North Neighborhood Association. I am writing to support the concerns expressed by Sabra and Warren Wagoner regarding the requested planning changes for the properties designated as 4474 and 4490 Valley Vista Lane. The proposed changes could prove to have a significant impact on the storm water flow from our neighborhood in the case of heavy rains. The entire Maderos del Cuenta residential street could be at risk. Recently we have seen the impact of the blockage of washes and the Town has sent numerous notices to property owners about the maintenance of the free flow of storm runoff through the

washes. We hope you will fully consider the potential impacts of building additional structures in and adjacent to the multiple washed that cross these properties.

In addition, we are quite concerned with the implications of an increase in the density of building on these properties and the potential precedent that an approval could have on future requests to further divide lots within the town. We are also concerned with the importance of adhering to plans that were approved by the Town at the time the original development was approved.

I plan to attend the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for January 22, 2019 to better understand the position of the Town with regard to this rezoning request. I hope to meet you there.

Richard A. (Rick) Horn

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:28 PM  
**To:** 'Sabra Wagoner'  
**Cc:** Paul Mood; Robert Lee  
**Subject:** FW: Questions for the Committee tomorrow re 4474 & 4490 Valley Vista  
**Attachments:** Shows the arroyo is 12' deep where the bridge will cross.JPG; The arroyo measures 77 ft across at bridge.JPG

Dear Ms. Wagoner,

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The drainage on the site must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

Please refence the responses below regarding your questions.

I copied the Town Engineer and the Town Fire Marshall on this email as they will respond to several of your questions.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

**From:** Sabra Wagoner  
**Sent:** Monday, January 21, 2019 6:58 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Questions for the Committee tomorrow re 4474 & 4490 Valley Vista

Hello George:

Below are questions I hope can be answered tomorrow regarding the lots being merged for development behind our property . We are happy to have conforming development but want certainty there is full oversight focused on proper water control of the ultimate accumulation area for run-off from all uphill Camelhead North properties. As you know, we already suffer flooding and street blockage when heavy rains occur.



1. In the Preliminary plat, can the "test" 165 foot diameter circles overlay unbuildable land, ie the arroyos? **Yes, the circle can overlap arroyos. Per Chapter 6 of the Town Code, the circle must touch the front building setback line and fit within the property.** A good portion of the acreage on both lots is arroyo and parts of it 12' below the apparent buildable portion of the lot.
2. The supplied Geotechnical survey described 8 foot deep soil percolation samples having been taken from two places. I can observe no evidence of digging, particularly by a backhoe, on site B2. I wonder if a backhoe could even access the lot.
3. The **runoff in the middle** of proposed lot 2 is significant. This third drainage arroyo (much coming from our lot) becomes between 4 and 5 feet deep. Is that what the slope drawings indicate? What will happen to this run-off if there is a house blocking it? How will it be re-routed? **I copied Town Engineer Paul Mood on this email. Paul will contact you shortly regarding your drainage questions.**
4. I have attached a picture of the depth of the steep western arroyo where the bridge is to go. It is easily 12 feet deep. It is not a gradual slope. It is a steep canyon. In the rendering pictures, it shows a gradual slope meandering down to a stream. Will the arroyos be sloped instead of the canyon they currently are and how would this modification impact water flows and possibly the buildable flat area? **I believe the washes will remain in their natural state. However, Town Engineer Paul Mood will provide input regarding the washes.**
5. Attached is a picture of the width of the arroyo where the bridge is to go. It measures about 77 feet across (in a non-scientific manner) but is certainly more than 60 feet that appeared somewhere in the drawings. Is this critical? **Paul Mood will also address this question and will contact you shortly.**
6. Since this property is not accessible except by a bridge (the renderings are idyllic in regards to the bridge and property) will fire/life equipment be able to reach the isolated property efficiently and depart the steep incline when utilizing a non-standard proposed cul-de-sac? If so, what purpose does the "standard" circle cul-de-sac serve? **The Town Engineer and Town Fire Marshall reviewed the proposed hammerhead and bridge and deemed the design compliant with traffic safety and fire safety standards. I copied Fire Marshall Bob Lee on this email. Bob will contact you shortly regarding emergency service access.**

Thank you in advance for addressing these questions.  
Sabra Wagoner







## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:09 PM  
**To:** 'David Wilson'  
**Cc:** Paul Mood  
**Subject:** RE: Conditional Use Permit 4490 & 4474 E Valley Vista Lane

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** David Wilson  
**Sent:** Monday, January 21, 2019 4:25 PM  
**To:** Planning Commission Contact <[planningcommission@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:planningcommission@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Cc:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Conditional Use Permit 4490 & 4474 E Valley Vista Lane

Commissioners:

I have two concerns regarding the application to construct properties on the above lots:

1. The hammerhead cul-de-sac, as opposed to the standard design: surely, this will be an issue if it in any way impacts access to, e.g. by fire, or safety of the lots in question and surrounding properties. This is not standard PV design, so why allow this? Why have standards if they are waived routinely?
2. There are significant washes on the parcels in question, including a drainage path that dissects the 4474 and 4490 lots on the east side; this latter path seems not to be reflected in the design documents. We have issues

with the flows of storm water in the Town generally and in our neighborhood particularly. Washes flow from E Maderos del Cuenta and, "upstream", from the PV Methodist Church across our property into the subject properties. Are all water paths adequately recognized in the plans for the subject properties? Can you be sure and assure the Town that water flows will not be impacted by the development of these properties?

There is continued pressure to grant variances. Over time, this has impacted and will continue to impact the quality of the Town as a highly desirable "zip code". Any one variance may not be an issue, but they accumulate to (a) become the norm and (b) detract from the quality, i.e., value, of the Town. The water issue may not be germane to the CUP currently under review by the Commission, but it is more than important to the development overall.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns.

Yours sincerely,

David Wilson

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 5:05 PM  
**To:** 'Michael Markham, JR'  
**Subject:** RE: Questions concerning 4474 E. Valley Vista Lot Split

Dear Mr. Markham,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

Per our discussion yesterday, a copy of your email will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

Please see the response below regarding your questions.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at: <https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** Michael Markham, JR  
**Sent:** Monday, January 21, 2019 2:36 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Questions concerning 4474 E. Valley Vista Lot Split

Mr. Burton and the Planning Commission,

I am the resident at \_\_\_\_\_ and border the proposed lot split of the Sanctuary II. I have a few questions that didn't appear to be addressed in the information given online that have raised some concerns for me. When you begin to look at the grades and disturbance areas shown and look at why there are the discrepancies listed below it appears that using the proper calculations, lot 16 (lot 3) of sanctuary may not have the ability to sell the amount of land to lot 15 (lots 1 and 2) in sufficient amounts to allow for a lot split. Additionally the disturbance areas and slope calculations vary depending on which of the developers plans you use, which disturbance areas are allowed, and which existing elevations are used. These deviations in the submitted information for lot 15 might also preclude the splitting of the lots.

1. Placing 2 homes on 4474 E Valley Vista Lane is introducing vehicular traffic, especially headlights shining to the other properties backyards. With the original anticipated building pad locations of the sanctuary development there are numerous areas that had previously not been exposed to headlights that are now exposed. The direction that affects me the most is facing southeast downstream in the drainage easement given the sloping



terrain. The proposed driveway location for lot 2 that runs parallel and adjacent to the wash as well as at the fire truck turn around, that will surely be used for parking, appear to be facing downstream in the wash. What is the builder proposing to do to mitigate the introduction of the headlights into our backyards? **None that I am aware of at this time, however, I will forward your email to the applicant and ask them to address this.**

2. The current disturbance plans ignore the portion of lot 1 that has already been disturbed by the builder. There is a large portion of the hillside, the majority of lot 1, that has been disturbed for approximately 3 ½ years and left as an eyesore to the community. This disturbance is not shown on C-3 as part of the disturbance area nor is it shown on the aerial used on sheet AE. Given the location of the new roadway alignment as well as the existing disturbed areas, nearly all, if not all, the property frontage of lot 1 and tract A will be or has already been disturbed in the steepest, most hillside portions of the both lots 1 and tract A (also the steepest most hillside portions of the original lot 15). In addition to the hillside disturbance the wash flowing NW to SE through the subject properties was also disturbed, narrowed and has never been restored and is not shown on the plans. Shouldn't the portions currently disturbed by the builder be included in the disturbance and slope calculations. **The building pad slope calculation for each lot is the percent of slope measured at right angles to the natural contours along a line passing through the center of the proposed building and terminating at the ends of the disturbed area limits of the building site. An area that is restored back to natural grade and restored with native vegetation does not count as disturbed area via the final hillside design. All restored areas are checked by staff as part of the final hillside inspection for a project.**
3. The current landscape plans also ignore the large area of the current disturbance and show no plan to restore the hillside nor wash to its previous undisturbed condition. **The site and wash will need to be restored. The site drainage must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual and the washes must be maintained in accordance with Town Code.**
4. Looking at the disturbance area on sheet C-3 with the same disturbance area shown but not labeled on sheet AE, the disturbance area of Lot 3 appears to be understated. The disturbance line cuts off the southeast corner of the house as well as ignores the disturbance area from the cutoff portion of the house down to the pool equipment between elevation 1330 and 1335. Not only for this split calculation is this exclusion important given how close lot 3 is to the allowable (within 4,200 sf), but for future use of this lot the disturbance area should be shown accurately. **Via the aerial photo, it appears that the disturbance boundary on Lot 3 is different than that shown on Sheet C-3. I will follow-up with the applicant regarding the difference.**
5. Slope calculation. I am not sure of the requirements for the slope calculation so I had a few questions.
  - a. In lot 3, the slope calculation does not appear to be perpendicular to the main slope and does not account for the steeper disturbance area of the house to the west. Additionally the elevations on the slope calculation appear to be existing grades not the original. Both of these conditions could be why the slope changed from 26% on the original plat to 23.3% on this new revision. I will check with the applicant regarding the grades. **The building pad slope line is based upon the natural grade elevations at the edge of disturbance (excluding driveways), with the line going through the center of the house.**
  - b. The slope calculation for lot 1 also appears to be the current existing, with the import material that has been placed, not the original elevations. The architectural layout also shows the buildings to be higher on the slopes than the grading and drainage drawings show the disturbance line to be. It is the grading drawings that were used to calculate disturbable area and slopes. Where are they really planning to disturb? This potentially affects their ability to split the lots due to how close all their calculations are to the allowable for fitting 3 lots in this location. Additionally, should the area previously disturbed by the builder be counted as disturbed area and used for the slope calculations? This would drastically increase the slope calculations since some of the currently disturbed area is in the steepest areas of lot 1. **The development shown for Lot 1 and Lot 2 are scenarios to illustrate that the lots can be built in accordance with the hillside code. The final design will probably be different than what is shown on Sheet C-3. However, if the subdivision is approved, the development of each lot must receive Hillside Committee approval demonstrating compliance with the hillside code. The building pad slope line will be calculated based upon the disturbance boundary for the proposed home. An area that is restored back to natural grade and restored with native vegetation does not count as disturbed area via the final hillside design.**



- c. The slope analysis combines both existing lots as one lot for the analysis. This causes lines A through M to not fall perpendicular to many of the elevation lines thus reducing the slopes, is this proper? **Yes, this was done in accordance with Section 2209 of the hillside code (with 3 slope lines per acre and the lines spaced equally across the lot). A copy of the hillside code (Article 22) is also attached for reference.**
  - d. The slope analysis lists the property as non hillside, is it the developers intent to remove the subject properties or any portion thereof from hillside? In one site visit to the properties, it is clear that these are hillside lots. **The applicant has not expressed an intent to remove these properties from the hillside designation. A hillside property owner may request removal from the hillside designation in accordance with Section 2210 of the Hillside Code. Such a request is subject to Town Council review and approval.**
  - e. The existing topo of the land for the slope analysis appears to be the current elevations post disturbance not the original based upon early topography from the recorders office. Are the original elevations being used? The use of the current disturbed existing grades softens the slopes. **The plan should identify the natural grades and I will check with the applicant to clarify which grades are shown.**
6. The grading and drainage drawings showing the disturbance areas and slope calculations conflict with the architectural renderings and layouts. Which disturbance and layout does the builder intend to use on these sites? The lot split calculations are tight enough adjusting the home location and size affects the viability of the split. **Yes, the footprint of the house on Lot 1 appears to be difference between the architectural rendering and the preliminary grading plan. I will contact the applicant to provide clarification and to update the plans/documents accordingly.**

Given some of the conflicts between the Architectural drawings and the civil drawings as well as the apparent missing areas in the disturbance calculations and other questions brought up above; I believe it would be premature at this time to recommend the split for approval given the inconsistencies and their potential impact on meeting the requirements for fitting 3 lots.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns regarding this particular plat change and appreciate feedback regarding my understanding and observations.

Sincerely,

Mike Markham Jr.

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 23, 2019 2:46 PM  
**To:** 'Dave Vince'  
**Cc:** Paul Mood  
**Subject:** RE: 4474 E Valley Vista Lane variance

Dear Mr. Morgan and Mr. Vanderkuyl,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The applicant submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

The drainage also must comply with the Town's Storm Drainage Design Manual.

I forwarded your email to the Town Engineer, Paul Mood, to provide input regarding the washes and site grading and drainage.

The Commission reviewed the application at yesterday's work study session and expressed concern regarding the proposed hammerhead.

The application is scheduled for Planning Commission public hearing review on February 5th; in which the Commission will take public comment and continue the application to a future meeting date for further review.

You may also review the application materials on the Town's website at:  
<https://paradisevalleyaz.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dave Vince  
**Sent:** Monday, January 21, 2019 1:05 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** 4474 E Valley Vista Lane variance

We are in opposition to a variance or plan that allows building on the island property located to the east of 4474 E. Valley Vista Lane and to the southeast of 4490 E Valley Vista Lane if it has a negative impact on the drainage arroyos or if it presents any fire/life safety risk due to its limited hammerhead access. The parcel proposed for development is surrounded by two deep arroyos. These arroyos play a critical role in preventing flooding in our neighborhood during

torrential rains. There is a third significant drainage path that dissects the property on the east side of the arroyo nearly in half. In the renderings this arroyo does not even appear. Can you assure us there will be no impediments to its flow? Another wash in our neighborhood has serious drainage issues. We don't want a similar problem due to changes made to the flow of water or the arroyos. We also want assurances all emergency vehicles will have unrestricted access to the properties being proposed. The PV standard, full circle cul-de-sac, may be prudent for this purpose. This isolated island property will be dependent on its bridge for services.

As you are probably aware, the developer requesting the modification currently owns 4474 Valley Vista Lane which is a 2.19 acre buildable lot and requires no variance to develop. The lot was designed approximately 20 years ago when the Hunt property was broken up and Sanctuary II estate lots were created. Is building two homes in the space originally designed for one consistent with the Sanctuary II's master plan? The lots were designed with preservation of open spaces in mind where desert life could thrive and the arroyos could flow unimpeded. This application threatens both. We treasure the open "countryside setting" the Town's founders envisioned. We are hopeful no variance will be granted. Once the desert is gone, it can never be replaced.

Sincerely,

David Morgan and Vincent Vanderkuyl



## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2019 5:38 PM  
**To:** 'jane horn'  
**Subject:** RE: Letter to homeowners in Camelback North regarding valley vista development PDF.pdf

Dear Ms. Horn,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for 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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** jane horn (via Google Drive)  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2019 10:19 AM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Letter to homeowners in Camelback North regarding valley vista development PDF.pdf

has shared the following PDF:



[Letter to homeowners in Camelback North regarding valley vista development PDF.pdf](#)



Mr. Burton,

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns.

Sincerely,  
Janie Horn

[Open](#)

Google Drive: Have all your files within reach from any device.  
Google LLC, 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043, USA

Google™

To: George Burton and other member of the Planning Committee

From: Homeowners in Camelback North Estates

Subject: Application to create a subdivision with three lots

The person/s signing below are in opposition to a variance or plan that allows building on the island property located to the east of 4474 E. Valley Vista Lane and to the southeast of 4490 E Valley Vista Lane if it has a negative impact on the drainage arroyos or if it presents any fire/life safety risk due to its limited hammerhead access. The parcel proposed for development is surrounded by two deep arroyos. These arroyos play a critical role in preventing flooding in our neighborhood during torrential rains. **There is a third significant drainage path that dissects the property on the east side of the arroyo nearly in half. In the renderings this arroyo does not even appear.** Can you assure us there will be no impediments to its flow? Another wash in our neighborhood has serious drainage issues. We don't want a similar problem due to changes made to the flow of water or the arroyos. We also want assurances all emergency vehicles will have unrestricted access to the properties being proposed. The PV standard, full circle cul-de-sac, may be prudent for this purpose. This isolated island property will be dependent on its bridge for services.

As you are probably aware, the developer requesting the modification currently owns 4474 Valley Vista Lane which is a 2.19 acre buildable lot and requires no variance to develop. The lot was designed approximately 20 years ago when the Hunt property was broken up and Sanctuary II estate lots were created. Is building two homes in the space originally designed for one consistent with the Sanctuary II's master plan? The lots were designed with preservation of open spaces in mind where desert life could thrive and the arroyos could flow unimpeded. This application threatens both.

We treasure the open "countryside setting" the Town's founders envisioned. We are hopeful no variance will be granted. Once the desert is gone, it can never be replaced.

Sincerely,

Name

Address

## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Friday, January 18, 2019 5:29 PM  
**To:** 'Sabra Wagoner'  
**Subject:** RE: 4474 Valley Vista Land

Dear Ms. Wagoner,

Thank you for the photos and information.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for 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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

**From:** Sabra Wagoner  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 7:41 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** 4474 Valley Vista Land

George

I am attaching photos taken on the island lot that is being considered for development and from the arroyo that divides the two properties on which the developer wishes to build. The photos show how much water/wash goes through the middle of the island lot to the degree it is creating a third arroyo. This third arroyo was not represented at all in the renderings. The main source of this water is through our property. Attached is a google earth picture that clearly shows the third arroyo.


Included also are pictures of the arroyo between the properties in question showing how deep and wide it is. The bridge and waterway are fancifully under represented in the renderings. I have attached the renderings for comparison purposes.

The photos also include pictures of the grading and leveling the developer did to 4474 without permit. This ugly scar is the result of cutting away the sloping hillside and pushed it into the arroyo to yield a flat building pad. All the desert vegetation was destroyed and not replaced. This precedent is concerning.

Please share these pictures with the Planning Commission members, Paul Mood and especially the person in charge of the waterway.

I hope these pictures will lead you to understand why any development on this lot is troublesome due to water run off management. We have an example of faulty arroyo management already in our neighborhood and want to avoid a repeat.

Thanks again,

 [A significant arroyo. Deep and wide.JPG](#) x

 [Drainage in middle of island lot.JPG](#) x

 Encroachment on arroyo from grading 4474 Valle... x

 Middle of island lot. Water is headed to arroyo... x

 Shows how deep drainage is in middle of lot.JPG x

 Shows what was done without a permit. Scarring ... x

 This is a deep and wide arroyo. Notice human in... x

 This is NOT a little stream as depicted in the ... x

Sabra Wagoner



























## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 6:36 PM  
**To:** 'Sabra Wagoner'  
**Subject:** RE: Valley Vista Lots - Planning meeting scheduled for 1/22

Hi Ms. Wagoner,

The existing home at 4490 E Valley Vista Lane will remain and is one of the three lots in this subdivision (with two new lots being created from 4474 Valley Vista and part of the lot line on 4490 Valley Vista being adjusted).

Also, the 165' circle must touch the 40' front building setback line and fit within each lot. The circle may be placed over easements, but has to touch the front setback line and fit within the property boundaries.

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

**From:** Sabra Wagoner >  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 11:10 AM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: Valley Vista Lots - Planning meeting scheduled for 1/22

George  
Thank you for your response. I appreciate having the documents forwarded to me as well. I believe from the drawings, the existing house located at 4490 E Valley Vista Lane will be one of the three houses in this subdivision. Am I correct? There will not be three new lots established and houses built? Also I do not understand the 165 circle, they appear not to fit the lots without overlapping into easements, etc. etc. Clearly not my background. Are you saying the circles are in compliance even if they are over lap deep arroyos? **(I do hope the planning commission plans to see these lots before taking action. These are very large arroyos that don't appear significant in the drawings.)**  
Another major concern, by adding another house to this already established community, is it not degrading the others? Why grant a hammerhead variance to a property tucked behind other properties for the sake of the almighty dollar while forgoing the safety issues involved. Also why risk disturbing significant arroyos!  
Have a great day,  
Sabra Wagoner

On Thu, Jan 17, 2019 at 10:36 AM George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Wagoner,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

You may also view the application and materials on the Town's website or by selecting the "Attachments" section on item #19-024 of the Planning Commission agenda (see attached).

The applicant has submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

I also forwarded your email to the Town Engineer, Paul Mood, to provide input regarding the washes and site grading and drainage.

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

**From:** Sabra Wagoner

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:53 PM

**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>

**Cc:** Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner <[jbienwillner@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:jbienwillner@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Vice Mayor Scott Moore <[smoore@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:smoore@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Julie Pace <[jpace@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:jpace@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Mark Stanton <[mstanton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:mstanton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Paul Dembow <[pdembow@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:pdembow@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Ellen Andeen <[eandeen@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:eandeen@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Anna Thomasson <[athomasson@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:athomasson@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>

**Subject:** Valley Vista Lots - Planning meeting scheduled for 1/22

George

Thank you very much for speaking with me regarding the application for the Valley Vista lots. As explained, the proposed application probably impacts our property as much as any.

The area they are attempting to build two homes on is surrounded by arroyos. The acreage on paper (after the re-draw) may meet town code when viewed aerially but a significant portion are deep arroyos and therefore unbuildable land.

Any construction but certainly the construction of two properties on this island space could negatively impact the arroyos. Our neighborhood has marginal heavy rain runoff drainage. Several times in the past years we have experienced flooding at our house and street which drains into the arroyos in question. Any restriction resulting from the developer's arroyo manipulation would have serious detrimental impact to our neighborhood properties.

Getting utilities and sewer to this property will undoubtedly be destructive to the existing natural landscape. Undergrounding them must be very difficult without impact to the arroyos and having them above ground would be an objectionable eyesore.

I also am skeptical about this developer's adherence to the arroyos' preservation, if he is the one who previously ignored Paradise Valley rules and without permits began grading and defacing 4474 allowing debris into the arroyo. This has never been remediated. He has already demonstrated "asking forgiveness is easier for him than asking permission."

The developer of 4474 could build on their 2.19 acre existing lot without any Town intervention. Nothing is holding him back but greed.

I request any variance be denied that facilitates building on the island because of its impact on the existing arroyo structure. Denial will insure preservation of the arroyos and the survival of the existing native plants and animals.  
**Granting a variance will destroy the current countrylike setting the Town's mission once honored.**

I welcome you or any of the Councilmen/women to come see the area in question. I believe by seeing the arroyos you will share my concerns that this is not a buildable lot without unacceptable modifications of the fragile existing arroyo system. This has been the case for over 30 years when the original Hunt property was broken up orphaning this unusable space. Nothing has changed.

Others in my neighborhood join me in disapproval of this application and any variance that serves to break up the currently buildable 2.19 acre property. The proposed (tiny house) island property if developed will no doubt require a further variance request for multi story development to enable adequate square footage for market viability. This clearly will be another point of contention. This should be avoided. Denying a variance to this developer will insure it.

Thank you for your time and service.

Sincerely,

Sabra Wagoner

--  
Sabra Wagoner



## George Burton

---

**From:** George Burton  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 17, 2019 10:37 AM  
**To:** 'Sabra Wagoner'  
**Cc:** Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Vice Mayor Scott Moore; Council Member Julie Pace; Council Member Mark Stanton; Council Member Paul Dembow; Council Member Ellen Andeen; Council Member Anna Thomasson; Paul Michaud; Jeremy Knapp (jknapp@paradisevalleyaz.gov); Paul Mood  
**Subject:** RE: Valley Vista Lots - Planning meeting scheduled for 1/22  
**Attachments:** Agenda 01-22-19.pdf

Dear Ms. Wagoner,

Thank you for your interest in this case.

A copy of your email was forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

You may also view the application and materials on the Town's website or by selecting the "Attachments" section on item #19-024 of the Planning Commission agenda (see attached).

The applicant has submitted a preliminary grading and drainage plan that is subject to Commission and staff review.

I also forwarded your email to the Town Engineer, Paul Mood, to provide input regarding the washes and site grading and drainage.

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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

**From:** Sabra Wagoner  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 16, 2019 4:53 PM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Cc:** Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner <[jbienwillner@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:jbienwillner@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Vice Mayor Scott Moore <[smoore@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:smoore@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Julie Pace <[jpace@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:jpace@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Mark Stanton <[mstanton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:mstanton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Paul Dembow <[pdembow@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:pdembow@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Ellen Andeen <[eandeen@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:eandeen@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>; Council Member Anna Thomasson <[athomasson@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto:athomasson@paradisevalleyaz.gov)>  
**Subject:** Valley Vista Lots - Planning meeting scheduled for 1/22

George

Thank you very much for speaking with me regarding the application for the Valley Vista lots. As explained, the proposed application probably impacts our property as much as any.

The area they are attempting to build two homes on is surrounded by arroyos. The acreage on paper (after the re-draw) may meet town code when viewed aerially but a significant portion are deep arroyos and therefore unbuildable land.

Any construction but certainly the construction of two properties on this island space could negatively impact the arroyos. Our neighborhood has marginal heavy rain runoff drainage. Several times in the past years we have experienced flooding at our house and street which drains into the arroyos in question. Any restriction resulting from the developer's arroyo manipulation would have serious detrimental impact to our neighborhood properties. Getting utilities and sewer to this property will undoubtedly be destructive to the existing natural landscape. Undergrounding them must be very difficult without impact to the arroyos and having them above ground would be an objectionable eye soar.

I also am skeptical about this developer's adherence to the arroyos' preservation, if he is the one who previously ignored Paradise Valley rules and without permits began grading and defacing 4474 allowing debris into the arroyo. This has never been remediated. He has already demonstrated "asking forgiveness is easier for him than asking permission." The developer of 4474 could build on their 2.19 acre existing lot without any Town intervention. Nothing is holding him back but greed.

I request any variance be denied that facilitates building on the island because of its impact on the existing arroyo structure. Denial will insure preservation of the arroyos and the survival of the existing native plants and animals.  
**Granting a variance will destroy the current countrylike setting the Town's mission once honored.**

I welcome you or any of the Councilmen/women to come see the area in question. I believe by seeing the arroyos you will share my concerns that this is not a buildable lot without unacceptable modifications of the fragile existing arroyo system. This has been the case for over 30 years when the original Hunt property was broken up orphaning this unusable space. Nothing has changed.

Others in my neighborhood join me in disapproval of this application and any variance that serves to break up the currently buildable 2.19 acre property. The proposed (tiny house) island property if developed will no doubt require a further variance request for multi story development to enable adequate square footage for market viability. This clearly will be another point of contention. This should be avoided. Denying a variance to this developer will insure it.

Thank you for your time and service.

Sincerely,



## 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 22<sup>nd</sup> and public hearing review on February 5<sup>th</sup>.

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 22<sup>nd</sup> 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](mailto:gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov)

---

**From:** Geoffrey  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2019 10:03 AM  
**To:** George Burton <[gburton@paradisevalleyaz.gov](mailto: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 weakening 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