From:
 Andy Gordon

 To:
 Loras Rauch

 Cc:
 Carol Gordon

Subject: Andy & Carol Gordon - Follow Up

Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 4:10:23 PM

EXTERNAL

Hi Loras: So nice sharing conversation today about PV's 2022 General Plan and how there might be exciting possibilities around our area.

Even though we do not have any imminent plans for our property, please feel free to contact us if we can help in brainstorming any ideas that town residents might value in the next decade.

Thank you for all the thought and inclusion you're encouraging.

Best: Andy & Carol

P.S. I did register on the pvtogether2022.com website and hope this doesn't duplicate with my standing email notices with the Town.

Andy and Carol Gordon



Staff Notes of Phone Conversation:

- 1. Discussed Redevelopment Area of Lincoln Drive South.
- 2. Resident felt that the Town was missing opportunities for an interesting "arts & culture live work" hub for this area.
- 3. Resident thought that in the future this area deserved a special charette so the residents could help determine the future of this area.

From: To:

;

; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; Paul Mood; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com;

oras Rauch

Subject: Date: Planning Commission Meeting - July 20, 2021 Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:10:56 PM

EXTERNAL

Good afternoon everyone,

Firstly, may I thank all of you for the time and effort you expend in serving our community. I, greatly, appreciate your dedication to our Town.

Wouldn't it be great if meetings could be held in person! However, I do commend your caution in holding meetings, remotely, while this ghastly pandemic still lingers... even though the technology is tricky to navigate.

I did tune into the meeting, last night, and I do have some questions and concerns, as follows:

Regarding land use, Mathew Zlyszeiko (representing Michael Baker Consulting) mentioned that the Town should offer "more opportunities to interact with other residents" as well "enhanced community spaces" and "encourage public art." I am concerned that we're focusing on this issue, since the feedback on the survey of the General Plan indicates that only 37% of residents see this as important. This means that 63% of residents deem the issue as either not important or merely somewhat important. In addition, I have to say, I was confused by the new matrixes which were used at the meeting. To avoid losing sight of the wishes of the majority of residents, it would seem less confusing to refer to the core source document... i.e. the survey results of the General Plan which gives clear percentage responses to particular questions, rather than paraphrased versions and comparative matrixes which can cause misunderstandings. Bearing all this in mind, please allow me to endorse the wishes of the majority (64%) of residents on land use. To directly quote Page 13 of the General Plan, the proposal seeks to "Encourage the creation of passive open space and recreation spots i.e. landscape plazas, gateways, and small seating areas along walking paths." All our properties in the Town of Paradise Valley are zoned as minimum one acre lots. Unlike high density areas, where there is a need for community recreational spaces, we all have more than sufficient leisure space, within our own boundaries. Provision of these facilities may attract people from out of town, rather than our own residents. We, already, have out of town cyclists racing through our Town so it seems undesirable to provide them with relaxation areas in which to loiter. Furthermore, these spaces may look benign and inviting, during the day. However, when darkness falls, these spaces, easily, become havens for all kinds of undesirable behavior such as drug abuse, alcohol abuse, and sexual abuse. In addition, these facilities will come at a financial cost to residents of our Town ... with initial hard and soft landscaping coupled with long term maintenance costs from funding which could be allocated elsewhere. The beneficiaries, financial or otherwise, may not be residents of our Town. In summary of this issue, I do encourage allocation of time and resources to the issues which are deemed as "Very Important".

Following on from the consideration of land use, there was mention of two community spaces

at the meeting... "the Goldwater Park" and a "pocket park in the vicinity of Lincoln and 56th (which I cannot locate)." As a long term resident of the Town, I was not aware that the Goldwater Park was anything other than a memorial since the plaque outside, simply, states "Barry Goldwater Memorial". Today, I did visit the "Goldwater Park" which is truly delightful. The hard and soft landscaping is well designed and well maintained with seating and gathering areas, but I have not heard any resident mention that they have used the park, in any way. Additionally, I am not aware of any opportunities to "interact with other residents" at this park. So, in concurrence with 63% of residents, it seems the Town has no need for any additional facilities of this nature.

Another concern about land use is the town owned parcel on the corner of Scottsdale Road and Doubletree Ranch Road, which amounts to 1.75 acres, street address 7128 E Doubletree Ranch Road. It may have seemed sensible to allow this plot to lie fallow, in the past. However, now seems to be the right time to make decisions about this plot since we are, unlikely, to see such high demand for land in the foreseeable future. Land use on plots bordering Scottsdale Road is happening all around. Now is a good time to sell! Considering current high land values, the Town may be able to raise over \$2 million from the sale of this land. Perhaps the sale of this lot could lead to a reduction in the police pension fund liability! Please consider this at your next meeting.

Continuing the subject of land use, Matthew Zlyszeiko mentioned there is a "strong desire" for a multi-modal community. I did skim read the 85 pages of the General Plan survey results, but couldn't find any mention of this subject matter. Apparently, this term refers to providing better facilities for public transport... buses, cyclists etc. Again, rather than paraphrasing, it would be most helpful if reference could be made to the General Plan survey results at meetings by quoting the page number and the percentage response from residents.

In conclusion, thank you once again for all your efforts in maintaining the character of our Town. The term "semi rural" was used at the meeting... and that's a perfect description. I do hope we can maintain our oasis in the desert!

Best regards

Marel Brady

From:

To: ; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; Paul Mood; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com;

ras Rauch

Subject: PV Meeting, 7/20/21

Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 6:56:40 PM

EXTERNAL

Good afternoon everyone,

I am most appreciative of the time you devote to matters relating to our town. Thank you very much for this, your work is appreciated.

My question is as follows:

Why pursue "Enhanced Community Spaces" in Paradise Valley?

I've only been here for 20 years but I don't know of a single resident that would leave his house to meet or interact socially with another resident in an "open space" in Paradise Valley. How many people do you actually personally know that regularly visit the Barry Goldwater Memorial area to interact socially with other residents?

Who would actually benefit from "small seating areas along walking paths" other than perhaps an installer of such a project?

Has anyone determined what percentage of PV residents consistently leave their above-average homes to go on these long walks in order to visit "passive open space recreation spaces?"

From a business point of view, who do you actually see as your target market for something like this? Retirees?

This type of action will enable the domino effect: What happens to the trash that humans leave behind? How much does the irrigation cost? Will it be lit up at night? Where do people park? Look at the resistance by residents and enforcement by the city to people parking in front of houses to climb Camelback mountain. Do you want more of this? What about safety?

This idea is not a practical one.

The Planning committee is so talented and so gifted, how about spending more of your valuable time and the Town's money on more important issues?

Sincerely,

Bernard Kirk

From:

; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; Paul Mood; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com;

Loras Rauch

Cc:

Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Anna Thomasson; Council Member Scott Moore; Council Member Ellen

Andeen; Council Member Julie Pace; Council Member Paul Dembow; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton

 Subject:
 PV Meeting, 7/20/21 - Our thoughts

 Date:
 Friday, July 23, 2021 5:34:15 PM

EXTERNAL

Dear Paradise Valley Planning Commission:

Thank you very much for your dedication to Paradise Valley. We realize how much time and effort is spent on matters that benefit all of us.

After hearing about the meeting held on July 20 and the plans to pursue "Enhanced Community Spaces" in Paradise Valley, we felt it appropriate to weigh in.

Our good fortune to live here is something we cherish. We've been residents for over 25 years and specifically sought out a home in Paradise Valley because of the spacious and well-maintained properties. Because of these beautiful properties, most with pools and other amenities that rival the best resorts, we question the need for parks and other spaces for gatherings. Who do you envision using these open spaces?

The Barry Goldwater Park is an example of a lovely small area to honor the great Barry Goldwater, but it is not a place where people gather. Lovely spaces to gather would also require parking capabilities, restroom facilities, regular maintenance for trash, maintenance for landscaping and so on. Then what about safety and law enforcement? It just seems a huge expense for a very small audience.

We can appreciate the good intentions, but please reconsider this and weigh the costs against benefits to so few. Please don't view this as criticism, because we do appreciate all the time and work you all put into keeping Paradise Valley the paradise it is, but it is our opinion that funds could be applied to much more important areas.

Sincerely, Vicki and Vernon Vaughn

CC: Mayor and Paradise Valley City Council

From:
To:
Loras Rauc

 Subject:
 RE: PV Meeting, 7/20/21 - Our thoughts

 Date:
 Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:38:40 AM

EXTERNAL

Thank you so much for responding. Cost vs benefit is of primary concern for me. I very much appreciate your acknowledgement Vicki Vaughn

From: Loras Rauch < LRauch@paradisevalleyaz.gov>

Sent: Saturday, July 24, 2021 10:15 AM

To: Vicki Vaughn

Subject: RE: PV Meeting, 7/20/21 - Our thoughts

Hello Mr. & Mrs. Vaughn,

Thank you for reaching out and sharing your thoughts and ideas on the 2022 General Plan Update! The Town has used a variety of means to reach out to the residents; our goal always being to provide multiple opportunities for residents to provide their input into this update.

As the Planning Commission and Town Council continue to review and evaluate the 2012 General Plan Goals & Policies, to determine which ones should be maintained, revised or deleted as part of the 2022 General Plan Update, your comments on what is important to you are valued and recognized.

I appreciate your time and your thoughts – please continue to reach out to me and stay involved.

Best regards,

Loras Rauch, AICP

Special Projects Planner
Community Development Department
6401 E. Lincoln Drive
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253
(phone) 480-348-3595
Irauch@paradisevalleyaz.gov

Office Hours: Mon-Fri 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m., closed noon-1:00 p.m. and holidays

Stay informed with the Town's response to COVID-19 by visiting: www.paradisevalleyaz.gov/COVID-19
Sign up to receive emergency alerts & notifications from Alert PV: www.paradisevalleyaz.gov/AlertPV
Sign up for the Town's weekly COVID-19 Update by visiting: https://l.townofpv.com/COVID19

Disclaimer:

All messages contained in this system are the property of the Town of Paradise Valley and are considered a public record

subject to disclosure under the Arizona Public Records Law (A.R.S. 39-121). Town employees, public officials, and those who generate e-mail to and from this e-mail domain should have no expectation of privacy related to the use of this technology.

From: Vicki Vaughn **Sent:** Friday, July 23, 2021 5:34 PM **To:** Planning Commissioner Campbell Planning Commissioner Charles Covington ; Planning Commissioner Pamela Georgelos <pgeorgelos@paradisevalleyaz.gov>; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke <<u>klocke@paradisevalleyaz.gov</u>>; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann < kliepmann@paradisevalleyaz.gov >; Planning Commissioner William Nassikas <wnassikas@paradisevallevaz.gov>; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose <<u>JRose@paradisevalleyaz.gov</u>>; Paul Mood pmood@paradisevalleyaz.gov; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com; Loras Rauch < LRauch@paradisevalleyaz.gov > Cc: Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner <iber display="block">; Council Member Anna Thomasson athomasson@paradisevallevaz.gov; Council Member Scott Moore <smoore@paradisevallevaz.gov>; Council Member Ellen Andeen <eandeen@paradisevallevaz.gov>; Council Member Julie Pace < <u>ipace@paradisevalleyaz.gov</u>>; Council Member Paul Dembow <pdembow@paradisevalleyaz.gov>; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton <mstanton@paradisevalleyaz.gov> **Subject:** PV Meeting, 7/20/21 - Our thoughts **EXTERNAL**

Dear Paradise Valley Planning Commission:

Thank you very much for your dedication to Paradise Valley. We realize how much time and effort is spent on matters that benefit all of us.

After hearing about the meeting held on July 20 and the plans to pursue "Enhanced Community Spaces" in Paradise Valley, we felt it appropriate to weigh in.

Our good fortune to live here is something we cherish. We've been residents for over 25 years and specifically sought out a home in Paradise Valley because of the spacious and well-maintained properties. Because of these beautiful properties, most with pools and other amenities that rival the best resorts, we question the need for parks and other spaces for gatherings. Who do you

envision using these open spaces?

The Barry Goldwater Park is an example of a lovely small area to honor the great Barry Goldwater, but it is not a place where people gather. Lovely spaces to gather would also require parking capabilities, restroom facilities, regular maintenance for trash, maintenance for landscaping and so on. Then what about safety and law enforcement? It just seems a huge expense for a very small audience.

We can appreciate the good intentions, but please reconsider this and weigh the costs against benefits to so few. Please don't view this as criticism, because we do appreciate all the time and work you all put into keeping Paradise Valley the paradise it is, but it is our opinion that funds could be applied to much more important areas.

Sincerely, Vicki and Vernon Vaughn

CC: Mayor and Paradise Valley City Council

From:
To:
Loras Rauc

Cc: Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Anna Thomasson; Council Member Ellen Andeen; Council Member

Scott Moore; Council Member Paul Dembow; Council Member Julie Pace; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton; Planning
; Planning Commissioner Pamela Georgelos;

<u> Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning Commissioner William</u>

Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com; Paul Michaud

Subject: Planning Commission Meeting - August 3, 2021

Date: Monday, August 9, 2021 10:02:41 AM

EXTERNAL

Dear Ms Rauch,

Thank you for your response to my letter of July 21 which outlined concerns regarding the Planning Commission meeting on July 20, 2021

As a follow up, I did listen to the recording of the Planning Commission meeting on August 3. That was a long meeting! Four hours! I commend you and the members of the Planning Commission for your dedication.

I do have further concerns. For ease of reference, I will address these at the particular time points during the recording of the meeting on August 3.

1 hour, 17 minutes - 1 hour, 25 minutes

During this time, commissioners discussed public transport. Currently, public transport frames the town along Tatum Blvd, Shea Blvd and Scottsdale Road. Commissioners agreed to insert wording which would "promote public transit services <mark>along major arterial routes WITHIN</mark> the town... keeping it more global, leaving it open as a policy, since we're going to have a whole lot different transport system within the next 10/20/30 years than what we're accustomed to now". This change of policy is very alarming, in my opinion, and needs to be removed. Almost every residence within the Town has a minimum of a 3 car garage, with a minimum of two cars. Residents have no need of public transport. If residents are not ambulatory, they use private hired cars. Resort visitors arrive either in their own private vehicle or have the facility to use private hotel shuttles. Why would we provide public transport along arterial routes for resort guests? There's nowhere, within the town, for resort guests to go! Why would residents want the noise and disturbance of public transport inside the perimeter of our town? It is beyond our powers to predict future transport systems. However, it is within our power to protect our environment. Please bear in mind that the General Plan Survey showed that 67% of residents did not deem regular public transport to be important. As with all important decisions, the survey results need to be consulted. It seems to me that, rather than a blanket policy on future public transport needs, we should address this issue on a case-by-case basis. As noted at the start of the meeting the words "peace, tranquility, privacy" are particular

concerns of residents. Please continue to be guided by these key words.

1 hour, 33 minutes - 1 hour, 58 minutes

Land use was discussed. Enhanced quality of life was mentioned. However, the content was mostly about consideration of walls, yard setbacks, landscaping, and general wordsmithing. Shouldn't we be discussing the sale of town owned land which could lead to the alleviation of the burden of police pensions?

1 hour, 58 minutes - 2 hours, 01 minutes

I note that your commissioners have acknowledged "a fair amount of community response and public input on open spaces". However, I'm puzzled that your response to the commissioner was that you are "not exactly sure what discussion you're referring to." You decided to defer this discussion until August 17. Please do familiarize yourself with all the community responses on public spaces, in readiness for the next meeting.

Finally, I am uneasy that my letter sent to you, on July 21, (and those of other concerned residents around that time) has not been made the subject of public record. Please can you attach all letters from the public regarding planning commission issues, received during the past few weeks, to the meeting agenda for August 17.

Best regards

Marel Brady

From: To:

Cc: Loras Rauch; Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Anna Thomasson; Council Member Ellen Andeen; Council

Member Scott Moore; Council Member Paul Dembow; Council Member Julie Pace; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton; ; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning

Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; matthewk@mbakerintl.com; Paul Michaud

Subject: Re: Planning Commission Meeting - August 3, 2021

Date: Monday, August 9, 2021 10:18:17 AM

EXTERNAL

All good points Marel.

The public transportation thing I thought at the time was carelessly used - perhaps to make everyone think that this person was "farsighted."

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 9, 2021, at 10:02 AM, marel brady

wrote:

Dear Ms Rauch,

Thank you for your response to my letter of July 21 which outlined concerns regarding the Planning Commission meeting on July 20, 2021

As a follow up, I did listen to the recording of the Planning Commission meeting on August 3. That was a long meeting! Four hours! I commend you and the members of the Planning Commission for your dedication.

I do have further concerns. For ease of reference, I will address these at the particular time points during the recording of the meeting on August 3.

1 hour, 17 minutes - 1 hour, 25 minutes

During this time, commissioners discussed public transport. Currently, public transport frames the town along Tatum Blvd, Shea Blvd and Scottsdale Road. Commissioners agreed to insert wording which would "promote public transit services along major arterial routes WITHIN the town... keeping it more global, leaving it open as a policy, since we're going to have a whole lot different transport system within the next 10/20/30 years than what we're accustomed to now". This change of

policy is very alarming, in my opinion, and needs to be removed. Almost every residence within the Town has a minimum of a 3 car garage, with a minimum of two cars. Residents have no need of public transport. If residents are not ambulatory, they use private hired cars. Resort visitors arrive either in their own private vehicle or have the facility to use private hotel shuttles. Why would we provide public transport along arterial routes for resort guests? There's nowhere, within the town, for resort guests to go! Why would residents want the noise and disturbance of public transport inside the perimeter of our town? It is beyond our powers to predict future transport systems. However, it is within our power to protect our environment. Please bear in mind that the General Plan Survey showed that 67% of residents did not deem regular public transport to be important. As with all important decisions, the survey results need to be consulted. It seems to me that, rather than a blanket policy on future public transport needs, we should address this issue on a case-by-case basis. As noted at the start of the meeting the words "peace, tranquility, privacy" are particular concerns of residents. Please continue to be guided by these key words.

1 hour, 33 minutes - 1 hour, 58 minutes

Land use was discussed. Enhanced quality of life was mentioned. However, the content was mostly about consideration of walls, yard setbacks, landscaping, and general wordsmithing. Shouldn't we be discussing the sale of town owned land which could lead to the alleviation of the burden of police pensions?

1 hour, 58 minutes - 2 hours, 01 minutes

I note that your commissioners have acknowledged "a fair amount of community response and public input on open spaces". However, I'm puzzled that your response to the commissioner was that you are "not exactly sure what discussion you're referring to." You decided to defer this discussion until August 17. Please do familiarize yourself with all the community responses on public spaces, in readiness for the next meeting.

Finally, I am uneasy that my letter sent to you, on July 21, (and those of other concerned residents around that time) has not been made the subject of public record. Please can you attach all letters from the public regarding planning commission issues, received during the past few weeks, to the meeting agenda for August 17.

Best regards

Marel Brady

From:

To: ; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com; Loras Rauch;

Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Scott Moore; Council Member Ellen Andeen; Council Member Paul

Dembow; Council Member Julie Pace; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton; Council Member Anna Thomasson

Subject: A TOPV Resident"s voice in Town Planning

Date: Monday, August 9, 2021 8:52:02 PM

EXTERNAL

Commissioners, I am a long-time TOPV resident.

I am AGAINST extending general public transportation into the interior of the TOPV.

I am AGAINST adding common new recreational spaces unless there are mechanisms already in place to effectively prevent/control the potential problems of associated influx of the homeless, "tent camps", vagrancy, increased drug/sex trafficking and drug use, etc. I believe these problems would be better avoided to begin with rather than relying on developing future measures to correct them.

Thank you,

Robert Sterrett Jr

From:

To:

; Planning Commissioner Pamela

Georgelos; Planning Commissioner Kristina Locke; Planning Commissioner Karen Liepmann; Planning
Commissioner William Nassikas; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; MATTHEWK@mbakerintl.com; Loras Rauch;
Mayor Jorry Rich William: Council Momber Scott Moore; Council Momber Flag

Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Scott Moore; Council Member Ellen Andeen; Council Member Paul Dembow; Council Member Julie Pace; Vice Mayor Mark Stanton; Council Member Anna Thomasson; Council

Member Anna Thomasson

Subject: Letter to Planning Commission on Public Space and Land Use

Date: Tuesday, August 10, 2021 9:54:03 AM

EXTERNAL

My husband and I are residents of Paradise Valley for over 40 years. We have watched many changes; some we liked and some not liked. We want to comment on the issue of "public space and land use" as well as, adding public transportation.

The best way for us to tell you that we are TOTALLY AGAINST setting up public space in our Town is by sharing our experience with you that our daughter has had within the past 8 years. Our daughter lives in NE Phoenix about 36th Street and Union Hills; nice, moderate income, family neighborhood within walking distance of an elementary school. I used to take our grand sons to the "park" at the end of their street and watch the boys play in the sand, on the swings and run through the green grass. Below is her experience with this area:

"In our community we have a 'green belt park' which is an open area with benches, shade and grass. People from the neighborhoods go and spend time at this park (especially during the cooler months) with their kids and sometimes dogs. About a year after the green belt was built there started to be a few vagrants that would use it to make camp. They set up tents in the evenings, they'd sleep out in sleeping bags and would bring their belongings with them. Usually this meant a whole bunch of shopping carts! The number of vagrants grew and within a few weeks it became an area where there were roughly 20-30 homeless individuals that were using this as their home. It became an encampment. Shopping carts everywhere, trash everywhere, tents, etc.

since there were no buildings or outhouses, the entire area stunk of human urine. Neighbors were complaining these individuals would go behind their walls and use it as a toilet for feces and they would just leave it there. The smell was unbearable and the sight was far less than what we would have wanted for our community. Numerous residents in our area made complaints with the city of Phoenix. The we cares program was dispatched (they offer services to the homeless community) but they say 90% of them don't accept any help. Phoenix police were called I'd guess 100's of times by residents but there wasn't much they could do. Some would be arrested for drugs or who knows what, but that was few and far between. Phoenix police would tell them to move along and they would have to vacate the premise but they would just come right back. It took our neighborhood and community roughly 4-5 months to get the homeless off that green belt area. Neighbors were finding syringes, alcohol bottles, for weeks! The homeless don't seem to care about the area and the worst is they used it as their toilet. The area still smells like urine. It's a battle to remove them and if you give them any space they abuse it. "

Now the park is not usable and the odor of urine remains. Children walking to the elementary school have to pass this area and it **STILL** has the stench of urine. Is this what we are opening our beautiful town up to by adding these public spaces for people to loiter, sell drugs, set up tents and bring in shopping carts? Those would be bad but then consider urine and fecal material and the stench they create in the heat of the Summer!!

YUCK.....is the only word that I can use to clearly express my opinion.

Regarding public transportation....the question is**WHY!**There is a new home around the corner from us that is almost finished being built. It has 5...yes, 5 garages and there are many, many more houses that have over 3 garages. Step back from this issue and think about the actual residents of the Town; do you REALLY believe that our residents NEED public transportation??? Or better yet....WOULD USE IT!

Thank you for all your hard work, time and energy that you donate to our "treasure of a town"! We are so truly blessed to have people like you who are willing to donate your time, sweat and energy!!

Sincerely,

Bob and Jeanne

Dr. and Mrs. Robert E. Sterrett, Jr.

· Good afternoon,

I am forwarding a message to you from a resident who is having difficulty with technology connections.
Please respond to Kathleen Monheit, email address as above

From: Kathleen Monheit

Date: August 10, 2021 at 3:57:46 PM PD'

Subject: Planning Commission Meetings

It has been brought to my attention that the Town of Paradise Planning Commission has been discussing the creation of vacant land in PV to be used as some sort of a "park" for social gathering. Almost all homes in our community have been built on a minimum of an acre and many have built their own entertaining and recreational facilities. I feel that this kind of public space would only encourage non-residents and out-of-owners to use this space, and at night, might attract all sorts of characters engaging in illegal activities. We already provide public biking paths for cyclists from neighboring communities which are a nuisance as they don't obey traffic laws and some ride in packs of 20-25. In addition, I doubt any homeowner would want this "gathering place" bordering their land.

It has also been discussed to provide public transportation within our Town. Again, we have no need for public transportation as most homes have at least one car for every occupant and there are a limited amount of through streets. As Paradise Valley is a bedroom community, we should not be having buses running up and down our streets, and, again, a crime issue. The busses I traveling Scottsdale have no more than 5-10 occupants.

Both of these ideas would incur a cost of maintenance plus wear and tear of our roads. As we do not pay TPV taxes, (and are trying to keep it that way) this would be an expense we do not need. We have always had a pretty low crime rate and I feel both of these ideas could provide an opportunity for non-resident individuals to partake in illegal activities.

Please do not try to change our unique Town into some kind of a sub-division. Most of us enjoy the low density and privacy Paradise Valley affords us.

Kathleen Monheit

From: <u>Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner</u>

To: Council Member Julie Pace

Cc: Vice Mayor Mark Stanton; Planning Commissioner Jim Rose; Lisa Collins; Klyszeiko, Matthew; Loras Rauch

Subject: RE: Upcoming Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Monday, August 16, 2021 11:40:25 AM

Dear Mrs. & Mr. Guglielmi,

Thank you so much for taking the time to reach out with your feedback. I have copied additional folks from the Town so that your feedback is officially noted and shared with the Town's Planning Commission and professional staff.

Just for the sake of background, when the Town Council unanimously approved the General Plan process and high-level direction, the process included a review of certain "elements" because state law requires the process to cover certain specified elements, such as open spaces, public transit, etc. (If you have interest, here is the state law on what needs to be at least addressed: https://www.azleg.gov/ars/9/00461-05.htm. Professional staff can fill you in on the process and how it is being handled as well, if you would like more details).

We are aware that some of the elements that must be addressed do not apply to our Town, and/or which the majority of our citizens would have no interest in considering or pursuing; while we have to follow the state law and look at the required elements, it does not mean that anyone involved in this state-mandated, once-every-ten-year process for the Town is looking to change the fundamental character or workings of our great Town. Quite the opposite -- I have great confidence in the Planning Commission (and Vice Mayor Stanton, the Town Council's liaison to the Commission), professional staff, and Council to continue to protect our Town and its historic values of low-density (one-home-per acre) residential living, exceptional public safety, no local property tax, and excellent service from the Town under a limited government model. These key values were also confirmed in a citizen survey that was completed as part of the General Plan process. So, please understand that exploring the required elements of the General Plan update as required by state law does not mean that there will be any Town initiatives on parks or new public facilities, or Town public transportation. I also do not support any such initiatives in the General Plan, and based on public discussions to date, I believe that the entire Town Council feels the same way. The General Plan will continue to have many more levels of open and transparent public review, until it is ultimately put to a public vote. I have every confidence that the document that is ultimately put forward will reflect our historic values and traditions, will be met with overwhelming approval – even then, it will be a "guide," and not legislation that changes

anything about the Town that is embedded into our ordinances and processes.

Thanks for being involved in the process to share your input and ideas. I hope this helps to set your mind at ease, and I'd be happy to discuss with you and take any additional questions or comments if you'd like: 480-348-3660.

Again, thanks so much for reaching out with your feedback, which is very valuable to us.

Best Regards,

Jerry Bien-Willner Mayor Town of Paradise Valley

<u>Sign up</u> to receive Town emergency alerts & notifications from Alert PV: <u>www.paradisevallevaz.gov/AlertPV</u>

Disclaimer: All messages contained in this email system are the property of the Town of Paradise Valley and are considered a public record subject to disclosure under the Arizona Public Records Law (A.R.S. 39-121). Town employees, public officials, and those who generate e-mail to and from this e-mail domain should have no expectation of privacy related to the use of this technology. To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, recipients of this message should not forward it to other Town Council members. Members of the Town Council should be mindful of Open Meeting law obligations in responding to or forwarding any message.

From:

Sent: Monday, August 16, 2021 9:46 AM

To: Mayor Jerry Bien-Willner; Council Member Julie Pace

Subject: Upcoming Planning Commission Meeting

EXTERNAL

Dear Mayor Bien-Willner and Council Member Ms. Julie Pace,

It has come to my attention that the Planning Commission is currently discussing public spaces and public transportation. My opinion is that the Town of Paradise Valley has no additional need for public facilities of this kind.

Please note my objection and also my husband's to these initiatives.

Thank you!

Barbara and Joe Guglielmi