



REQUEST TO SPEAK

5

Request to Speak cards must be submitted to City Staff **BEFORE** public testimony begins.

Public testimony is limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.

Additional time MAY be granted to speakers representing two or more persons.

Cards for designated speakers and the person(s) they represent must be submitted together.

NAME (print) Thomas N O'Leary MEETING DATE Jan 9, 2024 1:00 pm

NAME OF GROUP/ORGANIZATION (if applicable) _____

ADDRESS 5825 E Vernon Ave., Scotts. ZIP 85257

HOME PHONE 480-235-0273 WORK PHONE N/A

E-MAIL ADDRESS (optional) TNO1@aol.com

☒ I WISH TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEM # 16-2024 ☐ I WISH TO DONATE MY TIME TO _____

☒ I WISH TO SPEAK DURING "PUBLIC COMMENT"* CONCERNING above and the proposed Appl. c. to build at site of former Broad Services

*Citizens may complete one Request to Speak "Public Comment" card per meeting and submit it to City Staff. "Public Comment" time is reserved for citizen comments regarding non-agendized items. The Board and Commission may hear "Public Comment" testimony, but is prohibited by state law from discussing items which are not listed on the agenda.

This card constitutes a public record under Arizona law.

Request to Speak cards must be submitted to City Staff before public testimony begins on that item.

HOW TO ADDRESS THE BOARD AND COMMISSION:

- The Chair will call your name when it is your turn to speak.
- Approach the podium and state your name and address for the record.
- Groups wishing to speak are encouraged to select a spokesperson to represent the views of the group.
- Public testimony is limited to three minutes per speaker. *(At the Chair's discretion, speakers representing two or more persons may be granted additional time.)*
- A timer light, located at the podium, will help you to time your comments.
 - A green light indicates the timer has been activated.
 - A yellow light indicates there is one minute remaining.
 - A red light indicates the comment period has ended.

WRITTEN COMMENTS: Citizens who do not wish to address the Board and Commission in person may submit written comments by completing a yellow Written Comment card. Written Comment cards are available throughout the Kiva Forum and at the Staff table.

REJECTION/DEFEAT OF THE OAK STREET APPLICATION SHOULD BE A NO-BRAINER, SINCE IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO ENVISION A PROPOSAL MORE OUT OF CHARACTER WITH THE EXISTING NEIGHBORHOOD--PARTICULARLY RELATING TO TRAFFIC FLOW, **OR** ONE MORE ADVERSELY CONSEQUENTIAL TO THE PROJECTED NEEDS OF POTENTIAL FUTURE RESIDENTS OF THIS WOULD BE DEVELOPMENT.

AS A 46-YEAR RESIDENT OF THE IMMEDIATE AREA, I SEE ONE ACKNOWLEDGED LOW TRAFFIC OAK STREET ARTERY TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

I SEE SCOTTSDALE'S DIRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORICAL LIMITATIONS AND PERILS ALREADY EXTANT ON OAK (CONSIDERING THE SPEED RESTRICTIONS IN PLACE).

I ALSO SEE THE CURRENTLY UNBRIDGED CANALS TO THE EAST AND WEST ON OAK THAT NOW CREATE OAK STREET DEAD ENDS. THESE FACTS ALL INDICATE THAT THE DENSITY ADMITTEDLY PROPOSED BY THE APPLICATION'S RESIDENTIAL INTRUSION WILL NOT WORK.

TO EXPLAIN:

NOTHING WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CURRENTLY SHORTENED CONFIGURATION OF OAK STREET, CANAL TO CANAL, REMOTELY COINCIDES WITH THE HEIGHTENED RESIDENTIAL DENSITY ENVISIONED BY THE APPLICATION. WANT ANY CLOSE BY PROPERTIES WITH SUCH HIGH RESIDENTIAL

PACKING? PICK ANY NEARBY MULTI-LANED MAJOR ARTERY WITH SPEED LIMITS OF 40 MPH—THOMAS, MCDOWELL, INDIAN SCHOOL AND CAMELBACK ROADS. THAT'S WHERE THEY ARE.

THERE ARE KEY PEOPLE MISSING TODAY THAT YOU WON'T BE HEARING FROM, AND THOSE WOULD BE THE SCOTTSDALE CITIZENS WHO'D BE THE ACTUAL RESIDENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT NOW APPLIED FOR.

I'D SUBMIT THOSE FOLKS OUGHT HOLD THE HIGHEST PRIORITY TO YOUR CONSIDERATIONS.

THE EVENTUAL PROPOSED DWELLERS OF THIS VERY DENSE DEVELOPMENT MIGHT WELL LOGICALLY SEEK DESIRED PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND, IF SO, THEY WOULD PROBABLY BE LEFT STRANDED AND FAR REMOVED FROM THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS THEY'D REQUIRE.

OAK STREET TO THE BUS LINES OF THOMAS AND MCDOWELL ROADS, TO BE SURE, THOSE ARE HEFTY HIKES.

OR, WOULD SCOTTSDALE'S PLANNERS COUNT ON SEEKING DIVERTED EXISTING TRANSPORTATION LINES TO THE SHORTENED OAK CORRIDOR? I THINK NOT.

NOTE, NOTHING SAID HERE CAN BE DISPUTED. IT'S CERTAINLY LIKELY THAT LOWER INCOME PEOPLE ARE MORE LIKELY TO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION, AND NEED EASIER ACCESS TO MORE CONVENIENT SHOPPING, TRUE?

THERE ARE, AFTER ALL, GOOD REASONS WHY WE SEE THE HIGHER DENSITY RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENTS OFTEN LOCATED UPON MAJOR AND FAR MORE ACCESSIBLE ARTERIES, AND NOT ALONG MINOR ARTERIALS SUCH AS AN OAK STREET, AS NOW CONFIGURED. FOR EXAMPLES, AGAIN THINK THOMAS, INDIAN SCHOOL, MCDOWELL AND CAMELBACK. THOSE ARE ARTERIES WHERE HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL MAKES SENSE, ESPECIALLY FOR CITIZENS DEPENDENT ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR ESSENTIAL SERVICES, AND NEEDING MORE CONVENIENT ACCESS TO SHOPPING, ETC.

OAK STREET, AS NOW CONSTITUTED, IS FAR LESS EVEN THAN A MINOR ARTERIAL AS WE CONSIDER IT "DEAD ENDED" BY UNBRIDGED CANALS ON BOTH ITS EAST AND ITS WEST.

ONE LAST POINT, AND ONE SUSPECTS A POSSIBLE CREEP IN TOPIC:

CARE TO CONSIDER A REAL DISASTER FOR SOUTH SCOTTSDALE? TRY EVEN REMOTELY CONSIDERING, OR LINKING, BUILDING A MOTOR VEHICLE BRIDGE OVER THE CROSS-CUT CANAL, EAST ON OAK, TO GET PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION TO THIS DENSE DEVELOPMENT. THAT WOULD FOREVER CHANGE THE FACE OF EFFECTIVELY ALL OUR CITY'S SOUTHERN NEIGHBORHOODS AND SEND SOUTH SCOTTSDALE PROPERTY VALUES INTO A TAILSPIN.

ONE SUSPECTS THE SUBJECT PROPERTY WAS ACQUIRED FOR AN ADVANTAGEOUS PRICE, BUT WITH THE MOVANT'S PRESENT

INTENTION OF SEEKING A DEVELOPMENT FAR MORE SUITABLE
FOR PLACEMENT UPON A MORE TRADITIONAL WELL-TRAVELED
ARTERY THAT COULD SUPPORT THE DENSITY NOW BEING
ADVANCED.

SUMMARY REJECTION/DENIAL WOULD SEEM WELL JUSTIFIED.