

From: [mpreul](#)
To: [Mayor David D. Ortega](#); [Caputi, Tammy](#); [Durham, Thomas](#); [Janik, Betty](#); [Littlefield, Kathy](#); [Milhaven, Linda](#); [Whitehead, Solange](#); [City Council](#); [Projectinput](#)
Cc: [Bennett Beaudry](#); louispalmieri@mac.com; [Mark Speno](#); [Roger Malcolm](#)
Subject: Re: Rezoning @ 13647N. 87th Street, Case Number: 10ZN-2021
Date: Sunday, March 27, 2022 9:35:57 PM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

Dear Mayor, Vice Mayor, City Councillors:

At a recent City Planning Commission meeting, the Koo Application was voted down 5-2. A comment was made by a city administrator in response to a question by a planning commissioner that he did not know why the previous application had not been approved as the records apparently could not be located. I stated the application previously was not approved because the neighborhood responded to the city en masse about the variances requested, which did not fit anywhere near the parameters and character of the neighborhood properties.

During the commission meeting there were several statements by Mr. Koo and Mr. Richert that I specifically addressed. After the architectural drawings were shown, I spoke to the renderings which do not at all reflect the actual characteristics of the siting of the house structure which would in fact be only a few feet away from a freeway sound wall and other walls, and be situated on a remnant lot, appearing to be jammed in, and completely out of neighborhood character. The lot could only contain a very small home, and a large portion of the lot (the “wedge shape”) cannot be built on at all, further restricting any construction potential.

Mr. Koo stated his house would improve the appearances of neighborhood homes as he implied the homes in the neighborhood were rather plain and not of high quality materials. This is a point outside the main issues concerning this lot. But in fact the homes in the neighborhood are on large lots and constructed of the finest quality materials.

Mr. Richert stated the lot in its vacant situation represented a crime problem. There is no crime in this area, the lot is completely within the neighborhood confines, is small and bounded by high walls on 3 sides and within easy view from the street and bounding properties. That statement by Mr. Richert is not legitimate.

However, the main issue seems to be one of philosophy by Mr. Koo and Mr. Richert towards the neighborhood and zoning ordinances. At a neighborhood meeting with them at the lot several months ago, Mr. Richert stated to the effect, “Well, he’s [Mr. Koo] bought it [the lot], so you have to let him do something with it.” That situation is not the neighborhood’s problem. It’s obvious that Mr. Koo did not perform due diligence with regard to zoning or other construction requirements before purchasing the lot, as it appears he thought it would be an easy property value windfall.

The neighborhood has a right to its character and Scottsdale has had a philosophy that its neighborhoods are its primary interest. In fact signs upon entry into the city limits state “Most Livable City.” That statement first and foremost means the city’s neighborhoods are and should be the city’s main interest. That implies preservation of neighborhood character.

The current application by Mr. Koo is now one of a much greater pressure and seriousness — not application for variance, but application for rezoning — even employing a well known

Arizona real estate and property consultant in Mr. Richert. To rezone this lot could very well set a precedent for further rezoning in the neighborhood, where any lot could be halved or divided more. This would destroy one of Scottsdale's best neighborhoods. The neighborhood deserves to stay with properties zoned as is, and not have to succumb to someone's wish to force their radical idea on the neighborhood. There are many other properties inn Scottsdale that could suit Mr. Koo's architectural idea and that would not require rezoning. The Planning Commission voted Mr. Koo's application down 5-2 because of their expert understanding of this situation. I sincerely request the Council to follow this guidance of the Planning Commission.

Sincerely yours,
Mark C. Preul, MD and Karen B. Preul
8628 E. Davenport Dr.
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

On Mar 27, 2022, at 9:11 AM, Bennett Beaudry <bennett.beaudry@cox.net> wrote:

24 March 2022

Mayor David D Ortega
Vice Mayor Tammy Caputi
Councilmember Tom Durham
Councilwoman Betty Janil
Councilwomen Kathy Littlefield
Councilmember Linda Milhaven
Councilwoman Solange Whitehead

City Council
City of Scottsdale
3939 North Drinkwater Boulevard
Scottsdale, AZ 85251

Reference: Rezoning @ 13647N. 87th Street, Case Number: 10ZN-2021

Dear Mayor, vice Mayor, Councilmembers and Councilwomen:

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that **I am totally against the rezone effort of the vacant lot at 13647 N. 87th Street from R-35 zoning to R-10 zoning.** This property is a remnant created by the State of Arizona during the construction of the North 101. These parcels weresold off to property owners following their use as marshaling yards for construction materials and vehicle storage during the constructionprocess.

I believe there are no compelling reasons for supporting this application in the General Plan.

The efforts and statements of Mr. Reichert's and his clients' propositions are a stretch and clearly an attempt to divert from the main subjects of requirements for rezoning and not within the character of the surrounding homes. For example, the public safety problem he mentions is not a problem because Mr. Koo owns the lot and he's has to maintain it. There have never been any safety problems with his lot that is bordered on 4 sides by walls with only limited access to the street.

Because of the reduced size and "flag type" configuration of the lot, any home built on this site will not be commensurate with the architecture of the neighborhood. Their plan will not provide a home of similar value and size to those in the immediate and surrounding area. His plan is to build a two-story ultra-modern home (in a neighborhood where no 2-story homes exist) with less than 15 foot of street frontage and even the front door will not be seen from the street. This odd shaped lot that was never configured to be built on, will in our opinion, place downward pressure on property values and serve as a potential eyesore for decades to come.

In 2013, Mr. Koo applied to the city for a variance to build a home on this site and our community at the time overwhelmingly objected and the City Council agreed by voting it down. However, not to be deterred by what's in the best interest of McDowell Shadow homeowners, this time Mr. Koo has hired ex-City Planner and heavyweight David Reichert for his experience and influence to push this zoning change through the process.

Bottom line is that Mr. Koo could have gone just about anywhere in Scottsdale and found a bigger, appropriate lot, but at \$20,000, this sliver of a property was too enticing to ignore for an assumed easy windfall. The situation wasn't appropriate for the building/planning commission previously to allow variances, and nothing has changed, except the push for a more serious change to the neighborhood with a precedent-setting attempt at rezoning. This is how neighborhood character gets destroyed.

Hopefully the City of Scottsdale votes to preserve its philosophy of preservation of neighborhoods.

Bennett Beaudry
8714 East Voltaire Avenue Scottsdale, AZ 85260-4128
Cell: 480-980-1084

Bennett Beaudry

8714 East Voltaire Avenue
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Cell: 480-980-1084
Home: 480-922-9166

<2022.03.27_Letter To Mayor and Council.pdf>