

From: [Curtis, Tim](#)
To: sbeaudry5@cox.net
Cc: [Barnes, Jeff](#)
Subject: RE: Planning Commission Public Comment
Date: Wednesday, January 26, 2022 4:02:19 PM

Thank you for the comment. This case will be continued to the February 9 Planning Commission meeting.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Tim Curtis

From: WebServices <WebServices@scottsdaleaz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, January 26, 2022 3:53 PM
To: Planning Commission <Planningcommission@scottsdaleaz.gov>
Subject: Planning Commission Public Comment
Importance: Low

Name: Sharon Beaudry

Address: 8714 E Voltaira Avenue, Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Email: sbeaudry5@cox.net

Phone: (480) 922-9166

Comment:

I would like to provide my input for the rezoning applications (pre-application number: 544-PA-2020) for 13647 N. 87th Street, Scottsdale AZ. I have chosen to respond to Mr. Richert's following letter by annotation of the original letter point by point – my comments in red. Many neighbors met at the relevant property to hear from and interact with the owner and his petitioner. There was not anything that I heard that changed my mind. A rather naive comment was made by Mr. Richter to the effect of well we have to do something with the property. So, basically let us build something on it, even though the property as is was never meant to have a home on it based on current zoning — the property failed in this regard years ago for variance application, and now the parties want a more serious rezoning. Well, frankly it's not my problem or the neighborhood's problem to allow a home to be stuck into a property where it does not belong because it requires a rezoning. A solution was put forward at the neighborhood meeting to help Mr. Koo to allow the 3 neighboring properties to acquire the property for a very low cost, such as \$1 or other low cost from the owner (as the owner also states that since he's bought this property, the neighborhood and the city should allow him to do whatever he can think up to somehow build a home on it). Mr. Koo could have gone just about anywhere in Scottsdale and found a bigger, appropriately sized lot. It's clear the owner, Mr. Koo, believed that at \$20,000 he would make a conveniently high profit to then build a home on the property and he believed he could ram through variance changes (last time), and now a

zoning change. (Obviously he had not researched the development requirements before purchase, because it was only well after purchase that he first applied for variances.) The zoning change is the problem — it sets a precedent that the petitioner and owner failed to recognize. If such a situation can be allowed for this property, then such a rezoning could be allowed for other situations of property division in the neighborhood. That simply is the crux of the situation. The neighborhood has innate characteristics that have attracted homeowners and they need to be maintained. Other smaller lots are available in other areas of Scottsdale. The owner made an investment gamble without realizing what he thought would be an easy result. His miscalculation is not our problem. Beyond the radical rezoning attempt, practical issues come up, like frontage — the owner would have about 10- 15 feet of frontage — so where do visitors to his home park? — in front of every other home in the cul de sac? Many such related issues are germane here. Let the record reflect that a hand raise vote was held at the meeting. There was not one person who raised their hand in support of rezoning for this property. I and my family remain in opposition to this rezoning petition. I urge the city planning commission and the city council to deny this radical property zoning alteration. In summary, Mr. Richert's points avoid the main subjects of requirements for rezoning and do not place the character of the construction within the surrounding neighborhood. At this time nothing has changed with regard to the property — except now the push is for a more serious change to the neighborhood with an attempt to acquire precedent-setting rezoning. This is how neighborhood character gets destroyed. We moved into the neighborhood for its character including types of homes and lots — this lot was never supposed to be a development lot and was associated with some sort of irregular sale from the previous property owner. Why are we obligated as a neighborhood to go along with a rezoning that could impact every property owner in the area? Hopefully Scottsdale votes to preserve its philosophy of neighborhoods. I vote No, on changing this lot from an R1-35 zoning to an R1-10 zoning. I do not think this rezoning is in the best interest of our community or Scottsdale.