

From: mpreul
To: McClay_Doris
Cc: [Art Buck](mailto:Art_Buck); [Nan V Currie](mailto:Nan_V_Currie); david.richert@hotmail.com; louispalmieri@mac.com; [Kim Mangini](mailto:Kim_Mangini); [J Norris](mailto:J_Norris); eanolan@cox.net; [Jasper Norris](mailto:Jasper_Norris); [Robert Berry](mailto:Robert_Berry); Cox - AZBCB; [Roger Malcolm](mailto:Roger_Malcolm); Rob@manginicompanies.com; valglickman@gmail.com; samw1222@aol.com; [Mark Speno](mailto:Mark_Speno)
Subject: Re: McDowell Shadow Estates Rezoning Case (544-PA-2020)
Date: Monday, June 7, 2021 10:43:08 PM

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

Dear Doris,

Tonight 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 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 seems to think 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. The owner would then be removed from his burden. It's clear the owner 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. 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.

Sincerely,

Mark Preul

On Jun 6, 2021, at 1:21 PM, Mark Speno <markspeno@cox.net> wrote:

Dear Neighbors,

I wish to remind everyone again that tomorrow, Monday June 7th at 5:30pm at 13647 N. 87th Street is the Neighborhood Open House meeting regarding the rezoning of this undersized vacant lot. Anytime a rezoning request of this type is made, the City requires a community meeting to be held so that any neighbors who may be affected can have their voices heard before the application proceeds to the City Council for a vote. I have been informed that City Counselwoman Kathy Littlefield will be in attendance. It is imperative that we show a force tomorrow and let Kathy Littlefield and the lot owner/developer know that this is not in our best interests. Please forward this email to any of your neighbors who are not included in this thread.

Here is what's at stake:

A rezoning of the property to R1-10 will set a dangerous precedent that will encourage a wave of similar lot splitting and development resulting in increased density within our McDowell Shadows Estates. According to the City's own website where it defines the various zoning designations: ""R1-18 "...although less than one acre, still results in a low density of population"" and the proposed rezoning to ""R1-10 "...permits a higher density of population..."". A higher density rezoning within our neighborhood will turn it into something it was never meant to be. We, the residents of the McDowell Shadows Estates, moved here upon the reliance of current zoning and the expectation that our property values would not be diminished by the City increasing our density.

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. The property owner, Mr. Koo, proposes to build a 2-story home (in a neighborhood where no 2-story homes exist) that sits up unusually close to the freeway sound wall and the front door will not be seen from the street. Reduced curb appeal, higher density, 2-story home on an odd shaped lot that was never configured to be built on will, in my 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 Richert for his experience and influence to push this zoning change through the process.

I believe we can once again succeed in preserving the character of our neighborhood if we continue to be united on this matter. I hope to see you tomorrow .

Sincerely,

Mark Speno
480-694-6300

<Notice Letter-Open House (2nd meeting).pdf>

<64358207406__631F3190-F73D-4A8F-8DAD-037C81ACE643.jpeg>

<image.png>