

From: [Justin G](#)
To: [Derek Scheerer](#)
Subject: PAD Amendment Stonegate Mixed-Use Center (Reference Case: PAD24-05)
Date: Tuesday, April 30, 2024 10:50:27 AM

Hello,

I am the owner and occupant of the property located at 42759 W Cowpath Road Maricopa, AZ 85138. I am unsure that I will be able to make the meetings on this but I want to express my deep concerns for the proposed change. 1. I bought my home in 2008 with the understanding that the property would not further restrict access to Maricopa Casa Grande Highway, nor was this to affect the Senita or Glenwilde Subdivisions further, as we were a PLANNED Unit Development, Changing the rules now seems to be unfair to those of us who bought our homes with the understanding that things were all set.

Maricopa Casa Grande Highway is already too busy and at times unsafe due to aggressive drivers, speeding, and simply too much volume. It is very easy to have an accident turning off of Santa Rosa Parkway onto Maricopa Casa Grande Highway in either direction. This will be further impeded with this proposal. I am adamantly opposed to such changes. This development can be relocated to a more suitable area near the casino. Not every new shop needs to be built on Maricopa Casa Grande Highway. The area is becoming too condensed and congested.

My 78 year old mother Dixie Steffey lives and owns 42538 W Santa Fe St Maricopa, AZ 85138, she is also opposed to the idea of the proposed changes and development. Having lived in our homes since 2008 we are frustrated with the City's Planning thus far. There has been little consideration for the original plans, which sold us on living here. The days of the "Dark Sky" community have been obliterated by lights from Copper Sky and the other city parks. Large Box stores have created an asphalt jungle and yet more bright lights. The once peaceful rural community is turning into Central Phoenix. This is by no means why we decided to live here.

So with this being said we would like to register our strong objection to the proposed changes and ask that the development be turned down. There are plenty of other suitable locations within Maricopa.

Thank you,

Justin Gushard and Dixie Steffey

May 13, 2024

Robert Klob
41676 W Laramie Rd
Maricopa, AZ 85138

Former P&Z Commissioner, City of Chandler
Former DR Commissioner, City of Chandler
Current P&Z Commissioner, Pinal County
Professional in architecture and development for over 30 years.

I am probably one of the few that believe that apartments and high-density housing are needed for our community to grow and prosper. I also believe that we need substantially more high-density projects to achieve this goal. However, what is occurring is an influx of high-density housing in spot areas. The area around Walmart, has seen more than its share, and I believe the area has exceeded multi-family saturation.

According to the data shown on the "What's New Maricopa" website - as of today, there are approximately 4200 multi-family units either existing, in development, or platted within the Maricopa city limits – with many more allocated in future plats. Not including this site, there are over 1800 units within ½ mile of Walmart - that equates to 43% of all multi-family units in the city. That number jumps to 69% if you count all MF units within a mile. I have the unit counts if anyone is interested.

While I agree that we will need more multi-family projects, at what point does the city feel that an area is oversaturated?

I believe that keeping the previously approved PAD 20-05 that calls for single family homes in this same area solves several challenges. 1, its not adding to the oversaturation of multi-family units. 2, the development becomes much more enticing for a single-family developer due to the proximity to the same features mentioned – location, access, retail, dining, trails, etc. and 3rd, new single-family homes will add higher p.s.f. comps to an area of older homes – thus increasing the values of those neighboring homes in the process. Multi-family for rent adds no comps, or any opportunity for them in the future. For rent units only benefit one owner, while single family for sale benefits a whole neighborhood.

In addition, the existing PAD 20-05 represents the homesites with no direct access to Alan Stevens. This new PAD proposal requests access to a new spine road, AND access to Alan Stephens. Pushing more traffic into an area that is already congested – especially during peak times.

Should this new PAD be allowed, under the proposed development standards (P18, Narrative), the SF option shall have a minimum lot area of 2500 sf, 30'x80' lot, setbacks & a 30' max ht with max 15 u/acre. Under this same table, it allows multi-family and build-to-rent to have no lot size standards and allow 45' or 4 stories, and 28 u/acre. Nearly doubling the quantity and height restrictions of the neighborhood.

How will the water allocation be addressed? Will this be a unit for unit 100 yr allocation from Global like a single-family owned development would require – or is this another development that seeks to circumvent this rule since technically this is a single owner and not several hundred.

Since the applicant did not provide any tangible drawings, renderings, surveys, details, grading, lot development, etc to their submittal, there is no way to know for sure what their true intent is for this development. And as you read the staff report, it almost appears they intend to go thru this administratively and remove further participation from the public, this commission, and the city council once actual development designs have been prepared.

Conclusion

Approving this PAD amendment would not add any benefits to the local residents and it would push the immediate multi-family development in this area to well over 70% of all units in the city within a 1-mile radius. The density & 4 story height will remove privacy from neighbors and add congestion. In addition, the applicant has provided insufficient data and documentation to fully vet this project. But ultimately, this is an unnecessary project with an unfair burden to continue to put on the residents of this area. I strongly recommend this commission deny this proposal and maintain the existing SF design with no direct access to Alan Stephens Pkwy.

Thank You

-Robert Klob

½ mile from site

- Villas @ Stonegate 318 units
- Oasis @ the Wells 120 units
- Rev @ Porter 194 units
- Home @ Maricopa 536 Units
- Copa Flats 312 units
- Iron Pointe 200 Units
- Kelly Ranch 140 Units (40% of project, per submittal docs)
- **Total within ½ mile 1820 units (43%)**

1 mile from site

- Ironwood Ranch 252 units
- Gunsmoke 253 Units
- Reinsmann Commons 574 units
- **Total within 1 mile 1079 units (26%)**

2+ miles from site

- Bungalows on Bowlin 196 units
- Lofts @ Edison 43 units
- Hampton Edison 151 Units
- Villas @ the Gin 162 Units
- Innovation Villas 182 units
- Flatz 520 348 units
- Honeycutt Run 209 units
- **Total within 2+ miles 1291 units (31%)**

Derek Scheerer

From: Marie Blackwell <marie.copa@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2024 7:40 AM
To: Derek Scheerer
Subject: CASE PAD24-05 - Stonegate Mixed Use Center

Good morning,

I am writing to go on record as objecting to the proposed use for the above case. While we understand the need for apartments, the number which have been built in this area already have significantly increased traffic and a burden on the small infrastructure. Traffic will be significantly increased with the arrival of home depot and to add a large residential area would create congestion headaches.

It's time to start considering building apartments in other areas of the city, not just in this area. We bought homes here expecting others to do the same and for all of us to take care of the area. Apartments do not have this invested nature from their dwellers. Consider us a firm NO.

Sincerely,
Marie Blackwell