

Manning Property MGPA
Neighborhood Meeting Summary Notes
April 21, 2014

Following is a summary of questions asked and comments made at the neighborhood meeting:

General Plan Amendment Criteria

- Is market demand sufficient?
- A resident stated that the original owner intended to keep the property in its natural state
- A resident stated that if the density of one property is increased then the Town should master plan the area around it to be consistent
- A resident stated that it is unfair to approve a Major General Plan Amendment without additional development details
- A resident suggested that neighbors, rather than being for or against the proposal, consider what they could support and under what conditions
- A resident questioned how the criterion requiring community acceptance of the proposal would be met

Traffic and Circulation

- Will Shannon Road be widened with this project?
- What types of roadway improvements might be required?
- Will the applicant be required to analyze traffic impacts?
- Several residents stated that they are concerned with increased traffic
- A resident expressed concern that additional traffic would lead to eventual widening of Shannon Road and condemnation of property using eminent domain to widen the road

Site Grading

- Will the site be mass graded?
- Will natural buffers be provided around the perimeter of the property?

Riparian Habitat, Floodplain & Drainage Issues

- How are Critical Resource Area (washes) and Core Resource Area open space requirements calculated?
- Will environmental concerns be addressed at the General Plan Amendment stage?
- Several residents stated that there are existing drainage and flooding problems on their properties and that the proposed development might worsen the situation
- Several residents stated that the area is a sheet flow area and that there are numerous smaller washes that create runoff impacts

- Question was asked where detention basins would be located
- Concern with function of detention basins
- Concern with aesthetics of detention basins
- Is the property within the floodplain?
- Do detention basins count as open space?

Development Concept

- How many units are proposed?
- Will all units be single family detached?
- What is the advantage of higher density to existing 3.3-acre minimum lot size designation?
- Several residents stated that they would like to see the existing planned density (.3 units/acre) maintained to preserve quality of life and property values
- A resident stated that the market for 3.3 acre parcels is strong
- Will a Home Owners Association (HOA) be formed?
- A question was raised regarding compatibility of the proposed land use with existing properties
- Will horses be allowed? What accommodations will be made for equestrian safety?
- A resident stated that there is little buildable area and, therefore, the applicant's proposed density would likely not be viable
- Residents asked if the owners would entertain leaving the existing planned land use unchanged
- A resident stated that while the overall Oro Valley market might demand additional medium density residential development, it would not be appropriate
- A resident stated that although the overall density is low, individual pockets or clusters of development will be higher density, similar to Copper Creek
- Residents expressed concern with lighting impacts
- Residents expressed concern with potential 2 story homes

Town Review Process

- What is the neighborhood meeting notification radius?
- A question was asked regarding how the annual Major General Plan Amendment process works