

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
		Comments (Summarized) Received since March 10, 2015 - therefore not reflected in the Commission Draft Plan	
Community Organization	Dean Brennan of the AZ Alliance for Livable Communities Advocacy Committee	Support Pima Prospers, encourage the Commission to recommend approval; is a major step forward for enhancing livability for Pima County (PC) residents; considers the Comprehensive Plan to be the foundation for promoting livability...The AALC applauds the emphasis on the "Healthy Community Framework" by the designation of Healthy Communities as the core organization principle... physical environment - healthy lifestyle options...It is inspiring to see the strong emphasis placed on a healthy environment and the recognition that a healthy economy contributes significantly to a healthy community. ...Through this Comprehensive Plan, PC has taken a leadership role in addressing the critical issues surrounding the creation of healthy communities and the importance of providing healthy lifestyle options for all residents. ... compliments to planning staff, planning team, & community members. AALC urges Commission to respond favorably to the community vision set forth in Pima Prospers and forward to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for adoption.	No revisions proposed; comments only.
Agency	Metro Water District (Mike Block)	2nd letter from Metro (see 1st letter above): Providing additional comments. A description of the District is provided. Recommends revision of Water Element Goal 1 "Achieve water sustainability through <u>collaborative and</u> comprehensive integrated planning that coordinates water supply, demand management, climate variability, economic growth and respect for the environment." Want to clarify some comments - Metro recognizes/acknowledges that Pima County is the owner of non-Metropolitan effluent. Diablo Village service area is outside the Tucson metro area. Diablo Village service area equals water demands of 3,367 acre feet per year which is above previous demand of 598 acre feet per year. Request revision to Goal 1, Policy 9: "Minimize effect of development upon water supply for existing and future residents of Pima County through water conservation, <u>aquifer replenishment, direct re-use and restoration</u> measures when appropriate to offset the impacts as conditions of rezonings." Revision to Goal 1 Implementation Measures item "c" "Develop <u>through collaboration with stakeholders</u> strategies for the utilization of Pima County water resources consistent with the Water Rights Policy" and the District also recommends deleting "support" in Policy 2 under Goal 2 and amended as follows: Goal 2, Policy 2: "Collaborate with water providers to achieve sustainable water management in County-identified regional growth areas outside of the Tucson metropolitan area." These changes will ensure that Pima County and the District can continue to collaboratively work towards achieving the goals of Pima County's Comprehensive Plan and have a sustainable water future.	
Community Organization	Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection	Handout provided at the 3/25/15 public hearing. They have questions about ST-12, ST-13, IR-08, ST-11, ST-18. They OPPOSE IR-6, IR-9, IR-10, IR-11, IR-18, ST-08, ST-09, ST-10.	Staff met with the Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection.
Individual	Robert Jacobson, Ph.D.	Amendment to Section 4.24 New or Updated Communications Facilities - in Goal 2 amend "... support economic development" to be "support economic <u>and cultural</u> development". The development of a regional culture supportive of economic, educational, and environmental goals is paramount, as important as economic development itself. As a longtime regional planner, I am highly impressed by the Pima Prospers (PP) Team's work on PP.	See staff report supplement.
Individual - general	Scott Cleaves	I whole heartedly agree with the additions to the Pima Prospers plan regarding climate mitigation and adaptation. Commend the County for the progressive nature of these new changes.	No revisions proposed; comments only.
Individual	Sue Clark	Regarding individual request from Eric Clark: His parcels are 102-14-081C which is where his house is and 102-14-080B which is vacant land. Both parcels are lot splits from the 5915 N. Placita Chico and 5901 N. Placita Chico respectively. The owner of 5901 who did the lot split dedicated a 15' access easement to parcel 102-14-080B with the thought that a single family residence would be built but that never happened. The house at 5901 was sold and closed yesterday (Tues.) so the new owners probably know nothing about the MIU issue since the 300' notification letters were received on Friday. The item of concern for the neighborhood is that MIU would allow offices which could bring traffic through the residential cul de sac to use the access easement. Rudasill doesn't go through specifically to keep the NW medical complex traffic away from the residential area. Eric Clark's access to his house is from La Cholla. Now that he owns the parcel with access from Placita Chico and wants to change from LIU to MIU, it has become an item of concern for the residences. Does the staff report mention this issue? Thanks for your help with this.	Staff responded explaining the staff recommendation on the request.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual IR-5	Stephen Pender	Do LIU 1.2 and 0.3 have any relation to lot size? Or do they just indicate how much open space is required on a particular site? 1. I would caution about changing the lot sizes here to less than the current 3 acres as the topography is quite variable - to get more houses in I fear intensive blading would be required and would destroy a beautiful piece of land. 2. Access is a concern. N. Vista del Cerro Ranch Road, on the east side of the lot, is a narrow ranch road maintained by the neighbors - I'm afraid it would deteriorate under more intense use.	Staff responded answering the questions (They do relate to lot size but only in a comparative manner; neither LIU 1.2 or 0.3 typically use extensive blading; access would be worked out in the rezoning process and it is unlikely an existing easement would serve as an access).
Individual IR-6	Kelly Ursu	I & other neighbors have concerns with this request. Majority of the properties surrounding my property are acre+ lots that have livestock; concerned about home values depending on what is built; also on a shared well; depending on what is built can affect this well. ..have natural running washes through my property that flow from the property to be redesignated as MIU just north of me. Depending on what is built, it could affect how these washes flow which could create a flood zone close to my home. These are just initial concerns I have from receiving this notification; have not researched these negative impacts - don't know what is going to be built. Perhaps the land owners make intentions known and address/mitigate any negative side effects to the surrounding homeowners. As it stands now, I do not support this request to designate the mentioned property to MIU.	Staff responded that the staff recommendation allows for sensitive environmental design and conservation of natural open space.
Individual IR-6	Irene Hauer	Oppose change east of Shannon because: there is a lot of wildlife in this region; several people have livestock which may be too noisy or smelly to neighbors; the well shared by Pistachio Nursery and three other residences. The street east of Shannon, Freer turning into Cmo del Sur is a dirt road and would create a lot of dust from the increased traffic.	No response requested.
Individual IR-6	Michael Lesem	We would like to see the property east of Shannon be left as is LIU with entrance and egress onto Shannon and not onto Camino del Fierro. Camino del Fierro is presently dead ended at the North end a block before Linda Vista; would also like to see a 6' privacy wall on the south and east side (Cmo del Fierro)... Play grounds and walking trails should be included in their development plan. Water retention basins included to control sheet flooding. All of our neighbors located on Cmo del Fierro within the 300' zone agree that the property mentioned between Linda Vista, Shannon Road and Cmo del Fierro should remain LIU. Property south of Linda Vista under consideration should have a say in what the zoning should be for that porton of the plan.	Staff acknowledged comments.
Individual IR-6	Carol Forster	What is the planned change for this property? Does it take into consideration the huge and very old saguaros on the property and the large ironwood trees? Are apartments planned on the property? If MIU limits the land to single family dwellings, what is the minimum lot size? We recognize that development must happen, but are absolutely opposed to apartment or condominium complexes on this property.	Staff answered questions and acknowledged comments.
Individual IR-6	Carol Forster	Received notice of indivudal request.. called the info number 724-9000 and was shunted to a full mailbox; went online to get a definition of MIU in the zoning code and it wasn't there; just want to know nature of the development planned for this space, could have been included in the pages we received. distressing that your notice wasn't clearer; is the reason because some apartments are planned for our area that features only single family homes? .. impossible to tell based on the information we have been given.	See above.
Individual IR-6	Thomas Carlson	..In opposition; believe that owners of this private land should have the liberty to do with it what they will. My opposition, however, to this change is based on two factors; the deplorable condition of Thornydale Road and large number of houses that will likely be built, which will put Ironwoord Elementary School over capacity. Years ago County had plans to widen and repair Thornydale Road by 2010. Those plans were shelved and, to my knowledge, no alternate date has been announced. Apart from Valencia Road east of the aiport, Thornydale is one of the worst roads in Pima County on which I drive; developing 170+ acres of land will only make a bad road worse. ..am an elected member of the Marana Unified School District's (MUSD) Governing board and school population is of great concern to the District. ..we are not able to expand Ironwood Elementary. The acreage under consideration could support up to 1,700 homes if the MIU request is approved..only be a short matter of time before Ironwood Elementary would burst at the seams. Governing Board would have to realign school boundaries - becomes a significant emotional event for parents... As an alternative, I would recommend that no plan designation change be considered until Thornydale Road from Cortaro Road to Tangerine Road can be repaired. Additionally, I would recommend that the current LIU designation be retained but not necessarily in the 0.3 category.	No response requested.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual IR-10	Thomas Carlson	See above.	See above.
Individual IR-10	Kenneth Bos	Implore you to deny IR-10 due to bad state of Thornydale Road. Even if and when improvements are proposed, construction would be very chaotic. Traffic will increase through our subdivision on Crestone. Elementary school already has traffic in gridlock. Traffic is not safe.	Comments acknowledged.
Individual IR-10	James Livings	MIU-proposed area extended east to the wash about half way between Thornydale and Shannon. That would mean exits would be needed onto Sumter &/or Linda Vista. Neither street can handle more traffic without improvements. After driving the streets, it would make much more sense to have the eastern end of the MIU section align with the MIU proposed on the north side of Sumter - that would keep the MIU areas consistent along Thornydale and not require exits at Linda Vista or Thornydale.	Comments acknowledged.
Individual IR-11	Malcolm Wilson	Object to the request; it is immediately adjacent to Arthur Pack Park and very close to Audubon property, both of which have a mandate to protect the natural environment including wildlife. Are also concerned that AP Park is not large in the big picture and covers an area which should be considered as a major corridor for wildlife which homeowners now located in this area consider a positive feature. Observing wildlife was one of prime reasons for our purchase in Ironwood Meadows...	No response requested.
Individual IR-14	Barbara Carling & Jerry Kirkman	Have concerns and questions- 1. How secure is a restricted zoning change? If changed to professional offices can it be expanded to other uses or another zone? 2. Will there be adequate setback from Ajo Hwy and our property line? Our neighborhood has experienced significant changes to noise pollution since highway preparation work started. Supportive of development that enhances property values. Own experience being underwater with house value/debt. Concerned about drop in property value due to highway noise, accidents, smell from particular office uses, concerned about zoning change in the future or modification without neighborhood knowledge	No response requested.
Individual IR-19	Bob Divine	We love the quiet nature of our neighborhood, especially enjoy the dark sky; nature in our back yard and nearby trails. If we have a drive-thru retail across the street... it will change things only for the worse. We will no longer have 'dark sky', quiet and tranquil neighborhood. Please do not allow retail to become part of our immediate area...	No response requested.
Individual IR-19	Linda Lewallen	As a member of Millstone Manor community and neighbor - am opposed to this change. Do not believe it will add anything to neighborhood and can be seen as a first step toward an undesirable zoning change.	No response requested.
Individual IR-19	Kit Schweitzer	Am opposed to change - that change would allow zoning to be upped to CB-1 or CB-2 which is not appropriate for Millstone Manor neighborhood which is residential. Please deny application.	No response requested.
Individual IR-19	Victor Marmion	Residents of Millstone Manor and opposed to changing designation to NAC. While this is not a rezoning of property- it does open door to a later rezoning to either CB-1 or CB-2.	Explained staff's recommendation and acknowledged comments.
Individual IR-19	Kerstin Block	Opposed to request. The NAC could allow for a rezoning of this property to CB-1 or CB-21 which is not appropriate for this neighborhood; is a residential lot and should remain so.	Staff explained request and acknowledged comments.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Thomas Clayton	Supports the request.	Post cards - no response requested.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Linda Lewallen	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Antonio Badilla	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Mark & Linda Holbrook	Supports the request.	See above.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual IR-19 Post card	Samuel & Judith Gonzalez	Supports the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Alfred & Yolanda Cuestas	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Larry & Jean Elliott	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Ralph Marmion	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Paul & Karen Lawton	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Janet Henegar	Opposes the request. We need a pharmacy, supermarket, help for the elderly who cannot get to doctors or to town. There's enough activity in Tucson Estates.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Dorothy Bowler	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Brian & Karen Metcalf	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Rose Frankovich & Bill Eve	Oppose the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Virginia Turner	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Franz & Cynthia Kurath	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	John & Joan Kurath	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Gerardo & Patricia Altamirano	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19 Post card	Victor & Irma Marmion	Opposes the request.	See above.
Individual IR-19	John Shanahan	Do not support - the road is heavily traveled with traffice to the National park and Desert Museum; additional noise, signage, and light pollution; area has more than adequat commercial spaces; this is a quiet unique area on edge of Tucson Mountains.	
Neighborhood Association IR-20	Tucson Mountains Association	Strongly opposed. Wildlife corridors are major emphasis of SDCP for biodiversity and healthy ecosystems. Wildlife corridors are not narrow strips but broad, diverse areas that serve as habitat and corridors - like Sweetwater Preserve. This proposal would disrupt this major corridor - only significant corridor remaining from Tucson Mountains to the Santa Cruz River. Proposal is also inconsistent with wishes of the westside community expressed in 2005 when County planning for road improvement to Silverbell Corridor and in 2010 when designing improvements. The Silverbell Road Citizens Task Force in 2010 and Silverbell Action Coalition in 2005 demonstrated clear consensus. Silverbell Road corridor should retain its rural, country character. Both emphasized the need for maintaining wildlife corridors.	

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Petition - Individuals IR-21	50 signers	Support the staff recommendation of LIU1.2; in keeping with surrounding subdivisions that have single family homes on large lots. Value of homes would be negatively impacted with higher density; surface streets are insufficient to support higher traffic and compromise safety. Pomelo Drive and Los Altos lack shoulders and sidewalks, have many pedestrians; used by non-residents to avoid Oracle and Orange Grove Roads; roads in disrepair for long time and little chance to improve; additional traffic will further tax these streets, create safety hazards.	Staff acknowledged the comments.
Individual IR-21	Bart Blue	Moved here for the larger lots and spacing between neighbors; jewel of a neighborhood; serious use of outdoor space for sports & music; this change would greatly impact our current lifestyle; greatly opposed.	
Individual IR-21	Fred Banfield	Lived in neighborhood over 40 yrs.; change would completely change property ambiance negatively by surrounding with higher density housing. Against the change due to effect on own property but also would change neighborhood with increased traffic.	
Individual IR-21	Myron Smith	Support staff recommendation to maintain LIU 1.2 - provides description of Pomelo community, limited access, neighborhood is well established, homogenous, friendly; a few houses are now a few decades; lots of pedestrians; roads are bad, careless drivers, used by cars and trucks, safety worsened; restricted visibility due to vegetation; more accidents; these roads used to avoid Orange Grove & Oracle Roads. These drivers may not anticipate change; little or no supporting infrastructure (drainage & sewage); natural wash; property value - existing ground vegetation abates noise from Rancho Los Amigos trailer park (east); "Multidwelling units" would add noise to surrounding area & destroy homogeneity of neighborhood culture, reducing property values.	No response requested.
Individual IR-21	Deena & Lee Katterman	Against request; love the neighborhood, large lots, natural vegetation, each home has character; couldn't be at the hearing.	
Homeowners Association ST-9	Orange Ranch Estate HOA	Oppose change. Are a HOA of 75 owners - it will significantly increase non-resident, speeding traffic on our privately maintained streets (increase expenses, decrease tranquility & security). Pima County already created hazard with Twin Peaks I-10 access; using our streets as a shortcut, problem will get worse with new mall and even more with higher density; would devalue property; create complaints about having livestock; drainage issues - render useless 6 or more properties; Thornydale Road already dangerous and poorly maintained. Area was designated as SR and should stay that way.If we didn't want to live on large properties with livestock rights, we would have bought properties in town.	No response requested.
Individual ST-9	Dan Jones	Opposed to request; current and planned road structure can't handle - Thornydale and east/west roads. Will require additional school buildings or additional bus support. Amount of population will severely impact the water wells currently serving the area. Costs of development won't be covered leaving local homeowner with increased taxes.	No response requested.
Individual ST-12/13	Dale & Helen Anderson	Oppose change. Area next to their house is one RAC and up to one house per 5 acres. Proposed does not match the demographics of areas. There have been no demographic shifts, no building or public improvements in Rocking K Estates. Our understanding was a large buffer zone between Rocking K and any new development; was not to be overbuilt with houses. Would result in high density next to low density; more traffic on roads without capacity, increased noise, air and light pollution. Loss of plant and wildlife habitat; do not want everyone driving through our neighborhood to get to this new area on our roads. Will become dangerous for families who regularly walk and bike these roads. Their children learned about wildlife on this property and in this area.	Staff acknowledged the comments.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual ST-12/13	Robert & Betty Boyle	My wife and I and at least 11 neighbors are upset at notice received. There are 15 lots within 300' of ST-12. Each and every one of these properties are no less than 1.0 full acres. Many years ago we were assured that any development adjoining our 15 properties to the east would never be zoned any less dense than 1 RAC. But now you plan to break that promise by allowing LIU 3.0 to be backed up to our land and ruin spaciousness of area and decrease property values.	On 4/3/15 Staff responded via email by clarifying the actual request. ST-12: the map showing 3 parcels as ST-12 was incorrect. The ST-12 site is 17 acres and the ST-13 site is 220 acres. The 3rd parcel is actually proposed for lower density. The map has been revised. Email provides the reasons for staff recommendation. This is not a rezoning. Staff has withdrawn the land use change - this action will be presented to the Commission on April 8th. ST-13: 80 acres of the subject area is not eligible to receive transfer development rights; will modify the change and keep as LIU 0.3 while the balance of land will be MLIU down from MIU. Clarified the developer's circulation pattern which will only be internal. Attached letter from Supervisor Ray Carroll.
Individual ST-12/13	James Broome	Lived in Rocking K for over 30 yrs. The final agreement had numerous conditions included in the Rocking K plan adopted by the Board. Included were restrictions on using Los Reales or Camino Mirlo to access his development, limited access onto Spanish Trail, greenbelt between Rocking K eastside and development, zoning between Rocking K and the development would start with low density and increasing as it got farther east. We want those agreements honored including Don Diamond's agreement to build a road/bridge from Valencia to Old Spanish Trail. The 2nd Rocking K staff proposed is one that the commission voted several years later ST12 and ST15 I believe need to be deleted and left alone. We do not want hundreds of cars running through our nasty narrow streets.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	James/Robin Broome	This area had been the subject of a P&Z vote years ago but was turned down because the current residents didn't want a Rita Ranch syle neighbor. We have spoken a few times about our road and we don't want traffic routes through our neighborhood. I have been to the county planning office twice to try and find the specific compromises that went into the Roacking K SP in the 1980's without luck. Do the same conditions still exist? Is Don Diamond still required to build the road and bridge from Valencia Road to 90 degree turn off Spanish Trail?	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Richard Cowan #1	Strong opposition. Purchased home because of rural setting. Already note many more vehicles using Los Reales Road as a thoroughfare across Pantano Wash and more homes at its other end will only increase this unpleasant and dangerous occurrence. Traffic will only increase through our neighborhood. Increased density will cause more light pollution, loss of wildlife and plant habitat and potential decrease in property values. All these negative results will profit only the developer.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Richard Cowan #2	See above. Not opposed to development in area but at current rate of 1 house per 3 acres or 1 house per acre but do object to 3-5RAC. Same reasons as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Robert Genovese	As resident of Rocking K Ranch Estates for 25 years, strongly opposed. When Plan last updated, neighbors negotiated with Pima County a more pleasing and honorable transition of LIU 1.2 between Rocking K and potentially higher density development to east. Maintain this density to mitigate disappearing Rincon Valley. Current proposal motivated by a desire for uniformity or as a measure of conciliation to the developer. Maintain the more gradual transition in place.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Bradley & Sherrill Hammel	According to Fact Sheet, changes are based on None of these things has occurred in area. Our understanding of 2001 Comp Plan was to designate the buffer zone. This changes could result in significantly higher density which would adversely change the character of the existing neighborhood. There is currently not sufficient infrastructure to support existing LIU 3.0 area especially traffic. Also increase in noise, air and light pollution and loss of habitat; adversely affect quality of life.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Erica Johnsen	Extreme displeasure at requested change; opposition based on different density, semi-rural quality of life; decrease property value; changes to property taxes; also linking Cmo Mirlo and Los Reales to any nearby community would be disastrous.	Same as above.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual ST-12/13	Jim Johnsen	Common letter from multiple residents: Opposed to change (3 parcels (incorrectly) shown as ST-12); request further consideration and discussion. Rocking K Ranch Estates and adjoining properties request: Land use density remain at 1.2 RAC, provide explanation of what staff means by a 'technical error' or reason for initiation, guarantee of adequate buffer between Rocking K Ranch Estates, and guarantee of no ingress/egress to these parcels through Rocking K Ranch Estates. Provides background information that Diamond Ventures made presentation in 2007 where over 100 Rocking K Ranch Estates and neighboring residents attended. One of the promises was property would be no more than 1.2 RAC. Residents in opposition because: would add traffic and congestion to Old Spanish Trail, conflicts with Comprehensive Plan goals, would decrease property values, purposely live on larger lots for the tranquility, privacy, and diversity and have individual architecture, proximity to Saguaro National Park and Rincon Mountains, would create air and noise pollution. There are other area appropriate for higher density. Want to keep low density and avoid monochromatic.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Mary Keysor	Not adverse to growth & development, we strongly object to growth and development next door - not in keeping with density, problem of ingress/egress, overburdened natural resources, general lack of forethought, planning, communication and adequate justification.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Theresa Linnane	Do not support change; decrease property values, damage environment.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Jan Lonon	Previous opposition by neighbors to this particular change; not using Los Reales or Cmo Mirlo for access; problem of traffic.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Karen Lundberg	Never gotten notice of Pima Prospers meetings nor have neighbors.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Kathleen Malone	Deepest concerns are: how many residences, what roads used, water usage. Depletion of outlying wells, keep Rincon Valley pristine near Saguaro National Park.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Francisco & Blanca Nieto	Opposed - negative impact, roads not sufficient, notable density change, unacceptable for pedestrian travel.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Joyce Palmer	Comments about not publicizing meetings. Second letter received stating:	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Roger Pinkstaff	Concerned about high density housing at east end of Los Reales Road. Would conflict with residential Estates. Would be pressure to continue Los Reales into development What is planned here? Is there a buffer zone between these two development? Is there a height restriction on the building? Is there an open space requirement? Also several years ago was a proposal to extend Valencia to Old Spanish Trail ... what happened to that project?	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Christina Romano	Am opposed to change as this will affect traffic and quality of life in neighborhood. Deals were finalized with the Diamond company for this parcel to be a green buffer zone; the agreements need to be honored. Opposed to any road construction that connects Los Reales or Cmo Mirlo with any new housing developments. Also land at east end of Cmo Mirlo - strongly opposed to this change.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Chad Rudolph	Chose this area for pristine beauty and rural atmosphere. Do not approve of plan change. Area should be no greater than 1 RAC. Haven't met a single Rocking K Ranch resident who was involved in the planning process.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Jay Sayrahder	Strongly opposed; quaint rural neighborhood, why people bought here; the impact would be degradation of night sky and access to development from Los Reales Road will double our now abused roads, non residents passing through to Valencia; increased traffic noise and speeding, development could deter wildlife. Has this impact been studied? In addition what will be the impact on current resident's water system? Understanding growth in population requires development however 3 RAC destroys rural living...	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	William Schneider	Why is staff recommending a change in density along Los Reales, south of Old Spanish Trail?	Same as above.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual ST-12/13	Harold Stuth	Back in 2007 Ray Carroll and Diamond Ventures made assurances to our homeowners as follows: densities equal to or lower; open space along perimeter; bufferzone and prevention extensions to Los Reales and Cmo Mirlo. As the homowners of the land adjoining DVI we want density to remain similar. Expect there will be an open space buffer between properties for wildlife; will not support any potential future road development; expect these agreements to be honored.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Joy Tucker	Opposed to change; do not need such high density in desert; better for our environment and habitat to keep .3 RAC.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Cora Tadeo/Mayo	Common letter from multiple residents: Opposed to change (3 parcels (incorrectly) shown as ST-12); request further consideration and discussion. Rocking K Ranch Estates and adjoining properties request: Land use density remain at 1.2 RAC, provide explanation of what staff means by a 'technical error' or reason for initiation, guarantee of adequate buffer between Rocking K Ranch Estates, and guarantee of no ingress/egress to these parcels through Rocking K Ranch Estates. Provides background information that Diamond Ventures made presentation in 2007 where over 100 Rocking K Ranch Estates and neighboring residents attended. One of the promises was property would be no more than 1.2 RAC. Residents in opposition because: would add traffic and congestion to Old Spanish Trail, conflicts with Comprehensive Plan goals, would decrease property values, purposely live on larger lots for the tranquility, privacy, and diversity and have individual architecture, proximity to Saguaro National Park and Rincon Mountains, would create air and noise pollution. There are other area appropriate for higher density. Want to keep low density and avoid monochromatic.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Signed by 80 residents, approx. 48 had NOT submitted opposition in other forms of comments.	Petition received which is essentially the above letter.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Mr. & Mrs. Frederick Denson	Same as above but adding - looks like the same plan proposed about 12 years ago that was voted down.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Greg Lynch	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Helene Edwards & Rich Pruett	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Hector & Gail Herrera	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Valerie Stephens	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Jan Sayrahder	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	John & Lori George	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Kathleen & Terry Malone	Same as above.	Same as above.

Comment Type	Agency/Organization / Individual	Pima Prospers Comments	How the Comments have been Addressed
Individual ST-12/13	Rich & Melanie Brown	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Mike & Georgene Fromm	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Maria Lind	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Robert & Virginia Genovese	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	John Schorr	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Steve Keller	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Tom Lind	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Dale & Helen Anderson	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Harold & Donna Stuth	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Erice Johnsen	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Jim Johnsen	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Joyce Palmer & Drew Palmer	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Joy Tucker	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	R. Cowan & K. Collins	Same as above.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Tom Lind	Express concerns about upcoming planning changes for two areas east of Rocking K Ranch Estates. My concern with these areas is not their development, but the fact that agreements were made in the past that included non-developed buffer zones and prevention of road connections between Rocking K and any adjacent neighborhoods. I want to be sure that these recent planning changes honor those original agreements. Rocking K is a beautiful, quiet community - part of that is due to no through traffic. Extension of roads between our neighborhood and any future ones would greatly jeopardize that tranquility. Help us prosper by preserving our community's quiet way of life.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Sherry Romero	Am very opposed to the recommended change. Have been a resident in area for almost 30 years.	Same as above.
Individual ST-12/13	Charlie Tucker	Against density change or roadways in or through neighborhood; need to preserve the quality of life and property values.	Same as above.

