

ATTACHMENT B



City of Phoenix
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Staff Report Z-190-25-3
February 6, 2026

[Deer Valley Village Planning Committee](#) Meeting Date: February 17, 2026

[Planning Commission](#) Hearing Date: March 5, 2026

Request From: [R1-8](#) (Single-Family Residence District)
(2.50 acres)

Request To: [R-2](#) (Multi-Family Residence District)
(2.50 acres)

Proposed Use: Single-family residential

Location: Approximately 330 feet west of the northwest corner of 11th Avenue and Michigan Avenue

Owner: Jovanna Ortega, Residential Pursuits Investments, LLC

Applicant: Chris Brown, Arcadia Capital Group

Representative: William Allison, Withey Morris Baugh, PLC

Staff Recommendation: Approval, subject to stipulations

General Plan Conformity			
<u>General Plan Land Use Map Designation</u>	Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre		
<u>Street Map Classification</u>	13th Avenue	Local	25-foot east half street
	Michigan Avenue	Local	0-foot half street
<i>CELEBRATE OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITIES & NEIGHBORHOODS CORE VALUE; CERTAINTY & CHARACTER; DESIGN PRINCIPLE: Protect and enhance the character of each neighborhood and its various housing lifestyles through new development that is compatible in scale, design, and appearance.</i>			
The proposal, as stipulated, is compatible with existing residential developments and zoning districts in the area.			

General Plan Conformity

CELEBRATE OUR DIVERSE COMMUNITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS CORE VALUE; CERTAINTY AND CHARACTER; DESIGN PRINCIPLE: Create new development or redevelopment that is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding neighborhoods and incorporates adequate development standards to prevent negative impact(s) on the residential properties.

The proposal is sensitive to the scale and character of the surrounding residential area by adhering to the density and height limitations outlined in the R-2 zoning district.

BUILD THE SUSTAINABLE DESERT CITY CORE VALUE; WATER INFRASTRUCTURE (STORMWATER); DESIGN PRINCIPLE: Encourage construction plans that reflect a systematic and integrated approach to building design, civil engineering, and landscape architecture in order to maximize the potential for rainwater harvesting and stormwater retention for landscape watering.

The proposal, as stipulated, will provide stormwater harvesting through the use of green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) elements, while utilizing drought-tolerant plant species, thus reducing the amount of potable water needed for irrigation purposes.

Applicable Plans, Overlays, and Initiatives

[Complete Streets Guiding Principles](#): See Background Item No. 6.

[Zero Waste PHX](#): See Background Item No. 7.

[Housing Phoenix Plan](#): See Background Item No. 8.

[Conservation Measures for New Development](#): See Background Item No. 9.

[Phoenix Climate Action Plan](#): See Background Item No. 10.

Surrounding Land Uses and Zoning

	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Zoning</u>
On Site	Single-family residential	R1-8
North	Single-family residential	R-3
South	Single-family residential	R1-8
East	Single-family residential	R-3
West (across 13th Avenue)	Single-family residential	R1-6

R-2 – Multi-Family Residence District (Planned Residential Development Option)		
<u>Standards</u>	<u>R-2 Requirements</u>	<u>Provisions on the proposed site plan</u>
Gross Acreage	-	2.50 acres
Maximum Number of Units	30 units	19 units (Met)
Maximum Density	10.5, 12 with bonus	7.66 dwelling units per acre (Met)
Maximum Building Height	3 stories and 30 feet for the first 150 feet from development perimeter, 1 foot increase in height for each additional 5-feet of building setback to a maximum height of 4 stories and 48 feet 15 feet within 10 feet of a single-family zoning district, 1 foot increase in height for every additional 1 foot of building setback to the maximum permitted height	2 stories and 30 feet (Met)
Maximum Lot Coverage	60 percent	Not specified
Common Open Space	5 percent	7.95 percent (Met)
Minimum Parking	2 spaces per dwelling unit 38 spaces required	Not specified
Minimum Building Setbacks		
Front	10 feet	10 feet (Met)
Rear	None	None (Met)
Side	None	None (Met)
Street Side	10 feet	Not specified
Perimeter Street	20 feet	20 feet (Met)
Other Perimeter	15 feet	15 feet (Met)
Minimum Landscape Setbacks		
13th Avenue	15 feet	15 feet (Met)


Background/Issues/Analysis

SUBJECT SITE

1. This request is to rezone 2.50 acres located approximately 330 feet west of the northwest corner of 11th Avenue and Michigan Avenue from R1-8 (Single-Family Residence District) to R-2 (Multi-Family Residence District) for single-family residential. The subject site is currently developed with a single-family residence.

GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP DESIGNATIONS


2. The subject site and the surrounding properties to the north, south, east, and west are designated as Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre on the General Plan Land Use Map. The proposed R-2 zoning district is not consistent with the General Plan Land Use Map designation of Residential 3.5 to 5 dwelling units per acre; however, a General Plan Amendment is not required as the site is under 10 acres in size and the proposed zoning and land use map designation both fall under the same housing type, traditional lot.



General Plan Land Use Map, Source: Planning and Development Department

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING

3. To the north and east are single-family residences zoned R-3 (Multi-Family Residence District). To the south are single-family residences zoned R1-8 (Single-Family Residence District). To the west, across 13th Avenue, are single-family residences zoned R1-6 (Single-Family Residence District).




Zoning Aerial Map, Source: Planning and Development Department

PROPOSAL

4. Site Plan

The proposal is for a 19-lot residential subdivision. As shown on the site plan, attached as an exhibit, the individual lots will have a minimum width of 40 feet and a depth of between 67 feet and 78 feet. Each individual lot will observe a ten-foot front building setback as measured to the livable area of the house, and an 18-foot front building setback as measured to the face of the garage door. The site plan depicts a 15-foot perimeter setback along its north, east, and south sides, and a 20-foot perimeter setback along 13th Avenue. The proposal will also include approximately eight percent open space. Stipulation No. 1 requires the development to be in general conformance with the site plan.



Conceptual Site Plan, Source: 3 Engineering, LLC

5. **Elevations**

The elevations, attached as an exhibit, are generally typical of single-family detached development in the area and include a variety of colors and materials.

STUDIES AND POLICIES

6. **Complete Streets Guiding Principles**

In 2014, the City of Phoenix City Council adopted the Complete Streets Guiding Principles. The principles are intended to promote improvements that provide an accessible, safe, connected transportation system to include all modes, such as bicycles, pedestrians, transit, and vehicles. As stipulated, the proposed development would provide a sidewalk along 13th Avenue adjacent to the site. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 3.

7. [Zero Waste PHX](#)

The City of Phoenix is committed to its waste diversion efforts and has set a goal to become a zero-waste city, as part of the city's overall 2050 Environmental Sustainability Goals. One of the ways Phoenix can achieve this is to improve and expand its recycling and other waste diversion programs. The City of Phoenix offers recycling services for single-family residential properties.

8. [Housing Phoenix Plan](#)

In June 2020, the Phoenix City Council approved the Housing Phoenix Plan. This Plan contains policy initiatives for the development and preservation of housing with a vision of creating a stronger and more vibrant Phoenix through increased housing options for residents at all income levels and family sizes. Phoenix's rapid population growth and housing underproduction has led to a need for additional new housing units. The proposed development supports the Plan's goal of preserving or creating 50,000 housing units by 2030 by contributing to a variety of housing types that will address the supply shortage at a more rapid pace while using vacant land in a more sustainable fashion.

9. [Conservation Measures for New Development](#)

In June 2023, the Phoenix City Council adopted the Conservation Measures for New Development policy as part of a resolution addressing the future water consumption of new development (Resolution 22129). This resolution addresses the future water consumption of new development to support one of the City's Five Core Values in the General Plan which calls for Phoenix to "Build the Sustainable Desert City". The Conservation Measures for New Development policy includes direction to develop standards for consideration as stipulations for all rezoning cases that will address best practices related to water usage in nine specific categories. This is addressed in Stipulation Nos. 7 through 12.

10. [Phoenix Climate Action Plan:](#)

In October 2021, the Phoenix City Council approved the Climate Action Plan. The Climate Action Plan will serve as a long-term plan to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions and resiliency goals from local operations and community activities as well as prepare for the impacts of climate change. This plan contains policy and initiatives regarding stationary energy, transportation, waste management, air quality, local food systems, heat, and water. Goal W2 (Water), Action W2.4, pertains to the implementation of the [Greater Phoenix Green Infrastructure \(GI\) and Low Impact Development Details for Alternative Stormwater Management](#) to benefit the environment, promote water conservation, reduce urban heat, improve the public health, and create additional green spaces. This goal is addressed in Stipulation No. 11, which requires a minimum of two GI techniques for stormwater management to be implemented.

COMMUNITY INPUT SUMMARY

11. As of the writing of this report, staff has received seven emails and various attachments expressing opposition to this request citing concerns with the configuration of the cul-de-sac configuration located near the southeast corner of the site.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

12. The Street Transportation Department requires the developer to construct a 50-foot modified cul-de-sac at the termination of Michigan Avenue as well as a five-foot wide sidewalk along the east side of 13th Avenue adjacent to the site. The Street Transportation Department also requires the replacement of damaged or obsolete improvements, and that all improvements be consistent with the accepted Traffic Impact Statement, and that all new improvements be in compliance with ADA accessibility standards. These comments are addressed in Stipulation Nos. 2 through 6.
13. The Aviation Department requires that the property owner record a Notice to Prospective Purchasers of Proximity to Airport in order to disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of the Deer Valley Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 13.

OTHER

14. The site has not been identified as being archeologically sensitive. However, in the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, all ground disturbing activities must cease within a 33-foot radius of the discovery and the City of Phoenix Archaeology Office must be notified immediately and allowed time to properly assess the materials. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 14.
15. Staff has not received a completed form for the Waiver of Claims for Diminution in Value of Property under Proposition 207 (A.R.S. 12-1131 et seq.), as required by the rezoning application process. Therefore, a stipulation has been added to require the form be completed and submitted prior to final site plan approval. This is addressed in Stipulation No. 15.
16. The developer will provide a hydraulic/hydrologic analysis of offsite storm water flows, when present, at the time of preliminary site plan submittal for verification of required infrastructure in regard to lot space and density.
17. Development and use of the site is subject to all applicable codes and ordinances. Zoning approval does not negate other ordinance requirements. Other formal actions such as, but not limited to, zoning adjustments and abandonments, may be required.

Findings

1. The proposal, as stipulated, is appropriate at this location and is consistent with the scale and character of the surrounding area.
2. The proposal, as stipulated, will implement water-saving measures consistent with the city's Conservation Measures for New Development Policy.
3. The proposal will add to the diversity of housing options in the area.

Stipulations

1. The development shall be in general conformance with the site plan date stamped January 22, 2026, as modified by the following stipulations and approved by the Planning and Development Department.
2. A minimum 50-foot radius modified cul-de-sac shall be dedicated at the termination of Michigan Avenue, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
3. A minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed on the east side of 13th Avenue, adjacent to the development.
4. All mitigation improvements shall be constructed and/or funded as identified in the accepted Traffic Impact Analysis dated December 3, 2025.
5. Replace unused driveways with sidewalk, curb, and gutter. Also, replace any broken or out-of-grade curb, gutter, sidewalk, and curb ramps on all streets and upgrade all off-site improvements to be in compliance with current ADA guidelines.
6. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping and other incidentals as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
7. Prior to preliminary plat approval, documentation shall be provided that demonstrates participation in the Environmental Protection Agency's WaterSense certification program, or an equivalent program, as approved by the Planning and Development and Water Services departments.

8. Participation in the City of Phoenix Homeowner's Association Water Efficiency Program shall be incorporated into the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for the subdivision, prior to final site plan approval.
9. A WaterSense inspection report from a third-party verifier shall be submitted that demonstrates successful participation in the Environmental Protection Agency's WaterSense certification program, or an equivalent program, prior to certificate of occupancy, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
10. Only landscape materials listed in the Phoenix Active Management Area Low-Water-Use/Drought-Tolerant Plant List shall be utilized throughout the subdivision including the front yards of individual residential lots. This restriction shall be included in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for the subdivision.
11. A minimum of two green stormwater infrastructure (GSI) elements for stormwater management shall be implemented, as approved or modified by the Planning and Development and/or Street Transportation departments. This includes but is not limited to stormwater harvesting basins, bioswales, permeable pavement, etc., per the Greater Phoenix Metro Green Infrastructure and Low Impact Development Details for Alternative Stormwater Management.
12. Swimming pools on individual single-family lots shall be limited to 600 square feet in size.
13. The property owner shall record documents that disclose the existence, and operational characteristics of the Deer Valley Airport to future owners or tenants of the property. The form and content of such documents shall be according to the templates and instructions provided which have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney.
14. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.
15. Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition 207 waiver of claims form. The waiver shall be recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder's Office and delivered to the City to be included in the rezoning application file for record.

Staff Report: Z-190-25-3

February 6, 2026

Page 11 of 11

Writer

Robert Kuhfuss

February 6, 2026

Team Leader

Racelle Escolar

Exhibits



Zoning sketch map

Aerial sketch map


Conceptual Site Plan date stamped January 22, 2026

Conceptual Elevations date stamped December 10, 2025 (16 pages)

Correspondence (56 pages)





DEER VALLEY VILLAGE
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3




APPLICANT'S NAME: Arcadia Capital Group		REQUESTED CHANGE:	
APPLICATION NO: Z-190-25-3		FROM: R1-8 (2.50 ac.)	
DATE: 12/18/2025		TO: R-2 (2.50 ac.)	
GROSS AREA INCLUDING 1/2 STREET AND ALLEY DEDICATION IS APPROX. 2.50 Acres		REVISION DATES:	
		1/20/2026 2/2/2026	
AERIAL PHOTO & QUARTER SEC. NO. QS 38-26		ZONING MAP M-8	
MULTIPLES PERMITTED		STANDARD OPTION	
R1-8		11	
R-2		25	
		* UNITS P.R.D OPTION	
		13	
		30	

* Maximum Units Allowed with P.R.D. Bonus



DEER VALLEY VILLAGE
COUNCIL DISTRICT: 3



APPLICANT'S NAME: Arcadia Capital Group		REQUESTED CHANGE:	
APPLICATION NO: Z-190-25-3		FROM: R1-8 (2.50 ac.)	
DATE: 12/18/2025		TO: R-2 (2.50 ac.)	
GROSS AREA INCLUDING 1/2 STREET AND ALLEY DEDICATION IS APPROX. 2.50 Acres		REVISION DATES:	
		1/20/2026 2/2/2026	
AERIAL PHOTO & QUARTER SEC. NO. QS 38-26		ZONING MAP M-8	
MULTIPLES PERMITTED R1-8 R-2		STANDARD OPTION 11 25	
		* UNITS P.R.D OPTION 13 30	

* Maximum Units Allowed with P.R.D. Bonus



elevationA - DESERT CONTEMPORARY
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



elevationB - MODERN SPANISH
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



elevationC - MID-CENTURY MODERN
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




elevationD - MODERN PRAIRIE
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

PLAN ONE | FRONT ELEVATIONS
13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA


woodley
 architectural
 group, inc.
 colorado // 731 southpark dr. suite B
 littleton, co 80120 / 303.683.7231
 california // 2945 pullman st. suite A
 santa ana, ca 92705 / 949.553.8719

ARCA-2503

NOTE: THESE DRAWINGS ARE PRELIMINARY AND NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. SUCH AS PERMITS, CONTRACTS, OR FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, INCLUDING PHOTOCOPYING, RECORDING, OR BY ANY INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEM, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.




ALL PITCHES 4:12 U.N.O.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


PLAN ONE | ELEVATION A | DESERT CONTEMPORARY
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA

06.13.2025




ARCA-2503

NOTE: DIMENSIONS OF ELEVATIONS AND PERIMETER DIMENSIONS ARE FOR INFORMATION ONLY AND SHOULD BE USED FOR APPROXIMATE PURPOSES. DIMENSIONS SHALL BE BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE APPROXIMATE DIMENSIONS INDICATED IN THESE ELEVATIONS. DIMENSIONS SHALL BE BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE APPROXIMATE DIMENSIONS INDICATED IN THESE ELEVATIONS. DIMENSIONS SHALL BE BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE APPROXIMATE DIMENSIONS INDICATED IN THESE ELEVATIONS.



ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

RIGHT ELEVATION



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

REAR ELEVATION



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

LEFT ELEVATION


PLAN ONE | ELEVATION B | MODERN SPANISH
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA

06.13.2025



ARCA-2503

NOTE: CONSULT ALL APPLICABLE LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, AND STANDARDS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.




ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


06.13.2025

PLAN ONE | ELEVATION C | MID-CENTURY MODERN
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA


ARCA-2503



NOTE: CONSULT WITH THE CITY OF PHOENIX PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOR ALL PERMITS AND REGULATIONS. THESE DRAWINGS ARE INTENDED FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. SUCH AS CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. CONSULT WITH WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. FOR ALL PERMITS AND REGULATIONS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.




ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

06.13.2025

PLAN ONE | ELEVATION D | MODERN PRAIRIE
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA

ARCA-2503



NOTE: SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.



elevationA - DESERT CONTEMPORARY

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



elevationB - MODERN SPANISH

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



elevationC - MID-CENTURY MODERN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



elevationD - MODERN PRAIRIE

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

PLAN TWO | FRONT ELEVATIONS
13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA


06.13.2025

ARCA-2503

PHOENIX, ARIZONA


NOTE: SOME DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS. THESE DIMENSIONS ARE FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. SEE ALL PLANS FOR DIMENSIONS. CONSULT ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. FOR ALL DIMENSIONS. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS. THESE DIMENSIONS ARE FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND SHOULD NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. SEE ALL PLANS FOR DIMENSIONS. CONSULT ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. FOR ALL DIMENSIONS.






ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


PLAN TWO | ELEVATION A | DESERT CONTEMPORARY
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA

06.13.2025

ARCA-2503



NOTE: CONSULT ALL APPLICABLE LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES, AND CODES. THESE DRAWINGS ARE INTENDED FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES ONLY AND ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE. SEE A PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER OR ARCHITECT FOR MORE INFORMATION. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.




ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


06.13.2025

PLAN TWO | ELEVATION C | MID-CENTURY MODERN
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA

ARCA-2503




NOTE: DIMENSIONS INDICATED ON THIS DRAWING ARE APPROXIMATE. THE EXACT DIMENSIONS SHALL BE DETERMINED BY THE EXISTING STRUCTURE. THE ARCHITECT ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS. THE ARCHITECT ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS. THE ARCHITECT ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS.



ALL PITCHES 4:12 U.N.O.
ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

06.13.2025

**PLAN TWO | ELEVATION D | MODERN PRAIRIE
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA**

ARCA-2503



NOTE: OWNER IS RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING ALL DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS WITH THE ARCHITECT. THESE DRAWINGS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECT'S ORIGINAL DRAWINGS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECT'S ORIGINAL DRAWINGS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECT'S ORIGINAL DRAWINGS. THESE DRAWINGS MAY VARY FROM THE ARCHITECT'S ORIGINAL DRAWINGS.



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

elevationA - DESERT CONTEMPORARY



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

elevationB - MODERN SPANISH



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

elevationC - MID-CENTURY MODERN



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

elevationD - MODERN PRAIRIE


06.13.2025

PLAN THREE | FRONT ELEVATIONS
13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA


ARCA-2503

NOTE: SOME OF THE DIMENSIONS AND MATERIALS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE AND INTEND TO BE USED FOR VISUALIZATION PURPOSES ONLY. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE ACTUAL DIMENSIONS OF THE PROJECT. THE ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN THESE DRAWINGS.







ALL PITCHES 4:12 U.N.O.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



RIGHT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


06.13.2025

PLAN TWO | ELEVATION A | DESERT CONTEMPORARY
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
 PHOENIX, ARIZONA

ARCA-2503




NOTE: DIMENSIONS INDICATED ON THIS PLAN AND ELEVATION DRAWINGS ARE APPROXIMATE AND INTEND TO BE USED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THESE DIMENSIONS MAY VARY FROM THE ACTUAL DIMENSIONS OF THE PROJECT. WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS IN THIS DOCUMENT. CONTACT WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. FOR MORE INFORMATION.



RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


06.13.2025

PLAN THREE | ELEVATION B | MODERN SPANISH
13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA

ARCA-2503




NOTE: CONSULT ALL APPLICABLE ORDINANCES, SPECIFICATIONS, AND STANDARDS. THESE DRAWINGS ARE INTENDED TO BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE PERMITS AND PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES PROVIDED BY WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.



SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

RIGHT ELEVATION




ALL PITCHES 4:12 UNO.
 ROOF PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"




SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

REAR ELEVATION




SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

LEFT ELEVATION




RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


PLAN THREE | ELEVATION D | MODERN PRAIRIE
 13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA

06.13.2025


ARCA-2503



NOTE: DIMENSIONS INDICATED ON THIS DRAWING ARE APPROXIMATE AND INTEND TO BE USED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY. THE EXACT DIMENSIONS SHALL BE DETERMINED BY THE EXISTING ARCHITECTURAL RECORDS AND FIELD SURVEY DATA. THE ARCHITECT ASSUMES NO LIABILITY FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS ON THIS DRAWING. CONSULT THE ARCHITECT FOR ANY QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS.



Model 8850, Clear anodized aluminum, Clear glass



Model 8800, Black anodized aluminum, White laminated glass



Model 9100, Sonoma Ranch paint, White finish, Stockbridge IV windows, Decorative hardware




Model 9605, Contemporary paint, Custom painted after installation, Clear II vertical windows

MODELS
9100/9605


MODELS
8800/8850

1 Choose Your Style




2 Choose Your Color

Painted Finishes (Standard)




3 Choose Your Windows




Note: All window styles available on all sized designs. Window configuration may vary depending on door size. See Dealer or website for complete window selection.

1 Choose Your Frame Color

Anodized Finishes




2 Choose Your Glass




7

23




ELEVATION A
DESERT CONTEMPORARY
9100/9605 | CONTEMPORARY PANEL
CLEAR II WINDOWS



ELEVATION B
MODERN SPANISH
9100/9605 | SONOMA PANEL



ELEVATION C
MID-CENTURY MODERN
8800/8850 | 8800 BLACK ANODIZED ALUMINUM
W/GLASS -GLASS FINISH PER BUILDER



ELEVATION D
MODERN PRAIRIE
9100/9605 | CONTEMPORARY PANEL
CITY OF PHOENIX

DEC 1 0 2025

Planning & Development
Department

06.13.2025

WAYNE DALTON | GARAGE DOORS
13TH AVENUE & MICHIGAN | ARCADIA
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

ARCA-2503



colorado // 731 southpark dr. suite B
littleton, co 80120 / 303 683.7231
california // 2943 pullman st. suite A
san diego, ca 92105 / 949 553.8919

NOTE: ALL DRAWINGS ARE PRELIMINARY. THESE DRAWINGS MAY NOT BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE, SUCH AS PERMITS, CONTRACTS, OR FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION OF WOODLEY ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, INC.

From: [Kimberly Sisk](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 12:17:39 PM
Attachments: [2026.0130 Letter to Deer Valley Planning Committee.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good afternoon.

Please find my Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell - 520-784-3080

Kimberly Sisk
1117 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: kesisk2010@gmail.com
Cell: 520-784-3080

January 30, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1117 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, and have resided at this property for approximately eleven (11) years. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my residence.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed immediately in front of my home and one other residence in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. I work from home full time, with my primary office window located approximately forty (40) feet from the road. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair my ability to continue working from my home, which has been my established and stable work environment for over a decade.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a residence directly. *My office is in direct line of any loss-of-control incidents.* This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts. Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

I, as well as my neighbors, as home owners and parents, intend to attend all scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.**

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Sisk
Kimberly Sisk

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.
Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

From: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
To: "Kimberly Sisk"
Subject: RE: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive
Date: Friday, January 30, 2026 1:45:00 PM

Thank you for your email. When you arrive, please 1) sign the sign-in sheet and 2) complete an orange speaker card and hand it to me or the Committee Chair. You will have an opportunity to speak following the formal presentation. The Chair will determine how much time to allot to each speaker, typically 2 to 3 minutes each. Individuals may donate their time to another individual if that is made clear on the speaker card. We do not have formal mechanism to submit public comments, but your letter will be included in the staff report packet.

Hope this is helpful.

Robert H. Kuhfuss
Planner II* Village
Deer Valley Village and North Mountain Village

City of Phoenix
Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning Division
200 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

(602) 534-1608



From: Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 12:49 PM
To: Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov>
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

Good afternoon Mr. Kuhfuss.

I sent a separate email today submitting my written opposition to the referenced above rezoning application.

I understand there is a public meeting scheduled for February 17, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. before the Deer Valley Village Planning Committee, and I would like to speak at that meeting regarding my opposition.

Would you please provide guidance on the procedure for addressing the Committee? Specifically, I would appreciate clarification on whether advance sign-up or a formal request is required, how that process works if so, and whether there is a time limit for individual speakers so I can plan accordingly.

In addition, is there an online portal or formal mechanism available for submitting public comments on this rezoning application? I was unable to locate one and want to be sure my comments are properly submitted into the public record.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell - 520-784-3080

From: [Kimberly Sisk](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com
Subject: Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive
Date: Saturday, January 31, 2026 12:54:18 PM
Attachments: [2026.0131 Follow up 2nd Letter to Deer Valley Planning Committee with photos.pdf](#)
[2026.0131 Letter from Rose Joseph.pdf](#)
[2026.0131 Letter from Brett Judd.pdf](#)
[2026.0131 Letter from Alex Barber.pdf](#)
[2026.0131 Letter from Fadila Cufurovic.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good morning.

I am attaching my follow-up 2nd letter with photos to be added to the staff report.

I am also attaching letters from my 4 neighbors for convenience that each will be emailing to you both separately.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Fri, Jan 30, 2026 at 1:46 PM Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your interest in this case. Your letter will be attached to the staff report that will be sent to the Village Planning Committee.

Robert H. Kuhfuss

Planner II* Village

Deer Valley Village and North Mountain Village

City of Phoenix

Planning and Development Department

Long Range Planning Division

200 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85003

robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

(602) 534-1608



From: Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 12:15 PM

To: Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov>

Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive

Good afternoon.

Please find my Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk

Cell - 520-784-3080

Kimberly Sisk
1117 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: kesisk2010@gmail.com
Cell: 520-784-3080

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

This is my 2nd follow-up letter with additional information regarding the
above rezoning application.

I am the homeowner of 1117 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am
writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25,
specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the
construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

I am attaching photographs of my street, my home, and the proposed
location of the roundabout. These images clearly demonstrate that there is **no
physical space within our cul-de-sac to accommodate a roundabout.**

Construction of a roundabout at this location would materially and
negatively alter the livability of my home and neighborhood. I have relied on the
existing on-street parking for the past 11 years. A roundabout would eliminate
those spaces entirely, leaving me with no practical parking for my multiple
vehicles and no accommodation for guests during holidays, birthdays, or family
gatherings. In addition, vehicle headlights would be directed into my living space
at night, and my children would lose the ability to safely play and ride in front of
our home. These impacts would significantly disrupt both my family life and my
ability to work from home.

The loss of parking would not be limited to my household. The adjacent subdivision, which already has constrained parking, routinely relies on this area for overflow parking during family and community events. **A roundabout would remove that shared capacity and exacerbate existing constraints for multiple households.**

I have also included a photograph of the recently developed lot at the end of 11th Avenue and Union Hills. That project utilized a U-shaped roadway design and successfully accommodated 13 homes without the need for a roundabout. Construction was completed in January 2026, so the aerial imagery has not yet updated to reflect this development. **This example demonstrates that safe, functional alternatives exist that do not impose severe and unnecessary impacts on established neighborhoods.**

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

My neighbors, as homeowners and parents, intend to attend all scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac**

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.


Sincerely,
Kimberly Sisk
Kimberly Sisk

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.
Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com



For Sale ▾

F



Remove Bounda

528K

385K

Roundabout location

Cul-de-sac

N 13th Ave

N 13th Ave

N 13th Ave

N 11th Ave

N 11th Ave

W Willow Maria Dr

W Michigan Ave

E Rose Hart Dr

395K 427K 371K 382K 412K 405K

404K 400K 390K

393K

402K

397K

390K

378K

424K

405K

356K

366K

437K

330K

394K

373K

447K

395K

618K

1121

484K

1117

515K

1113

534K

1109

490K

1105

489K

590K

541K

461K

498K

430K


3

3

3

31

27



Remove Bound

New Development with U-shaped road - 13 homes - just finished building January 2026

528K

1121

ROUNDABOUT LOCATION

Rezoning
sign

One of my
little humans

No space for more traffic;
lose parking space;
headlights in front of home
windows; lose space for
children to safely play and
ride bikes

1117





**ROUNDAABOUT
LOCATION**





1117

My office window

Start of roadway

1117



We have multiple vehicles,
motorcycles, dirt bikes, and
trailer; lost of space for parking
- been here 11 years

1113

1117

1121

Roundabout
location



Cul-de-sac view from 11th avenue;
no space for additional traffic;
side road goes into another sub-division with
almost too much traffic already



1117

1113

1105

1109

View from 1117
towards 11th Avenue;
limited road space

Rose Joseph
1113 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: flexpassion@gmail.com
Cell: 623-202-9642

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1113 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed immediately in front of my home and one other residence in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my house at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. I also have a handicap man living in my home with reduced mental capacity, as well as I believe there is a group home in the neighborhood that this would be an increased safety risk for. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts. Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

I, as a homeowner, plan to attend any possible scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.** I will be unable to attend the February 17, 2026, meeting as I have a scheduled medical procedure that day.

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Rose Joseph

Rose Joseph

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Brett Judd
1105 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: brettjudd70@gmail.com
Cell: 303-809-3952

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1105 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my home at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts. Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

I, as a homeowner, plan to attend any scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.**

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Brett Judd

Brett Judd

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Alex Barber
1121 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: alexdbarber@gmail.com
Cell: 347-392-6017

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1121 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed immediately in front of my home and one other residence in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my home at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

I currently have a renter in the home who has several minor children. Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts.

Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

My neighbors, as homeowners and parents, intend to attend all scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.** I unfortunately live out-of-state in New York and unable to attend in person. If I may attend virtually, I would love that opportunity. Please advise.

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Alex Barber

Alex Barber

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Fadila Cufurovic
1109 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: f.cufurovic@cox.net
Cell: 602-410-4021

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1109 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my house at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts. Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

I, as a homeowner, plan to attend any possible scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.**

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Fadila Cufurovic

Fadila Cufurovic

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

From: [Alex Murr](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#); bill@wmbattorneys.com
Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 - SEC 13th Avenue
Date: Sunday, February 1, 2026 8:37:02 AM
Attachments: [2026.0131 Letter from Alex Dabarber \(1\).pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Alex Dabarber
1117 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: alex_dabarber@gmail.com
Cell: 347-392-6017

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1121 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed immediately in front of my home and one other residence in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my home at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

I currently have a renter in the home who has several minor children. Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts.

Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

My neighbors, as homeowners and parents, intend to attend all scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.** I unfortunately live out-of-state in New York and unable to attend in person. If I may attend virtually, I would love that opportunity. Please advise.

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Alex Dabarber

Alex Dabarber

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

From: [Brett Judd](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
Subject: Zoning
Date: Sunday, February 1, 2026 5:21:17 PM
Attachments: [2026.0131 Letter from Brett Judd.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Brett Judd
1105 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: brettjudd70@gmail.com
Cell: 303-809-3952

January 31, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue
and Villa Maria Drive

I am the homeowner of 1105 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

The proposed roundabout would be constructed in a small cul-de-sac consisting of only five homes. This is not an arterial roadway environment. The placement of a roundabout at this location would effectively place my home on the functional berm of a highway, subjecting my property to traffic conditions wholly incompatible with residential use.

There is minimal setback between the roadway and my home. The prolonged construction activity, followed by permanent increases in traffic volume, headlights shining into my home at night, noise, and vehicular proximity, would materially impair any reasonable use and quiet enjoyment of my home.

From a public safety standpoint, the proposed design creates an unreasonable risk. Vehicles navigating a roundabout in such close proximity to residences increase the likelihood of loss-of-control incidents. Given the lack of significant buffer space or frontage, a vehicle could leave the roadway and strike a

residence directly. This is not a speculative concern given the geometry, speed variance, and proximity involved.

Additionally, there are approximately seven (7), or more, neighborhood children under the age of thirteen who regularly ride bicycles and play within this neighborhood, including within my cul-de-sac. Introducing a roundabout and higher traffic volumes into what is currently a low-traffic residential area creates a foreseeable and unacceptable safety hazard for these children.

The proposed changes would also result in a substantial negative impact on property value and marketability. Homes located immediately adjacent to roundabouts experience reduced desirability due to noise, headlights, traffic exposure, and safety concerns. This would directly impair my ability to sell or refinance my home in the future.

My objections align with established City of Phoenix planning principles applied by the City of Phoenix Planning & Development Department, including:

Land use compatibility

Phoenix planning policy emphasizes compatibility between new development and existing neighborhoods. Introducing a roundabout into a small residential cul-de-sac conflicts with established low-density residential use and character.

Protection of established neighborhoods

City planning documents consistently prioritize protecting existing neighborhoods from incompatible traffic patterns and infrastructure that disproportionately burden a small number of residents.

Transportation context sensitivity

Traffic infrastructure is intended to be context-sensitive. Roundabouts are typically appropriate for collector or arterial roadways, not for short residential cul-de-sacs with minimal setbacks and no buffering.

Public safety considerations

Planning and zoning decisions must account for foreseeable safety impacts. Increased traffic volume and altered traffic patterns in close proximity to homes and children present a legitimate safety concern that should be avoided.

Property impact and livability

City planning principles recognize that rezonings should not impose undue negative impacts on nearby property owners, including loss of quiet enjoyment, reduced livability, or diminished property value.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, **provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.**

I, as a homeowner, plan to attend any scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and **will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac.**

Please include this letter as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,
Brett Judd
Brett Judd

cc: William F. Allison, Esq.
Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

From: [Kimberly Sisk](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com
Subject: Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive
Date: Sunday, February 1, 2026 5:17:59 PM
Attachments: [8. Photo of street on a Sunday.pdf](#)
[9. Photo of street on Sunday by posting of Rezoning notice.pdf](#)
[11. New Subdivision on 11th Ave and Union Hills with U-shaped roadway - 2nd photo.pdf](#)
[10. New Subdivision on 11th Ave and Union Hills with U-shaped roadway.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good afternoon, Mr. Kuhfuss.

Please find additional photos to add with my prior two letters and photos for the staff report.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Sat, Jan 31, 2026 at 12:53 PM Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com> wrote:

Good morning.

I am attaching my follow-up 2nd letter with photos to be added to the staff report.

I am also attaching letters from my 4 neighbors for convenience that each will be emailing to you both separately.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Fri, Jan 30, 2026 at 1:46 PM Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your interest in this case. Your letter will be attached to the staff report that will be sent to the Village Planning Committee.

Robert H. Kuhfuss

Planner II* Village

Deer Valley Village and North Mountain Village

City of Phoenix

Planning and Development Department

Long Range Planning Division

200 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85003

robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

(602) 534-1608



From: Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 12:15 PM

To: Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov>

Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive

Good afternoon.

Please find my Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk

Cell - 520-784-3080



Visitor parking

Roundabout area

visitor parking

Work vehicle
parking - only
available area
for home at
1117

1117
house



Roundabout in this area

Visit on a Sunday parking

Road in front of 1117 and 1121 houses



**2nd part of U-shaped
roadway for new
Subdivision on 11th
Avenue and Union Hills**



**1st part of U-shaped
roadway in new
subdivision on 11th
Avenue and Union
Hills**

From: [Kimberly Sisk](#)
To: [Robert H Kuhfuss](#)
Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com; info@3engineering.com
Subject: Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive
Date: Sunday, February 1, 2026 7:05:55 PM
Attachments: [2026.0201 Follow up 3rd Letter to Deer Valley Planning Committee with photos.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Good evening, Mr. Kuhfuss.

Please find attached my 3rd letter with attached aerial photo, and request for records submission.

Please add this with my prior two (2) letters, and photos 1-11 for the staff report.

I have included 3engineering (Attn: VP, Matthew Mancini) on this email as I believe their site plan has a design failure, which could open them up to a foreseeable liability issue.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Sun, Feb 1, 2026 at 5:15 PM Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com> wrote:

Good afternoon, Mr. Kuhfuss.

Please find additional photos to add with my prior two letters and photos for the staff report.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Sat, Jan 31, 2026 at 12:53 PM Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com> wrote:

Good morning.

I am attaching my follow-up 2nd letter with photos to be added to the staff report.

I am also attaching letters from my 4 neighbors for convenience that each will be emailing to you both separately.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk
Cell-520-784-3080

On Fri, Jan 30, 2026 at 1:46 PM Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your interest in this case. Your letter will be attached to the staff report that will be sent to the Village Planning Committee.

Robert H. Kuhfuss

Planner II* Village

Deer Valley Village and North Mountain Village

City of Phoenix

Planning and Development Department

Long Range Planning Division

200 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor

Phoenix, Arizona 85003

robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

(602) 534-1608



From: Kimberly Sisk <kesisk2010@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, January 30, 2026 12:15 PM

To: Robert H Kuhfuss <Robert.Kuhfuss@phoenix.gov>

Cc: bill@wmbattorneys.com

Subject: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive

Good afternoon.

Please find my Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive.

Thank you.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk

Cell - 520-784-3080

Kimberly Sisk
1117 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
Email: kesisk2010@gmail.com
Cell: 520-784-3080

February 1, 2026

Phoenix Planning & Development Department
200 West Washington Street, 2nd Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Email: robert.kuhfuss@phoenix.gov

Re: Formal Opposition to Rezoning Application Z-190-25 – SEC 13th Avenue and Villa Maria Drive

This is my 3rd follow-up letter with additional information regarding the above rezoning application.

I am the homeowner of 1117 W. Michigan Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona. I am writing to formally and unequivocally oppose Rezoning Application Z-190-25, specifically as it relates to the proposed traffic reconfiguration and the construction of a roundabout directly impacting my cul-de-sac and my home.

Roundabout safety concerns

Safety and Liability Concerns Regarding Backing Movements Into a Roundabout

Roundabouts are designed and engineered for **continuous forward traffic flow**. All elements of a roundabout—geometry, sight lines, signage, pedestrian crossings, and driver expectations—assume vehicles will **enter, circulate, and exit while moving forward**.

Any design that requires or encourages drivers to **back into or reverse near a roundabout creates a foreseeable and avoidable safety hazard. This would require us to back into our driveway, which doing so would also be a safety hazard.**

From a traffic-engineering standpoint, reversing movements in a roundabout environment **are unsafe because drivers circulating in the roundabout are not expecting backward movement. Their attention is directed to yielding patterns and vehicles approaching from the left, not to a vehicle suddenly reversing into the travel path. This violates fundamental principles of predictable driver behavior, which is a core safety assumption in roadway design.**

Visibility is also severely compromised. When a driver reverses, their field of view is further reduced, increasing the risk of collision with circulating vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. Pedestrian crossings are intentionally placed close to roundabout entries and exits; reversing movements place pedestrians directly in conflict with a maneuver they cannot reasonably anticipate.

From a safety and liability perspective, collisions involving backing vehicles are almost universally attributed to the reversing driver. **Because roundabouts are not designed to accommodate reverse movements, there are no mitigating features to reduce that risk.** As a result, any crash involving backing in or near a roundabout would be entirely foreseeable, **raising serious concerns about exposure to liability for approving a design that creates this condition.**

In short, if a proposed roadway configuration makes backing into a roundabout necessary or likely, that condition reflects a design failure, not a driver behavior issue. Safer, well-established alternatives exist and should be considered to avoid introducing an unnecessary and preventable safety risk into an established neighborhood.

Site-Specific Dimensions & Physical Constraints

Based on the aerial view of the cul-de-sac serving 1105, 1109, 1113, 1117, and 1121 W. Michigan Ave, the following constraints are visually evident (*photo attached*):

- This is a **short residential cul-de-sac** with homes lining both sides and no excess pavement width.
- The turning area is already fully utilized for:
 - Vehicle turnaround
 - On-street parking
 - Guest and overflow parking for adjacent subdivisions

- The proposed roundabout location is positioned **inside the only functional turning bulb**, leaving no remaining space for:
 - Forward-only vehicle circulation
 - Parking retention
 - Pedestrian clearance zones

Key planning reality:

A standard single-lane roundabout requires substantially more diameter than this cul-de-sac provides. Even without landscaping or splitter islands, the geometry visible in the aerial shows that a roundabout would **physically displace parking and force backing movements**.

This is not a matter of preference — it is a **space limitation**.

2. Photo Overlay Explanation (Using My Actual Cul-de-Sac)

What the photo shows (from the attached aerial)

- The cul-de-sac is labeled with homes **1105 through 1121** along W. Michigan Ave
- The proposed roundabout location sits **directly in front of existing residences**
- There is no secondary access or escape route

Critical visual takeaway:

The overlay makes clear that **forward circulation cannot physically occur** here. Backing is not hypothetical — it is the only way vehicles could maneuver.

3. This aerial shows the cul-de-sac serving homes 1105 through 1121 West Michigan Avenue. Roundabouts are designed for continuous forward movement, but this location does not have the physical diameter to support that. As the diagram shows, vehicles would be forced to back up in order to maneuver, placing reversing traffic directly in front of homes and pedestrian areas. Drivers do not expect reverse movements in a roundabout, visibility is limited, and children and pedestrians are placed in unavoidable conflict zones. From a planning and safety standpoint, if backing becomes necessary, that indicates a design failure, not a driver behavior issue. Safer, forward-only alternatives exist and should be used here.

Key Concerns for Consideration

Safety

- Roundabouts are engineered for continuous forward vehicle movement.
- The site geometry does not support forward-only circulation, creating forced backing maneuvers.
- Reversing vehicles introduce unpredictable movements, limited sight distance, and direct conflict with pedestrians and children near homes.

Neighborhood Impact

- The design would eliminate long-standing on-street parking relied upon by multiple households.
- Loss of parking affects residents and adjacent subdivisions during normal use and family gatherings.
- Headlight intrusion and proximity to residences materially affect livability, and those working from home to continue their jobs.

Liability & Risk

- Collisions involving backing vehicles are typically assigned fault to the reversing driver.
- *Because the backing condition is inherent to the design, any resulting collision would be foreseeable.*
- *Approving a backing-dependent configuration increases potential exposure when safer alternatives exist.*

This shows liability as **foreseeable**, not speculative, if rezoning application is approved as submitted.

To be clear, I am not opposed to the development of the nineteen homes referenced in this application, *provided that the existing block wall separating the new development from my cul-de-sac remains intact and no roundabout or similar traffic feature is introduced into or immediately adjacent to our residential street.*

My neighbors, as homeowners and parents, intend to attend all scheduled hearings and meetings related to this application and *will continue to strongly oppose any design that introduces a roundabout or materially increases traffic exposure to my cul-de-sac*

Please include *this letter, as well as my prior two (2) letters and multiple photographs 1-11*, as part of the official record for Rezoning Application Z-190-25.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Sisk

Kimberly Sisk


cc: William F. Allison, Esq.

Email: bill@wmbattorneys.com

info@3engineering.com (Attn: Matthew Mancini, VP)

For Sale

Remove Bounda



Roundabout location

Cul-de-sac

There would be zero street parking which the 7 home owners and other cul-de-sacs relied on for decades and conflicts with 112 existing residential parking area.

Forced backing movement - homeowners must reverse to maneuver

New Request

Reference No: R031099-020126

Logged in as: kesisk2010@gmail.com

Thank you for your interest in public records of City of Phoenix. Your request has been received and is being processed in accordance with ARS §39-121. Your request was received on February 01, 2026 and given the reference number R031099-020126 for tracking purposes.

Your request will be forwarded to the relevant department(s) to locate the information you seek and to determine the volume and any costs associated with satisfying your request. You will be contacted about the availability and/or provided with copies of the records in question.

You can monitor the progress of your request in "[My Request Center](#)"

RE: Public Records Request – 13th Ave & Michigan Roundabout, Project No. 5343,
RZSP01

To the City Clerk and Records Custodian,

Pursuant to Arizona public records law, please produce the records listed below relating to the roundabout proposed or constructed at 13th Avenue and Michigan Avenue, Project No. 5343, Rezoning RZSP01:

1. All stamped civil and traffic plan sets, revisions, redlines, and as built drawings.
2. All traffic, drainage, and sight distance analyses submitted with the project, including exhibits and software outputs.
3. City review comments and responses from Street Transportation, Planning and Development, Fire, and any other reviewing department, including staff reports and meeting notes.
4. Email correspondence between City staff and the applicant, developer, or engineer regarding roundabout geometry, signing and striping, emergency access, drainage, or safety concerns.
5. Any conditions of approval, directives, or required deviations imposed by the City relating to the roundabout design.
6. Any complaints, service requests, police reports, or internal memoranda referencing safety, visibility, drainage, or incidents at or near this intersection.

If any portion of this request is denied, please identify the specific exemption relied upon and release all segregable portions. Electronic production is preferred.

Thank you for your assistance.

Warm regards,

Kimberly Sisk

Kimberly Sisk
1117 W. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85023
kesisk2010@gmail.com
520 784 3080