

Lauren Schumann

From: Mark Fitzgerald <Mark@azcapitolconsulting.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2024 10:31 AM
To: Andy Bass; Lauren Schumann; Kevin Mayo; David De La Torre
Cc: Joshua Wright; Chandni Bhakta
Subject: Thank you!

Hello all,

Thank you for meeting with us this morning to address our questions. Following a deeper understanding and your team resolving language concerns, we no longer have any issues with the City proposed text amendments. On behalf of my team, we appreciate your willingness to compromise and respond to all our inquiries.

Kevin, I will provide the language for you to draft a letter to our members, clarifying that the changes do not prevent developers from charging for parking. My initial interpretation of the revised language was incorrect, but the letter will help rectify any misunderstandings. Additionally, I will draft a letter supporting the staff's recommendation to P&Z regarding guest parking requirements.

I just spoke to Vice Mayor Orlando and shared this update with him. As a result, we will be canceling any previously scheduled meetings with your councilmembers. My sincerest apologies for the miscommunication.

Once again, thank you all, and I look forward to future collaboration.

Respectfully,

Mark Fitzgerald
Capitol Consulting, LLC
1415 N. 7th Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85007
PH: 209-986-0842
Email: mark@azcapitolconsulting.com

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: Chandni Bhakta <Chandni@azcapitolconsulting.com>
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2023 5:14 PM
To: Lauren Schumann; Mark Fitzgerald
Cc: Kevin Mayo; David De La Torre; courtney-azcapitolconsulting.com
Subject: RE: City of Chandler proposed Zoning Code Amendments

Good afternoon,

Thank you for engaging AMA in your discussion of the upcoming code amendment as it relates to multifamily projects and parking. We applaud the staff's time, research, and resources it took to compile this proposal. We are in support of the increased height from 44 feet to 55 feet that would require a Mid-Rise overlay to areas of growth, reducing the requirements to completely screen roof mounted equipment, and open to adding a provision that multifamily will be allowed additional time during the initial lease up.

However, AMA strongly opposes the increase in (guest) parking requirements by 0.25 and preempting apartment communities from charging for any parking spaces that are required to be built per the zoning code. This intent would initially raise the cost for development of multihousing projects versus the number of units that could be built due to the parking restrictions. Currently we are seeing several cities actually work to reduce their parking requirements especially for affordable housing communities and housing near major transit or transportation corridors.

Below are some highlight points that AMA would like to bring to your attention:

- Implementing via the zoning code a limitation if parking fees or parking rent is a government overreach: Restricting apartment owners from charging for parking constitutes an unnecessary government intervention into private property rights and ongoing property operations. Property owners should have the autonomy to set their own pricing policies, especially when it comes to a valuable asset like parking.
- Financial burden on property owners : For rental housing owners and managers, the prohibition on charging for parking may translate into financial burdens. The costs of maintaining and operating parking facilities can be significant, and if owners are unable to recover these costs through parking fees, they may need to offset the expenses through other means such as higher rents across the board. Whereas charging parking rent or fees based on type of parking (covered, uncovered or in some cases individual enclosed garages) or the needed parking spots is a more equitable approach allowing the resident to determine the parking option that best fits their needs and budget. While some families renting a three bedroom, they might need two or three parking spaces but another person renting a three bedroom and using the extra rooms as an office and guest space may only need one parking space.
- Unintended consequences: Implementing such policies may lead to unintended consequences, such as reduced investment in apartment communities, less upkeep of parking infrastructure, or a potential decline in the quality of housing services provided to tenants.
- Operational flexibility for property owners: Different apartment communities may have varying needs and circumstances. Allowing property owners to set parking policies, including whether to charge for parking, enables them to adapt to the unique requirements of their residents and the local context.

In summary, we hope that you will harmonize urban planning goals without infringing on property rights on-going property management. However, in the case of prohibiting fees or rents for parking no such balance exists, and property owners and some residents will be left disadvantaged. The city mandates additional parking, driving up costs, only to

then hinder landlords from charging for parking. If parking fee restrictions pass, it could lead to a potentially far-reaching and adverse consequences down the road.

Sincerely,

Chandni Bhakta
Capitol Consulting, LLC
P.O. Box 13116
Phoenix, AZ 85007-3116

Office: (602) 712-1121
Cell: (602) 909-4689

From: Lauren Schumann <Lauren.Schumann@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 12:16 PM
To: Chandni Bhakta <Chandni@azcapitolconsulting.com>; Mark Fitzgerald <Mark@azcapitolconsulting.com>
Cc: Kevin Mayo <Kevin.Mayo@chandleraz.gov>; David De La Torre <David.DeLaTorre@chandleraz.gov>
Subject: City of Chandler proposed Zoning Code Amendments

Good Afternoon Mark and Chandni,

Thank you for taking the time to meet with us last week as the City of Chandler finalizes the proposed code amendment. We wanted to reach out to see if you had any comments, questions, or concerns as we are in the process of preparing the memo for the Planning and Zoning Commission 11/15 meeting.

Lauren Schumann
Principal Planner, City of Chandler's Planning Division
215 E. Buffalo St.
Chandler, AZ 85225
(480) 782-3156

Lauren Schumann

From: Rebecca Hill <rebecca@downtownchandler.org>
Sent: Monday, November 6, 2023 4:00 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Cc: Lauren Koll
Subject: Zoning Code Feedback

Hi Lauren,

On behalf of the Downtown Chandler Community Partnership, there are a few concerns we would like to discuss/see addressed.

1. Should we require an entertainment permit for business already in the entertainment district?
 - It has been suggested putting specifics (time and decibels) in the new Zoning Code Amendment
2. Is it reasonable to ask new renters (DC Heights) to sign a waiver acknowledging the entertainment district?
 - Include guidelines into Land Use and Zoning directed to multifamily establishments requiring renters to acknowledge Entertainment District and existing permit regulations.
 - Any amplified music or speakers on public areas within the Entertainment District must be permitted through the City. Including but not limited to; entertainers, speakers expressing opinions, pan handlers, non-profits seeking donations, etc.
3. Sign Code, Item F. Would the City reconsider this if there were certain hours of this sign being lit? This will have an impact for several current businesses, some that are already established and certainly any new business currently in the zoning process. (Potentially, Hidden House, Maple House, Food Court, Ghett Yo, the Perch, One Chandler)

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Rebecca

Rebecca Hill
Executive Director
100 W Boston St., #5
Chandler, AZ 85225
480-855-3539 Office
480-406-5898 Cell



CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2023 12:52 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Thu, 10/19/2023 - 12:51 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Erich Wichterman

Address

970 E Desert Inn Dr
Chandler, Arizona. 85249

Email

erich.wichterman@gmail.com

Comments

Not in favor of permitting accessory dwelling units on single-family lots. For every family that wants to allow this for extended family there are 10 others that are seeking to generate a revenue stream. This amounts in practicality to change zoning from SFR to multi-family. Not in favor of Home occupations amendment. This amounts to a zoning amendment to support business - business should be conducted in a business zoned area. Such an amendment adds to traffic posing a danger to citizens and quite frankly degrades the neighborhood into mixed use.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Sunday, October 22, 2023 4:33 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Sun, 10/22/2023 - 04:33 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Seth Borman

Address

1408 E Gail Dr.
Chandler, Arizona. 85225

Email

sethborman@yahoo.com

Comments

The city's focus on parking is unwarranted, there is no parking crisis and thus no need to drastically increase parking requirements. This is true especially of ADUs and home occupations. With ADUs, many of the units will be occupied by people that don't drive. If I build an ADU in my home it will be for an elderly relative that doesn't drive. With home occupations, most people don't use their garages for parking anyway, they park in the driveway. This is directly applicable to my family, as we are in the process of opening a small business that would have gone in our garage if that were allowed. Because it can't, we found a small office space in an adjacent city.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 4:50 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 10/25/2023 - 04:50 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Linda Miller

Address

930 W Oriole Way
Chandler, Arizona. 85286

Email

lindasmiller2@gmail.com

Comments

I think all of these are good ideas. Many would solve a lot of HOA versus resident disputes if carried to existing communities where applicable. thank you for asking fir community feedback.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2023 12:21 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Mon, 10/23/2023 - 12:21 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Margaret Pena

Address

2373 W. Flint St
Chandler, Arizona. 85224

Email

penafami@aol.com

Comments

Could you let me know which areas (neighborhoods) these changes would be impacting?

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 25, 2023 8:01 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 10/25/2023 - 08:01 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Suzanna Williams

Address
1760 E i digo dr
Chandler, Arizona. 85286

Email
suzibean@gmail.com

Comments
We are in favor of increasing the size of open air residential rmanadas

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 7:40 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Fri, 10/27/2023 - 07:40 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
David Freet

Address
599 S Terrace Road
Chandler, Arizona. 85226

Email
fxstsaz99@cox.net

Comments
I am against all of these proposed changes to the current codes.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 27, 2023 9:37 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Fri, 10/27/2023 - 09:36 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Setliff Jo Setliff Jo

Address

5172 w Dublin lane
Chandler, Arizona. 85226

Email

josetliff@gmail.com

Comments

Like the addition of shipping containers and guest parking.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Priority: Five Day
Assigned To: Tawna Mower

Requester Name: Karin Taylor
Requester Phone # (928) 856-1151
Request Service Location :

Customer Comments: Hello, I am writing to share my opinion on city parking codes. I moved to Chandler a few years ago and I am happy to see that the city allows companies to request lower parking requirements after a study. I believe that this does not go far enough, as the mandate for a study to prove a lack of need places unnecessary spending requirements on potential entrepreneurs. A government-mandated spending requirement limits development by presuming that the government knows what businesses should be spending their money on better than business owners themselves. In addition to the increased land and construction spending requirements for potential small businesses, the requirement for large parking lots creates an ongoing financial burden by making the company hire additional night or weekend security staff to ensure the vacancy of the lot. Parking lots that are sized to account for large single-day events may be useful for the theater or a mall on Black Friday, but for most businesses they are a liability. People who simply want to run their business are now tasked with managing a massive tract of land that sits unused most days and attracts dangerous behavior such as doing donuts and loitering. The government is forcing companies to increase startup costs for the benefit of owning land that does nothing but attract foolish young men looking for a misdemeanor. Dealing with the behavior of these parking lot hooligans, noise complaints, and the resulting legal requirements is another burden that city parking requirements are hoisting on small business owners. The requirements themselves do not increase business traffic, and companies should be able to be responsible for the design and spending on their own property to the extent that it is safe. Laws are supposed to keep the citizens safe. The mild inconvenience of trying to find a parking spot in a crowded lot is not a safety issue, it is a free market issue. Businesses should be responsible for their own company, and if they lose business due to people being unable to find a place to park in a smaller lot that is a lesson they need to learn as an entrepreneur, not a danger that the government needs to protect them from. In fact, with the increased vagrancy and public disturbance that large parking lots encourage, the government has created a law that increases danger to the public while restricting commerce. I urge you to bring these requirements down as soon as you can so that we can see more innovative businesses and fewer viral videos of people crashing their car while doing donuts in a vacant lot. Sincerely, Karin Taylor

Created By: RESTAPILogOn on 9/6/2023 at 8:21:17 PM

To open this record in the web application click on the link below. If this does not work for you, you can copy the link and paste it into Internet Explorer

[Link to View](#)

This email came from an automated system. Do not reply to this email.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 10:20 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Tue, 11/28/2023 - 10:19 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Jill Evans

Address

3330 S. Gilbert Rd.
Unit #2028
Chandler, Arizona. 85286

Email

jill.evans3@gmail.com

Comments

Regarding the proposed amendment for Multi-Family Residential Parking: I currently live in a condominium complex that was built 15 years ago. We have a limited number of guest parking spaces (approximately 35 to accommodate 184 living units). The proposed amendment would require that we have .25 guest spaces per unit for a total of 46 spaces. As a fully developed property, there is absolutely no space to create extra guest parking. Another proposed amendment is not to charge a fee for guest parking. Our HOA has recently implemented paid guest parking. This was done as guest parking was being abused by residents who had more vehicles than assigned parking spaces and were using guest parking spaces for their own personal vehicles. This obviously caused issues for other residents who now could not find a guest parking space for an actual guest. Our HOA tried many things to deter this including visitor passes, towing, etc. Nothing worked. Now that we use a software system (Zark Parking) to rent a guest space for a nominal fee, this issue has significantly reduced. I am not in favor of this amendment as it will cause unnecessary hardship. I urge you not to pass these particular parts of your proposed amendment. Thank you.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 12:17 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Tue, 12/05/2023 - 12:16 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Trina Bates

Address

609 W San Marcos Dr
Chandler, Arizona. 85225

Email

teensyfaye@gmail.com

Comments

I am in favor of the proposed elimination of the ramada size limit and instead using a percentage (30%) of the area of the yard. I am also in favor of the newly proposed setbacks for ramadas. Great idea!

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 4:06 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/29/2023 - 04:05 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Lisa Sackett

Address
4578 W Earhart Way
Chandler, Arizona. 85226

Email
happyveggie2@gmail.com

Comments

I would really like for the current restrictions on building ramadas or shade structures anywhere on our property to be removed. Our planet is warming and Arizonans should be able to reduce the temperatures around our homes any way possible.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 3:27 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/29/2023 - 03:26 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

nanette grisham

Address

4667 w. shannon,
chandler, Arizona. 85226

Email

arizona_nan@yahoo.com

Comments

this is response to; home occupations subject..... i totally disagree to any home occupations businesses. these would bring VERY negative occurrences to any neighborhoods. they could include; heavy traffic, unsafe to children , strangers, parking illegally, debris thrown around. if a person wants a business, rent a location in a strip mall type of building. NOT garage OR home occupations.... and; who would enforce the hours of 9am - 7pm ? the police have more important duties. i DO not want my driveway blocked so some person could operate a business near me. also, strangers, bring crimes, break-ins, thefts, NO THANK YOU !!

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 12:51 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/29/2023 - 12:51 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Nancy Landeryou

Address

4650 W Ivanhoe St
Chandler, Arizona. 85226

Comments

Keep the home occupation code as it stands. Residential areas should be just that, for residents, not for commercial use. If businesses that are run out of a home, allow customers and employees in and out, throughout the day, there will be more traffic in and out of our neighborhoods. This increases the danger of accidents to children, pets, and the elderly. Not to mention, strangers coming in and out of our neighborhoods. We have a tight knit community, where neighbors look out for each other. How will we know if certain people belong in our neighborhoods, if it becomes a free for all? Keep businesses where they belong, in shopping centers! I doubt if other people would approve of this change, if it were more widely known to the general population. Are you just accommodating a special interest group or friend? This seems like a very important zoning change that should be brought to the public for a vote.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 11:31 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/29/2023 - 11:30 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name
Joseph Dale

Address
4849 E Karsten Dr
Chandler, Arizona. 85249

Email
azjoedale@q.com

Comments

In regards to eliminating requirements for driveway to be connected to garage or carport: IMO, having two driveways in most of our cookie cutter master planned communities with lots under .3 acres would be an eyesore. What would happen is we would have cars parked on both driveways so your front yards now become one giant driveway. Instead of this, how about reduce amount of parking landscape (cement, pavers, etc) is allowed.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 28, 2023 2:11 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Tue, 11/28/2023 - 02:10 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Leslie Minkus

Address

3372 E Gemini Ct
Chandler, Arizona. 85249

Email

faminkus@msn.com

Comments

With the support of my Co-Chair and City Liaison, Linda Sawyer and the members of our the LD13 Local Government Committee, our FOCUS IS ALL ABOUT true, clear and FULL transparency, open dialog and communications regarding proposed ordinances and agenda issues that are presented and discussed at all future city work sessions, study sessions and department meetings between our LD13 Committee Members, including Residents of Chandler, AND the City Staff, Mayor and Council Members. It is also important for the City to publicly provide clear and complete feedback to justify their reasoning supporting each decision made by each elected official that voted on an ordinance.

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 12:53 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/15/2023 - 12:53 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Theo Anglin

Address

1613 E Cindy St
Chandler, Arizona. 85225

Email

theoanglin99@gmail.com

Comments

I am overwhelmingly in support of the code changes, especially regarding ADUs!

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 9:30 AM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Submitted on Wed, 11/15/2023 - 09:30 AM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Tracie Younce

Address

3632 E PRESCOTT PL
CHANDLER, Arizona. 85249

Email

tyounce@hotmail.com

Comments

Most of these amendments appear to align with nearby cities and more modern updates however I would like to question the elimination of the pool setback of 5 feet. What is the benefit of this change that would outweigh any issues that could be caused by setting the pool decking so close to a neighbor? Wouldn't this cause more problems with masonry fencing and tree roots, etc? I realize lot sizes have dwindled in newer neighborhoods and doesn't always allow room for a pool to be installed on a property but to change the pool set back regulations is not the way to handle citizens wanting a pool in their small yard. Why are you allowing lot sizes so small in the first place if you would allow a pool on that property? What is the overall majority benefit of this amendment?

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Lauren Schumann

From: City of Chandler <webmaster@chandleraz.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 15, 2024 4:17 PM
To: Lauren Schumann
Subject: Webform submission from: Code Amendments: Public Comment Form

Submitted on Mon, 01/15/2024 - 04:17 PM

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Name

Andrew DeValk

Address

213 S Maple St
Chandler, Arizona. 85226

Email

andrewjdevalk@gmail.com

Comments

Due to the current cost of living, an ADU with built in cooking capabilities would help so many residents like us in various ways. This would allow residents to provide a long-term solution to an aging parent, family member, adult children, friend, or even the opportunity to rent the space long-term (which provides another affordable housing opportunity within Chandler) makes economic sense for all involved. Wouldn't this add value to living in Chandler? An in-law suite adds value to homes. Allowing the chance to rent out an ADU would also increase property values. However, care should be taken in making sure that there is little to no impact on the neighborhood as it relates to parking and aesthetics. Thank you for your consideration!

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.