Taylor Manemann

From: Michelle Wood [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2026 1:21 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Tonight's Planning Commission Meeting
Attachments: Meeting leave behind (1).pdf

This Message Is From an External Sender
This message came from outside your organization.
Report Suspicious

Hi Taylor,

Looking forward to seeing you this evening! Again, thank you so much for all your help throughout this process. I really appreciate it.

I've attached a data sheet I've been working on in preparation for tonight's meeting. I wanted to share it with you in advance, as it includes several questions and points I believe are important to consider.

I was actually planning to bring printed copies to leave behind at tonight's meeting, but I'm not sure if that's allowed. This is my first time going through this process, so I would appreciate your guidance on whether that's appropriate or if there's a better way to share the information.

Thank you so much!

Michelle

VALE SERENO | Neighborhood Density & Planning Compatibility

Chandler Planning & Zoning Commission | October 21, 2026 | Case PLH26-0021

Resident request: Evaluate a lower-density subdivision with fewer homes and larger lots, using the full set of adjacent neighborhoods, rural parcels, and Chandler's adopted planning objectives as the basis for comparison.

1 | What is proposed?

Vale Sereno proposes 53 single-family lots. Using the previously reported 12.1 net acres, this is approximately **4.38 homes per net acre**. The working plan shows lots of approximately 5,232–7,170 square feet; these figures should be cross-checked against the submitted preliminary development plan.

2 | Residential density classifications — Chandler 2026 General Plan

General Plan neighborhood category	Dwelling units per acre
Rural residential	0–2.5
Low-density residential	2.6–3.5
Medium-density residential	3.6–12
Vale Sereno (calculated proposal)	4.38

The General Plan describes rural and low-density residential as appropriate adjacent to rural or large-lot subdivisions. Medium-density residential can be considered in specified transitional or mixed-use contexts. These categories are planning guidance, not automatic zoning prohibitions. [1]

3 | Neighborhood lot-size evidence — include the omitted communities

Community / parcel type	Available lot-size evidence	Evidence status
Vale Sereno (proposed)	~5,232–7,170 sq. ft.	Working application figures; verify
Symmetry at Magnolia (Shea)	9,500 sq. ft. minimum	Published community listing [2]
Tierra Linda	20,143 and 20,707 sq. ft.	Individual assessor/listing examples [3]
Circle G at Riggs Ranch	~0.75 acre to more than 1 acre (~32,670+ sq. ft.)	Community description; plat verification needed [4]
Riggs Homestead Ranch III / IV	Lot-size range pending plat review	Prior density comparison only
Cooper Heights / McKinley Glenn	Lot-size range pending plat review	Prior density comparison only
Nearby rural parcels	Parcel-by-parcel acreage pending assessor map	Include agricultural/unsubdivided parcels

Important: Individual property examples do not establish subdivision-wide lot-size ranges. For an apples-to-apples analysis, the Commission should examine recorded plats, parcel sizes, and gross/net density across the same geographic boundary.

4 | Previously compiled density comparison (verification pending)

Neighborhood	Homes / acre
Riggs Homestead Ranch III	0.96
Riggs Homestead Ranch IV	1.07

Neighborhood	Homes / acre
Cooper Heights	2.20
McKinley Glenn	2.44
Vale Sereno	4.38

These four existing-neighborhood values come from the working comparison and require confirmation against the applicant's submitted neighborhood analysis or recorded plats. Tierra Linda, Circle G, Magnolia, and rural parcels should be added to the same analysis.

5 | Southeast Chandler Area Plan (SECAP): rural/agrarian character

The **1999 Southeast Chandler Area Plan** identifies protection of agricultural heritage, rural lifestyles, and low-density character as objectives. It even discusses a rural/agrarian zoning approach, including residential densities not exceeding two units per acre as one implementation option. [5]

The **2026 General Plan** acknowledges that SECAP has historically maintained low densities and rural-styled development. It also recognizes a newer mechanism for certain remnant parcels: average aggregate density of properties within a **half-mile** may be used to comply with the area plan's maximum allowable density. [1]

Question for the City: What policy, calculation, or site-specific finding supports moving from the established rural/agrarian development pattern to 4.38 homes per acre on this property? If the half-mile aggregate-density approach is being used, please provide the full parcel inventory, acreage, exclusions, and calculation.

6 | Questions for the applicant and Commission

1. Which neighborhoods and rural parcels were included in the density and lot-size comparison, and why were Tierra Linda and Circle G at Riggs Ranch omitted?

2. What are the recorded lot-size ranges, median lot sizes, and gross and net residential densities for each nearby community?

3. How does a one-mile search for two-story houses establish compatibility without comparing lot sizes, setbacks, and neighboring land uses?

4. What is the specific planning justification for the proposed density under SECAP and the 2026 General Plan?

5. What would a revised plan look like using lots comparable to Magnolia's documented 9,500-square-foot minimum, with fewer total lots?

7 | Requested action

Request that the applicant return with a lower-density subdivision layout and a complete, documented comparison that includes Tierra Linda, Circle G at Riggs Ranch, Magnolia, Riggs Homestead Ranch, Cooper Heights, McKinley Glenn, and adjacent rural parcels. Evaluate the plan against both current General Plan policies and the rural/agrarian intent of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan.

Sources and verification notes

[1] Chandler 2026 General Plan: https://www.chandleraz.gov/GeneralPlan ; full plan at chandleraz.gov (2026).

[2] Homes.com, Symmetry at Magnolia community page (minimum 9,500 sq. ft.); Shea Homes official site confirms 93 single-story homesites.

[3] Coldwell Banker listing, 2175 E Champagne Pl (20,143 sq. ft.); Realtor.com, 2176 E Champagne Pl (20,707 sq. ft.).

[4] livinginphoenixaz.com, Circle G at Riggs Ranch neighborhood profile; verify against county assessor and subdivision plats.

[5] City of Chandler, Southeast Chandler Area Plan, adopted September 16, 1999: https://www.chandleraz.gov/sites/default/files/documents/imported/LRP_SoutheastChandlerAreaPlan.pdf

[6] Public hearing notice, PLH26-0021, October 21, 2026; 53-lot proposal.

Taylor Manemann

From: Sue Phlipot [redacted]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2026 4:41 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Re: New Development north of Tierra Linda in Chandler Heights

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

To: Taylor Manemann, City Planner

Re: Proposed K. Hovnanian Vale Sereno Development

Date: October 19, 2026

The purpose of my mail is to humbly ask you to reconsider the proposed K. Hovnanian Vale Sereno Community ACCESS POINTS (entrance/exit).

I am a resident of Tierra Linda and my home borders Via de Palmas to its north. At Tierra Linda, mapping programs cannot always distinguish between MAIN ACCESS with CONTROL BOX and EMERGENCY ONLY padlocked access. We have misdirected traffic coming onto Via de Palmas daily from Cooper Road due to mapping glitches. The volume of misdirected traffic will greatly increase for anyone living along Via de Palmas Road from Deliverers, Landscapers, Pool Services, Uber/Lyft, etc. coming from the south to enter Vale Sereno mistakenly. In addition, Via de Palmas is too narrow for this volume of traffic. The developer or the City of Chandler will have to bear the expense of making necessary road/infrastructure improvements along Via de Palmas on the north side, to include an additional ~ 20ft. right of way and widening of the existing road. I do not see this as part of the proposed plan. It is necessary for these improvements to be completed before construction begins if this secondary gate is to be operable and utilized by construction vehicles. These improvements have already been provided on the south side of Via de Palmas 20+ years ago when Tierra Linda was platted and approved.

I contend that the sole MAIN ACCESS with CONTROL BOX proposed for Vale Sereno on Cooper Road will be sufficient to sustain access for the new community. Tierra Linda has 59 homes, greater in number than Vale Sereno, and has operated for 20+ years with a single MAIN GATE with CONTROL BOX ACCESS with no bottlenecks or access issues into or out of the community. Our required secondary gate is padlocked and for emergency use only. Furthermore, McKinley Glenn (27 homes), Hawthorn Manor (84 homes), Hazelwood (22 homes), Symmetry at Magnolia (93 homes), Countryside estates (~200 homes), and others all have only ONE MAIN ACCESS with secondary EMERGENCY ACCESS ONLY gates.

I am requesting that you keep the proposed gate access on Via de Palmas Road to be in compliance with City of Chandler Codes, yet designate it as a padlocked EMERGENCY ONLY gate access – no vehicles of any kind except Fire or Police. This will benefit the developer and residents in several ways: The developer costs will decrease without the need to install 2 additional gate operators, linkages, controls, etc. The resident HOA fees would be less since there is only one MAIN GATE to maintain and operate. As a former HOA President & Treasurer of Tierra Linda, I know firsthand the cost of maintaining

an operable gate and how that affects the HOA Budget. The security will be significantly better with only one MAIN ACCESS POINT. In addition, eliminating the secondary operable gate and requiring it be designated as EMERGENCY ONLY will greatly benefit the residents of Tierra Linda and Circle G Ranch who border Via de Palmas and do not wish to incur more noise, traffic, loitering behind their homes.

The secondary operable gate is unnecessary and redundant. Please do not approve it as proposed but instead require that it be designated as EMERGENCY ONLY.

Thank you for taking my petition into consideration.

Respectfully,

Sue Phlipot

Tierra Linda Resident

Former Tierra Linda HOA Board Member



Taylor Manemann

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 6, 2026 12:45 PM
To: Taylor Manemann; [redacted]
Subject: Proposed New Community Chandler Heights and Cooper

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Dear Members of the City of Chandler Planning Commission,

I am writing regarding the proposed K. Hovnanian development adjacent to our neighborhood, McKinley Glenn, and specifically the proposed treatment of Lot 53, which sits directly behind our property.

First, I want to express our appreciation to K. Hovnanian and particularly to Brendan Ray for listening to the concerns we have raised and working to identify a potential solution for Lot 53. Mr. Ray recently shared with me the option K. Hovnanian intends to submit to the City, which would place a single-story home on Lot 53 with an increased setback providing approximately 20 feet between our shared wall and the home itself.

We genuinely appreciate that effort. A single-story home with an increased setback is a meaningful improvement and demonstrates a willingness by the builder to listen to the concerns of existing homeowners and work toward a solution.

However, one important concern remains regarding the long-term protection of that setback.

I asked Mr. Ray what restrictions would apply to the 20-foot area after the home is sold. For example, could a future homeowner construct a shed, accessory structure, pool equipment enclosure, or another improvement immediately adjacent to our shared wall?

Our request is very simple: **we would like the entire 20-foot area between our wall and the residence to remain a true buffer, free from structures and equipment.** We respectfully ask the Commission to consider how such a restriction could be formally established and preserved for future homeowners—whether through zoning stipulations, the plat, CC&Rs, a deed restriction, or another enforceable mechanism.

While Lot 53 directly affects our home, our concern is also part of a broader issue we hope the Commission will consider when evaluating this development.

The Character of the Surrounding Area

When we purchased our home in McKinley Glenn, our property carried a premium in part because of the additional space and privacy behind it. We fully understood that the property behind our neighborhood would likely be developed someday. We were not opposed to that then, and we are not opposed to it now.

We love Chandler. We welcome new neighbors, and we are happy to share the city and community we love with more families and allow more people the opportunity to call Chandler home.

What we reasonably expected, however, was that when this property was eventually developed, the City would be mindful of the development pattern that had already been established in this part of Chandler and that new development would be reasonably consistent with the character of the surrounding area.

The communities surrounding or immediately neighboring this proposed development demonstrate that pattern:

- **McKinley Glenn:** Lots generally exceed 10,000 square feet, with many approximately 10,600–14,000+ square feet and larger premium lots.
- **Hawthorn Manor by Tri Pointe Homes:** Lots typically average approximately 0.25–0.27 acres, or roughly 11,000–12,000+ square feet.
- **Symmetry at Magnolia by Shea Homes:** Lots typically range from approximately 0.20–0.25 acres, or roughly 8,500–11,000+ square feet. The community also features intentionally generous lot widths, including approximately 75-foot and 114-foot-wide configurations, allowing for more spacious layouts and greater separation between homes.
- **Tierra Linda:** Approximately 20,000-square-foot lots.
- **Riggs Ranch Meadows:** Lots typically range from approximately 0.16–0.30 acres, or roughly 7,000–13,000+ square feet, with some rare oversized pie-shaped or cul-de-sac lots reaching approximately 0.45 acres or more.
- **Circle G at Riggs Homestead Ranch:** Lots commonly approximately 35,000–38,000+ square feet, with some exceeding one acre.

Against that surrounding development pattern, a new community with lots averaging approximately **5,000 square feet**represents a significant departure.

Perhaps particularly relevant is Symmetry at Magnolia because it demonstrates that this development pattern is not simply a reflection of older neighborhoods. Magnolia is a newer community in this same area of Chandler, yet its lots are approximately 8,500–11,000+ square feet and include generous 75-foot and 114-foot-wide configurations. Even recent development in this area has continued to recognize the larger-lot, more spacious residential character that surrounds this property.

Our Preference Is Consistency With the Area

We want to be clear that our preference would be for the development itself to be more consistent with the surrounding communities and the character of this area of Chandler.

We chose to live here because of what makes this particular part of Chandler special—the larger lots, wider homesites, greater setbacks, lower density, and the sense of openness those characteristics create. Those qualities are not unique to McKinley Glenn. They are reflected throughout the surrounding communities.

We never expected the land behind us to remain vacant. What we did expect was that future development would be reasonably consistent with the character that had already been established in this area. We did not anticipate that the property would be developed at a density so substantially different from virtually every community surrounding it.

For that reason, our first preference would be to see **larger lots and a lower-density development that is more compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods.** We believe that would represent the most natural and appropriate continuation of the development pattern in this part of Chandler.

We understand that communities evolve and that every new development does not need to replicate the neighborhood next door. But there is a meaningful difference between reasonable evolution and introducing a residential density that is significantly different from the communities surrounding a property.

If the Proposed Density Moves Forward

If the City ultimately determines that the proposed higher density and approximately 5,000-square-foot lots are appropriate, then we believe it becomes even more important to create meaningful and permanent transitions where this development directly borders established neighborhoods.

Those protections could include larger transition lots, increased setbacks, single-story homes where appropriate, landscape buffers, and permanent restrictions ensuring that those buffers cannot later be filled with accessory structures, sheds, pool equipment, or other improvements.

The proposed solution for Lot 53 is a positive step in that direction, and we sincerely appreciate K. Hovnanian and Mr. Ray working with us.

However, for the proposed 20-foot setback to provide meaningful long-term protection, we respectfully ask that it be preserved as a **true 20-foot buffer**—not simply a setback for the primary residence that could later be filled with structures or equipment.

More broadly, we hope the Commission will consider not only how to buffer existing homeowners from a substantially higher-density development, but also whether that level of density is consistent with this particular area of Chandler in the first place.

Chandler has grown successfully because it has found ways to welcome new development while respecting the communities that are already here. We believe those two goals can coexist.

We welcome responsible development of this property. We welcome new families to Chandler. And we sincerely appreciate the efforts K. Hovnanian has made to listen to our concerns.

We simply ask that, as this project moves forward, the City protect the character of an area that existing homeowners chose and invested in, maintain an appropriate transition between new and established neighborhoods, and continue the thoughtful approach to development that has made this part of Chandler such a desirable place to call home.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and service to our community.

Sincerely,

Michelle Wood
McKinley Glenn

September 11, 2026

Ms. Taylor Manemann
City Planner
Chandler Planning & Zoning
215 E. Buffalo St.
Chandler, AZ 85225

RE: McKinley Glenn Homeowners' Opposition to Chandler Zoning Case PLH26-0021

Dear Ms. Manemann:

On behalf of the Board of the McKinley Glenn Homeowners Association and the residents of McKinley Glenn, I am writing to share our opposition to the proposed K. Hovnanian Vale Sereno development that is pending before the City of Chandler. The proposed development is located at the southeast corner of Cooper Road and Chandler Heights Road. McKinley Glenn is a single-story, semi-custom, 22-home development located to the north of the proposed development, with McKinley Glenn homes abutting the development.

The proposed development, with a density of 4.21 dwellings per acre, is entirely inconsistent with the immediately adjacent and premium custom and semi-custom McKinley Glenn and Tierra Linda developments. For example, the average lot size in McKinley Glenn is slightly over 11,000 square feet, while the average lot size for the proposed development is roughly half the size. Also, the proposed development is a mix of single and two-story homes, whereas the homes on the adjacent County island, McKinley Glenn, and Tierra Linda are exclusively one-story homes.

Finally, the increased traffic on Cooper Road entering and exiting the planned 53-home development is a safety concern. Traffic heading to the development from the north will need to cross two lanes of traffic to enter the primary entrance on Cooper Road, which is located very close to the intersection of Cooper Road and Chandler Heights Road. Also, development traffic exiting on E. Via de Palmas and making a left turn will need to cross two lanes of traffic on Cooper Road. These safety concerns must be evaluated and addressed as part of the City's review of the proposed development.

In sum, the proposed development is entirely inconsistent with the adjacent communities, will decrease property values for the adjacent semi-custom and custom homes, and creates traffic safety concerns due to its high density. Therefore, it should not be recommended for approval by the Chandler Planning and Zoning Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Ruchika Hanmod

Ruchika S Hanmod
President,
McKinley Glenn Homeowners Association

8/26/2026

Brennan,

Listed below are the concerns that we have about the new neighborhood Vale Sereno on the corner of Chandler Heights Rd. and Cooper in Chandler. We feel our property will have the biggest impact on Privacy because the new development would share more border with ours than any other property (around 528 feet). According to the current plan that would be 10 lots shared on our border. Privacy is a major concern. We want the same privacy we have now and so house type, distance from our property line, and landscaping are all major concerns.

1. We would like to know the distance from our south wall to the property line of the lots and then the distance to the houses.

2. We would like to know the distance from our west wall to the property line of the lots and then the distance to the houses.

3. We would like single story houses on the first street south of our property. The reason behind this is for us to keep the privacy we have now. With two story houses that close to our backyard they would be able to see our whole yard giving us no privacy.

4. We would like Lot 53 to be a single-story house. The reason behind this is for us to keep the privacy we have now

5. We would like the Landscaping bordering our property to provide more privacy. This would include privacy trees on both sides of the fence and include a watering system.

6. We are concerned that the 5-acre lot on the corner is higher than our side of the fence since that lot was full of dirt piles from dump trucks before the Chandler Heights Road expansion project started. When that project started the dirt was just spread out and not removed. This essentially raised the entire lot, and the block wall no longer gives us the same amount of privacy. We would like the dirt taken out before they start developing the property or some resolution since the fence will be too low for privacy. Also, when it rains all the water flows on to our property because that lot is now higher than ours.

7. We would like to be compensated for our block fence. This is common and we were reimbursed by the builder on the East side of our property.

We wanted to state that we also have the same concern as others at the meeting about the small lot sizes compared to all other developments in our area, 85249.

From our experience working with the city on the Chandler Heights Rd expansion project and having to deal with a change in project management, we have learned that we need these agreements acknowledged by everyone and in writing.

Thank you,

Jeff and Tammy Gehling

Taylor Manemann

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 10:12 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Concerns Regarding Proposed Development North of Tierra Linda / South of McKinley Glen

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Dear Ms. Manemann,

I am a resident of the Tierra Linda community in Southeast Chandler, and I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed residential development planned directly north of our neighborhood and south of McKinley Glen.

I understand this property will eventually be developed, and I am not opposed to responsible growth. My concern is that the current proposal appears inconsistent with the established character of the surrounding neighborhoods. Specifically, I would like the City to consider:

- **Housing density** — The proposal reportedly includes more than twice the number of homes found in surrounding neighborhoods, on significantly smaller lots. I'd ask that density be brought more in line with the established area.
- **Two-story homes** — Two-story homes placed near our predominantly single-story communities represent a notable departure from the existing character. I'd ask that their placement be carefully considered.
- **Buffering and setbacks** — Meaningful landscape buffers, larger setbacks, and open space along the neighborhood boundaries would help create a smoother transition between the existing and proposed communities.
- **Traffic and safety** — I am concerned about increased traffic along Cooper and Via de Palmas, particularly given the planned access point via Via de Palmas Road. These are streets where families walk, bike, and jog, and I'd ask that traffic and safety impacts be carefully evaluated.

I respectfully ask the City and the Planning Commission to encourage a development that reflects the thoughtful planning principles that have long defined Southeast Chandler.

Thank you for your time and for considering my input.

Sincerely,
Vaibhav Thokia
[redacted]

Taylor Manemann

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 1:01 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: New Development north of Tierra Linda in Chandler Heights

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Hello Taylor!
My husband and I have been residents in Tierra Linda (Cloud & Cooper Roads) for 9 years now. We have enjoyed the peaceful quietness of this section of Chandler immensely. We are cyclists and long distance walkers and use the surrounding streets daily for our enjoyment. Our home is located in the far NE corner of Tierra Linda and backs up to Via de Palmas and the existing county island properties.

We have been away for 4 weeks now in Europe attending our son's wedding and vacationing. As a result we have not been able to attend the recent planning meeting to discuss our concerns in person regarding the proposed development.

While we love Chandler and all it has to offer its residents, the lack of MASTER PLANNING, such as was found in Ahwatukee where we lived for 24 years, is quite evident. It seems to be the nature of this area where farmlands dominated and over time each small parcel was being developed independently. This has created what I call a number of SLOT COMMUNITIES, one street in and out, with little aesthetics in the surroundings. I do not know how a city planner can overcome this type of small parcel development, which does not "flow" so well. However, it needs to start at some point in south Chandler to make a difference in our future development, aesthetics, and safety.

Michael and I are strongly opposed to multi story housing in this area. It is inconsistent with the surrounding communities. It will affect privacy and values on existing lots in adjacent communities. The density is really going in the wrong direction! Our Tierra Linda Community is a very intimate community of only 59 homes on 1/2 acre parcels. Although they are custom homes, I feel that the layout (6 cul de sacs with a center median, one way in/out, wide streets and large set backs) is so very desirable. I wish that someone in planning would be able to enact a change that would REQUIRE less density such as Tierra Linda. It would improve the desirability. People would pay more for larger lot opportunities and space between their homes. It's the developers who are driving maximum profit by these 2 story, small parcel homesites. Who should win? I contend that you and your planning department are in the drivers seat here and are able to say NO to this type of development. The development of these tightly clustered homes with little frontage, garage forward, courtyard style (can't see front doors) must be slowed/stopped. We can do better in Chandler! If this is what we offer, people will have no choice but to purchase based upon location. However, if we offer a product that is much more aesthetic and appealing to people who want something better, it will sell. It will create a much more desirable place to live in our community.

I kindly ask you to look to the greater good for our Chandler Heights section of town and start NOW by making a difference. Please do not approve the plans as submitted. It is NOT what our area needs. Buffers along perimeters are something, yet not enough. Access points like on Via de Palmas, are not a good idea. Two story homes are easily avoidable by planning. Please do what is right in your heart for our beautiful Chandler, not what the developers want. Ask them to plat a community like Tierra Linda with tract homes that are visually pleasing, open in front, set back from the WIDE STREETS.

I thank you for taking the time to read my opinions and requests. PLEASE make a difference and make some changes beginning today!

Kind Regards,
Susan Phlipot
former HOA Board President of Tierra Linda HOA
Retired Engineer
[redacted]

Taylor Manemann

From: mike Topete [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 10:51 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: New development NORTH OF TIERRA LINDA AND SOUTH OF MCKINKEY GLEN

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Ms. Manemann,

I want to express my concerns about the new development going in just north of my home in Chandler. The development is going to be putting a lot of 1 and 2 story homes and crowded housing in that area.

This area is known for beautiful, expensive home sites, and a way of living we have come to love in the southeast Chandler area. I believe a development like this is going to lower our home value, make it un enjoyable for people like myself to experience the quiet that Chandler has to offer. Our home directly backs up to this piece of land that is proposed for this development. My understanding is that via De Palmas will be used as an entry point to this development and I'm hoping that another solution can be found.

Below are some solutions that we are asking the city to consider.

WE ARE ASKING THE CITY TO CONSIDER
- ☑ Better buffering between neighborhoods
- ☑ Larger setbacks along the McKinley Glenn boundary
- ☑ More meaningful open space where the communities meet
- ☑ A development that is compatible with the surrounding single-story neighborhoods
- ☑ Planning that continues the vision that has made Southeast Chandler a wonderful place to live

I feel like this development can be planned better and more in line with the communities that surround it.

Thank you,

Mike and Chelsea Topete
[redacted]
Tierra Linda community homeowners
Sent from my iPhone

Taylor Manemann

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 1:20 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Proposed development near tierra linda

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

I respectfully ask the City of Chandler to encourage a development that reflects the same successful planning principles found throughout Southeast Chandler by:

✅ Providing a meaningful landscape buffer along the northern edge of the proposed development where it borders McKinley Glenn.

✅ Increasing setbacks between existing and proposed homes.

✅ Adding meaningful open space to create a smoother transition between neighborhoods.

✅ Carefully considering the placement of two-story homes so the development is compatible with the surrounding single-story communities.

✅ Designing a neighborhood that complements the quality, character, and thoughtful planning that have made Southeast Chandler one of Chandler's premier residential areas

Michael Phlipot

Taylor Manemann

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 8:03 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Proposed Development: Chandler Heights and Cooper Rd

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

In regards to the proposed development on the Southeast corner of Chandler Heights and Cooper. I have the following concerns/comments

1) Traffic
    a. Unless turning lanes are created for residences making right turns into the proposed community, traffic is going to be slowed/back up on either one or both Chandler Heights and Cooper Rd.
    b. Entrances to this neighborhood would be very close to the intersection and potentially cause a lot of traffic issues.
    c. I have seen a fair number of accidents with people suddenly slowing down to make a right turn into neighborhoods without turning lanes.
2) Two story homes
    a. Putting two-story homes right next to the single-story homes in McKinley Glenn is not fair to them. Their concerns should be taken into account.
    b. I would not want to suddenly have a lot of two-story homes with views into my backyard go up after I purchased my home.
3) Density and Style
    a. The density and style of the homes does not seem to be in line with the character of this immediate area.

Michael J. Boles
[redacted]

Taylor Manemann

From: ken mcalister [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:53 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Case #: PLH26-0021

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Taylor,
For this housing development I am in strong opposition to a couple of things. First the density. The density of this development does not match the surrounding developments in the area. It is way too dense and really needs to stay consistent with the surrounding developments to be a cohesive community. Second, this development borders county island properties. These current properties need to continue to have their privacy. I would request that ALL houses boarding the surrounding of the development be single story just like Treeland, Haywood and McKinley Glenn which are the most recent developments in the area. Third I would request that egress be eliminated on the south side of the property and not allowed to dump onto Via de Palmas. It should be just like Hawthorne Manor and be an emergency exit only. Again to stay consistent with the surrounding area development.
Please make sure this gets to P&Z and also city council.

Ken

Taylor Manemann

From: D Hong [redacted]
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 7:28 AM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Comments Regarding Proposed New Home Development South of McKinley Glenn and North of Tierra Linda communities

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Dear Mr. Manemann,

I am a resident of the Tierra Linda community/sub-division, located south of the proposed development site. I support responsible growth and understand that this property will ultimately be developed. My primary concern is not the development itself, but rather the proposed density and inclusion of two-story homes.

For many years, our area of Southeast Chandler has been characterized by single-story neighborhoods, larger lots, generous setbacks, and a lower-density residential feel. Communities throughout this area, including Tierra Linda, Circle G, McKinley Glenn and neighboring subdivisions, reflect this planning vision and contribute to the character that attracts residents to the area.

The proposed development's higher density and two-story homes appear inconsistent with the established pattern of surrounding neighborhoods. I respectfully ask the City to consider whether a lower-density, predominantly single-story design would be more compatible with the existing character of Southeast Chandler and better align with the thoughtful planning principles that have shaped this area and our homeowner investments.

Thank you for your time and consideration of resident feedback during the review process.

Sincerely,

Darian Hong
Tierra Linda Resident/Homeowner

Taylor Manemann

From: Sri Reddy [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2026 2:14 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Reg: Mckinley Glenn neighborhood proposed Plan Vale Sereno

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Hi Taylor,

Hope you are doing well.

FYI, I sent the email below but have not received any response whatsoever. I am deeply concerned that this high-density housing development could negatively affect the value, appeal of our homes.

Many thanks,
Reddy

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Sri Reddy** [redacted]
Date: Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 12:43 PM
Subject: Request for Clarification on Build Plans – Vale Sereno Development
To: bray@raylawaz.com <bray@raylawaz.com>

Hi Ray Law Firm,

Good morning.

I hope you are doing well. I am writing to request clarification regarding the buildable plans for the development (attached for reference).

Specifically, we would like to understand the plans for the lots highlighted along the eastern boundary (the row backing up to our property). Could you please confirm whether these homes are planned as single-story or two-story constructions?

We purchased our home less than a year ago and paid a significant premium with the understanding and expectation that there would be no direct obstruction to our backyard view. The newly proposed plans appear to potentially impact that view, which is a concern for us.

Given this, we kindly request consideration that any homes along this particular row be limited to single-story construction.

We would greatly appreciate your clarification on the current plan and any flexibility regarding this matter.

Thank you for your time and assistance. We look forward to your response.

Best regards,
Reddy
Mckinley Glenn (Cachet Homes)



Taylor Manemann

From: Chris Leason [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2026 1:24 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Chandler Zoning Case # PLH26-0021 - K. Hovnanian Vale Sereno

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Dear Ms. Manemann:

I am writing as a resident of the McKinley Glenn community in opposition to the proposed K. Hovnanian Vale Sereno development that is pending before the Chandler Planning Division. As you are aware, the proposed development is contemplated for the southeast corner of Copper Road and Chandler Heights Road. The proposed development (1) deviates from the Southeast Chandler Area Plan (Sept. 16, 1999), (2) is inconsistent with existing, single-story communities adjacent to the proposed development (e.g, McKinley Glenn, Tierra Linda, Circle G, and the County island homes directly north, south, and east of the development), and (3) will create unsafe conditions on Copper Road with the additional volume of traffic turning into and out of the proposed development.

As noted in the Southeast Chandler Area Plan (page I-7), the proposed development sits in an area designated as "Rural/Agrarian Character" where "[d]ensity transitions and overall development compatibility are issues that must be considered." (page I-9). By comparison, the area to the south of the development is identified as "Traditional Suburban Character," where "residential development densities of 2.5 dwelling units per acre may be the norm, but [] opportunities exist to increase density to 3.5 dwelling units per acre should certain amenities be provided." (page I-9). The distinction between a "Rural/Agrarian" character and a "Traditional Suburban" character suggests that a lower density is contemplated in the "Rural/Agrarian" portion of southeast Chandler where the development is planned.

By contrast, the proposed development shows a density of 4.21 dwelling units per acre. This saturated density of homes is in opposition to the nature of a "Rural/Agrarian" character and the surrounding, premium custom/semi-custom developments such as McKinley Glenn, Tierra Linda, and Circle G. As an example, the average lot size in McKinley Glenn is slightly over 11,000 square feet, while the average lot size for the proposed development appears to be roughly half the size. Many of the homes around the proposed development, such as Circle G, have lot sizes much larger than the proposed development.

Further, the mix of single and two-story homes is entirely inconsistent with the adjacent communities. The homes on the County island surrounding the development are all one story, McKinley Glenn and Tierra Linda have only one-story homes, and Circle G has one-story homes on the lots closest to the development. In addition, while amenities and buffer zones are provided in the development adjacent to the County island homes to the east and south of the development, no

such buffer zones are provided to the north adjacent to McKinley Glenn and to the east adjacent to the County island homes on E. Via de Palmas.

Finally, the increase in traffic on Copper Road is a concern from a safety standpoint. The primary gate access is close to the intersection of Copper Road and Chandler Heights Road. Traffic heading to the development from the north will need to make a left hand turn into the development, crossing two lanes of traffic on the widened Copper Road, with the community entrance being close to the intersection. Also, traffic exiting the community on E. Via De Palmas and making a left onto Copper Road to head south will need to cross two lanes of traffic.

In closing, I note that a similar high-density development was proposed roughly 14 years ago at the site of the current Hawthorn Manor community on Chandler Heights Road. When that high-density community, comprised of similarly sized one and two-story homes on similarly sized lots, was before the Planning and Zoning Commission, numerous affected residents, including myself, spoke out in opposition to the development. Given the numerous concerns expressed by the community, the Planning and Zoning Commission tabled a vote on the proposed development. Ultimately, the land was sold to Maracay Homes, who developed Hawthorn Manor into a larger lot community with exclusively single-story homes. This subsequent development was approved by both the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council.

I anticipate without significant modifications to the planned development, consistent with the requirements of the Southeast Chandler Area Plan and taking into consideration the existing, premium single-story homes around the development, similar opposition to Vale Sereno will exist before the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council (if the development as currently contemplated is approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission).

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Chris Leason
2180 E. Nolan Place
Chandler, AZ 85249

Taylor Manemann

From: Michelle Wood [redacted]
Sent: Saturday, July 25, 2026 1:18 PM
To: Taylor Manemann
Subject: Proposed Residential Development – Southeast Corner of Cooper Road & Chandler Heights Road

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender
You have not previously corresponded with this sender.
Report Suspicious

Dear Planning Commission Members,

My name is Michelle Wood, and I am a resident of the McKinley Glenn community. I am writing to respectfully express my concerns regarding the proposed residential development at the southeast corner of Cooper Road and Chandler Heights Road.

When we purchased our home, we understood that the property behind us would likely be developed one day. We also expected that any future development would be thoughtfully designed to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and provide an appropriate transition between the existing and new communities.

McKinley Glenn is an upscale, single-story community surrounded by neighborhoods with similar quality, character, and thoughtful planning. The established development pattern in this area emphasizes compatibility, privacy, generous setbacks, and smooth transitions between neighborhoods. We believe any new development should continue those same design principles.

This request is also consistent with the City of Chandler's stated planning priorities. Chandler's General Plan, Strategic Framework, and planning policies emphasize preserving and enhancing established neighborhoods, maintaining each neighborhood's distinct character, and balancing new development with neighborhood preservation and community character. The City's planning policies also recognize the importance of evaluating a proposed development's responsiveness to its setting and its relationship to adjacent properties.

When we purchased our home at **2141 E. Nolan Place**, we paid a premium because of its size and its location backing to open land. While we understood that the open land would eventually become residential, we reasonably expected that future development would maintain setbacks and design standards consistent with the surrounding communities.

Unfortunately, the current proposal raises significant compatibility concerns.

Under the proposed site plan, Lot 53 would place the side of a new home directly adjacent to the rear of our property, creating a relationship unlike any that currently exists in the surrounding neighborhoods.

This design significantly reduces privacy, changes established sight lines, and creates an abrupt transition between the existing neighborhood and the proposed development.

One of our greatest concerns is that the **northern boundary**, where McKinley Glenn meets the proposed development, receives virtually **no meaningful transition treatment**. Elsewhere in the development, the plan includes:

- Open space
- A dog park
- Landscaping
- Wider internal streets
- Community gathering areas

Yet along the McKinley Glenn boundary, residential lots are placed directly against the existing neighborhood with little buffering. This creates an inconsistent design approach and places a disproportionate burden on the existing homeowners.

The lack of a meaningful buffer along this boundary appears inconsistent with Chandler's goal of balancing new development with the preservation and enhancement of established neighborhoods. A well-designed transition should protect the privacy and character of existing homes rather than placing the most direct and intrusive lot configuration against the neighborhood boundary.

I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to consider modifications that would better protect adjacent residents, including:

- Increasing the setback or landscape buffer along the northern boundary adjacent to McKinley Glenn.
- Reconfiguring or relocating Lot 53 to create a more compatible transition.
- Incorporating additional open space or enhanced landscaping between the existing neighborhood and the proposed homes.
- Ensuring the transition between the neighborhoods reflects the same thoughtful planning found throughout the rest of the project.

My family has invested significantly in our home and chose McKinley Glenn because of its quality, privacy, and consistent residential character. I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to require a more appropriate transition along the northern boundary before the project is approved.

Thank you for your time, your service to our community, and your thoughtful consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

Michelle Wood
2141 E. Nolan Place
Chandler, AZ 85249