Comprehensive Summary of Neighborhood Meetings

Project: Oracle and Suffolk Rezoning and Conditional Use Permit
Meeting Location and Time: Town Hall and online from 6-7:30pm
Dates: 1st Neighborhood Meeting held on March 12, 2026. 2nd Neighborhood Meeting held on: October 22, 2026

Attendance: Approximately 30 residents and interested parties attended both neighborhood meetings, including Councilmembers Robb and Jones-Ivey.

Staff Contact: Jessica Hynd, ask@orovalleyaz.gov.
Applicant Contact: Keri Silvyn, KSilvyn@LSLawaz.com

Staff's and the applicant's presentations are available online at OVprojects.com.

Next Steps: Please check OVprojects.com for updates. A second neighborhood meeting will be scheduled at a later date.

Questions and Comments
During the neighborhood meetings, participants identified concerns and discussed design solutions to mitigate the concerns. A summary of the neighborhood meetings is provided below. Recordings of each meetings are available online at OVprojects.com.

Additional questions or comments: Please contact Jessica Hynd, ask@orovalleyaz.gov with any additional questions or comments.

1st Neighborhood Meeting: Attended by ~30 people in-person and 14 online

Questions

1. Anticipated days and hours of operation?
2. Maximum occupancy of all facilities?
3. Will the existing Javelina habitat be disrupted? How will safety be impacted after?
4. How will drainage be affected after the removal of the existing berm?
5. Are there going to be any scholarship for students of lower income?
6. Does the use seem compatible with the surrounding neighborhood?
7. Have to have an access point on Suffolk Drive?
8. Can cars be restricted from leaving the parking lot onto Suffolk?
9. Does the 25 height inlcude mechanical equipment?
10. What happens if the rezoning and the project fails?
11. How can water be properly drained after removal of the berm/wash?
12. Police providing extra help -- who pays for increased policing/accidents?
13. How much revenue will Oro Valley get from this project?
14. Additional retail and restaruant spaces expected? Addtional square footage?

Comments or Concerns

Site Design

1. Outdoor courtyard actvity space, park-like space in SE corner to become an internal courtyard
2. Distance from east property line
3. Screen walls along boundaries
4. Sound and outdoor lighting into the surrounding neighborhood
5. Trees and follow up maintenance, species selection and longevity -- girdling and misseltoe
6. Indigenous trees not appropriate
7. People are looking up to this building, views lost, shadows on propoerties
8. Two stories will change the look of the block can conflicts with existing land use map -- conflict with OV Path Forward general plan

Safety

1. Monitoring, lines of sight
2. Secuirty cameras on site
3. Maximum occupancy
4. Tree/foliage disruption after Javelina habitat disruption
5. Outdoor lighting
6. Walking at night
7. Potential space for homeless encampment along wash, behind property, along nearest propoerty -- screen walls and balcony
8. Potential harm for children
9. Drug use and sex in parking lots -- cameras not enough to mitigate

Traffic

1. Traffic analysis of Oracle and Suffolk
2. Access points
3. On-site parking
4. Traffic signal at Suffolk and Oracle
5. Suffolk is not a major street; previous light installation
6. Speeding
7. Parking spaces
8. More accidents onto Suffolk

Other

1. Iterative changes to the project
2. Petition 26 total signed in objection; R-S zoning should be preserved
3. Changes in area surrounding the neighborhood over time; preserve culture
4. Existing office use was appropriate and should not change
5. Other locations for KTR
6. Late hours; noise from KTR going into the neighborhood
7. Existing javelina/wildlife habitat disruption
8. Flood water/drainage diversion after existing berm is removed
9. Tree/foliage disruption after Javelina habitat disruption
10. Right use for the right location - indoor recreational use is appreciated
11. Other KTR location is "huge and loud" -- large outdoor speakers, numerous parked cars and traffic, children outside according to KTR rules
12. Restaurant hours
13. Drainage displaced by parking lot
14. Children left alone
15. No demostrated need in proposed location -- other recreation uses exist
16. Historic neighborhood
17. Building height will disrupt views
18. Restaurant hours
19. Drainage impacts and storage
20. Water passing through the existing wash
21. Places for inside activities during summer
22. Economic impact
23. Verbage for C-N zoning conflicts with the proposed project -- Surrounding businesses are R-S
24. Existing building and architecture is not compatiable with the neighborhood
25. Oldest community / entrance to Oro Valley -- first residential development should be respected
26. Project can create bonds in the community and keep people in OrO Valley

Potential Improvements

1. Mitigation measures for noise leakage
2. Encouraging right turns onto Suffolk Drive

2nd Neighborhood Meeting: Attended by ~30 people in-person and 9 online

Questions

1. Where are the rentention basins located?
2. Where are the trash areas located?
3. What about the air conditioning?
4. Will the entrance roads of the facility be widened?
5. Are the culverts going underneath the parking? Will water drain into Suffolk?
6. How many simultaneous parties do the applicant anticipate?
7. What happens if the rezoning is not approved? Similar process in the future? What comes after?
8. What would be permitted if another use is permitted?
9. If you lived adjacent to this project, would you still be in favor?
10. Why can you not find land that would fit a larger KTR location?
11. Hillary Lourati -- What commitments are being made to have more local businesses in Town and how does this project help that?
12. Are the Town's subdivision standards still in effect for traffic calming?
13. What traffic/accident studies have been done?
14. How will cars not stack up with the proposed site design?
15. You're asking for a rezoning and a CUP in the most historic neighborhood of Oro Valley? Why this site appropriate?
16. How the conditions of the CUP enforced?

Comments or Concerns

Site Design

1. Retention basin locations
2. Refuse locations
3. Air conditioning systems
4. Architecturally incompatible with mid-century design of the neighborhood(?)(resident comment cut out due to internet connection)
5. Alley is used by delivery services and others
6. Thoughtful and positive development design

Safety

1. Intersection light concerns
2. Cars passing through the neighborhood
3. Construction hazards and timing
4. Indoor recreation supports safety for children from heat
5. Speeding, no sidewalks, blind curbs and steep hills

Traffic

1. Road widening
2. Pickup and drop-off and traffic stacking
3. Intersection light concerns
4. Signs on Suffolk will not be obeyed
5. Widening of the road
6. Oro Valley is responsible for Suffolk Drive
7. No place to walk to the proposed use
8. Would like to see a separate traffic study for Suffolk Drive
9. Existing traffic issues will be exacerbated
10. Upgrades should not fall on the homeowners
11. Traffic concerns not so bad
12. Light at Suffolk and Oracle and accidents
13. 210 ft required for the bus lane on Oracle, project does not meet and can cause stacking on Oracle
14. ADOT accident report not accurate

Other

1. Support for the project for child therapy and engagement options
2. Petition signed opposing the rezoning and CUP
   a. Scale of the project is too big compared to the neighborhood
   b. Through-traffic increases create risk
   c. Opposed to the location for KTR, no other locations adjacent to residential streets (Glendale, Scottsdale)
3. Consider residential history and neighborhood character/feel/views
4. Snowball effects of the rezoning -- building heights
5. CUP criteria not being met based on nuisance and traffic volume and impact
6. Provides and location for kids to be active close to home, enjoy sports, make friends, and build healthy habits. Good for families and support locat economy. Potential to strengthen community.
7. Opposed to the location -- Oro Valley does not regulate which buisnesses come into the Town... businesses are welcome so long as zoning permits... the proposed project does not meet the zoning, hence the rezoning.
8. No need for restaurant and retail. Disproportionate effect on nearby properties.
9. Sounds great, but oppose the location
10. Interesting that the applicant purchased the property knowing that the zoning is
11. Support for the project to have kids be active and outside, and support for the location. This plot of land will eventually become something, why not become a place for families?
12. Potential reduction of property value due to loss of view
13. Facilities like KTR are valuable in helping kids develop their passions, make friends, and challenge themselves.
14. Opposed to the rezoning, leading to bookends of commercial properties
15. This business will have a positive impact on kids and the community. Would not want an apartment complex instead.
16. Kids will have a safe place to be active. Positive addition to community.
17. This project will bring economic benefits to the Town. Tax revenue generating are best for this site.
18. Support the project, Nothing else for kids to do that keep them active
19. This type of facility helps for coaching, mentorship, development and training. Would hate to see something else in this location.

Potential Improvements

1. Traffic calming improvements along Suffolk Drive