

Village @1 Eleven PUD 288

Introduction: Name, Address, 20 years at this residence.

I will make this introduction brief. It is important for this Planning Commission to know my personal history with the City of Broken Arrow to better understand my reasoning and conclusion that the rezoning of the 28.95 acres from A-1 to CM, RS4 and PUD should **not** happen.

Dating / 51 - Drive In/ Airstrip

Moved to BA 36 years ago:

Canterbury Victorian uniqueness / Aspen Park Children Best Halloween / Greyoaks more grass than cement

Opening Statement:

The Planning Commission of Broken Arrow should not allow the A-1 rezoning to CM or RS4 or PUD. Instead it is my suggestion that the Planning Commission should allow and promote the A-1 property to be rezoned to that of Residential Estate (RE)

Why Residential Estate and not PUD?

Broken Arrow has very few RE Zoned property developments. On the other hand Broken Arrow does have numerous PUD developments all over Broken Arrow. Broken Arrow RE Communities are Cedar Ridge, The Trails and the 138th St, 141st St and Greyoaks. Looking at the zoning maps I have found small, restricted, few spots of RE scattered around. These are not of the scope of Cedar Ridge, The Trails and Greyoaks.

Residential Estates are very desirable and rare to obtain. That is why Bixby and Sapulpa invest a lot RE into their overall planning. Broken Arrow RE is more desirable in the fact that it is more "In Town" and closer to markets, theaters, Rose District, Restaurants, Parks and Trails.

The Property that the Developers of Village@ 1eleven want to build on would be better utilized as a continuing of the Residential Estate growth for Broken Arrow.

That part of town is already a RE area. Please don't throw away a perfect opportunity to expand RE so close to town! Even more unique to the area that encompasses North to South 101st to 111th and East to West Aspen to Garnet is the watershed of Aspen Creek and Haikey Creek. These creeks are a natural resource and highway for Deer, Turkey, Bobcat, Coyote, Rabbits, Possum, Armadillo, Owls, Hawks, Squirrels and even a once spotted young male Mountain Lion a the end of our street. Again please do not harm this unique country living inside the City of Broken Arrow by rezoning to CM/PUD/RS4.

The potential loss of this wonderful property to a developer to make a more concrete than grass, cookie cutter, structure squeezed, Dallas type urban village would be shameful.

Residential Estate Homeowners are long tern residents and citizens who love their homes. It is very important to note that there is a big difference between owning a PUD Property and owning a RE home. Broken Arrow should know that very few homes in all of it's RE Zones do not have property come up for sale very often. That is because RE owners stay put. They not only maintain there property but improve it by investing heavily into the architectural and recreational designs of their properties. Home values maintained and grow. Pride of ownership is high. Loyalty to community is rock solid.

After reading the published 288 PUD Design Proposal there are serious flaws in it's presentation and mischaracterization of it's intent.

I will reference the City of Broken Arrow's Chapter 2 Zoning Districts page on PUD Requirements.

1. To permit and encourage innovative land development while maintaining appropriate limitation on the character and intensity of use and assuring compatibility with adjoining and proximate properties;

- The Village @1eleven does not offer anything innovative in land development or assures the compatibility with adjoining proximate properties. There is nothing innovative about how many flats you can squeeze into one development and not call it apartments. There is nothing innovative about a few ponds and business space that could become an unknown of possible renter scenarios. There is absolutely no compatibility with adjoining and proximate properties. For example; from my house I will be looking straight down the gated entrance to the Village and it's Dwellings, the most unsightly design of the property. I will have to navigate the increased amount of traffic out of my neighborhood whose only exit is my street Chestnut Ave. My neighbors who are already pouring money into sound barriers in fear of this development are now out a great expense including my family. PUD Requirement #1 Fail.

2. To permit greater flexibility within the development to best utilize the physical features of the particular site;

- The Developer's PUD 288 Design published concept list no specifics in regard to how this Village best utilizes features of this particular site. They only state that they meet the requirement of the City in this regard. PUD Requirement #2 Fail.

3. To encourage the provision and preservation of meaningful open space;

- What preservation of meaningful open space? The tiny little proposed corner park that they keep small in size to allow more flats to be built? This Village destroys open space! PUD Requirement #3 Fail.

4. To encourage integrated and unified design and function of the various uses comprising the planned unit development;

- * The integrated and unified design is an apartment complex with small homes all framed together with a store front. The Village inside a already established community of RE homes with schools and other rural well laid out neighborhoods makes the Village an island to the surrounding social

properties and not a contributor in any way. This Village goes against the grain. PUD Requirement #4 Fail.

5. To encourage a more productive use of land consistent with the public objectives and standards of accessibility, safety, infra structure and land use compatibility.

* What productive use of land is the Village when compared to the already established community of surrounding properties? It diminishes accessibility by it's generation of additional traffic and noise. When it comes to safety it jeopardizes the existing flow of traffic in and out of established neighbor hoods. Land use compatibility is non existent. PUD Requirement #5 Fail.

This Village may be appropriate in another location but not here at 111th and Aspen. This is Broken Arrow traditional farm land, sod farm, creek bottom, woods and fields all with appropriate RE neighborhoods and schools that fit into these attributes encompassing the uniqueness and feel of the country while living in the city. Please vote this PUD zoning down and in it's stead continue the growth of the Residential Estates at this location that appreciate and preserve these blessings.

A very concerned citizen and property owner of Broken Arrow

Mark Smith
4805 S. Chestnut Ave.
Broken Arrow, OK. 74011