

Final Exhibits and staff report for this agenda item were not properly included with the online agenda notification in a timely manner for residents to review and comment.

Since no documents were provided for a review of this submittal, I went back and reviewed the documents showing a concept design submitted in the zoning cases (GPA 21-07 & ZON 21-05) staff report from the April 25 agenda. I have the following concerns:

1. Site plan

- a. Site plan does not conform to new Maricopa MF Design Standards
- b. No articulation to buildings, and minimal offsets
- c. No articulation or aesthetic appeal for site layout
 - i. Roads are straight and parallel establishing lack of creativity and lack of interest.
 - ii. Minimal/No articulation to buildings will create a tunnel effect.
 - iii. Substantial western exposure – less than ideal
 - iv. Should have articulating building heights & greater setbacks along Alan Stephens Pkwy & Stonegate. 3 story structure creates lack of privacy north of Alan Stephens Residents.
 - v. Site Design interest is not on par with other developments in the area or recently approved MF projects.
- d. What is the building on the NWC?
 - i. No design, floor plan or elevations.
- e. What is the area in the center (near playground equipment) Its big enough for another row of units?
 - i. No design, or use concepts for this area?
- f. No guest parking ANYWHERE for northern portion of development.
- g. Primary entries – no turn-around zone before gate to stop queuing onto Stonegate if car(s) are unable to go thru gate.
- h. Access from A+ Charter School
 - i. Joint Use agreement with the school?
 - ii. Additional queuing traffic during student drop off/ pick up
 - iii. Out only, or in/out option @ gates?
- i. No Landscape drawings to review/comment
 - i. Opportunity for vertical landscape (trees) are only at the endcaps and will do nothing to break up the massing of the structures.
 - ii. Not enough room between buildings for shade trees.
 - iii. Sidewalks should articulate.
- j. No Photo-Voltaic and site lighting plans to review/comment.
- k. Phasing of construction?
- l. Fencing, walls, gates, and signage design and specifications?
- m. 20' standard between buildings will feel VERY tight and congested.

- n. 24' BOC (22' clear) drive aisles are VERY tight for midsize/large vehicles. Most valley cities require 26' min face of curb.
 - o. Appears to be a sidewalk along garage side, but elevations show "wing" walls in that space. Which is it?
 - p. Concerned about on-site retention being predominantly underground and such a small area separating the north border with Single Family Homes. During a high rainfall event, combined with Maricopa's propensity for flooding issues in the past, this could create an over concentration of rainwater in the area that could lead to potential unnecessary damage to the existing single-family homes in Glennwilde.
 - i. Grading plans provided are not adequate or show pertinent info for rainwater runoff and/or volumes.
 - q. Emergency vehicle turning radius shown appear to be tight and don't represent the needed capacity of a 90 degree turn without using the extra space for parking or between buildings.
2. Building Elevations/Architecture
- a. No floor plans to be able to tell actual building articulation and massing or sizes.
 - b. 2 color pallets shown, which color/scheme goes on which buildings? No color callout for "hardieplank"
 - c. Shade structure shown on elevations between buildings, but not shown on site plan. View is deceiving.
 - d. (Brown scheme) some steel awnings show dark grey, but standing seam awnings show white/lt grey. Not called out in pallet.
 - e. No color or material data for "custom steel shade structure".
 - f. Grey Scheme
 - i. Too monotone, needs texture similar to version with browns/greys.
 - ii. Why no siding?
 - iii. Rear elevation (garage side) no articulation and massing, roof heights, etc.
 - iv. Awnings appear to be lt grey, but scheme shows as dark grey?
 - v. Deep tunnel design for entry does not follow design standards or create an inviting entry. Could also be a safety concern @ night.
 - vi. Why 2 different design scenarios for "grey" concept?
 - vii. "wing" walls are deceptive in how they appear on elevations, but not shown on site plans. Due to how tight the drive aisles are, these could be a problem with larger vehicles entering & exiting garages.
 - g. Shadows are giving a false sense of depth and massing.

- h. (recommend) applicant provide a 3D model to show complete street perspective of both parking and greenspace to properly demonstrate actual building massing and relationship.

Questions for Applicant –

- 1. Is this development for you to develop and manage and maintain, or do you plan on flipping this either before or during construction, or soon thereafter?
- 2. Management – will there be an onsite manager during normal business hours, or will this be managed off site? If/when there is a concern, who can neighbors contact?