APPLICANT REQUEST:

1. to increase the site grading standards for 18.61.054-1 to exceed grading from maximum of 80% of site to 100% of total site area.

2. to increase perimeter exposed slopes and perimeter walls per 18.61.054H3a to exceed, 6 feet in height to a maximum height of 14 along the east boundary and 11 feet in height along the south boundary.

3. to increase the combined height of the exterior east boundary fill slope from the allowed 12 feet above the natural grade per 18.61.054H3c to include the existing height of the fill slopes of the right-of-way to a maximum height of 24 feet from natural grade at the foot of the right-of-way.

4. to allow the planting area to be at the top of the slope instead of requiring a 6 foot planting bench between the combined fill slopes of the existing right-of-way and the additional 14 foot project slope per 18.61.054H3d.

The applicant's original request included an exception to the Hillside Development Zone Bufferyard requirements but their latest site cross-section shows compliance by implementing a 75” wall/open fence topside, along the roadways.

Motion included staff's recommended conditions with revisions plus additional comments made prior to and after the Motion among Committee members as follows.
MOTION: The Motion was made to Approve P21VA00014 by Member Becker and seconded by Member Eglin subject to DRC recommended conditions as follows:

1. HDZ exceptions for the proposed site development plan shall be implemented as approved by the DRC.
2. An additional 10% of Amenity Landscaping shall be added to the development’s Landscape Plan, supplementing what is required in the zoning code to compensate for 100% site grading.
3. Applicant shall provide staff with one electronic copy of the approved DRC documents for staff sign-off in compliance with the DRC decision.
4. The location and design of any retaining walls adjacent to Pima County right-of-way is subject to approval from the Department of Transportation to ensure there is no impact to the existing Pima County public art walls located on the southwest corner of the property.

Comments made by Committee Members:
Objection by Member Clement: would like to preserve more of the sloped area as natural open space and reduce the total number of building pods from 4-3.

Member Hall asked if this area could support the proposed density and if so how was the drainage going to work? Also concerned about the intensity of transportation already in the area and how this project will address traffic issues.

Response: Traffic study and Drainage Report would be required during Site Design Review Phase.

Reminder that the DRC was to specifically review for hillside development zone issues such as external slopes, grading and amenity landscaping.

In General the Committee brought up concerns regarding one access point for the complex. Member Eglin noted that density was not the issue but could the fire access only exit be used as an ingress/egress easement as well?

VOTE: MOTION to Approve case P20VA00014 was made by Member Becker and seconded by Member Eglin. Motion passed unanimously by a Vote 6-1. Member Clement voting Nay.

For details, refer to the DRC meeting agenda, staff report and applicant package.

If you have any questions or need clarification, please contact me at (520)724-9596.