City of Tucson Development Services
Kelly Lee Project Manager
201 N. Stone 1st Floor
Tucson AZ 85701

Re: Arroyo Reserve: DP18-0060

Kelly,

Please find the following response to the first submittal comments.

Pima County Addressing:

Robin Frieman-.pdf redlines

Attached are the .pdf redlines with responses.

Pima County Parks and Recreation:

Glen Hicks-Comments

6’ Path to be changed to 12’ asphalt path.

The path has been changed to a 12’ asphalt path.

City of Tucson Zoning:

Michael Moreno-Comments

1. COMMENT: Additional Comment: 2-06.3.5 - Remove Development Package PDSD approval stamp on all sheets. Reserve a three-inch by five-inch space in the lower right quadrant of each sheet for an approval stamp. The approval stamp will be applied electronically.

An approval block has been placed on each sheet 3x5.

2. COMMENT: A brief legal description and a statement as to whether the project is a re-subdivision are to be provided.

A legal description has been added to the cover page. As discussed, the plat shown within the assessors site is not recognized and this plat will, therefore, be a re-subdivision of Block 2 of the desert Steppes Estates plat.

3. COMMENT: Please provide the information noted by the standard above.

The latest development number and administrative address has been added as well as the DSMR and S0 number for the previous plat as it may affect the current plat.
4. COMMENT: Provide the development package case number, DP18-0060, adjacent to the title block on each sheet and provide the correct address for the proposed development site.

The administrative address listed does not seem to be correct, it appears that the address on the cover sheet applies to the property across 22nd Street. The administrative address must be listed on all sheets next to the title block.

The administrative address has been corrected.

5. COMMENT: Once the final plat case number has been assigned, please list it as reference next the title block of all sheets.

Acknowledged.

6. COMMENT: Please provide the information noted by the standard.

An existing conditions sheet has been added. Currently no easements encumber the existing project as the original plat is considered non binding. The existing conditions match the title report supplied to Alliance Engineering.

7. COMMENT: If applicable, draw and label all existing easements.

See comment 6.

8. COMMENT: Please provide the dimensioned width of paving, curbs, curb cuts, and sidewalks.

These are shown within the cross sections on sheet 6.

9. COMMENT: Please provide the information noted by the standard above.

Zoning boundaries have been clearly defined on Sheet 2 existing conditions. Zoning boundary line has been added to legend.

10. COMMENT: The proposed streets do not include parking on both sides of the streets. Design all interior streets to include parking on both sides of the streets.

Parking is now incorporated on both sides.

11. COMMENT: Clarify whether or not the two parking spaces for each dwelling will be located on site.

Parking is shown on lot details on sheet 6. KB Has requested a one car parking garage. The second car will be parked on the drive, while there is a single guest parking per lot adjacent to the lot.

12. COMMENT: Contact City of Tucson Real Estate Department and enquire on the process to vacate or abandoned dedicated interior street right-of-way per the previous plat.

A package has been submitted regarding the vacation of the right of way.
13. COMMENT: Provide the information for the future sidewalk, right-of-way lines, sight visibility triangles, etc. for 22nd Street. Add the dimension from the existing and future curb to property line along 22nd Street.

No lots will access 22nd street. SVT’s are shown at the single entry to the subdivision off of 22nd street.

14. COMMENT: Please provide a dimensioned detailed drawing on sheet 5 that demonstrates compliance with the street building setback for the 5 lots along 22nd Street.

A dimensioned detail, Perimeter Lot 22nd street, has been added to sheet 6.

15. COMMENT: Show existing pedestrian circulation along abutting rights-of-way.

The existing sidewalks have been called out (keynote 11).

16. COMMENT: Add the sidewalk connection from the southeast entrance of the accessible ramp on 22nd Street to the new street side walk along the new street entrance, next to lot 39.

Per our meeting, sidewalk has been added to both sides of the street and the connection to 22nd has been shown.

17. COMMENT: See related comment 14.

See response comment 14.

18. COMMENT: Please list the allowed and proposed density calculation on the cover sheet.

These calculations were a part of the original submittal under Tabulations.

19. COMMENT: Please provide the preliminary elevation drawings with the next submittal.

These are submitted herewith.

20. COMMENT: Refer to design professionals review comments for the architectural variation plan.

Noted. Preliminary submitted herewith.

21. COMMENT: Refer to design professionals review comments for the architectural variation plan.

Noted. Preliminary submitted herewith.

22. COMMENT: Refer to design professionals review comments for the architectural variation plan.

Noted. Preliminary submitted herewith.

23. COMMENT: Refer to design professionals review comments.

All houses will be one story and a privacy mitigation plan will not be required.
24. COMMENT: If applicable provide the information noted by the standard above.

See response to comment 23.

25. COMMENT: If applicable provide the information noted by the standard above
See response to comment 23.

26. COMMENT: If applicable provide the information noted by the standard above
See response to comment 23.

27. COMMENT: If available provide CC&R’s with the next submittal or submitted with the final plat.

CC&R’s have been submitted herewith.

28. COMMENT: Under the tabulation text block revise the R-4 classification to R-1.

R-4 has been changed to R-1

TEP:

Liza Castillo

1. Tucson Electric Power Co., (TEP) has reviewed the development plan/tentative plat submitted on March 26, 2018 and is unable to approve at this time. Existing TEP overhead facilities along the northern portion of the development need to be shown on the plans, as well as existing TEP underground facilities adjacent to Lot 18 of the plans.

The existing utilities have been added north and west of the project.

2. Also please note in the Title Block that this is a resubdivision of Barrio Arroyo, Book 64 Page 76.

Due to the foreclosure of the property, the subdivision plat was never legally completed, therefore, this is still a re subdivision of Block 2.

Landscape:

Andrew Connor

See attached separate response from GRS.
Robert Sherry

1. Revise the site utility drawing to show the locations of the proposed sanitary manholes (the manholes are noted but no manholes are shown).

   This has been corrected

2. Clarify the boxed elevation note on the grading and paving plan: is it the pad elevation or the proposed first floor elevations for the buildings (FFE)?

   All elevations shown are pad grade.

3. Show the proposed point of connection to the sewer for each lot.

   HCS Connections have been shown.

4. Based on the rim elevation of the next upstream sanitary manhole and the first floor elevation, determine the need for a backwater valve for each lot per Section 715.1, IPC 2012, as amended by the City of Tucson.

   A list of backwater valve lots has been shown on sheet 8.

Loren Makus

General: The site was raised, and the detention basins were reconfigured. Cross sections and details for have been added. A new culvert between lots 24 and 27 was added.

1. Identify the floodplain boundary in the legend. Label the floodplain on all sheets showing the boundaries.

   This has been shown.

2. The dimensions on River Reserve don't match the referenced detail (B/5). The detail indicates parking on one side. With 33 feet of pavement and two feet of wedge curb, there is space for parking on both sides of the street: two 10-foot travel lanes and two 7-foot parking lanes for 34 feet.

   Cross sections have been revised.

3. The scaled width of the motor courts south of River Reserve doesn't match the dimensions in the referenced detail (C/5). Label the dimensions of the motor courts. With 32 feet of pavement and wedge curb, two parking lanes may be accommodated.

   Cross sections have been revised.

4. Sheet 3 is labelled as preliminary grading and drainage. This was submitted as tentative plat and grading. Revise the title to remove the "preliminary." The sheet index should also be changed.
5. Show existing and proposed grades on the grading plan sheets.

The existing contours are now shown.

6. The introduction of the drainage report describes a different project than this one. Revise the introduction and all other sections as necessary to be applicable to this project.

This has been revised.

7. The FEMA delineation of the floodplain affects much more of the project site than indicated by the plan sheets. Show the existing FEMA delineation as shown on the FIRM panels. If the floodplain boundary is to be changed in the course of this project, a LOMR will be required. Until the LOMR is approved, the existing delineation will be used for permitting and compliance. Show the proposed delineation as proposed.

The FEMA line has been shown on the existing conditions map. Based on initial Hecras analysis with the detailed contours and 1,000 cfs shown within the FEMA report, this line is incorrect and can be revised with a LOMR. This matter has been sent to CMG drainage.

8. Provide an encroachment analysis for the fill required to reduce the extent of the floodplain. Show no adverse impact on adjacent and nearby properties.

Per the above comment, there will be no encroachment into the floodplain.

9. Provide security barriers for the basins that are greater than 2 feet deep and the side slopes are steeper than 4:1. Note that where the water depths are less than 2 feet but the top of the basin is more than 2 feet above the basin bottom the barrier will be required unless a weir or other overflow structure is provided to ensure water depths less than 2 feet.

These have been provided.

10. Clearly identify the boundaries of the basin in the southwest corner of the project. If the boundary is a retaining wall, demonstrate that the wall amounts to less than 35 per cent of the basin perimeter per page 79 of the retention/detention manual.

Retaining walls have been eliminated except for the southern portion of the basin. Berms are now a part of the basin. See sheet 5 sections.

11. If the basin perimeter makes use of retaining walls, provide geotechnical evaluation of the foundation in soils subject to inundation.

Geotechnical evaluation of the footing is being prepared and will be submitted with next submittal.
12. Provide a complete SWPPP including a SWPPP site map showing best management practices.

This is submitted herewith.

13. Identify the purpose for each common area.

This has been added.

14. Provide representative dimensions and cross section for each basin as well as other features on the site such as the slope adjacent to Palm Tree Drive Wash.

Sheet 5 Details has been added.

Let me know if there is anything else required.

Respectfully,
Alliance Engineering, PC

[Signature]

Derek M. Roberts, PE
President