



BENJAMIN W. GRAFF
PARTNER
LAND USE & ZONING ATTORNEY

DIRECT: 602.845.0989
BGRAFF@ADAYGRAFF.COM

Citizen Participation Report ("CPR") for Country Club Apartments

Case No. Z17-004

Filed with the City of Mesa: May 2, 2017

Purpose & Introduction to Project

The purpose of this Citizen Participation Report is to inform the City of Mesa Planning & Zoning and City Planning Staff of the Applicant's outreach to citizens, property owners, neighbor associations, agencies, schools, and businesses in the vicinity of the site to introduce and explain our application for the Country Club Apartments, located at 715 North Country Club Drive, Mesa, Arizona. The property is located on the East Site of Country Club Drive, South of Rio Salado Parkway and North of University Drive. We are applying for a Site Plan Review & Approval, but there is not need to change the underlying zoning designation (RM-4), which already permits multi-family uses as-of-right. The proposed density and height is also permitted as-of-right on this site. The project is therefore appropriate for the existing RM-4 zoning, and no variances are requested. Our citizen participation plan, as executed, assured that those affected by this application had adequate opportunity to learn about and comment on the proposal.

Contact Information

Peter Swingle
Athena Studio, LLC
4700 North 12th St., Ste 205
Phoenix, AZ 85014
(602) 274-5000 peter@athenastudio.net

Benjamin Graff
Aday Graff PC
2200 E. Camelback Road, Ste 221
Phoenix, AZ 85016
(602) 845-0989 BGraff@AdayGraff.com

Citizen & City Meeting Summary

Schedule: Pre-application meeting – November 7, 2016
Application Submittal – December 19, 2016
First neighborhood meeting – December 21, 2016. No attendees due to short notice.
Second neighborhood meeting was January 23, 2017. No attendees. It was discovered right before this meeting that the list given by the city was not a comprehensive list of neighbors, so a third meeting was scheduled.
Third neighborhood meeting was February 1, 2017 and was attended by 53 people. Due to great amount of neighbor feedback, we offered to have another neighborhood meeting before the DR workshop.
Fourth neighborhood meeting was February 11, 2017 and was attended by 37 people.
DR workshop was attended February 14, 2017: 5 neighbors and city staff offered recommendations to improve project

ADAY GRAFF PC

2200 E. CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 221, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016
OFFICE: 602.726.2197 FAX: 602.726.2361



BENJAMIN W. GRAFF
PARTNER
LAND USE & ZONING ATTORNEY

DIRECT: 602.845.0989
BGRAFF@ADAYGRAFF.COM

E-mail sent to neighbors within 500' list who commented at DR workshop describing changes in detail. (Copy included with 2nd DR submittal)
DR workshop April 11th, 2017: revised elevations and site plan per recommendations.
Submittal of Citizen Participation Report and Notification Materials by April 12, 2017
Revised material samples and supplemental information provided to City on May 1, 2017
Formal Notification to the City of Mesa's required notification list: May 2, 2017
Additional Neighborhood Outreach: Applicant will email all previously interested parties prior to May 17, 2017 for any further comments
Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing – May 17, 2017

Please Note: The Applicant is the builder and property manager and will continue to reach out to neighbors and address any issues during construction and operation of the multi-family development.

Summary of Citizen Outreach Results and Changes to Plan per Neighborhood Requests

The following is a summary of some of the concerns expressed by neighbors during our meetings and during the February 14th, 2017 Design Review workshop at the City of Mesa. We kept very detailed records of issues brought up at all prior meetings. See Sign-In Sheets and Minutes attached at **Tab A**.

Concerns about Escobedo and LIHTC housing. We conducted direct outreach to neighbors to inform them that this project is not, and will not be, affordable housing. It is market rate housing with rents of approximately \$995 for two-bedroom units and \$1,145 for three bedroom units. These rents can be supported at this site according to our market study completed by Robert L. Siegel and Associates in 2016. The market study emphasizes that this project has a very high probability of success due to high exposure from a busy arterial street and easy access to all primary services and all levels of retail in the immediate area. Management will conduct criminal background checks on all prospective tenants as it is done in all market-rate multi-family housing. No subsidized renters will be allowed. We understand that there is existing stock of apartments in this area, but most are older than 40 years. This project fills a gap for quality rentals within the market. Communicating this information directly to the specific individuals concerned about "affordable housing" resulted in a reduction in opposition and a significant gain in support by the neighborhood.

Adjacency to Evergreen Historic District. In addition to the two neighborhood meetings to address concerns of the neighbors, we provided outreach efforts and follow-up email correspondence on this topic. Primary concerns understandably came from the neighbors to the east, which are in the Historic District. Since we are not in the Historic District, but adjacent, we have still in good faith listened to and accommodated those affected by our development. We have made several adjustments to our original design in order to accommodate our neighbors and make the design more in line with historic standards and appearances:

ADAY GRAFF PC

2200 E. CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 221, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016
OFFICE: 602.726.2197 FAX: 602.726.2361



BENJAMIN W. GRAFF
PARTNER
LAND USE & ZONING ATTORNEY

DIRECT: 602.845.0989
BGRAFF@ADAYGRAFF.COM

- Changed single row of trees to a double row of staggered trees at East Property Line.
- Increased the proposed fence height along the East property line from 6' to 8'.
- Moved a dumpster enclosure away from the east property line
- Eliminated East-facing balconies which would overlook properties to East.
- Provided a more contrasting color palette to break up the massing of the building
- Provided a varied material palette in order to reduce the amount of stucco.
- Ensured that no carport canopies are placed adjacent to the east property line.
- Increased trees along East property line to 36" box trees. (Reach maturity faster)

Concern about future deterioration of the project. Originally, the neighbors were not aware that the owner/applicant will remain as the operator and we conveyed this information more clearly in subsequent correspondence and meetings. The owner is hands-on and visits his existing properties at least once a week. The property will have a landscape company maintain the landscaping twice a month, and will have qualified maintenance staff dedicated to maintenance of the building. The owner will supply contact information to the neighbors so that issues are addressed in a timely manner.

Desire for reduction of density. Some neighbors expressed a concern that we were rezoning the property – we are not. Others learned through our communications that multi-family may be built on this site as-of-right, which directed the conversation toward how we could improve the design, materials, and aesthetics. The neighbors were further assured by the fact that the proposed density, at 20.85 units per acre, is less than 70% of the allowed maximum density for this site. The proposed density is at the minimum necessary for this site to cover the costs of land and development and also provide sufficient income over the long term for a high level of maintenance for this project, which is one of the stated desires of the neighbors. The density level was carefully determined as a balance point of several factors including income, parking, setbacks, and other zoning limitations.

Desire for increase of children's play areas to keep children occupied onsite. Neighbors concerned that not having enough open space would lead to activity within their neighborhood. Per the neighbors' requests, the site has been reconfigured to combine the open spaces into one large open area which allows ample room for children to run and play. This area was placed along the north side of the building to allow the building to shade the open space for the majority of the day. The size of the pool area and playground area have been increased from the previous plan. We have added BBQ and picnic areas outside of the central open space. We have provided a shade trellis for the pool area which visually connects to the two residential buildings and provide more pedestrian-scale elements onsite.

Increase the quality of materials. Neighbors and City Staff commented that the exterior was too plain and uninteresting in our original design. We have since reduced the amount of stucco in the façade and introduced cementitious siding and metal siding as complementary materials which raise the level of quality of the facades while adding texture, contrast and visual interest.

ADAY GRAFF PC

2200 E. CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 221, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016
OFFICE: 602.726.2197 FAX: 602.726.2361



BENJAMIN W. GRAFF
PARTNER
LAND USE & ZONING ATTORNEY

DIRECT: 602.845.0989
BGRAFF@ADAYGRAFF.COM

Decrease the impact of the building at the East façade. In addition to rotating the units so that the balconies do not face to the East (addressing the neighbors requests for privacy), we have introduced a new color scheme which uses contrasting colors to reduce the impact of the East façade.

Maximize effectiveness of tree screening at east property line. In consultation with our landscape architect, his recommendation for staggering the trees at the East property line is the most efficient and effective way to create a visual screen between the two properties. The neighbors have responded positively to these changes.

Shaded area for children to wait for school bus. We have provided a shaded area in front of the relocated office which allows children to await the school bus sheltered from the elements.

Desire to move carports away from building. The carports have been moved to the opposite side of the driveway from the building.

Address landscaping adjacent to power lines along the South property line. Neighbors expressed specific concern about this potential conflict. We have worked with our landscape architect on sizing and placement of trees so that they do not interfere with power lines along the South property line.

Conclusion

We have been working with our surrounding neighbors and City Staff diligently since November of 2016. The result has been a true example of collaboration and a design/site plan which has seen drastic changes which reflect the desires of the neighborhood. With approximately 55 neighbors in opposition to the project at the first neighborhood meeting, the last DRC Hearing was only attended by two (2) neighbors who expressed concerns. Multiple neighbors who were previously opposed made public statements to the DRC that they were now in favor of the project as a result of the significant changes. We are very pleased to bring the site plan to the City of Mesa Planning & Zoning Commission with support from the neighborhood and we will continue to meet and correspond with any neighbors who continue to have questions or concerns.

ADAY GRAFF PC

2200 E. CAMELBACK RD., SUITE 221, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85016
OFFICE: 602.726.2197 FAX: 602.726.2361

Country Club Drive Neighborhood Meeting Sign In Sheet

February 1, 2017

Name	Address	Phone/E-mail
Jenny Burnham	1062 W. 4th Place	jennyrburnham@gmail.com
Lynn Burnham	1062 W. 4th Pl.	BURNHAMLYNNW@gmail.com
MARIE DEEN	225 W. 1st St. Unit 10	MARIEGEN2@gmail.com
Ruby Richard	225 W. 1st #116 Mesa	rubyrichards12@yahoo.com
✓ Denis & Lily Tetreault	714 N. Robson	DRT2411@aol.com
Janet Coombs	530 N. Vineyard	JanetandAmanda@yahoo.com
Arlo & Jan Judd	625 N. Date St	arjudd@yahoo.com
W. Dea Montague	555 N. Orange St	ulamontague@hotmail.com
Dan Packard	865 W. 21st Place	dajpackard@msn.com
Heather & Rob Scantlebury	European Historic Dist	hscantz@cox.net
✓ Rob & Jody Peterson	773 N. Robson	jodypeterson@mac.com
Randy & Sally Cooper	558 N. Robson	ParkAvenueCatering@gmail.com
ANITA FARRAH	642 N. ROBSON	AFARRAH@COX.NET
Tyler Montague	534 N. Orange	tjmontague@gmail.com
✓ Betty Watson	766 N. Robson	480-835-5524
Connie Hajicek	612 N. Grand	480-602-882-7657
V. Linnick	820 N. Robson	vicki@twtdbooks.com
✓ Allen Chando	722 N. ROBSON St	Allen480@yahoo.com
✓ Anissa Chamey	722 N. Robson St	AnaKono@yahoo.com
T.J. McMichael	227 W 9th Pl. SD	480-969-6482
Bill Karas	525 N. Robson	Bill@KarasKustoms.com
Janice Lantton	744 N. Vineyard	onenandjanee@gmail.com
Julie Peterson	628 W. Camino Cir	julie8peterson@gmail.com
Don & Nansi Hobbs	660 N. Vineyard	donwhobbs@hotmail.com
Owen Lantton	744 N. Vineyard	solantton3@gmail.com
✓ Shelley Conner	742 N. Robson	seconner4@gmail.com
Bob Wright	660 N. DATE	bwright25@gmail.com

Name

Address

Phone / Email

Name	Address	Phone / Email
Brant Layton	1022 W. 9th St.	480-944-0932 / belaytm@gmail.com
Melinda Layton	1022 W. 9th St	480-688-4360 / 007mam@gmail.com
Shelby Bailey	525 N. Orange	480-201-6951 / mamsansb@hotmail.com
Mark Stambaugh	847 W 10th St.	480-491-9320 / mstambaugh@cox.net
Jay Bailey	525 N ORANGE	602 622-1815 jlbaila977@hotmail.com
Rick WARREN	626 N. Robson	972-358-8387 rickwarren428@gmail.com
Jennifer Duff	146 W 2nd St	602-524-9652 jduff@jefinh.com
Barb Bingham	601 N. GRAND	480-467-9910 barbara.a. bingham@gmail.com
CHARLES WRIGHT	529 N. CHERRY	480 969 3303 C9WR16@cox.net
Kathy Cooper	558 N. Robson	480-833-3396 COX-NET
Sally Cooper	558 N. Robson	480-833-3396 CANDIDSON@cox.net
Bob Bailey	5341 Robson - 727 N.C.C.Dr.	602 206 7278
Roy Smith	431 N. ORANGE	480-833-3905 rsmith@aol.com
Mick Conner	742 N. Robson	MCONNER40@HOTMAIL.COM
Tom Wuorio	425 W. 6th Place N. on	tomwuorio@hotmail.com
Charissa West	640 N Vineyard 85201	Sissalou@gmail.com
Gary Davis	735 N. Robson 85801	grndinchian@aol.com 480-242-8357
JAMES HANKINS	804. N ROBSON	482 FAX3K@YAHOO.COM 602-381-9023
James Heywood	706 N Robson	480 586 4987
John + Jan Hays	430 W. CLARK	480-834-5447
Ray + Melissa HEINLENS	613 N. ORANGE	602 617 0322 RPR386@GMAIL.COM
Suzann + Jerry HUGHES	813 N. Robson	480 888 9547 / hughes.mesa@centurylink.net
Stephanie + Bob Wright	606 N. DATE 85201	602-291-9514 Stephanie.wright@cox.net
Susan Olte	633 W Conterra	480-964-5329 - scott@cox.net
ARROW Miller	613 N. Robson	480-205-2091 CHRIS@TIGERTACO.COM
Vic LINDOFF	820 N. Robson	480-962-4729 VLINDOFF@VINTAGEBOOKS.COM

Minutes from Neighborhood Meeting of 2/1/2017

According to the attached sign-in sheet, about 50 people attended this meeting. Note that some names are entered twice, hence 53 separate entries.

The meeting started promptly at 6pm. I introduced myself as the project architect and representative. After I apologized for the mix-ups in the planning of the two previous neighborhood meetings, and explained the mix-up between myself and the city in regard to the notification list, the group mostly wanted to talk about the socio-economic impact that our project would have on the neighborhood. They wanted to know what the target rents would be and what kind of resident screening would be in place to prevent a lot of section 8 vouchers being used at the property. Some people indicated that they would prefer the vacant lot to any kind of apartments, and that there were already too many apartments in their neighborhood. Because the local apartments are older properties, the tenants are less than desirable which leads to many issues with crime. Unfortunately, the owner could not be present at the meeting, and I had to defer answers to some of these questions. I did confirm that the owner would be present at the next meeting and that answers would be forthcoming. I made a note to be pre-emptive and try to provide answers to the group via e-mail at the earliest possible time. The group questioned the process in general, and I explained that we should focus on this particular meeting and that I was willing to hear each and every one of them, even if it meant staying until midnight.

The neighbors do not feel that the city is on their side, and asked why a City representative was not present. I explained that direct City participation in this phase of the process is not required, but the City would be involved in the next stage.

After the initial barrage, I was able to give a presentation of the project, explaining that the project falls within all limitations of the existing zoning, and does indeed address some of their concerns about crime by providing 'eyes on the street' in all four directions, and by providing controlled access to each building.

One person suggested that we have the project gated off, both vehicle and pedestrian, for the safety of the residents. I took time to explain the large amount of space that is needed onsite for stacking space and rejection turnaround space to accommodate a gated vehicular access.

At least two of neighbors immediately to the east were present and expressed concern about residents throwing things over their fence or climbing the fence and requested an 8' block wall between our properties. The alley that exists there has been abandoned by the city and sections added to those neighbors properties. I suggested that we would be amenable to the 8' wall, since that was one of the few concrete and constructive architectural ideas that was presented. I told them that a 6' wall was definitely part of the planned improvements. They had a concern about the units facing the east looking into their yards. I showed them a section of the project which included their yards and showed the existing 40' mature trees and shrubs between our project and their structures, as well as proposed new trees within the 20' landscape setback on our property. I explained that when I was on site, I was unable to see any of the houses to the east due to the mature plant growth that is currently existing, and that the closest units are more than 150' from their homes.

They questioned the need for more apartments and when I told them that we had a market study which showed a clear need, they wanted to see that. I did not have the market study ready at hand, and if I did, I was unsure how my clients would feel about sharing that information. I suggested that I might be able to summarize it and present it to the group.

They want some kind of assurance that the landscaping and the property will be properly maintained so that this project does not end up 'like all the other apartments' in the neighborhood in 5-10 years. They inquired about my projects of 5-15 year age range and what they look like today. I

explained that my clients and I have a very successful track record in market-rate, low-income and even for-sale multi-family housing, and that I would be glad to send them a full list of my project history. That seemed to satisfy some people. I further explained that the majority of my projects consistently have occupancy rates in the 90% or higher range, which is part of the reason why my services are sought out. I also explained that every successful project is a partnership, not only between the owner and the developer, but also including the city and the neighborhood, and that I was looking forward to detailed suggestions on how to improve the project as proposed.

They asked whether covered parking was being provided and whether the site would be adequately lighted, including lighting for the carports. I pointed out the carports on the plan and let them know that there is one carport per unit. The carports will be lit, and a site lighting plan conforming to city standards will be completed.

They want to know how the property will benefit the neighborhood in addition to benefitting the developer. They brought up Mark Taylor developments as an example, in regard to amenities and quality of upkeep. They wanted to know who our prospective target residents were. They expressed concern about income disparity between the proposed project and the rest of the neighborhood, and the fact that businesses look at average income as an indicator of whether or not to establish in the neighborhood. They brought up the City's poor record of attracting quality businesses to the area and the multiple attempts to revitalize the Downtown corridor, which in their opinion had mixed results. I explained that the light rail was a valuable asset to the Downtown corridor, and had proven potential to bring quality projects and quality businesses to the city, in the same manner that it is doing so for Phoenix and Mesa. I told them that I had a project along the light rail that was just finishing construction at 2148 East Apache Boulevard, and invited them to go and see firsthand the type of quality product that the light rail can bring, due to the fact that it spurs development of all kinds along its path of travel.

Some voiced desire for single-family or attached single family for-sale product over this type of product, because of the perception that renters do not have a sense of neighborhood pride. I explained that the cost of the land is too high to support single family development, and that the zoning of the land supported a higher density development, which is appropriate given the proximity of the light rail. They then suggested that this project would be better received if it replaced some of the older stock of apartments rather than simply adding to the number of apartments. I asked that people in the room by show of hands indicate how many of them had lived in apartments at some point in their lives. Most hands were raised, including mine. I made the point that living in an apartment is not necessarily an indicator that one is a criminal or unwanted element, and that the apartment were filling a demonstrated need in the fabric of the community because there have not been any new apartments built in the immediate neighborhood since the mid-80s. They asked how this project would be different than the others, and I pointed out that apartments pre-1991 were not built under the ADA and were likely not suitable for disabled persons. These older apartments also typically did not have desirable items like washers and dryers or dishwashers in the units, which are now commonplace and expected amenities. They expressed a disdain for the high amount of low-income housing that is being built in the City of Mesa. I assured them that this was not low-income housing and that we are looking to attract quality, long-term residents. I explained that the quality of our construction, in particular in regard to sound-proofing between the units, would exceed code minimums, since noise complaints are the most common cause of unit turnover in apartments. Furthermore, the owner has a shared interest with the community in not seeing a high turnover rate in these apartments.

They are worried that the income scale of these residents negatively impacts the attractiveness of the area for quality businesses and shops, because the average income for the neighborhood is depressed by adding 71 apartment dwelling families to the mix. I offered to look into what the rental rates are going to be, as well as the potential resident vetting process, and provide answers to those

questions. They suggested Tri-Star Detection occupant screening, and I offered to present this as an option to the ownership.

They are worried that the project does not have enough 'effective open space' for kids to play, and that those kids will become bored and wander the neighborhood looking for trouble. They suggested that more or larger recreational areas be considered, including a cabana, benches, an area for children to play and throw a football or kick a soccer ball. I offered to take that into consideration in the next round of site design.

They suggested that we work with local CEPTD (police working with the city) in order to get some ideas for increasing security for the project and discouraging criminal activity. They wanted to know if there would be security cameras onsite. I confirmed that we would be working with CEPTD as part of our ongoing refinement of the design, and that the design is a work in progress. One person expressed that security cameras would be a good idea, and I said that option was one that we were considering.

They brought up the question of traffic impact on Country Club Drive, and I indicated that the subject property is not large enough for the City to require a traffic study. They talked about the negative impact that widening Country Club Drive from 4 lanes to 6 lanes plus turn lane has had on the neighborhood in terms of traffic and crime. They talked about a desire for traffic calming on Country Club, and I encouraged them to contact the City's traffic department about these issues. I explained that I did not have any control over the public right of way, only what falls within the project boundary.

They brought up that there is a criminal element in the neighborhood which subsist on 'shopping' (stealing) from the neighborhood, removing any identifying marks from the stolen items, and then selling those items at the local pawn shop for cash. This activity is known to occur at the self-storage facility to the north of the property. They reiterated a strong consideration for security at the project. I made a note to myself to consider moving the bike racks to the interior courtyards of the buildings so that they would be secured at night.

They brought up that there is a significant amount of homeless persons who transit Country Club past our project between the homeless shelter and the soup kitchen. I explained that the reason the City was open to low-income housing was to help aid this population of their city and that ADOH is increasingly effective at combining social services with an increasing stock of successful low-income housing in order to help alleviate this problem.

After the first hour, people gradually started to filter out.

They suggested the next meeting be held at the First Christian Church Disciples at the terminus of Rio Salado Pkwy. They have a good sized community room there and more parking than the fire station did. Vic Linoff showed up partway through the proceedings and stayed until it was just he and I in the room. Vic has an extensive background in planning, and we had an in-depth one-on-one conversation about the subject property and the state of the neighborhood, as well as the city's zoning and general plan, including discussion about other cities' zoning and form-based codes. The meeting adjourned at 8:05pm.

I added the names and contact information of all of the attendees to our contact list. 13 attendees overlapped with the existing list. We agreed to schedule the next neighborhood meeting before the DR workshop on the 14th, and that all attendees would be notified of the neighborhood meeting and the DR workshop.

Dear Neighbor,

This letter is a courtesy letter those who voiced their concerns about our project at the February 14th Design Review workshop at the City of Mesa. We would like to thank you all for your continued input and reassure you we are addressing your concerns in a positive and constructive manner. We have kept detailed records of issues brought up at that meeting as well as previous meetings, and would like to present our responses to those concerns.

Concerns about Escobedo and LIHTC housing. This project is not, and will not be, affordable housing. It is market rate housing with rents of approximately \$995 for two-bedroom units and \$1,145 for three bedroom units. These rents can be supported at this site according to our market study completed by Robert L. Siegel and Associates in 2016. The market study emphasizes that this project has a very high probability of success due to high exposure from a busy arterial street and easy access to all primary services and all levels of retail in the immediate area. Management will conduct criminal background checks on all prospective tenants as it is done in all market-rate multi-family housing. No subsidized renters will be allowed. We understand that there is existing stock of apartments in this area, but most are older than 40 years. This project fills a gap for quality rentals within the market.

Adjacency to Evergreen Historic District. We have had two neighborhood meetings to address concerns of the neighbors. Primary concerns understandably came from the neighbors to the east, which are in the Historic District. Since we are not in the Historic District, but adjacent, but we have, in good faith, listened to and accommodated those affected by our development. We have made several adjustments to our original design in order to accommodate our neighbors:

- Changed single row of trees to a double row of staggered trees at East Property Line.
- Increased the proposed fence height along the East property line from 6' to 8'.
- Moved a dumpster enclosure away from the east property line
- Eliminated East-facing balconies which would overlook properties to East.
- Provided a more contrasting color palette to break up the massing of the building
- Provided a varied material palette in order to reduce the amount of stucco.
- Ensured that no carport canopies are placed adjacent to the east property line.
- Increased trees along East property line to 36" box trees. (Reach maturity faster)

Concern about future deterioration of the project. The owner is hands-on and visits his existing properties at least once a week. The property will have a landscape company maintain the landscaping twice a month, and will have qualified maintenance staff dedicated to maintenance of the building. The owner will supply contact information to the neighbors so that issues are addressed in a timely manner.

Desire for reduction of density. The proposed density, at 20.85 units per acre, is less than 70% of the allowed maximum density for this site. The proposed density is at the minimum necessary for this site to cover the costs of land and development and also provide sufficient income over the long term for a high level of maintenance for this project, which is one of the stated desires of the neighbors. The density level was carefully determined as a balance point of several factors including income, parking, setbacks, and other zoning limitations.

Desire for increase of children's play areas. Neighbors concerned that not having enough open space would lead to activity within their neighborhood. The site has been reconfigured to combine the open spaces into one large open area which allows ample room for children to run and play. This area was placed along the north side of the building to allow the building to shade the open space for the majority of the day. The size of the pool area and playground area have been increased from the

previous plan. We have added BBQ and picnic areas outside of the central open space. We have provided a shade trellis for the pool area which visually connects to the two residential buildings and provide more pedestrian-scale elements onsite.

Increase the quality of materials. We have reduced the amount of stucco in the façade and introduced cementitious siding and metal siding as complementary materials which raise the level of quality of the facades while adding texture, contrast and visual interest.

Decrease the impact of the building at the East façade. In addition to rotating the units so that the balconies do not face to the East, we have introduced a new color scheme which uses contrasting colors to reduce the impact of the East façade.

Demonstrate sustainable aspects of the project. There are two types of sustainability, active and passive. Active would be solar panels and other items which create energy. We are not providing any active items at this time, but rather are focussing on creating a superior building envelope which directly benefits the residents via reduced energy costs. Passive sustainability involves the selection of quality building envelope materials and construction systems. In consultation with a LEED AP professional, this building will utilize the following passively sustainable elements:

- Dual-pane, low-e windows.
- High reflectivity roofing surface.
- Energy star appliances and light fixtures.
- High efficiency HVAC systems.
- Insulation package exceeding requirements of the International Energy Conservation Code.
- Solar shading strategies for windows and sliding glass doors.

Concern about messiness of Sissoo trees. Per the request of the neighbors, we have exchanged sissoo trees for acacia anuera.

Maximize effectiveness of tree screening at east property line. In consultation with our landscape architect, his recommendation for staggering the trees at the East property line is the most efficient and effective way to create a visual screen between the two properties.

Shaded area for children to wait for school bus. We have provided a shaded area in front of the relocated office which allows children to await the school bus sheltered from the elements.

Playground area to be bigger for fall areas. The playground has been increased in size and the manufacturer recommended fall zone has been added to the site plan.

Desire to move carports away from building. The carports have been moved to the opposite side of the driveway from the building.

Architectural renderings which reflect landscape plan. We have created a 3-D model of the site which includes landscaping of a scale commensurate to the landscape plan.

Address landscaping adjacent to power lines along the South property line. We have worked with our landscape architect on sizing and placement of trees so that they do not interfere with power lines along the South property line.

Thank you for all of your continued interest in this case

Respectfully,



Peter Swingle, Architect