

From: Alice Roe <alicer@dakotacom.net>
To: Ruopp Rebecca <Rebecca.Ruopp@tucsonaz.gov>
CC: Beizer Nanci <nbeizer@dakotacom.net>
Date: 8/31/2015 1:02 PM
Subject: Draft Grant Road Corridor Vision Comments

Again a tour de force of organizing and placing what we requested into the document.

Thank you for the additional weekend to review. I needed it. I found being able to refer to the Redline version very useful. Thank you for posting it.

I think the document is much more manageable. Although the Stand Alone Executive Summary leads to some redundancies when reading through the whole document, that is ok and is expected.

Here are some specific thoughts, most not too serious, and may not be worth acting upon:

1. Map line colors: The use of the gold or yellowish color for a line that outlines the Centers does not show up when I print in gray scale. The color seems to match part of the logo, but against the grayed aerials, the lines disappear. Nit picky, but I find I have to use a hard copy and my older HP 1320 does not print color. Maps on pages 3, 24, 27, 29, 31, 34, 37, 40, 43, 46, 50, 53, 56, 58, 60. Note, the zoning and land use maps have sufficient gray scale value differences to be usable from a gray scale printer.
2. pages 4 & 5: The numbering for Exhibits seems out of order with Exhibit I.2 on page 4 and Exhibit I.1 on page 5.
3. page 18: Under Objective B third line, typo "...Tucson build landscape..." should be "...Tucson built landscape..."
4. page 49: Eastern Portion Segments Tucson to Country Club (and segments to the east) (cont'd) Adopted Land Use Policy: mention of Jefferson Park Neighborhood Plan. JP is west of Campbell. I think this should have been Blenman Vista Neighborhood Plan and verbiage. Probably a cut/copy and paste error.
5. Appendix page 8, Existing Conditions Study, Assets: page 8 at the bottom, there is some text that got dropped. See below for comparison of Redline version with August 2015 draft. The problem may be that the Aug2015 version has a page break that has somehow obscured some lines (Note due to my copying and pasting from the PDF's, the text did not preserve the existing line breaks, but instead used my email's width. Oh well...):

From the Redline version:

Grant Road serves a range of housing needs
The Grant Road Corridor Sstudy Aarea contains sections with more multifamily housing than typically found in Tucson. This multifamily housing serves a wider range of housing need than solidly the single family neighborhoods (although most multifamily housing is rental, under-serving any demand for owner-occupied multifamily housing). The amount of multifamily housing also creates a relatively high population density that could support local businesses

From the August 2015 draft:

Grant Road serves a range of housing needs
The Grant Road Corridor Study Area contains sections with more multifamily housing than typically found in Tucson. This multifamily housing serves a wider range of housing need than the single family

August 2015 □ Grant Road Community Character & Vitality Corridor Vision □ APPENDIX 8

amount of multifamily housing also creates a relatively high population density that could support local businesses.

So, That is It. I have looked at this version. Yes we have truly made it better and more user friendly. Thank you all for the work on the realization to create the policy document. Any questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Alice Roe
alicer@dakotacom.net
520-795-7310