

PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT



Meeting Date: August 10, 2022
General Plan Element: *Land Use*
General Plan Goal: *Create a sense of community through land uses*

ACTION

Ashler Hills Park MUMSP 18-UP-2021

Request to consider the following:

1. A recommendation to City Council regarding a request by owner for approval of a Municipal Use Master Site Plan for a new park on a +/- 15-acre site with Multiple-Family Residential Environmentally Sensitive Lands (R-5 ESL) zoning located at the northwest corner of E. Ashler Hills Drive and N. 74th Way (APN: 216-51-098).

Purpose of Request

In accordance with Section 1.501 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Development Review Board and Planning Commission shall review and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding a proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan (MUSP) for any site larger than one (1) acre of gross lot area. The applicant's request is for a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan (MUMSP) for a new park.

Key Items for Consideration


- The proposed site is larger than 1 acre, triggering the need for a Municipal Use Master Site Plan
- Municipal Use Master Site Plan Criteria
- Proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan is consistent with Scottsdale General Plan 2035
- City Council initiated the Ashler Hills Park MUMSP on November 10, 2020
- [Parks and Recreation heard](#) this case June 15, 2022, and recommended approval with a 3-1 vote
- [Development Review Board](#) heard this case July 7, 2022, and recommended approval with a 4-1 vote
- Public Comment Received

OWNER

City of Scottsdale

APPLICANT CONTACT

Brad Walldorf
Project Manager with Capital Project Management
(480) 312-7790



LOCATION

Northwest corner of E. Ashler Hills Drive and N. 74th Street. APN: 216-51-098.

BACKGROUND

General Plan

The Scottsdale General Plan 2035 Land Use Element designates the property as Developed Open Space (Parks). The Developed Open Space category includes public or private recreation areas, such as golf courses and city parks. Some developed open space may also be used as drainage facilities for flood control. Developed open spaces provide amenities for both residents and visitors. To this end, the Scottsdale General Plan 2035 Recreation Element designates this site as a Neighborhood Park. Neighborhood Parks are defined as a facility that is roughly two (2) to ten (10) acres in size, intended to meet the recreation needs of people living or working within a one-half mile radius. Neighborhood parks provide primary recreation services and facilities; are easily accessible and available to local residents; serve a single neighborhood or several neighborhoods, depending on the location of the park; are preferably located with or next to elementary schools, neighborhood centers, or other gathering places; and are accessed mainly by pedestrians and bicycles. Although the net site area is 15 acres, the developed park area is approximately 3-4 acres which aligns with other city designated Neighborhood Parks.

Zoning

The subject site is currently zoned R-5 ESL, Multiple-family Residential Environmentally Sensitive Lands Overlay. The site was annexed into the City in 1983 via Ordinance No. 1611 with R1-70, Single-family Residential District zoning. In 1991, the ESL, Environmentally Sensitive Lands Overlay, was applied. Later in 2001, the site was rezoned from R1-70 ESL, Single-family Residential Environmentally Sensitive Lands, to R-5 ESL, Multiple-family Residential Environmentally Sensitive Lands, under the Whisper Rock Master Zoning and General Plan case, 10-ZN-2001 and 4-GP-2001. The area was also designated as a park at that time.

Context

The site is located on the northwest corner of the E. Ashler Hills Drive and N. 74th Street intersection. The property is surrounded by a commercial shopping center to the west, residential subdivision to the north, vacant land to the east, and a golf course to the south. Please see context graphics.

Adjacent Uses and Zoning

- North: Sevano Village aka Las Piedras Subdivision, zoned R1-5 ESL
- South: Golf Course, zoned R1-70 ESL
- East: Vacant land, zoned R1-70 ESL
- West: Commercial shopping center, zoned C-2 ESL

Other Related Policies, References:

Scottsdale General Plan 2035
Environmentally Sensitive Lands Overlay
Zoning Ordinance

APPLICANT’S PROPOSAL

Development Information

The applicant’s request is for a recommendation to the City Council on the proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan to construct a new park which includes pickle ball courts, lawn area, playground and picnic area, pedestrian circulation, and associated parking and landscaping improvements.

- Existing Use: Vacant undeveloped land
- Proposed Use: Municipal use, park
- Parcel Size: 653,217 SF / 15 acres (net)
- Buildings Area: +/- 8,000 SF (shaded canopies)
960 SF (bathrooms)
- Building Height Allowed: 36 feet above natural grade
- Building Height Proposed: 27.7 feet above natural grade
- Parking Required: 45 spaces
- Parking Provided: 70 spaces
- Natural Open Space Required: 183,124 square feet / 4.2 acres
- Natural Open Space Provided: 183,612 square feet / 4.21 acres

IMPACT ANALYSIS

Municipal Use Master Site Plan (MUMSP)

In accordance with Section 1.501 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Development Review Board and Planning Commission shall review and make a recommendation to the City Council regarding a proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan for any site larger than one (1) acre of gross lot area. The purpose of the Municipal Use Master Site Plan is to find that the proposed municipal use is of general community interest and to ensure that the general public has the opportunity to comment on the proposed use and site plan design. When evaluating a MUMSP, staff encourages the Development Review Board and Planning Commission to provide a recommendation based on the proposed plan and the compatibility of the proposed use to the adjacent and abutting developments.

Municipal Use Master Site Plan Findings (Zoning Ordinance Section 1.502):

- A. The Municipal Use Master Site plan is not potentially detrimental to adjacent properties.
 - The proposed site plan is designed so that the park and associated improvements are on the south half of the site, closer to the commercial shopping center, and farther away from the single-family subdivision to the north.
 - The required Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) per the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Overlay is placed on the north half of the site to buffer the park from the northern residential subdivision. Additionally, the proposed courts are lower in elevation from N. 74th Street.

- B. The site plan proposes a municipal use that is of general community interest.
 - The new park, which includes pickle ball courts, playground and lawn area, shade amenities, and pedestrian connections provides recreational and open space service for the community and nearby neighborhoods.

Transportation/Trails

Staff finds that vehicular access to the site is provided via one driveway entrance along the southern boundary on E. Ashler Hills Drive. The site plan includes a new left turn lane to enter the park as required by Transportation staff, 6-foot wide sidewalk along the street frontage, and 6-foot stabilized DG path to connect to the northern subdivision. There are 45 required parking spaces for the park use and 70 parking spaces are provided on the site plan.

Water/Sewer

The applicant provided Basis of Design reports for water and sewer, which have been accepted by the Water Resources Division. The City of Scottsdale is an Arizona Department of Water Resources designated provider with a 100 years Assured Water Supply and will supply water in accordance with City codes, ordinances, and the City’s Drought Management Plan. All infrastructure upgrades necessary to serve this project will be completed by the applicant.

Fire/Police

The nearest fire station is within 2 miles of the site and located at 31802 N. Pima Road. The subject site is served by Police District 4, Beat 20. As with any project that contributes to growth, the fire department and police department continually anticipate and evaluate resource needs for the city’s budget process.

Natural Area Open Space

The subject site is required to provide 183,124 SF of natural area open space (NAOS) and is providing 183,612 SF per the site plan. The NAOS is located on the north half of the overall site and will be dedicated to protect the natural desert area. Additionally, the two large washes that bisect the property will be maintained and protected in place.

Community Involvement

The applicant has gone through an extensive public outreach effort for the project. With the submittal of the application, staff and the applicant notified all property owners within 750 feet of the site and posted hearing signs. The applicant also held two virtual open houses. Staff has received

many letters of concern from the Las Piedras subdivision to the north (see Attachment #7.) Citizen concerns include proposed park size, increased traffic, security, lighting, number of pickle ball courts, and more.

OTHER BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

Parks and Recreation Commission:

The [Parks and Recreation Commission](#) heard this case on June 15, 2022 and the motion for approval passed with a 3-1 vote.

Development Review Board:

The [Development Review Board](#) heard this case on July 7, 2022 and the motion for approval passed with a 5-1 vote with the consideration that park hours be reduced from 10:30pm to 10:00pm at night and pathway lighting height be reduced from the current 16 feet.

Park staff was able to do more research and the city code dictates that all park hours are from sunrise to 10:30pm, so that cannot be modified without a city-wide text amendment.

The park lighting is conceptual at this point, and is going to be reviewed by the Development Review Board under case 51-DR-2021, but the applicant can choose to revise the pathway lighting to be shorter in height.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommended Approach:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find that the Municipal Use Master Site Plan criteria have been met, and determine that the proposed Municipal Use Master Site Plan is consistent and conforms with the adopted General Plan, and make a recommendation to City Council for approval of the Municipal Use Master Site Plan, per the attached stipulations.

RESPONSIBLE DEPARTMENTS

Current Planning Services	Stormwater Management
Capital Project Management	Water Resources
Transportation Engineering	Fire & Life Safety Services

STAFF CONTACTS

Katie Posler
Senior Planner
Current Planning
480-312-2703

E-mail: kposler@scottsdaleaz.gov

Brad Walldorf
Project Manager
Capital Project Management
480-312-7790

E-mail: bwalldorf@scottsdaleaz.gov

APPROVED BY



Katie Posler, Senior Planner, Report Author

7/19/2022

Date



Tim Curtis, AICP, Current Planning Director
Planning Commission Liaison
Phone: 480-312-4210 Email: tcurtis@scottsdaleaz.gov

7/27/2022

Date



Erin Perreault, AICP, Executive Director
Planning, Economic Development, and Tourism
Phone: 480-312-7093 Email: eperreault@scottsdaleaz.gov

07/28/2022

Date

ATTACHMENTS

1. Context Aerial
2. Resolution No. 12560
 - Exhibit 1: Aerial Close Up
 - Exhibit 2: Stipulations
 - Exhibit A to Exhibit 2: Site Plan
3. Existing General Plan Land Use Map
4. Existing Zoning Map
5. Traffic Impact Summary
6. City Notification Map
7. Public Comment
8. Applicant's Public Participation Report
9. Parks and Creation Commission June 15th 2022 Marked Agenda
10. Development Review Board July 7th 2022 Marked Agenda



Context Aerial

18-UP-2021

RESOLUTION NO. 12560

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SCOTTSDALE, MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA, APPROVING A MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN FOR A NEW PARK ON A +/- 15-ACRE SITE WITH MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS (R-5 ESL) ZONING LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF E. ASHLER HILLS DRIVE AND N. 74TH WAY (APN: 216-51-098).

WHEREAS, the Development Review Board held a public hearing on July 7, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on August 10, 2022; and

NOW, THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona, as follows:

Section 1. That the City Council finds the Municipal Use Master Site Plan for the proposed Ashler Hills Park provides an amenity to adjacent properties and the site plan proposes a municipal use of general community interest.

Section 2. That the Municipal Use Master Site Plan described in 18-UP-2021, for the property shown on Exhibit 1 and attached as Exhibit A to Exhibit 2 is approved conditioned upon compliance with all stipulations attached hereto as Exhibit 2 and incorporated herein by reference.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Scottsdale this ___ day of _____, 20__.

ATTEST:

CITY OF SCOTTSDALE, an Arizona municipal corporation

By: _____
Ben Lane
City Clerk

By: _____
David D. Ortega
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

By: _____
Sherry R. Scott, City Attorney
By: Joe Padilla, Deputy City Attorney



Close-up Aerial

18-UP-2021

**Stipulations for the Conditional Use Permit
For Ashler Hills Park MUMSP
Case Number: 18-UP-2021**

These stipulations are in order to protect the public health, safety, welfare, and the City of Scottsdale.

SITE DESIGN

1. CONFORMANCE TO CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN. Development shall conform with the conceptual site plan with the city staff date of 7/20/22, attached as Exhibit A to Exhibit 2. Any proposed significant change to the conceptual site plan as determined by the Zoning Administrator, shall be subject to additional action and public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.
2. BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITATIONS. No building on the site shall exceed 36 feet in height, measured as provided in the applicable section of the Zoning Ordinance.
3. ALTERATIONS TO WATERCOURSES. Any proposed alteration to the natural state of watercourses with a peak flow rate of 50 CFS or higher shall be subject to the wash modification process.



INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEDICATIONS

4. CIRCULATION IMPROVEMENTS. Before any certificate of occupancy is issued for the site, the owner shall make dedications and provide improvements in conformance with the staff approved site plan.
5. DRAINAGE REPORT. In the required drainage report design shall be compliant with the DS&PM.
6. EASEMENTS.
 - a. EASEMENTS DEDICATED BY PLAT. The owner shall dedicate to the city on the final plat, all easements necessary to serve the site, in conformance with the Scottsdale Revised Code and the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
 - b. EASEMENTS CONVEYED BY SEPARATE INSTRUMENT. Before any building permit is issued for the site, each easement conveyed to the city separate from a final plat shall be conveyed by an instrument or map of dedication subject to city staff approval, and accompanied by a title policy in favor of the city, in conformance with the Design Standards and Policies Manual.
7. CONSTRUCTION COMPLETED. Before any building permit is issued for the site, the owner shall complete all the infrastructure and improvements required by the Scottsdale Revised Code and these stipulations, in conformance with the Design Standards and Policies Manual and other applicable standards.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL

8. ARCHAEOLOGICAL. Any development on the property is subject to the requirements of Scottsdale Revised Code, Chapter 46, Article VI, Protection of Archaeological Resources, Section 46-134 - Discoveries of archaeological resources during construction.

This drawing is an instrument of service and the property of Floor Associates and shall remain their property. The use of this drawing shall be restricted to the original site for which it was prepared and publication thereof is expressly limited to such use. Reuse, reproduction or publication in whole or in part, is prohibited without written consent.



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE




SITE DATA

PROJECT NAME	ASHLER HILLS PARK
PROJECT ADDRESS	Ashler Hills Dr. & N. 74th Way
PARCEL #	216-51-098
SUBDIVISION	SEVANO VILLAGE MOD
S/T/R	14 SN 4E
LAT/LONG	33.7799, -111.9209
QS#	56-45
PARCEL ZONING	R-5 ESL
ADJACENT ZONING	N: R1-5 / E: R1-70 / S: R1-130 / W: C-2, R1-43
GROSS LOT AREA	653,228 SF 15.00 Acres
NET LOT AREA	391,231 SF 8.98 Acres
GROSS FLOOR AREA	960 SF (Restrooms / Maintenance)
VEHICULAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS	lot size / type: 15 acres / park required stalls: 45 (3 spaces per 1 acre) proposed stalls: 70
ACCESSIBLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS	required stalls: 3 (4% of 45 total req'd. stalls) proposed stalls: 3
BIKE PARKING REQUIREMENTS	required spaces: 5 (1 per every 10 req'd. parking stalls) proposed spaces: 24
FIRE LANE REQUIREMENTS	required radius for R2: 49' for commercial and multi-family residential uses proposed radius: 52' diameter required fire lane width: minimum width 24'-0" proposed: 24'-0" - 28'-0"

NAOS DATA

NATURAL AREA OPEN SPACE (NAOS)	landform category: lower desert
	site slopes:
	0-2%: 33,415 SF x 0.2 = 6,683 SF of req'd. naos
	2-5%: 189,925 SF x 0.25 = 47,481 SF of req'd. naos
	5-10%: 265,874 SF x 0.3 = 79,762 SF of req'd. naos
	10-15%: 75,970 SF x 0.3 = 22,791 SF of req'd. naos
	15-25%: 33,303 SF x 0.3 = 9,991 SF of req'd. naos
	25%+: 54,721 SF x 0.3 = 16,416 SF of req'd. naos
	total required naos: 183,124 SF
	total provided naos: 183,612 SF

Staff Date
7/20/22



Resolution No. 12560
Exhibit A to Exhibit 2
Page 1 of 2



OWNER
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
CONTACT: BRAD WALLDORF, PE
PHONE: 480.312.7790

CONSULTANTS
CONSULTANT'S FIRM
CONSULTANT
ADDRESS 1



ASHLER HILLS PARK
ASHLER HILLS DRIVE & NORTH 74TH WAY
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

PROJECT NO.	20027
DRAWN BY	FA TEAM
CHECKED BY	CB

SUBMITTAL	
NO.	DATE
1	11.05.21
MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN	
2	04.08.22
MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN	



ISSUED FOR
MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN
PARTIAL SITE PLAN

MP-05


SHEET 01 OF 02

PROJECT #: 1960 PA#: 2020 KEY CODE: 22N63

This drawing is an instrument of service and the property of Floor Associates and shall remain their property. The use of this drawing shall be restricted to the original site for which it was prepared and publication thereof is expressly limited to such use. Reuse, reproduction or publication by any method, in whole or in part, is prohibited without written consent.



VICINITY MAP
NOT TO SCALE



SITE DATA

PROJECT NAME: ASHLER HILLS PARK
 PROJECT ADDRESS: Ashler Hills Dr. & N. 74th Way
 PARCEL #: 216-51-098
 SUBDIVISION: SEVANO VILLAGE MOD
 S/T/R: 14 SN 4E
 LAT/LONG: 33.7799, -111.9209
 QS#: 56-45
 PARCEL ZONING: R-5 ESL
 ADJACENT ZONING: N: R1-5 / E: R1-70 / S: R1-130 / W: C-2, R1-43
 GROSS LOT AREA: 653,228 SF | 15.00 Acres
 NET LOT AREA: 391,231 SF | 8.98 Acres
 GROSS FLOOR AREA: 960 SF (Restrooms / Maintenance)

VEHICULAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS: lot size / type: 15 acres / park
 required stalls: 45 (3 spaces per 1 acre)
 proposed stalls: 70

ACCESSIBLE PARKING REQUIREMENTS: required stalls: 3 (4% of 45 total req'd. stalls)
 proposed stalls: 3


BIKE PARKING REQUIREMENTS: required spaces: 5 (1 per every 10 req'd. parking stalls)
 proposed spaces: 24

FIRE LANE REQUIREMENTS: required radius for R2: 49' for commercial and multi-family residential uses
 proposed radius: 52' diameter
 required fire lane width: minimum width 24'-0"
 proposed: 24'-0" - 28'-0"

NAOS DATA

NATURAL AREA OPEN SPACE (NAOS) landform category: lower desert
 site slopes:
 0-2%: 33,415 SF x 0.2 = 6,683 SF of req'd. naos
 2-5%: 189,925 SF x 0.25 = 47,481 SF of req'd. naos
 5-10%: 265,874 SF x 0.3 = 79,762 SF of req'd. naos
 10-15%: 75,970 SF x 0.3 = 22,791 SF of req'd. naos
 15-25%: 33,303 SF x 0.3 = 9,991 SF of req'd. naos
 25%+: 54,721 SF x 0.3 = 16,416 SF of req'd. naos
 total required naos: 183,124 SF
 total provided naos: 183,612 SF

Staff Date
7/20/22



Resolution No. 12560
Exhibit A to Exhibit 2
Page 2 of 2

FLOOR associates
 1425 N. First Street
 Second Floor
 Phoenix, AZ 85004
 602.462.1425 P
 602.462.1427 F

OWNER
 CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
 CONTACT: BRAD WALLDORF, PE
 PHONE: 480.312.7790

CONSULTANTS
 CONSULTANT'S FIRM
 CONSULTANT
 ADDRESS 1

CERTIFICATION



ASHLER HILLS PARK
 ASHLER HILLS DRIVE & NORTH 74TH WAY
 SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA

PROJECT NO.	20027
DRAWN BY	FA TEAM
CHECKED BY	CB


SUBMITTAL	
NO. DATE	ISSUED FOR
11.05.21	MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN
04.08.22	MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN

ISSUED FOR
MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN
 PARTIAL SITE PLAN

MP-06


SHEET 02 OF 02

PROJECT #: 1940 PA: 2020 KEY CODE: 22N43



General Plan

18-UP-2021



Zoning Aerial

18-UP-2021

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The access will be located at the roundabout at 74th Way and Ashler Hills Drive. During the construction of the Project, the existing roundabout/traffic circle will be removed. In addition, an eastbound left turn lane will be added and the existing bike lane will be extended to the proposed entrance. The design of the site driveway and side walk across the driveway should be designed Per the City of Scottsdale *Standard Detail Drawings*, revised in 2020 based on the following details: COS Driveway Type CL-1, DSPM 5-3.200, and DSPM Sec. 5-3.205. The City's details are also provided in **Attachment C**. The site will provide approximately 70 parking spaces to accommodate the park.

The park will consist of approximately 8 pickleball courts, 1 basketball court, and a general park area. CivTech estimated the acreages of the general park area to be approximately 6.8-acres. CivTech is aware that only a portion of the 6.8-acres will be utilized as a general park; but to be conservative, it was assumed that the general will be the entire 6.8-acres.

This TIS is part of Floor Associates' application to the City requesting a rezoning of the project site. The purpose of this statement is to document the expected number of daily and peak hour trips generated by the site and analyze the adjacent signalized intersection.

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS

Scottsdale Road is a north-south minor arterial roadway classified by the City of Scottsdale's *Functional Classification Map*. The roadway is a four (4) lane divided roadway with two (2) travel lanes and a bike lane in each direction and a center 29-foot raised median. Scottsdale Road begins to the north at Carefree Highway extending south to transition into Drinkwater Boulevard just south of Camelback Road. The posted speed limit is 50 miles per hour (mph) within the vicinity of the site.

Ashler Hills Drive is an east-west non-classified roadway. The roadway is mainly a two (2) lane roadway with one (1) lane in each travel direction. Between Scottsdale Road and the roundabout to the east, Ashler Hills Drive provides one (1) eastbound lane, two (2) westbound lanes, a bike lane in each direction, and a center 13-foot raised median. Ashler Hills Drive begins to the west at 68th Street extending east to become 74th Way at the roundabout. The posted speed limit is 25 mph within vicinity of the site.

The intersection of **Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive** operates as a signalized intersection with protected-permitted left turn phasing in the northbound, eastbound, and westbound approaches and protected left turn phasing in the southbound approach. The northbound and southbound approaches are striped to consist of an exclusive left turn lane, two (2) through lanes, a bike lane, and an exclusive right turn lane. The eastbound approach is striped to consists of an exclusive left turn lane, a shared through/right-turn lane, and a bike lane. The westbound approach is striped to consists of an exclusive left turn lane, one (1) through lane, a bike lane, and an exclusive right turn lane. A designated pedestrian crosswalk is provided at each leg of the intersection.

CivTech engaged Field Data Services of Arizona, Inc. on Wednesday, April 14, 2021 peak hour volume turning movement counts were performed from 7:00-9:00 AM and 4:00-6:00 PM and Saturday, April 17, 2021 peak hour volume turning movement counts were performed from 7:00-9:00 AM and 11:00 AM-1:00 PM at Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive for this project. CivTech also engaged in All


Traffic Data for 24-hour approach counts on Ashler Hills Drive between 73rd Street and the roundabout on Thursday, March 17, 2022.

CivTech took historical daily traffic volumes from the City of Scottsdale website Daily Traffic Volume Map to estimate an average annual growth rate. Average daily traffic volumes on Scottsdale Road between Ashler Hills Drive and Dove Valley Road were considered. The location experienced an average annual increase of 0.7% per year from 2016 to 2018. To be conservative a 1% annual growth rate (1.010 annual expansion factor for the 2022 year) was applied to the 2021 turning movement counts at the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive to obtain 2022 existing traffic volumes. CivTech utilized the 2022 24-hour counts to obtain the AM and PM peak hour through volumes at 74th Way and Existing Driveway located just east of the roundabout. By doing so, the volumes separate the commercial trips from the residential trips traveling along 74th Way.

Saturday peak hour counts at 74th Way and Existing Driveway were not conducted. To obtain the Saturday volumes at 74th Way and Existing Driveway, CivTech compared the PM with Saturday peak hour ins/outs traffic volumes at the east leg of the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive. The results indicate that the eastbound approach (heading northbound on 74th Way) calculated a factor of 1.40 and the westbound (heading southbound on 74th Way) calculated a factor of 0.97 when comparing the PM and Saturday peak hour ins/outs at the east leg of the Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive. Therefore, the factor was applied to the existing PM peak hour at 74th Way and Existing Driveway to obtain the Saturday peak hour volumes along 74th Way.

The existing traffic volumes observed for this study intersections are presented in **Figure 2** for the typical weekday AM, PM, and Saturday peak hours. Traffic volume counts are provided in **Attachment D**.

Figure 2 – Existing Peak Hour Traffic Volumes



TRIP GENERATION

The potential trip generation for the proposed development was estimated utilizing the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition* and *Trip Generation Handbook, 3^d Edition*. The ITE *Trip Generation Manual* contains data collected by various transportation professionals for a wide range of different land uses. The data are summarized in the report and average rates and equations have been established that correlate the relationship between an independent variable that describes the development size and generated trips for each categorized land use. The report provides information for daily and peak hour trips.

ITE *Trip Generation Manual* does not provide trip generation rates for the specific land uses like pickleball court and basketball court. Since a pickleball court highly similar to a tennis court in terms of number of players, it was assumed that the pickleball courts will utilize the tennis court for PM Peak hour trip generation rates. For the AM peak hour, CivTech conducted a survey from 7:00 AM – 9:00 AM of vehicle counts utilizing the basketball court and pickleball courts during on Monday, March 21, 2022 at the Thompson Peak Park located on west of Hayden Road south of Thompson Peak Parkway in Scottsdale, Arizona. The park consists of 3 pickleball courts next to 1 basketball court. Based on the observations there were zero basketball users; at approximately 7:45 AM, the basketball court was converted into three additional pickleball courts. Therefore, the rates derived were based on 6 pickleball courts being counted on the field. The highest peak hour based on the observations were between 8:00 – 9:00 AM. The observation verifies that a total of 35 trips were made during the AM peak hour with 28 inbound trips and 7 outbound trips. With 35 total trips and 6 pickleball courts, results in an AM peak hour rate of 5.83. It should be noted that not all the players were playing at the same time. There were some people that stood by and waited for their turn to play. Thus, this concluded that the 5.83 would be maximum rate for the pickleball court. To be conservative, the Saturday peak hour for the pickleball courts is assumed to be the same as the AM peak hour.

CivTech prepared the recently approved Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) for the Legacy Sports Family Entertainment Park in Mesa, Arizona. The park utilized the tennis court trip generation rates to derive trip generation rates for the basketball court. The ratio between the maximum number of players for a basketball game and for a tennis game is 10 to 4. Therefore, a multiple of 2.5(= $\frac{10}{4}$) were applied to the tennis court to estimate the basketball court land use for total daily, AM, PM, and Saturday peak hour. Based on the field data stated above, there were zero trips observed for the basketball court. Therefore, the basketball court AM peak hour rate will remain zero.

The anticipated trip generation is summarized in **Table 1**. Detailed trip generation calculations along with the field data observations are provided in **Attachment E**.

Table 1 – Trip Generation

Land Use	ITE Code	ITE Land Use Name	Quantity Units*		AM Distribution		PM Distribution		SAT Distribution					
					In	Out	In	Out	In	Out				
Park	411	Public Park	6.80	Acres	59%	41%	55%	45%	55%	45%				
Pickleball Courts	490	Tennis Courts	8	Courts	80%	20%	50%	50%	80%	20%				
Basketball Court	490	Tennis Courts	1	Courts	-	-	50%	50%	50%	50%				
ADT and Peak Hour Trips														
Land Use	ADT		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Sat Peak Hour					
	Rates	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total	Rate	In	Out	Total
Park	13.65	92	0.02	0	0	0	0.11	1	0	1	0.28	1	1	2
Pickleball Courts	30.32	242	5.83	38	9	47	4.21	17	17	34	5.83	38	9	47
Basketball Court	75.80	76	-	0	0	0	10.53	6	5	11	6.63	4	3	7
Total		410		0	0	0		24	22	46		43	13	56

The proposed development is anticipated to generate 410 weekday daily trips, 47 trips during the typical weekday AM peak hour, 46 trips during the typical weekday PM peak hour, and 56 trips during the Saturday peak hour.

TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT


A single trip distribution pattern was used in order to develop site generated traffic for the new proposed park. The trip distribution assumptions were made based on the surrounding residential area. It was assumed that the park will attract majority of the trips from north and south of Scottsdale Road and a small percentage will be on Ashler Hills Drive and 74th Way. The trip distribution percentages used for this analysis are shown in **Table 4**.

Table 2 – Trip Distribution Percentages

Roadway	Directions (to/from)	Distribution Percentages
Scottsdale Road	North	55%
Scottsdale Road	South	40%
Ashler Hills Drive	West	3%
74 th Way	North	2%
Total		100%

Figure 3 illustrates the trip distribution percentages shown in **Table 2** along the roadway network within the study area. The percentages presented in **Table 2** were applied to the site trips generated to determine the weekday AM, PM, and Saturday peak hour site traffic at the intersections within the study area. **Figure 3** illustrates the resulting site generated traffic for the proposed development.


Figure 3 – Site Generated Traffic Volumes



2022 SURROUNDING DEVELOPMENT TRAFFIC VOLUMES

East of the site is an undeveloped vacant land. The parcel is proposed to be 101 townhomes in the future with two (2) accesses, one (1) at the existing driveway and one (1) driveway on 74th Way. To be conservative, CivTech considered the east development to be open by the time the Park is open and generated trips using the ITE 11th Edition trip generation rates for LUC 215. For the Saturday peak hour assumptions, CivTech applied the ITE’s Saturday peak hour of generator rates. The resulting trip generation indicated that the east development is anticipated to generate 720 weekday daily trips, with 47 trips (15 in/32 out) during the AM peak hour, 57 trips (32 in/25 out) during the PM peak hour, and 58 trips (28 in/30 out) during the Saturday peak hour. A single trip distribution pattern was provided for the development. Based on the Google Earth Pro aerial, there are multiple commercial developments are to the north of Ashler Hills Drive. Therefore, it was assumed that 63% of the trip distribution will be on Scottsdale Road north of Ashler Hills Drive. With the Loop 101 Freeway located approximately 8.41 miles to the south, a 35% trip distribution was assumed to be on Scottsdale Road south of Ashler Hills Drive to represent vehicles traveling long distances to/from work. The remaining 2% was assumed to be on Ashler Hills Drive west of Scottsdale Road to consider the cut through traffic that are heading to/from the schools located to the northwest. **Figure 4** illustrates the resulting site generated traffic for the east development at the study intersections. Trip generation calculations for the east development is provided in **Attachment F**.


Figure 4 – East Development Site Generated Traffic Volumes



2022 TOTAL TRAFFIC VOLUMES

2022 total traffic volumes at the site access and the main intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive were determined by adding the proposed site generated traffic volumes and east development site generated traffic volumes to the existing traffic counts. **Figure 5** illustrates the resulting 2022 total traffic at the study intersections. Based on the highest peak hour generating less than 50 trips during the AM peak hour and only 56 trips estimated for the Saturday peak hour it was assumed that 70 parking spaces would be sufficient for the park.

Figure 5 – 2022 Total Traffic Volumes



TRAFFIC IMPROVEMENT AND ANALYSIS

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The concept of level of service (LOS) uses qualitative measures that characterize operational conditions within the traffic stream. The individual levels of service are described by factors that include speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, and comfort and convenience. Six (6) levels of service are defined for each type of facility for which analysis procedures are available. They are given letter designations A through F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Each level of service represents a range of operating conditions. Levels of service for intersections are defined within ranges of average control delay per vehicle, the number of seconds a vehicle can expect to wait due to the presence of a traffic control device. **Table 3** lists the level of service criteria for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

Table 3 – Intersection Level of Service Criteria

Level of Service	Control Delay (sec/veh)	
	Signalized	Unsignalized
A	≤ 10	≤ 10
B	> 10-20	> 10-15
C	> 20-35	> 15-25
D	> 35-55	> 25-35
E	> 55-80	> 35-50
F*	> 80 (or v/c>1)	> 50 (or v/c>1)

*Source: Exhibits 19-8, 20-2, 21-8, and 22-8,
 Highway Capacity Manual 2016*

Synchro 11 software using the methodologies of the latest (6th) edition of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM 2016) will be used to calculate average per-vehicle control delays, from which movement, approach, and overall intersection levels of service are determined. Signal timing at the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive were provided by the City of Scottsdale Engineer. The capacity analysis for the AM and PM peak hours at the site access, for existing, background (existing + east development), and total (background + site) are summarized in **Table 4**. The Synchro analysis worksheets are included as **Attachment G**.

Table 4 – 2021 Levels of Service and Delays

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	Approach/ Movement	Without Ocotillo Crossing Apartments					
				2022 Existing AM(PM)[SAT]		2022 No Build AM(PM)[SAT]		2022 Build AM(PM)[SAT]	
				Delays (s)	LOS	Delays (s)	LOS	Delays (s)	LOS
1	Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.	Signal	NB	8.6 (11.7) [12.1]	A (B) [B]	9.5 (17.5) [17.4]	A (B) [B]	10.1 (17.8) [17.7]	B (B) [B]
			SB	10.4 (11.2) [12.0]	B (B) [B]	10.9 (15.9) [16.5]	B (B) [B]	10.8 (15.9) [16.5]	B (B) [B]
			EB	51.1 (49.5) [50.5]	D (D) [D]	53.8 (51.3) [52.1]	D (D) [D]	53.9 (51.3) [52.1]	D (D) [D]
			WB	44.5 (89.3) [81.6]	D (F) [F]	47.2 (45.1) [44.7]	D (D) [D]	47.4 (46.1) [45.5]	D (D) [D]
			Overall	14.0 (22.7) [21.3]	B (C) [C]	15.3 (21.6) [21.4]	B (C) [C]	15.6 (22.0) [21.7]	B (C) [C]
A	Ashler Hills Dr./74 th Way & Access A	1-way stop (SB)	SB Shared	- (-) [-] ⁽¹⁾	- (-) [-] ⁽¹⁾	0.0 (0.0) [0.0]	A (A) [A]	8.6 (8.6) [8.6]	A (A) [A]
			EB Left	- (-) [-] ⁽¹⁾	- (-) [-] ⁽¹⁾	0.0 (0.0) [0.0]	A (A) [A]	7.4 (7.4) [7.4]	A (A) [A]

(1) In the existing conditions, the roundabout is a 2-legged intersection. Synchro HCM does not analyze 2-legged intersection. Since there are no conflicting movements, this intersection was assumed to operate acceptably during the existing condition.

The results of capacity analysis of the study intersection summarized in **Table 4** shows that the proposed site access and the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive is predicted to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better) with the exception of the westbound

approach in during PM and Saturday peak hour during the existing conditions. However, the overall level of service for the intersection is operating at an acceptable level of service of C or better. The delays with the added park traffic in the westbound direction were increased one second or less for the AM, PM and Saturday peak hours. The overall increase in delay for the intersection were 0.4 sec or less for AM, PM and Saturday peak hours.

The basic signal timing plan was utilized for all peak hour analyses. However, based on the City’s signal timing sheet, the eastbound through and westbound through lanes maximum split provided was less than the minimum split. The City’s Engineer asked CivTech to keep the signal timing consistent to the spreadsheet provided for the existing analysis only. For the No Build and Build conditions, CivTech mitigated the signal timing at the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive to provide 120 seconds of cycle length and adjusted the green time to provide acceptable levels of service at all approaches.

With the mitigation of the signal timing, the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills Drive is expected to operate acceptably.

QUEUE STORAGE ANALYSIS

Adequate turn storage should be supplied on any approach where turn lanes are permitted and/or warranted. A queuing analysis was prepared according to the methodology documented in *AASHTO’s A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*. The storage length for a turn lane is typically estimated as the length required to hold the average number of arriving vehicles per two minutes, where unsignalized. The equations used for the calculations are shown below, and the resulting turn lane storage requirements for the study intersection:

For unsignalized intersections, the storage length for a left turn lane is determined by the following equation:

$$\text{Storage Length} = \left\{ \frac{\ln[P(n>N)]}{\ln \frac{v}{c}} - 1 \right\} \times 25 \text{ feet}$$

as defined in *AASHTO’s A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets Equations 9-3 and 9-4*. Queue storage queue calculations worksheet is provided in **Attachment H**.

Table 5 – Queue Storage Lengths

ID	Intersection	Intersection Control	Movement	Queue Storage			
				Existing ⁽¹⁾	AASHTO	HCM ⁽²⁾	Recommended
2/A	Ashler Hills Dr./74 th Way & Access A	1-way stop (SB)	EB Left	TWLTL	25’	25’	93’

The results of the queue storage calculations indicate a queue storage of 25-feet for the eastbound left into the site. Based on Google Earth, there are approximately 230-feet of storage that can be queue back to the raised median on the west of the driveway. Per the site plan, a queue storage length of 93-feet was proposed for the eastbound left turn lane.

SIGHT DISTANCE ANALYSIS

Adequate sight distance must be provided at intersections and site access driveways to allow safe turning movements. There must be sufficient unobstructed sight distance along both approaches of a street/driveway intersection and across their included corners to allow operators of vehicles to see each other in time to prevent a collision. Along a tangent segment of roadway, the area that is to be unobstructed is a right triangle. The position of the driver about to exit the driveway is one (often called the origin) point of the triangle.

Sight distance measurement for this Project is based on City of Scottsdale methodology in accordance to Section 5-3C, Intersection & Driveway Sight Distance Requirements which adhere to AASHTO’s calculation of sight distance. The City of Scottsdale set the point of the driver position at 5-feet to the right from the center of the driveway, 3.5 feet above the pavement, and a setback of 15-feet from the inner edge of curb. 74th Way/Ashler Hills Drive is a non-classified road with a posted speed limit of 25 mph; therefore, the assumed design speed is 5 mph over the posted speed limit. The City of Scottsdale and AASHTO’s calculation resulted in the same sight distance measurements. Sight distance calculations according to the City of Scottsdale guidelines are summarized in **Table 6**.

Table 6 – City of Scottsdale Sight Distance Requirements

Driveway	Posted Speed Limit/ Design Speed (mph)	Sight Distance Along Roadway	
		Through Lane	Left Turn Lane
Access A	25/30	290’	335’

Sight distance availability for traffic turning onto 74th Way/Ashler Hills Drive from the proposed site driveway (the north leg of the roundabout) was measured on Google Earth Pro and is provided in **Exhibit A**.

The City of Scottsdale criteria also states, “Sight lines are to be drawn on roadway and landscaping plans to represent the areas that must be free of all objects and topography in excess of 18 inches above the roadway surface, however, certain vegetation will be allowed. Vegetation placed within the sight triangle will be a low variety that remains below 18 inches when mature. Trees can be considered within the triangles as long the canopies are above 8 feet, they are a single trunk variety, and they are not spaced in a configuration that creates a “picket fence” effect.”

Sight visibility should be provided at all driveways according to the distances shown in **Table 5** and that sight triangles at public intersections are maintained according to Section 5-3 of the City of Scottsdale’s Code. All vegetation and trees should be maintained according to the City of Scottsdale’s regulations. Sight distance worksheets and Section 5-3 of the City of Scottsdale’s Code have been along with AASHTO’s sight distance calculations are included within **Attachment H**.

CONCLUSIONS

From the above, the following can be concluded:

- The proposed park consists of pickleball courts, a basketball court, picnic ramadas, and trails with 70 parking spaces located at Ashler Hills Drive at 74th Drive in the City of Scottsdale, Arizona.

- The proposed development is anticipated to generate 410 weekday daily trips, 47 trips during the typical weekday AM peak hour, 46 trips during the typical weekday PM peak hour, and 56 trips during the Saturday peak hour.
- The 24-hour bi-directional counts conducted along Ashler Hills Drive determined that there are approximately 521 total daily trips (269 eastbound approach and 252 westbound approach). The site generated weekday daily total will add only 410 trips and the east development site generated weekday daily total is projected to add 720 trips onto Ashler Hills Drive projecting the average daily to 1,643 total daily trips.
- Based on the highest peak hour generating less than 50 trips during the AM peak hour and only 56 trips estimated for the Saturday peak hour it was assumed that 70 parking spaces would be sufficient for the park.
- The results of the queue storage calculations indicate a queue storage of 25-feet for the eastbound left into the site. Based on Google Earth, there are approximately 230-feet of storage that can be queue back to the raised median on the west of the driveway. Per the site plan, a queue storage length of 93-feet was proposed for the eastbound left turn lane.

Thank you for allowing CivTech to assist you on this project. Please contact me with any questions you may have on this Traffic Statement.

Sincerely,

CivTech



David S. Duffy, P.E.
Senior Traffic Engineer

Attachments (9)

- A. City's Comments and Responses
- B. Site Plan
- C. COS Standard Detail Drawings
- D. Traffic Counts
- E. Trip Generation Calculations
- F. East Development Trip Generation Calculations
- G. Synchro Analyses
- H. Queue Storage Calculations
- I. Sight Distance Calculations and City's Requirements

Exhibit A – Sight Distance Photos

1st Submittal

Disposition Codes: (1) Will Comply (2) Will Evaluate (3) Delete Comment (4) Defer to Consultant/Owner

Reviewer Name, Agency: **Phil Kercher & Parker Murphy, City of Scottsdale**

Item	Review Comment	(Code) & Response
1.	Transportation - The site driveway should be designed in conformance with COS Driveway Type CL-1, COS Standard Detail #2256. The sidewalk across the driveway should be modified to conform to the driveway detail, not be separated so far from the curb line. DSPM 5-3.200; DSPM Sec. 5-3.205; COS Standard Detail Drawings - 2020 revision.	(1) Will comply. The design standard details is included as part of the attachments.
2.	Transportation - What speed limit is the sight visibility triangle based upon?	Sight distance triangle is 5 mph over the posted speed limit (30 mph).
3.	Transportation - Staff suggests moving the site driveway west of the traffic circle to improve sight triangle, or at circle but remove center island. Conceptual plan sent to CPM.	(1) The proposed driveway is now proposed to be at the roundabout.
4.	Traffic Study - Page 1 - Correct title to "74th Way" and remove references to 74th drive throughout the report.	(!) Will comply.
5.	Traffic Study - Page 2 - Remove or modify the statement that "there was a previously approved planned for this location with the location of the driveway on 74th Avenue instead of..." This site is on 74th Way. Staff was not aware of any previously approved plans.	(1) Will comply.
6.	Traffic Study - Page 2 - Remove or modify the statement this is not a traffic analysis. The study contains level of service analyses and is a traffic analysis, not just a trip generation statement.	(1) Will comply.
7.	Traffic Study - Page 4 - The trip generation estimates need to include AM peak hour trips for the pickleball courts and basketball courts. If necessary the consultant should do some count at existing City facilities.	(1) CivTech personnel conducted a field study and collected AM peak hour counts for the pickleball and basketball court at the Thompson Peak Park located west of Hayden Road and south of Thompson Peak Parkway.



1st Submittal



Disposition Codes: (1) Will Comply (2) Will Evaluate (3) Delete Comment (4) Defer to Consultant/Owner

Reviewer Name, Agency: **Phil Kercher & Parker Murphy, City of Scottsdale**

Item	Review Comment	(Code) & Response
8.	Traffic Study - Provide a trip generation estimate for the undeveloped property just east of the park site using the existing zoning and include these trips in the traffic analysis.	(1) CivTech reached out to Murphy Parker, the City Engineer and received information for the east development. The City does not have a site plan that informed that the development will be townhomes under LUC 215 in the ITE's Trip Generation 11th Edition with 101 DUs.
9.	Traffic Study - The study should comment on the proposed driveway location and necessary sight distance. The study should provide comment on the proposed location at the traffic circle.	(1) CivTech provided a section of the sight distance calculations as well as an exhibit with the sight distance measurements at the roundabout.
10.	Traffic Study - Study should collect traffic data east of the commercial driveways.	(1) new 24-hour bidirectional counts were conducted just east of 73rd St. and is provided as part of the attachments.
11.	Traffic Study - General, no changes required. ITE Trip Generation 11th Edition should be used be used for future submittals.	(1) analysis has been updated to ITE's Trip Generation, 11th Edition.
12.	Traffic Study - Ensure Synchro analysis utilizes existing signal timing as provided. Please resubmit the revise application requirements and additional information identified in Attachment A. Resubmittal Checklist, and a written summary response addressing the comments/corrections identified above as soon as possible for future review.	(1) CivTech utilized latest signal timing provided by the City. CivTech reached out to the City's Engineer and confirmed that the "Basic Timing Plan" can be used by it must match the timing sheet in the existing condition analysis even if the green time are less than the minimum time for the eastbound and westbound through movements. The City Engineer suggests that mitigation of the green time should happen in the "no-build" and "build" analysis.





REVISED 6/25/19



GENERAL NOTES

1. SIDEWALK SHALL CONFORM TO MAG STANDARD DETAIL 230 AND COS SECTION 340.
2. CURB AS CALLED FOR ON PLANS.
3. CURB & GUTTER SHALL CONFORM TO MAG STANDARD DETAIL 220. SINGLE CURB SHALL CONFORM TO MAG STANDARD DETAIL 222.
4. DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES SHALL CONFORM TO COS STANDARD DETAIL 2251 EXCEPT FOR MODIFICATIONS AS NOTED. DRIVEWAYS SHALL BE 3" AC A-1/2" ON 6" ABC UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED. SEE PLANS FOR DRIVEWAY LIMITS.
5. CURB TERMINATION PER MAG STD DET 222.
6. WHEN INSTALLING NEW DRIVEWAYS ALONG AN EXISTING STREET, SAWCUT, REMOVE, & REPLACE A MINIMUM 2' WIDE STRIP OF AC PAVEMENT PER COS STANDARD DETAIL 2200.



DETAIL NO.
2256

**City of Scottsdale
 Standard Details**

APPROVED BY:
**Scottsdale Standards &
 Specifications Committee**

COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL LOW VOLUME DRIVEWAY

DETAIL NO.
2256




FIGURE 5-3.34 ROUNDABOUT SIGHT DISTANCE

STREET ACCESS AND DRIVEWAYS

5-3.2000

Driveway types are determined by land use type and street classification. The standards for these driveway types are illustrated in Figure 5-3.38 through Figure 5-3.43. Refer to Figure 5-3.39 for driveway grade standards.

DRIVEWAY SPACING

5-3.201

Standard and minimum driveway spacing will generally conform to the following standards. This minimum spacing applies to proposed site driveway separation as well

as separation from existing or planned driveways and streets on adjacent parcels. The spacing is measured to the driveway or street centerline.

STREET TYPE	STANDARD DRIVEWAY SPACING	MINIMUM DRIVEWAY SPACING
Local Residential / Local Collector	50 feet	50 feet
Local Industrial / Local Commercial	165 feet	125 feet
Minor Collector	165 feet	125 feet
Major Collector	250 feet	150 feet
Minor Arterial	330 feet	250 feet
Major Arterial	500 feet	300 feet

FIGURE 5-3.35 DRIVEWAY SPACING

Standard driveway spacing criteria shall apply for all new driveways where there are no conflicts with existing driveway and street intersections, site frontage is adequate, and there are no conflicts with natural features or drainage structures. The minimum driveway spacing may be allowed when approved by Transportation staff where those conflicts noted above exist or other site plan associated issues do not allow the standard driveway spacing to be implemented. In locations where the standard driveway spacing cannot be achieved, a deceleration lane may be required to mitigate the impact of the closer driveway spacing.

For sites that have frontage on two streets, primary access should be onto the minor street frontage. A maximum of two driveway openings is permitted to a site or parcel from the abutting street(s). The Transportation Department may permit additional driveway entrances when projected travel demands indicate it is in the interests of good traffic operation, and when adequate street frontage exists to maintain the above guidelines.

Where new development adjoins other similarly zoned property or compatible land uses, a cross access easement may be required to permit vehicular movement between the parcels or to reduce the number of access points required onto the adjacent public street. Combining driveways reduces the number of conflict points for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other vehicles. This may be required regardless of the development status of the adjoining property, unless the cross access is determined to be unfeasible by city staff.

New driveways on collector and arterial streets in areas that do not have raised medians shall align with existing or planned driveways and street intersections to avoid creating interlocking left turns and other conflicts. Offsets in the driveway centerlines may be allowed up to 6 feet. If the driveways cannot be aligned, the driveways should be offset a minimum distance of 125 feet along streets without a center turn lane, and a minimum 250 feet along streets with a center turn lane.

When site driveway locations are modified, any existing driveways that are not going to be utilized for access must be removed and replaced with curb, gutter, and sidewalk to match the adjacent improvements.

DRIVEWAY LOCATIONS

5-3.202

A new access driveway will not be allowed (measured to the driveway centerline):

- A. Within 30 feet of any commercial property line, except when it is a joint-use driveway serving two abutting commercial properties and access agreements have been exchanged between, and recorded by, the two abutting property owners;
- B. When the total width of all driveways serving a property exceeds 50 percent of the curb line frontage;
- C. Within 50 feet of the rights-of-way line of an intersecting non-arterial street;
- D. Within 100 feet of the rights-of-way line of an intersecting arterial street;
- E. Within 100 feet of an approved median opening location on an arterial street;
- F. Less than the minimum spacing as established under Section 5-3.201;

VEHICULAR NON-ACCESS EASEMENT

5-3.203

For proper control of driveway access, a vehicular non-access easement (V.N.E.) is to be granted to the city, except at approved access points, along all collector and arterial streets when abutting property develops.

RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAYS

5-3.204

A. **Single-family Residential Development**

Driveways serving single-family residential units should be S-1 type driveways as shown in Figure 5-3.40. Only one driveway per lot street frontage is allowed except where the street frontage is of sufficient length to maintain a separation of 50 feet between driveways. The minimum driveway length is 18 feet, measured from the face of the garage opening to the back of sidewalk or the back of curb if no sidewalk is provided. Refer to Section 2-2.308 for additional discussion on driveways. Refer to Standard Detail Drawings (2200 Series) for access ramp design requirements.

B. **Multi-family Residential Development**

Driveways serving multi-family residential units should be CL and CH type driveways, as shown in Figure 5-3.41 through Figure 5-3.44. Type CL-1 and CL-2 are low-volume driveways to be used on local streets. Type CH-1, -2 and -3 are high volume driveways to be used on collector and arterial streets. CL type driveways may be required along urban character collector and arterial streets with higher pedestrian traffic. The minimum driveway length is 50 feet, measured from the entrance to the off-street parking area to the back of sidewalk, or to the back of curb if no sidewalk is provided. Refer to Standard Detail Drawings (2200 Series) for access ramp design requirements.

C. **Limitations on Residential Access**

Residential properties that have frontage on a local street, an arterial, or collector street are limited to local street access.

In some instances, residential parcels fronting only on arterial or collector streets may be given access if alternate public access is not available. When such access is allowed, the driveway must be circular, or it must have a turn-around area to ensure there is no need for backing onto the street.

NON-RESIDENTIAL DRIVEWAYS

Driveways for commercial and industrial development are shown on Figure 5-3.41 through Figure 5-3.44. The minimum length for a commercial or industrial driveway is 50 feet, measured from the entrance to the off-street parking area to the back of sidewalk or the back of curb if no sidewalk is provided. Driveway designs need to include a level path of travel across the driveway for pedestrians in conformance with ADA requirements.

A. **Commercial Driveways**

The "CL" and "CH" type driveways are designed to serve commercial properties. A "CL" type driveway is used for low-volume driveways on low volume streets. A "CH" type driveway is used for driveways on arterials, major collectors and high volume minor collectors, or at other locations when required by the Transportation Department. The CH-2 and CH-3 driveways are used at all access driveways opposite median openings. CL type driveways may be required along urban character collector and arterial streets with higher pedestrian traffic. Refer to Standard Detail Drawings (2200 Series) for access ramp design requirements.

B. **Industrial Driveways**


The CL-1 and CH-1 type driveways are typically used to serve industrial properties. Normally industrial access is not permitted on arterial or major collector streets; however, if such access is allowed, commercial driveway standards apply. Refer to Standard Detail Drawings (2200 Series) for access ramp design requirements.

**Intersection Turning Movement
Prepared by:**



Project #: 21-1247-001

TMC SUMMARY OF Scottsdale Rd & Ashler Hills Dr



TOTAL	AM	MD	PM
53	35		18
14	6		8
140	104		36

AM	MD	PM	TOTAL
13		28	41
2		13	15
70		248	318

TOTAL	AM	MD	PM
132	93		39
1609	682		927
184	69		115

LOCATION #: 21-1247-001

TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT

Scottsdale Rd & Ashler Hills Dr
(Intersection Name)

WEDNESDAY 04/14/21
Day Date

COUNT PERIODS

AM	700AM	-	900AM
NOON		-	
PM	400PM	-	600PM

AM PEAK HOUR 745 AM

NOON PEAK HOUR _____

PM PEAK HOUR 400 PM

Intersection Turning Movement

Prepared by:



FIELD DATA SERVICES OF ARIZONA, INC.
520.316.6745



N-S STREET: Scottsdale Rd DATE: 04/14/21 LOCATION: Scottsdale
 E-W STREET: Ashler Hills Dr DAY: WEDNESDAY PROJECT#: 21-1247-001

LANES:	NORTHBOUND			SOUTHBOUND			EASTBOUND			WESTBOUND			TOTAL
	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	
	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	
6:00 AM													
6:15 AM													
6:30 AM													
6:45 AM													
7:00 AM	45	122	3	1	136	2	1	0	13	10	1	1	335
7:15 AM	18	144	5	1	145	2	4	0	25	5	0	1	350
7:30 AM	11	117	4	2	172	7	7	1	17	9	0	2	349
7:45 AM	45	180	13	0	176	12	14	1	30	5	0	1	477
8:00 AM	33	146	14	4	151	8	14	2	44	14	1	5	436
8:15 AM	10	170	22	1	156	6	4	0	22	19	1	2	413
8:30 AM	5	186	20	2	185	1	3	3	8	32	0	5	450
8:45 AM	4	210	23	4	193	1	2	4	10	20	0	5	476
9:00 AM													
9:15 AM													
9:30 AM													
9:45 AM													
10:00 AM													
10:15 AM													
10:30 AM													
10:45 AM													
11:00 AM													
11:15 AM													
11:30 AM													
11:45 AM													

TOTAL	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	TOTAL
Volumes	171	1275	104	15	1314	39	49	11	169	114	3	22	3286
Approach %	11.03	82.26	6.71	1.10	96.05	2.85	21.40	4.80	73.80	82.01	2.16	15.83	
App/Depart	1550	/	1346	1368	/	1597	229	/	130	139	/	213	

AM Peak Hr Begins at: 745 AM

PEAK

Volumes	93	682	69	7	668	27	35	6	104	70	2	13	1776
Approach %	11.02	80.81	8.18	1.00	95.16	3.85	24.14	4.14	71.72	82.35	2.35	15.29	

PEAK HR.

FACTOR:	0.887	0.934	0.604	0.574	0.931
---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

CONTROL: Signal

COMMENT 1:

GPS: 33.777534, -111.925847

Intersection Turning Movement



FIELD DATA SERVICES OF ARIZONA, INC.
520.316.6745



N-S STREET: **Scottsdale Rd** DATE: **04/14/21** LOCATION: **Scottsdale**
 E-W STREET: **Ashler Hills Dr** DAY: **WEDNESDAY** PROJECT# **21-1247-001**

LANES:	NORTHBOUND			SOUTHBOUND			EASTBOUND			WESTBOUND			TOTAL
	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	
	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	
1:00 PM													
1:15 PM													
1:30 PM													
1:45 PM													
2:00 PM													
2:15 PM													
2:30 PM													
2:45 PM													
3:00 PM													
3:15 PM													
3:30 PM													
3:45 PM													
4:00 PM	13	224	36	8	201	3	5	2	11	70	2	9	584
4:15 PM	8	225	31	5	170	1	3	3	10	63	4	12	535
4:30 PM	8	248	24	8	175	3	5	1	7	65	3	2	549
4:45 PM	10	230	24	0	159	3	5	2	8	50	4	5	500
5:00 PM	11	207	25	5	193	2	2	1	12	51	3	3	515
5:15 PM	10	214	33	5	155	4	6	3	10	44	3	5	492
5:30 PM	12	224	21	6	154	1	2	1	7	47	4	5	484
5:45 PM	7	223	19	2	137	3	2	0	6	54	1	8	462
6:00 PM													
6:15 PM													
6:30 PM													
6:45 PM													

TOTAL	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	TOTAL
Volumes	79	1795	213	39	1344	20	30	13	71	444	24	49	4121
Approach %	3.79	86.01	10.21	2.78	95.79	1.43	26.32	11.40	62.28	85.88	4.64	9.48	
App/Depart	2087	/	1874	1403	/	1859	114	/	265	517	/	123	

PM Peak Hr Begins at: 400 PM

PEAK

Volumes	39	927	115	21	705	10	18	8	36	248	13	28	2168
Approach %	3.61	85.75	10.64	2.85	95.79	1.36	29.03	12.90	58.06	85.81	4.50	9.69	

PEAK HR.

FACTOR:	0.965	0.868	0.861	0.892	0.928
---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------


CONTROL: **Signal**
 COMMENT 1: **0**
 GPS: **33.777534, -111.925847**

Intersection Turning Movement
Prepared by:



Project #: 21-1247-003

TMC SUMMARY OF Scottsdale Rd & Ashler Hills Dr



TOTAL	AM	MD	PM
24	11		13
16	8		8
71	25		46

AM	MD	PM	TOTAL
29		32	61
6		13	19
88		234	322

TOTAL	AM	MD	PM
97	41		56
1530	601		929
250	92		158

LOCATION #: 21-1247-003

TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT

Scottsdale Rd & Ashler Hills Dr
(Intersection Name)

SATURDAY
Day

04/17/21
Date

COUNT PERIODS

AM	700AM	-	900AM
NOON		-	
PM	1100AM	-	100PM

AM PEAK HOUR 800 AM

NOON PEAK HOUR _____

PM PEAK HOUR 1115 AM

Intersection Turning Movement

Prepared by:



FIELD DATA SERVICES OF ARIZONA, INC.
520.316.6745



N-S STREET: **Scottsdale Rd** DATE: **04/17/21** LOCATION: **Scottsdale**
 E-W STREET: **Ashler Hills Dr** DAY: **SATURDAY** PROJECT# **21-1247-003**

LANES:	NORTHBOUND			SOUTHBOUND			EASTBOUND			WESTBOUND			TOTAL
	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	
	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	
6:00 AM													
6:15 AM													
6:30 AM													
6:45 AM													
7:00 AM	0	78	7	0	64	1	1	0	3	3	0	0	157
7:15 AM	4	76	8	2	72	0	2	0	2	6	0	1	173
7:30 AM	4	100	14	4	85	1	3	0	9	6	0	3	229
7:45 AM	9	124	16	3	82	1	2	2	9	10	0	4	262
8:00 AM	9	154	26	3	129	1	1	4	1	17	0	7	352
8:15 AM	9	118	21	4	114	1	1	1	8	20	5	9	311
8:30 AM	8	152	19	2	128	0	5	0	5	25	1	10	355
8:45 AM	15	177	26	5	138	2	4	3	11	26	0	3	410
9:00 AM													
9:15 AM													
9:30 AM													
9:45 AM													
10:00 AM													
10:15 AM													
10:30 AM													
10:45 AM													
11:00 AM													
11:15 AM													
11:30 AM													
11:45 AM													

TOTAL	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	TOTAL
Volumes	58	979	137	23	812	7	19	10	48	113	6	37	2249
Approach %	4.94	83.39	11.67	2.73	96.44	0.83	24.68	12.99	62.34	72.44	3.85	23.72	
App/Depart	1174	/	1035	842	/	973	77	/	170	156	/	71	

AM Peak Hr Begins at: 800 AM

PEAK

Volumes	41	601	92	14	509	4	11	8	25	88	6	29	1428
Approach %	5.59	81.88	12.53	2.66	96.58	0.76	25.00	18.18	56.82	71.54	4.88	23.58	

PEAK HR.

FACTOR:	0.842	0.909	0.611	0.854	0.871
---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

CONTROL: **Signal**

COMMENT 1:

GPS: **33.777534, -111.925847**

Intersection Turning Movement



FIELD DATA SERVICES OF ARIZONA, INC.
520.316.6745



N-S STREET: Scottsdale Rd DATE: 04/17/21 LOCATION: Scottsdale
 E-W STREET: Ashler Hills Dr DAY: SATURDAY PROJECT#: 21-1247-003

LANES:	NORTHBOUND			SOUTHBOUND			EASTBOUND			WESTBOUND			TOTAL
	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	
	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	
10:00 AM													
10:15 AM													
10:30 AM													
10:45 AM													
11:00 AM	14	209	25	11	199	1	4	1	9	47	2	2	524
11:15 AM	13	216	39	13	198	5	2	3	14	69	2	6	580
11:30 AM	10	228	34	8	197	2	5	2	13	59	4	4	566
11:45 AM	16	256	44	10	190	1	1	3	11	57	3	10	602
12:00 PM	17	229	41	4	194	4	5	0	8	49	4	12	567
12:15 PM	13	213	38	10	200	0	4	3	5	63	0	8	557
12:30 PM	21	214	43	12	178	3	4	1	10	49	2	9	546
12:45 PM	11	247	30	7	189	5	4	3	6	62	7	10	581
1:00 PM													
1:15 PM													
1:30 PM													
1:45 PM													
2:00 PM													
2:15 PM													
2:30 PM													
2:45 PM													
3:00 PM													
3:15 PM													
3:30 PM													
3:45 PM													

TOTAL	NL	NT	NR	SL	ST	SR	EL	ET	ER	WL	WT	WR	TOTAL
Volumes	115	1812	294	75	1545	21	29	16	76	455	24	61	4523
Approach %	5.18	81.58	13.24	4.57	94.15	1.28	23.97	13.22	62.81	84.26	4.44	11.30	
App/Depart	2221	/	1902	1641	/	2076	121	/	385	540	/	160	

PM Peak Hr Begins at: 1115 AM

PEAK

Volumes	56	929	158	35	779	12	13	8	46	234	13	32	2315
Approach %	4.90	81.28	13.82	4.24	94.31	1.45	19.40	11.94	68.66	83.87	4.66	11.47	

PEAK HR.

FACTOR:	0.904	0.956	0.838	0.906	0.961
---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

CONTROL: Signal
 COMMENT 1: 0
 GPS: 33.777534, -111.925847

Start Date: 3/17/2022						
Start Time: 12:00:00 AM						
Site Code: 1						
Station ID:						
Location 1: ASHLER HILLS DR E.O 73RD ST						
Date	Time	EB	WB			
3/17/2022	12:00 AM	1	1			
3/17/2022	12:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	12:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	12:45 AM	2	0			
3/17/2022	01:00 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	01:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	01:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	01:45 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	02:00 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	02:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	02:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	02:45 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	03:00 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	03:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	03:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	03:45 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	04:00 AM	1	1			
3/17/2022	04:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	04:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	04:45 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	05:00 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	05:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	05:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	05:45 AM	1	1			
3/17/2022	06:00 AM	0	2			
3/17/2022	06:15 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	06:30 AM	0	0			
3/17/2022	06:45 AM	0	0	EB	WB	Total
3/17/2022	07:00 AM	1	1			
3/17/2022	07:15 AM	0	2			
3/17/2022	07:30 AM	2	2			
3/17/2022	07:45 AM	3	3			
3/17/2022	08:00 AM	0	2	6	8	14
3/17/2022	08:15 AM	1	1	5	9	14
3/17/2022	08:30 AM	4	3	6	8	14
3/17/2022	08:45 AM	1	4	8	9	17
3/17/2022	09:00 AM	3	5	6	10	16
3/17/2022	09:15 AM	3	5			
3/17/2022	09:30 AM	2	7			
3/17/2022	09:45 AM	7	2			
3/17/2022	10:00 AM	3	9			
3/17/2022	10:15 AM	10	6			
3/17/2022	10:30 AM	5	6			
3/17/2022	10:45 AM	7	6			
3/17/2022	11:00 AM	6	5			

3/17/2022	11:15 AM	2	4			
3/17/2022	11:30 AM	3	7			
3/17/2022	11:45 AM	6	7			
3/17/2022	12:00 PM	7	4			
3/17/2022	12:15 PM	5	7			
3/17/2022	12:30 PM	9	6			
3/17/2022	12:45 PM	7	8			
3/17/2022	01:00 PM	4	4			
3/17/2022	01:15 PM	5	6			
3/17/2022	01:30 PM	1	4			
3/17/2022	01:45 PM	7	8			
3/17/2022	02:00 PM	7	6			
3/17/2022	02:15 PM	7	7			
3/17/2022	02:30 PM	4	5			
3/17/2022	02:45 PM	1	3			
3/17/2022	03:00 PM	3	2			
3/17/2022	03:15 PM	5	3			
3/17/2022	03:30 PM	4	3			
3/17/2022	03:45 PM	8	6	EB	WB	Total
3/17/2022	04:00 PM	10	1			
3/17/2022	04:15 PM	6	3			
3/17/2022	04:30 PM	5	9			
3/17/2022	04:45 PM	4	3			
3/17/2022	05:00 PM	1	3	25	16	41
3/17/2022	05:15 PM	6	7	16	18	34
3/17/2022	05:30 PM	6	3	16	22	38
3/17/2022	05:45 PM	11	7	17	16	33
3/17/2022	06:00 PM	8	9	24	20	44
3/17/2022	06:15 PM	7	2			
3/17/2022	06:30 PM	2	2			
3/17/2022	06:45 PM	3	8			
3/17/2022	07:00 PM	4	2			
3/17/2022	07:15 PM	3	2			
3/17/2022	07:30 PM	1	3			
3/17/2022	07:45 PM	2	0			
3/17/2022	08:00 PM	3	0			
3/17/2022	08:15 PM	4	1			
3/17/2022	08:30 PM	3	3			
3/17/2022	08:45 PM	5	1			
3/17/2022	09:00 PM	1	0			
3/17/2022	09:15 PM	3	2			
3/17/2022	09:30 PM	2	0			
3/17/2022	09:45 PM	4	0			
3/17/2022	10:00 PM	1	0			
3/17/2022	10:15 PM	1	2			
3/17/2022	10:30 PM	2	4			
3/17/2022	10:45 PM	1	1			
3/17/2022	11:00 PM	0	0			
3/17/2022	11:15 PM	0	0			
3/17/2022	11:30 PM	1	0			
3/17/2022	11:45 PM	1	0			
	Total	269	252			

Start Time	17-Mar-22 Thu	EB	WB							Total
12:00 AM		3	1							4
01:00		0	0							0
02:00		0	0							0
03:00		0	0							0
04:00		1	1							2
05:00		1	1							2
06:00		0	2							2
07:00		6	8							14
08:00		6	10							16
09:00		15	19							34
10:00		25	27							52
11:00		17	23							40
12:00 PM		28	25							53
01:00		17	22							39
02:00		19	21							40
03:00		20	14							34
04:00		25	16							41
05:00		24	20							44
06:00		20	21							41
07:00		10	7							17
08:00		15	5							20
09:00		10	2							12
10:00		5	7							12
11:00		2	0							2
Total		269	252							521
Percent		51.6%	48.4%							
AM Peak	-	10:00	10:00	-	-	-	-	-	-	10:00
Vol.	-	25	27	-	-	-	-	-	-	52
PM Peak	-	12:00	12:00	-	-	-	-	-	-	12:00
Vol.	-	28	25	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
Grand Total		269	252							521
Percent		51.6%	48.4%							
ADT		ADT 521		AADT 521						

Methodology Overview

This form facilitates trip generation estimation using data within the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition and methodology described within ITE's Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition. These references will be referred to as Manual and Handbook, respectively. The Manual contains data collected by various transportation professionals for a wide range of different land uses, with each land use category represented by a land use code (LUC). Average rates and equations have been established that correlate the relationship between an independent variable that describes the development size and generated trips for each categorized LUC in various settings and time periods. The Handbook indicates an established methodology for how to use data contained within the Manual when to use the fitted curve instead of the average rate and when to adjustments to the volume of trips are appropriate and how to do so. The methodology steps are represented visually in boxes in Figure 3.1. This worksheet applies calculations for each box if applicable.

Box 1 - Define Study Site Land Use Type & Site Characteristics

The analyst is to pick an appropriate LUC(s) based on the subject's zoning/land use(s)/future land use(s). The size of the land use(s) is described in reference to an independent variable(s) specific to (each) the land use (example: 1,000 square feet of building area is relatively common).

Land Use Types and Size

Proposed Use	Amount Units	ITE LUC	ITE Land Use Name
Park	6.800 Acres	411	Public Park
Pickleball	8 Courts	490	Tennis Courts
Basketball	1 Courts	490	Racquet/ Tennis Club

Box 2 - Define Site Context

Context assessment is to "simply determine whether the study sites is in a multimodal setting" and "could have persons accessing the site by walking, bicycling, or riding transit." This assessment is used in Box 4. The Manual separates data into 4 setting categories - Rural, General Urban/Suburban, Dense Multi-Urban Use and Center City Core. This worksheet uses the following abbreviations, respectively: R, G, D, and C. The Manual does not have data for all settings of all land use codes. See the table on the next page titled "Site Context and Time Periods" - if this table is not provided, the "General Urban/Suburban" setting is used by default.

Box 3 - Define Analysis Objectives Types of Trips & Time Period

This tool will focus on vehicular trips for a 24-hour period on a typical weekday as well as its AM peak hour and PM peak hour. Other time period(s) may be of interest.

Site Context and Time Periods - Actual Setting, Setting Data Available for LUC, Setting Used in Analyses

Proposed Use	Setting	ADT		AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Saturday	
		Available	Used	Available	Used	Available	Used	Available	Used
Park	General Urban/Suburban	G	G	G	G	G	G		N/A
Pickleball	General Urban/Suburban	G	G		N/A	G	G		N/A
Basketball	General Urban/Suburban	G	G		N/A	G	G		N/A

If the desired setting is not available within the *Manual*, adjustments may be made in Boxes 6 through 8.

Box 4 - Is Study Site Multimodal?

Per the Handbook, "if the objective is to establish a local trip generation rate for a particular land use or study site, the simplified approach (Box 9) may be acceptable but the Box 5 through 8 approach is required if the study site is located in an infill setting, contains a mix of uses on-site, or is near significant transit service."

Box 5/Box 9 - Estimate Baseline Trips/Estimate Vehicular Trips (Determine Equation)

Vehicle trips are estimated using rates/equations applicable to each LUC. When the appropriate graph has a fitted curve, the Handbook has a process (Figure 4.2) to determine when to use it versus using the weighted average rate or collecting local data. The methodology requires for engineering judgement in some circumstances and permits engineering judgement to override or make adjustments when appropriate to best project (example 1: study site is expected to operate differently than data in the applicable land use code - such as restaurant that is closed in the morning or in the evening; example 2: LUC data in a localized area fails to be represented by the typically selected fitted curve/weighted average rate - a small shop/LUC 820, AM peak hour is skewed by the high y-intercept).

Equation Type: Equation Used [Equated Rate] (Type Abbreviations: Weighted Average Rate ("WA"), Fitted Curve ("FC"), or Custom ("C"))

Proposed Use	ADT	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday
Park	FC: $T=0.64 \cdot X + 88.46$ [13.65]	WA: $T=X \cdot 0.02$ [0.02]	WA: $T=X \cdot 0.11$ [0.11]	C: $T=X \cdot 1.96$ [1.96]
Pickleball	WA: $T=X \cdot 30.32$ [30.32]	C: $T=X \cdot 5.83$ [5.83]	WA: $T=X \cdot 4.21$ [4.21]	C: $T=X \cdot 5.83$ [5.83]
Basketball	C: $T=X \cdot 75.8$ [75.80]	C: $T=X \cdot 0$ [0.00]	C: $T=X \cdot 10.525$ [10.53]	C: $T=X \cdot 6.63$ [6.63]

Box 5/Box 9 - Estimate Baseline Trips/Estimate Vehicular Trips (Apply Equations and in/out Distributions)

Baseline Vehicular Trips

Proposed Use	ADT				AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour				Saturday			
	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total
Park	50%	46	46	92	59%	0	0	0	55%	1	0	1	50%	7	6	13
Pickleball	50%	121	121	242	80%	38	9	47	50%	17	17	34	80%	38	9	47
Basketball	50%	38	38	76	0%	0	0	0	50%	6	5	11	50%	4	3	7
Totals		205	205	410		38	9	47		24	22	46		49	18	67

CivTech Field Data

21-0480: Pickleball and Basketball Surveying

Monday, March 21, 2022

Basketball					
	Time		Carpool?	Number of Vehicle	Number of People
	Arrival	Departure			
7:00 AM					
7:05 AM					
7:10 AM					
7:15 AM					
7:20 AM					
7:25 AM					
7:30 AM					
7:35 AM					
7:40 AM					
7:45 AM					
7:50 AM					
7:55 AM					
8:00 AM					
8:05 AM					
8:10 AM					
8:15 AM					
8:20 AM					
8:25 AM					
8:30 AM					
8:35 AM					
8:40 AM					
8:45 AM					
8:50 AM					
8:55 AM					
9:00 AM					

Monday, March 21, 2022

Pickleball					
	Time		Carpool?	Number of Vehicle	Number of People
	Arrival	Departure			
7:00 AM	y			1	1
7:05 AM	y		y	1	2
7:10 AM	y			1	1
7:15 AM	y, y			1,1	1,1
7:20 AM	y			1	1
7:25 AM	y (D.O)	y		1, 1	1, 1
7:30 AM	y, y, y			1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1
7:35 AM	y, y		n, y	1, 1	1, 2
7:40 AM	y			1	1
7:45 AM	y			1	1
7:50 AM		y		1	1
7:55 AM	y, y, y, y	y	y, n, n, n	1, 1, 1, 1, 1	2, 1, 1, 1, 1
8:00 AM	y, y, y, y			1, 1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1, 1
8:05 AM	y, y, y (D.O)	y		1, 1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1, 1
8:10 AM	y		y	1	2
8:15 AM	y, y, y		n, y, y	1, 1, 1	1, 2, 2
8:20 AM	y, y (D.O), y, y	y	y, n, n	1, 1, 1, 1, 1	2, 1, 1, 1, 1
8:25 AM	y, y, y	y		1, 1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1, 1
8:30 AM					
8:35 AM	y, y, y		y	1, 1, 1	2, 1, 1
8:40 AM	y, y	y, y		1, 1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1, 1
8:45 AM					
8:50 AM	y, y, y, y			1, 1, 1, 1	1, 1, 1, 1
8:55 AM		y, y	y, n	1, 1,	2, 1
9:00 AM	y, y		n, y	1, 1	1, 2

Pickleball		
	Time	
	Arrival	Departure
7:00 AM	1	
7:05 AM	1	
7:10 AM	1	
7:15 AM	2	
7:20 AM	1	
7:25 AM	1	1
7:30 AM	3	
7:35 AM	2	
7:40 AM	1	
7:45 AM	1	
7:50 AM		1
7:55 AM	4	1
8:00 AM	4	
8:05 AM	3	1
8:10 AM	1	
8:15 AM	3	
8:20 AM	4	1
8:25 AM	3	1
8:30 AM	0	0
8:35 AM	3	
8:40 AM	2	2
8:45 AM	0	0
8:50 AM	4	
8:55 AM		2
9:00 AM	2	

Time	Every 15 Mins		Every Hour	
	Ins	Outs	Ins	Outs
7:00 AM				
7:15 AM	3	0		
7:30 AM	4	1		
7:45 AM	6	0		
8:00 AM	5	2	13	1
8:15 AM	8	1	18	3
8:30 AM	10	2	23	4
8:45 AM	5	2	29	5
9:00 AM	6	2	28	7

Ratio of 6 courts (in the filed) to 8 courts (proposed) 1.33

Peak Hour Trips		
Ins	Outs	Total
38	9	47

AM Rates	
Total	5.83
Ins	80%
Out	20%

Additional Notes:

D.O = Drop off

1 motor vehicle

y = yes

n = no

Eventually, around 7:45 AM, the basketball court was transformed into more pickleball courts

Every Hour is based on the "Every 15 mins" calculations

Methodology Overview

This form facilitates trip generation estimation using data within the Institute of Transportation Engineer's (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition and methodology described within ITE's Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition. These references will be referred to as Manual and Handbook, respectively. The Manual contains data collected by various transportation professionals for a wide range of different land uses, with each land use category represented by a land use code (LUC). Average rates and equations have been established that correlate the relationship between an independent variable that describes the development size and generated trips for each categorized LUC in various settings and time periods. The Handbook indicates an established methodology for how to use data contained within the Manual when to use the fitted curve instead of the average rate and when to adjustments to the volume of trips are appropriate and how to do so. The methodology steps are represented visually in boxes in Figure 3.1. This worksheet applies calculations for each box if applicable.

Box 1 - Define Study Site Land Use Type&Site Characteristics,

Box 2 - Define Site Context | Box 3 - Define Analysis Objectives Trip Types&Time Period

The analyst is to pick an appropriate LUC(s) based on the subject's zoning/land use(s)/future land use(s). The size of the land use(s) is described in reference to an independent variable(s) specific to (each) the land use (example: 1,000 square feet of building area is relatively common). Context assessment is to "simply determine whether the study sites is in a multimodal setting" and "could have persons accessing the site by walking, bicycling, or riding transit." This assessment is used in Box 4. The Manual separates data into 4 setting categories - Rural, General Urban/Suburban, Dense Multi-Urban Use and Center City Core. This worksheet uses the following abbreviations, respectively: R, G, D, and C. The Manual does not have data for all settings of all land use codes. The "General Urban/Suburban" setting is used by default.

This tool will focus on vehicular trips for a 24-hour period on a typical weekday as well as its AM peak hour and PM peak hour. Other time period(s) may be of interest.

Land Use Types and Size

Proposed Use	Amount Units	ITE LUC	ITE Land Use Name
Single Family Attached	101 Dwelling Units	215	Single-Family Attached Housing

Box 4 - Is Study Site Multimodal?

Per the Handbook, "if the objective is to establish a local trip generation rate for a particular land use or study site, the simplified approach (Box 9) may be acceptable but the Box 5 through 8 approach is required if the study site is located in an infill setting, contains a mix of uses on-site, or is near significant transit service."

Box 5/Box 9 - Estimate Baseline Trips/Estimate Vehicular Trips (Determine Equation)

Vehicle trips are estimated using rates/equations applicable to each LUC. When the appropriate graph has a fitted curve, the Handbook has a process (Figure 4.2) to determine when to use it versus using the weighted average rate or collecting local data. The methodology requires for engineering judgement in some circumstances and permits engineering judgement to override or make adjustments when appropriate to best project (example 1: study site is expected to operate differently than data in the applicable land use code - such as restaurant that is closed in the morning or in the evening; example 2: LUC data in a localized area fails to be represented by the typically selected fitted curve/weighted average rate - a small shop/LUC 820, AM peak hour is skewed by the high y-intercept).

Equation Type: Equation Used [Equated Rate] (Type Abbreviations: Weighted Average Rate ("WA"), Fitted Curve Type: Equation Used [Equated Rate])

Proposed Use	ADT	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Saturday
Single Family Attached	FC: T=7.62*X-50.48 [7.12]	FC: T=0.52*X-5.7 [0.46]	FC: T=0.6*X-3.93 [0.56]	WA: T=X*0.57 [0.57]

Box 5/Box 9 - Estimate Baseline Trips/Estimate Vehicular Trips (Apply Equations and in/out Distributions)

Baseline Vehicular Trips

Proposed Use	ADT				AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour				Saturday			
	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total	% In	In	Out	Total
Single Family Attached	50%	360	360	720	31%	15	32	47	57%	32	25	57	48%	28	30	58

External Vehicular Trips

Proposed Use	ADT				AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour				Saturday														
	In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total												
Single Family Attached				360				15				32				25				28				30			58
Totals				360				15				32				25				28				30			58

Net New Trips. Pass-by trips and truck trips may be subtracted from the total external vehicle trips, if applicable/data available. Diverted link trips may also be separated, but are often (conservatively) grouped with primary trips.

Net New Trips

Proposed Use	ADT				AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour				Saturday														
	In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total												
Single Family Attached				360				15				32				25				28				30			58
Totals				360				15				32				25				28				30			58




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↖	↗	↖	↗	↗	↖	↑↑	↗	↖	↑↑	↗
Traffic Volume (vph)	35	6	71	2	13	94	689	70	7	675	27
Future Volume (vph)	35	6	71	2	13	94	689	70	7	675	27
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	15.0	25.0	15.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	50.0
Total Split (%)	13.6%	22.7%	13.6%	22.7%	22.7%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 110
 Actuated Cycle Length: 110
 Offset: 8 (7%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Existing AM

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	6	105	71	2	13	94	689	70	7	675	27
Future Volume (veh/h)	35	6	105	71	2	13	94	689	70	7	675	27
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	38	7	86	77	2	6	102	749	38	8	734	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	228	9	112	183	181	154	513	2317	1034	468	2198	980
Arrive On Green	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.04	0.65	0.65	0.01	0.62	0.62
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	121	1483	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	38	0	93	77	2	6	102	749	38	8	734	14
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1603	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.1	0.0	6.3	4.3	0.1	0.4	2.3	10.2	0.9	0.2	10.9	0.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.1	0.0	6.3	4.3	0.1	0.4	2.3	10.2	0.9	0.2	10.9	0.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.92	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	228	0	122	183	181	154	513	2317	1034	468	2198	980
V/C Ratio(X)	0.17	0.00	0.76	0.42	0.01	0.04	0.20	0.32	0.04	0.02	0.33	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	334	0	283	252	330	280	656	2317	1034	670	2198	980
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	44.8	0.0	49.9	43.9	44.9	45.0	7.3	8.4	6.8	7.8	10.1	8.1
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	3.7	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.0	0.0	2.6	1.9	0.0	0.2	0.8	3.8	0.3	0.1	4.2	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	44.9	0.0	53.6	44.5	44.9	45.1	7.4	8.8	6.9	7.8	10.5	8.1
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	D	D	D	A	A	A	A	B	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		131			85			889			756	
Approach Delay, s/veh		51.1			44.5			8.6			10.4	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	11.2	74.1	8.4	16.3	7.5	77.8	10.8	13.9				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.3	12.9	4.1	2.4	2.2	12.2	6.3	8.3				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.2				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			14.0									
HCM 6th LOS			B									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												

Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations											
Traffic Volume (vph)	18	8	250	13	28	39	936	116	21	712	10
Future Volume (vph)	18	8	250	13	28	39	936	116	21	712	10
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	15.0	25.0	15.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	50.0
Total Split (%)	13.6%	22.7%	13.6%	22.7%	22.7%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 110
 Actuated Cycle Length: 110
 Offset: 8 (7%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	18	8	36	250	13	28	39	936	116	21	712	10
Future Volume (veh/h)	18	8	36	250	13	28	39	936	116	21	712	10
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	20	9	29	272	14	15	42	1017	63	23	774	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	184	23	74	278	242	205	469	2193	978	348	2157	962
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.13	0.13	0.03	0.62	0.62	0.02	0.61	0.61
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	389	1255	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	20	0	38	272	14	15	42	1017	63	23	774	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1644	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.1	0.0	2.4	10.0	0.7	0.9	1.0	16.9	1.7	0.5	12.0	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.1	0.0	2.4	10.0	0.7	0.9	1.0	16.9	1.7	0.5	12.0	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.76	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	184	0	97	278	242	205	469	2193	978	348	2157	962
V/C Ratio(X)	0.11	0.00	0.39	0.98	0.06	0.07	0.09	0.46	0.06	0.07	0.36	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	309	0	290	278	330	280	630	2193	978	528	2157	962
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	47.1	0.0	49.8	46.6	42.0	42.1	8.0	11.3	8.4	8.8	10.9	8.5
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	0.9	47.7	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.5	0.0	1.0	6.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	6.5	0.6	0.2	4.7	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	47.2	0.0	50.8	94.3	42.0	42.2	8.0	12.0	8.5	8.8	11.3	8.5
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	F	D	D	A	B	A	A	B	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		58			301			1122			803	
Approach Delay, s/veh		49.5			89.3			11.7			11.2	
Approach LOS		D			F			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.0	72.9	7.3	19.8	8.9	74.0	15.0	12.1				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.0	14.0	3.1	2.9	2.5	18.9	12.0	4.4				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.1				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay				22.7								
HCM 6th LOS				C								
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												



Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↶	↷	↶	↷	↷	↶	↷↷	↷	↶	↷↷	↷
Traffic Volume (vph)	13	8	236	13	32	57	938	160	35	787	12
Future Volume (vph)	13	8	236	13	32	57	938	160	35	787	12
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	7.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	15.0	25.0	15.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	50.0	50.0	20.0	50.0	50.0
Total Split (%)	13.6%	22.7%	13.6%	22.7%	22.7%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%	18.2%	45.5%	45.5%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 110
 Actuated Cycle Length: 110
 Offset: 8 (7%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Existing SAT

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	8	46	236	13	32	57	938	160	35	787	12
Future Volume (veh/h)	13	8	46	236	13	32	57	938	160	35	787	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	14	9	38	257	14	18	62	1020	87	38	855	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	176	19	79	271	253	214	439	2160	964	350	2134	952
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.14	0.14	0.04	0.61	0.61	0.03	0.60	0.60
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	313	1320	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	14	0	47	257	14	18	62	1020	87	38	855	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1633	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.8	0.0	3.1	10.0	0.7	1.1	1.4	17.4	2.5	0.9	13.9	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.8	0.0	3.1	10.0	0.7	1.1	1.4	17.4	2.5	0.9	13.9	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.81	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	176	0	98	271	253	214	439	2160	964	350	2134	952
V/C Ratio(X)	0.08	0.00	0.48	0.95	0.06	0.08	0.14	0.47	0.09	0.11	0.40	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	310	0	288	271	330	280	590	2160	964	515	2134	952
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	47.4	0.0	50.0	46.1	41.5	41.6	8.4	11.9	8.9	9.0	11.6	8.8
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	1.4	40.4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.4	0.0	1.3	5.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	6.7	0.9	0.3	5.4	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	47.4	0.0	51.4	86.5	41.5	41.7	8.4	12.6	9.1	9.0	12.1	8.8
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	F	D	D	A	B	A	A	B	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		61			289			1169			899	
Approach Delay, s/veh		50.5			81.6			12.1			12.0	
Approach LOS		D			F			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.6	72.2	6.7	20.5	9.8	73.0	15.0	12.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4	13.6	43.9	10.0	19.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.4	15.9	2.8	3.1	2.9	19.4	12.0	5.1				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.1				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			21.3									
HCM 6th LOS			C									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↖	↗	↖	↗	↗	↖	↑↑	↗	↖	↑↑	↗
Traffic Volume (vph)	35	6	82	3	33	94	689	76	16	675	27
Future Volume (vph)	35	6	82	3	33	94	689	76	16	675	27
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	10.0	39.0	12.0	41.0	41.0	20.0	56.0	56.0	13.0	49.0	49.0
Total Split (%)	8.3%	32.5%	10.0%	34.2%	34.2%	16.7%	46.7%	46.7%	10.8%	40.8%	40.8%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary
























Cycle Length: 120
 Actuated Cycle Length: 120
 Offset: 8 (7%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Background AM

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	6	105	82	3	33	94	689	76	16	675	27
Future Volume (veh/h)	35	6	105	82	3	33	94	689	76	16	675	27
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	38	7	86	89	3	18	102	749	42	17	734	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	228	10	123	198	208	176	509	2304	1028	472	2225	992
Arrive On Green	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.04	0.65	0.65	0.02	0.63	0.63
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	121	1483	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	38	0	93	89	3	18	102	749	42	17	734	14
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1603	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.3	0.0	6.8	5.4	0.2	1.2	2.4	11.3	1.1	0.4	11.7	0.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.3	0.0	6.8	5.4	0.2	1.2	2.4	11.3	1.1	0.4	11.7	0.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.92	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	228	0	133	198	208	176	509	2304	1028	472	2225	992
V/C Ratio(X)	0.17	0.00	0.70	0.45	0.01	0.10	0.20	0.33	0.04	0.04	0.33	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	249	0	446	198	552	468	639	2304	1028	538	2225	992
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	48.3	0.0	53.6	46.4	47.5	47.9	7.7	9.4	7.6	8.0	10.6	8.5
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	2.5	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.0	0.0	2.8	2.4	0.1	0.5	0.9	4.3	0.4	0.2	4.5	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	48.4	0.0	56.1	47.0	47.5	48.0	7.8	9.8	7.7	8.0	11.0	8.5
LnGrp LOS	D	A	E	D	D	D	A	A	A	A	B	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		131			110			893			765	
Approach Delay, s/veh		53.8			47.2			9.5			10.9	
Approach LOS		D			D			A			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	11.2	81.2	8.6	18.9	8.6	83.9	12.0	15.5				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	13.6	42.9	5.0	35.4	6.6	49.9	7.0	33.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.4	13.7	4.3	3.2	2.4	13.3	7.4	8.8				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.3				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			15.3									
HCM 6th LOS			B									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations											
Traffic Volume (vph)	18	9	259	14	44	39	936	127	41	712	10
Future Volume (vph)	18	9	259	14	44	39	936	127	41	712	10
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	14.4	36.6	22.4	44.6	44.6	11.4	49.0	49.0	12.0	49.6	49.6
Total Split (%)	12.0%	30.5%	18.7%	37.2%	37.2%	9.5%	40.8%	40.8%	10.0%	41.3%	41.3%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary
























Cycle Length: 120
 Actuated Cycle Length: 120
 Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Background PM

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	18	9	36	259	14	44	39	936	127	41	712	10
Future Volume (veh/h)	18	9	36	259	14	44	39	936	127	41	712	10
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	20	10	29	282	15	24	42	1017	68	45	774	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	206	34	98	397	383	325	411	1954	872	310	1958	873
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.20	0.20	0.03	0.55	0.55	0.03	0.55	0.55
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	423	1227	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	20	0	39	282	15	24	42	1017	68	45	774	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1650	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.2	0.0	2.7	17.1	0.8	1.5	1.2	21.7	2.4	1.3	15.0	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.2	0.0	2.7	17.1	0.8	1.5	1.2	21.7	2.4	1.3	15.0	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.74	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	206	0	132	397	383	325	411	1954	872	310	1958	873
V/C Ratio(X)	0.10	0.00	0.29	0.71	0.04	0.07	0.10	0.52	0.08	0.15	0.40	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	309	0	426	397	608	515	429	1954	872	335	1958	873
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	49.1	0.0	52.0	41.1	38.2	38.5	11.8	17.0	12.7	12.9	15.5	12.1
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	0.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.6	0.0	1.1	8.0	0.4	0.6	0.5	8.9	0.9	0.5	6.1	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	49.2	0.0	52.5	46.1	38.3	38.6	11.8	18.0	12.9	13.0	16.1	12.2
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	D	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		59			321			1127			825	
Approach Delay, s/veh		51.3			45.1			17.5			15.9	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.2	72.2	7.4	30.2	10.3	72.1	22.4	15.2				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	5.0	43.5	9.4	39.0	5.6	42.9	17.4	31.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.2	17.0	3.2	3.5	3.3	23.7	19.1	4.7				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.1				

Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	21.6
HCM 6th LOS	C

Notes

User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.




Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	↖	↗	↖	↗	↗	↖	↑↑	↗	↖	↑↑	↗
Traffic Volume (vph)	13	9	247	14	51	57	938	170	53	787	12
Future Volume (vph)	13	9	247	14	51	57	938	170	53	787	12
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	18.0	41.4	22.0	45.4	45.4	12.2	44.0	44.0	12.6	44.4	44.4
Total Split (%)	15.0%	34.5%	18.3%	37.8%	37.8%	10.2%	36.7%	36.7%	10.5%	37.0%	37.0%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max

Intersection Summary
























Cycle Length: 120
 Actuated Cycle Length: 120
 Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Background SAT

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

												
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	9	46	247	14	51	57	938	170	53	787	12
Future Volume (veh/h)	13	9	46	247	14	51	57	938	170	53	787	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	14	10	38	268	15	27	62	1020	93	58	855	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	198	28	105	384	387	328	385	1953	871	310	1950	870
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.55	0.55	0.04	0.55	0.55
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	341	1296	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	14	0	48	268	15	27	62	1020	93	58	855	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1637	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.9	0.0	3.3	16.2	0.8	1.6	1.8	21.8	3.4	1.7	17.2	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.9	0.0	3.3	16.2	0.8	1.6	1.8	21.8	3.4	1.7	17.2	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.79	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	198	0	132	384	387	328	385	1953	871	310	1950	870
V/C Ratio(X)	0.07	0.00	0.36	0.70	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.52	0.11	0.19	0.44	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	363	0	488	384	620	526	407	1953	871	338	1950	870
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	49.4	0.0	52.2	41.0	38.0	38.4	12.1	17.1	12.9	12.9	16.1	12.3
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	0.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.4	0.0	1.4	7.6	0.4	0.6	0.7	8.9	1.3	0.7	7.0	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	49.4	0.0	52.9	45.7	38.1	38.4	12.1	18.1	13.2	13.0	16.8	12.3
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	D	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		62			310			1175			919	
Approach Delay, s/veh		52.1			44.7			17.4			16.5	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.8	71.9	6.9	30.4	10.7	72.0	22.0	15.3				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	5.8	38.3	13.0	39.8	6.2	37.9	17.0	35.8				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.8	19.2	2.9	3.6	3.7	23.8	18.2	5.3				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.1				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			21.4									
HCM 6th LOS			C									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	23	41	0	0	0
Future Vol, veh/h	0	23	41	0	0	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	0	25	45	0	0	0

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	45	0	-	0	70 45
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	45 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	25 -
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42 6.22
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518 3.318
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1563	-	-	-	934 1025
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	977 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	998 -
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1563	-	-	-	934 1025
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	934 -
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	977 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	998 -

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0	0
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1563	-	-	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	-	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	0	-	-	-	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	-	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	56	46	0	0	0
Future Vol, veh/h	0	56	46	0	0	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	0	61	50	0	0	0

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	50	0	-	0	111 50
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	50 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	61 -
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42 6.22
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518 3.318
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1557	-	-	-	886 1018
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	972 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	962 -
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1557	-	-	-	886 1018
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	886 -
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	972 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	962 -

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0	0
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1557	-	-	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	-	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	0	-	-	-	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	-	-

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	0					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	0	63	50	0	0	0
Future Vol, veh/h	0	63	50	0	0	0
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	0	68	54	0	0	0

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	54	0	-	0	122
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	54
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	68
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1551	-	-	-	873
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	969
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	955
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1551	-	-	-	873
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	873
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	969
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	955

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	0	0	0
HCM LOS			A


Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1551	-	-	-	-
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	-	-	-	-	-
HCM Control Delay (s)	0	-	-	-	0
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0	-	-	-	-

Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations											
Traffic Volume (vph)	35	7	86	3	38	94	689	91	37	675	27
Future Volume (vph)	35	7	86	3	38	94	689	91	37	675	27
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	10.0	39.0	12.0	41.0	41.0	20.0	56.0	56.0	13.0	49.0	49.0
Total Split (%)	8.3%	32.5%	10.0%	34.2%	34.2%	16.7%	46.7%	46.7%	10.8%	40.8%	40.8%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)	15.9	10.3	20.9	16.1	16.1	82.0	76.7	76.7	78.3	73.2	73.2
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.13	0.09	0.17	0.13	0.13	0.68	0.64	0.64	0.65	0.61	0.61
v/c Ratio	0.19	0.51	0.48	0.01	0.11	0.21	0.33	0.09	0.09	0.34	0.03
Control Delay	42.7	18.8	50.8	48.3	0.6	6.5	11.0	1.0	5.8	12.3	0.0
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	42.7	18.8	50.8	48.3	0.6	6.5	11.0	1.0	5.8	12.3	0.0
LOS	D	B	D	D	A	A	B	A	A	B	A
Approach Delay		24.5		35.7			9.4			11.5	
Approach LOS		C		D			A			B	

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 120	
Actuated Cycle Length: 120	
Offset: 8 (7%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green	
Natural Cycle: 90	
Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated	
Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.51	
Intersection Signal Delay: 13.2	Intersection LOS: B
Intersection Capacity Utilization 50.4%	ICU Level of Service A
Analysis Period (min) 15	

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Total AM

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	35	7	105	86	3	38	94	689	91	37	675	27
Future Volume (veh/h)	35	7	105	86	3	38	94	689	91	37	675	27
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	38	8	86	93	3	20	102	749	50	40	734	14
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	228	11	122	198	208	176	509	2259	1007	481	2225	992
Arrive On Green	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.11	0.04	0.64	0.64	0.03	0.63	0.63
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	137	1469	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	38	0	94	93	3	20	102	749	50	40	734	14
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1606	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	2.3	0.0	6.8	5.7	0.2	1.4	2.4	11.7	1.4	0.9	11.7	0.4
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	2.3	0.0	6.8	5.7	0.2	1.4	2.4	11.7	1.4	0.9	11.7	0.4
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.91	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	228	0	133	198	208	176	509	2259	1007	481	2225	992
V/C Ratio(X)	0.17	0.00	0.71	0.47	0.01	0.11	0.20	0.33	0.05	0.08	0.33	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	249	0	447	198	552	468	639	2259	1007	524	2225	992
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	48.3	0.0	53.6	46.6	47.5	48.0	7.8	10.1	8.2	7.7	10.6	8.5
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	2.6	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	1.0	0.0	2.9	2.5	0.1	0.5	0.9	4.5	0.5	0.4	4.5	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	48.4	0.0	56.2	47.2	47.5	48.1	7.8	10.5	8.3	7.8	11.0	8.5
LnGrp LOS	D	A	E	D	D	D	A	B	A	A	B	A
Approach Vol, veh/h		132			116			901			788	
Approach Delay, s/veh		53.9			47.4			10.1			10.8	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	11.2	81.2	8.6	19.0	10.1	82.4	12.0	15.5				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	13.6	42.9	5.0	35.4	6.6	49.9	7.0	33.4				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	4.4	13.7	4.3	3.4	2.9	13.7	7.7	8.8				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.3				

Intersection Summary

HCM 6th Ctrl Delay	15.6
HCM 6th LOS	B

Notes


User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.

Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations											
Traffic Volume (vph)	18	10	268	15	56	39	936	137	54	712	10
Future Volume (vph)	18	10	268	15	56	39	936	137	54	712	10
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	14.4	36.6	22.4	44.6	44.6	11.4	49.0	49.0	12.0	49.6	49.6
Total Split (%)	12.0%	30.5%	18.7%	37.2%	37.2%	9.5%	40.8%	40.8%	10.0%	41.3%	41.3%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)	14.2	10.0	29.7	24.4	24.4	73.4	69.0	69.0	74.3	69.5	69.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.12	0.08	0.25	0.20	0.20	0.61	0.58	0.58	0.62	0.58	0.58
v/c Ratio	0.11	0.29	0.84	0.04	0.14	0.10	0.50	0.15	0.19	0.38	0.01
Control Delay	34.5	25.6	62.0	40.0	0.7	9.3	18.0	1.7	10.1	15.9	0.0
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	34.5	25.6	62.0	40.0	0.7	9.3	18.0	1.7	10.1	15.9	0.0
LOS	C	C	E	D	A	A	B	A	B	B	A
Approach Delay		28.2		50.9			15.7			15.3	
Approach LOS		C		D			B			B	

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 120
 Actuated Cycle Length: 120
 Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
 Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.84
 Intersection Signal Delay: 21.1
 Intersection Capacity Utilization 66.6%
 Analysis Period (min) 15
 Intersection LOS: C
 ICU Level of Service C

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Total PM

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary


Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	18	10	36	268	15	56	39	936	137	54	712	10
Future Volume (veh/h)	18	10	36	268	15	56	39	936	137	54	712	10
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	20	11	29	291	16	31	42	1017	74	59	774	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	206	37	97	398	385	326	410	1939	865	312	1955	872
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.21	0.21	0.03	0.55	0.55	0.04	0.55	0.55
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	455	1199	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	20	0	40	291	16	31	42	1017	74	59	774	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1654	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	1.2	0.0	2.7	17.4	0.8	1.9	1.2	21.9	2.7	1.7	15.0	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	1.2	0.0	2.7	17.4	0.8	1.9	1.2	21.9	2.7	1.7	15.0	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.73	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	206	0	134	398	385	326	410	1939	865	312	1955	872
V/C Ratio(X)	0.10	0.00	0.30	0.73	0.04	0.10	0.10	0.52	0.09	0.19	0.40	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	310	0	427	398	608	515	428	1939	865	331	1955	872
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	49.0	0.0	51.9	41.3	38.2	38.6	11.9	17.3	13.0	13.1	15.5	12.2
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	0.5	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.6	0.0	1.2	8.4	0.4	0.7	0.5	9.0	1.0	0.7	6.2	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	49.1	0.0	52.4	47.3	38.2	38.7	12.0	18.4	13.2	13.2	16.1	12.2
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	D	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		60			338			1133			839	
Approach Delay, s/veh		51.3			46.1			17.8			15.9	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.2	72.1	7.4	30.3	10.7	71.6	22.4	15.3				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	5.0	43.5	9.4	39.0	5.6	42.9	17.4	31.0				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.2	17.0	3.2	3.9	3.7	23.9	19.4	4.7				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	3.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.1				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			22.0									
HCM 6th LOS			C									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												

Lane Group	EBL	EBT	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations											
Traffic Volume (vph)	13	10	254	15	61	57	938	190	80	787	12
Future Volume (vph)	13	10	254	15	61	57	938	190	80	787	12
Turn Type	pm+pt	NA	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm	pm+pt	NA	Perm
Protected Phases	3	8	7	4		1	6		5	2	
Permitted Phases	8		4		4	6		6	2		2
Detector Phase	3	8	7	4	4	1	6	6	5	2	2
Switch Phase											
Minimum Initial (s)	5.0	10.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	10.0
Minimum Split (s)	10.0	36.6	10.0	34.6	34.6	11.4	27.1	27.1	11.4	22.1	22.1
Total Split (s)	18.0	41.4	22.0	45.4	45.4	12.2	44.0	44.0	12.6	44.4	44.4
Total Split (%)	15.0%	34.5%	18.3%	37.8%	37.8%	10.2%	36.7%	36.7%	10.5%	37.0%	37.0%
Yellow Time (s)	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.4	5.1	5.1	4.4	5.1	5.1
All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0
Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Lost Time (s)	5.0	5.6	5.0	5.6	5.6	6.4	6.1	6.1	6.4	6.1	6.1
Lead/Lag	Lead	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag	Lead	Lag	Lag
Lead-Lag Optimize?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Recall Mode	None	None	None	None	None	None	C-Max	C-Max	None	C-Max	C-Max
Act Effct Green (s)	14.0	10.0	29.2	24.1	24.1	72.4	66.6	66.6	74.9	69.5	69.5
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.12	0.08	0.24	0.20	0.20	0.60	0.56	0.56	0.62	0.58	0.58
v/c Ratio	0.08	0.34	0.82	0.04	0.16	0.17	0.52	0.22	0.28	0.42	0.01
Control Delay	34.3	23.7	59.9	40.0	0.8	9.6	19.0	6.8	10.8	16.5	0.0
Queue Delay	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Delay	34.3	23.7	59.9	40.0	0.8	9.6	19.0	6.8	10.8	16.5	0.0
LOS	C	C	E	D	A	A	B	A	B	B	A
Approach Delay		25.7		48.1			16.6			15.8	
Approach LOS		C		D			B			B	

Intersection Summary

Cycle Length: 120
 Actuated Cycle Length: 120
 Offset: 0 (0%), Referenced to phase 2:SBTL and 6:NBTL, Start of Green
 Natural Cycle: 90
 Control Type: Actuated-Coordinated
 Maximum v/c Ratio: 0.82
 Intersection Signal Delay: 20.8
 Intersection LOS: C
 Intersection Capacity Utilization 66.2%
 ICU Level of Service C
 Analysis Period (min) 15

Splits and Phases: 1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.



21-0480 Ashler Hills
2022 Total SAT

1: Scottsdale Rd. & Ashler Hills Dr.
HCM 6th Signalized Intersection Summary

Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations												
Traffic Volume (veh/h)	13	10	46	254	15	61	57	938	190	80	787	12
Future Volume (veh/h)	13	10	46	254	15	61	57	938	190	80	787	12
Initial Q (Qb), veh	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ped-Bike Adj(A_pbT)	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Parking Bus, Adj	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Work Zone On Approach		No			No			No			No	
Adj Sat Flow, veh/h/ln	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870	1870
Adj Flow Rate, veh/h	14	11	38	276	16	32	62	1020	104	87	855	6
Peak Hour Factor	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Percent Heavy Veh, %	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Cap, veh/h	198	30	103	384	388	329	385	1937	864	312	1948	869
Arrive On Green	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.21	0.21	0.04	0.55	0.55	0.04	0.55	0.55
Sat Flow, veh/h	1781	368	1273	1781	1870	1585	1781	3554	1585	1781	3554	1585
Grp Volume(v), veh/h	14	0	49	276	16	32	62	1020	104	87	855	6
Grp Sat Flow(s),veh/h/ln	1781	0	1641	1781	1870	1585	1781	1777	1585	1781	1777	1585
Q Serve(g_s), s	0.9	0.0	3.4	16.7	0.8	2.0	1.8	22.0	3.8	2.6	17.2	0.2
Cycle Q Clear(g_c), s	0.9	0.0	3.4	16.7	0.8	2.0	1.8	22.0	3.8	2.6	17.2	0.2
Prop In Lane	1.00		0.78	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00
Lane Grp Cap(c), veh/h	198	0	133	384	388	329	385	1937	864	312	1948	869
V/C Ratio(X)	0.07	0.00	0.37	0.72	0.04	0.10	0.16	0.53	0.12	0.28	0.44	0.01
Avail Cap(c_a), veh/h	363	0	490	384	620	526	406	1937	864	333	1948	869
HCM Platoon Ratio	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Upstream Filter(I)	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Uniform Delay (d), s/veh	49.3	0.0	52.2	41.2	38.0	38.5	12.2	17.4	13.3	13.3	16.1	12.3
Incr Delay (d2), s/veh	0.1	0.0	0.6	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.0
Initial Q Delay(d3),s/veh	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
%ile BackOfQ(50%),veh/ln	0.4	0.0	1.4	7.9	0.4	0.8	0.7	9.0	1.4	1.0	7.1	0.1
Unsig. Movement Delay, s/veh												
LnGrp Delay(d),s/veh	49.4	0.0	52.8	46.7	38.0	38.5	12.3	18.4	13.6	13.5	16.9	12.3
LnGrp LOS	D	A	D	D	D	D	B	B	B	B	B	B
Approach Vol, veh/h		63			324			1186			948	
Approach Delay, s/veh		52.1			45.5			17.7			16.5	
Approach LOS		D			D			B			B	
Timer - Assigned Phs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8				
Phs Duration (G+Y+Rc), s	10.8	71.9	6.9	30.5	11.1	71.5	22.0	15.4				
Change Period (Y+Rc), s	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6	6.4	6.1	5.0	5.6				
Max Green Setting (Gmax), s	5.8	38.3	13.0	39.8	6.2	37.9	17.0	35.8				
Max Q Clear Time (g_c+I1), s	3.8	19.2	2.9	4.0	4.6	24.0	18.7	5.4				
Green Ext Time (p_c), s	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.1				
Intersection Summary												
HCM 6th Ctrl Delay			21.7									
HCM 6th LOS			C									
Notes												
User approved pedestrian interval to be less than phase max green.												

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	3.1					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	37	23	41	1	0	9
Future Vol, veh/h	37	23	41	1	0	9
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	40	25	45	1	0	10

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	46	0	-	0	151
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	46
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	105
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1562	-	-	-	841
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	976
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	919
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1562	-	-	-	819
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	819
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	951
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	919

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	4.5	0	8.6
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1562	-	-	-	1023
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.026	-	-	-	0.01
HCM Control Delay (s)	7.4	-	-	-	8.6
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	-	0

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.5					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	24	56	46	0	0	22
Future Vol, veh/h	24	56	46	0	0	22
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	26	61	50	0	0	24

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	50	0	-	0	163 50
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	50 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	113 -
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42 6.22
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518 3.318
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1557	-	-	-	828 1018
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	972 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	912 -
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1557	-	-	-	814 1018
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	814 -
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	955 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	912 -

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	2.2	0	8.6
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1557	-	-	-	1018
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.017	-	-	-	0.023
HCM Control Delay (s)	7.4	-	-	-	8.6
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	-	0.1

Intersection						
Int Delay, s/veh	2.8					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR
Lane Configurations						
Traffic Vol, veh/h	48	63	50	1	0	18
Future Vol, veh/h	48	63	50	1	0	18
Conflicting Peds, #/hr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sign Control	Free	Free	Free	Free	Stop	Stop
RT Channelized	-	None	-	None	-	None
Storage Length	75	-	-	-	0	-
Veh in Median Storage, #	-	0	0	-	0	-
Grade, %	-	0	0	-	0	-
Peak Hour Factor	92	92	92	92	92	92
Heavy Vehicles, %	2	2	2	2	2	2
Mvmt Flow	52	68	54	1	0	20

Major/Minor	Major1	Major2	Minor2		
Conflicting Flow All	55	0	-	0	227 55
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	55 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	172 -
Critical Hdwy	4.12	-	-	-	6.42 6.22
Critical Hdwy Stg 1	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Critical Hdwy Stg 2	-	-	-	-	5.42 -
Follow-up Hdwy	2.218	-	-	-	3.518 3.318
Pot Cap-1 Maneuver	1550	-	-	-	761 1012
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	968 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	858 -
Platoon blocked, %		-	-	-	
Mov Cap-1 Maneuver	1550	-	-	-	735 1012
Mov Cap-2 Maneuver	-	-	-	-	735 -
Stage 1	-	-	-	-	935 -
Stage 2	-	-	-	-	858 -

Approach	EB	WB	SB
HCM Control Delay, s	3.2	0	8.6
HCM LOS			A

Minor Lane/Major Mvmt	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBLn1
Capacity (veh/h)	1550	-	-	-	1012
HCM Lane V/C Ratio	0.034	-	-	-	0.019
HCM Control Delay (s)	7.4	-	-	-	8.6
HCM Lane LOS	A	-	-	-	A
HCM 95th %tile Q(veh)	0.1	-	-	-	0.1

21-0480: Ashler Hills

Sight Distance Analysis

Location: Access & Ashler Hills

Assumptions and/or Givens

Elements of Design from AASHTO	6th Edition	AASHTO Ref
Driver Eye Height		
Passenger Vehicle	3.50 ft	§3.2.6.1, p 3-15
Truck	7.60 ft	§3.2.6.1, p 3-15
Object Height		
Stopping Sight Distance	2.00 ft	§3.2.6.2, p 3-15
Passing Sight Distance	3.50 ft	§3.2.6.2, p 3-15
Vehicle Height	4.25 ft	§3.2.6.1, p 3-15
Driver Eye Location		
From Edge of Major Rd Traveled Way	14.50 ft	§9.5.3.2.1, p 9-43
Deceleration Rate (a)		
Passenger Vehicle	11.20 ft/sec ²	§3.2.2.2, p 3-4
Truck	N/A ft	
Brake reaction time (t)	2.50 sec	§3.2.2.1, p 3-3

Site Specific Data (Bike & turn lanes are outside traveled way and are not considered)

Major Street Design Speed (V _{major})	30	MPH	
Grades - Approaching Minor Street from: (- = approaching downhill)			
Left (G _L)		%	
Right (G _R)		%	
Approach Grade Adjustment Factor	Left 1.0		Tbl 9-5, p 9-42
	Right 1.0		
Major Road Through Lanes on Each Approach	1.0	(Use 1 for RI/RO/[LI] only)	
Median Width (in "Lane Equivalents")		(Use 0 for RI/RO/[LI] only)	
Minor Road Approach Upgrade, if >3%		%	
Minor Road Access (check restricted)	LI	LO/Th	RO

Stopping Sight Distance = Brake Reaction Distance + Braking Distance

Neglecting Effect of Grade $d = 1.47Vt + 1.075 \frac{V^2}{a}$ Eq 3-2, p 3-5

Calculated d= 196.7 ft
Design d= 200 ft

With Effect of Grade $d = 1.47Vt + \frac{V^2}{30((\frac{a}{32.2}) \pm G)}$ Eq 3-3, p 3-5

Calculated d= 196.3 ft - left
200 ft - right
Design d= 196.3 ft - left
200 ft - right

SSD's do not consider design for truck operations, since better visibility is considered to offset longer braking distance. §3.2.2.5, p 3-6



21-0480: Ashler Hills

Sight Distance Analysis

Location: Access & Ashler Hills

Intersection Sight Distances

Case B—Intersections with Stop Control on the Minor Road

AASHTO Ref
§9.5.3.2, p 9-42

Case B1—Left Turn from the Minor Road

§9.5.3.2.1, p 9-43

Design Vehicle	Time Gap (t _g)	AASHTO Ref
Passenger Car	7.5 sec	Tbl 9-6, p 9-44
Single-Unit Tuck	9.5 sec	Tbl 9-6, p 9-44
Combination Truck	11.5 sec	Tbl 9-6, p 9-44

Time gap adjustments

Add'l lanes to cross (1 st is assumed)		
Passenger Car	0.5 sec	See Notes
Trucks	0.7 sec	below
Minor Approach Upgrade (Per each 1%>3%)	0.2 sec	Tbl 9-5, p 9-37

Site data

Major Road Lanes on Left Approach	1.0	§9.5.3.2.1, p 9-44
Minor Road Approach Upgrade, if >3%	0 %	§9.5.3.2.1, p 9-44

Time Gap based on site data

Design Vehicle Gap+Adj for Approach Grade>3%+Adjs for Add'l Lanes & Median

Passenger Car	7.5 sec
Single-Unit Tuck	9.5 sec
Combination Truck	11.5 sec

ISD to left & right along Major Road ISD=1.47V_{major}t_g (ft) Eq 9-1, p 9-45

Vehicle	calculated ISD=	ISD to Left and Right	design ISD=
Passenger Car	330.8 ft		335 ft
Single-Unit Tuck	419.0 ft		420 ft
Combination Truck	507.2 ft		510 ft



21-0480: Ashler Hills

Sight Distance Analysis

Location: Access & Ashler Hills

Intersection Sight Distances (cont'd)

		<i>AASHTO Ref</i>
<u>Case B2—Right Turn from the Minor Road</u>		§9.5.3.2.2, p 9-47
&		
<u>Case B3—Crossing Maneuver from the Minor Road</u>		§9.5.3.2.3, p 9-48
Design Vehicle	Time Gap (t _g)	
Passenger Car	6.5 sec	Tbl 9-8, p 9-47
Single-Unit Tuck	8.5 sec	&
Combination Truck	10.5 sec	Tbl 9-10, p 9-49
Time gap adjustments		
Add'l lanes to cross (1 st is assumed) - Case B-3 Only*		
Passenger Car	0.5 sec	See Notes
Trucks	0.7 sec	below
Minor Approach Upgrade (Per each 1%>3%)		
Case B-2 Only	0.1 sec	Tbl 9-8, p 9-47
Case B-3 Only	0.2 sec	Tbl 9-10, p 9-49
Site data		
Major Road Lanes on Left Approach	1.0	§9.5.3.2.2, p 9-47
Minor Road Approach Upgrade, if >3%	0 %	§9.5.3.2.2, p 9-47
Time Gap based on site data (sec)		
	<u>B2 & B3</u>	<u>B3 Only</u>
<i>Design Vehicle Gap+Adj for Approach Grade>3%(+Adjs for Add'l Lanes & Median for B3)</i>		
Passenger Car	6.5	6.5
Single-Unit Tuck	8.5	8.5
Combination Truck	10.5	10.5
ISD to left (B2/B3) & right (B3) along Major Rd ISD=1.47V _{major} t _g (ft) Eq 9-1, p 9-45		
		<u>ISD to Left ISD to right</u>
		<u>(B2 & B3) (B3 Only)</u>
Passenger Car	calculated ISD=	286.7 286.7
	design ISD=	290 290
Single-Unit Tuck	calculated ISD=	374.9 374.9
	design ISD=	375 375
Combination Truck	calculated ISD=	463.1 463.1
	design ISD=	465 465

*Number of major road lanes is irrelevant in Case B2.

The differences between Case B1 and Cases B2 & B3 are reduced time gaps and time gap adjustment for the minor approach upgrade. §9.5.3.2.3, p 9-48



21-0480: Ashler Hills

Sight Distance Analysis

Location: Access & Ashler Hills

Intersection Sight Distances (cont'd)


		<i>AASHTO Ref</i>
Case F—Left Turns from the Major Road		§9.5.3.6, p 9-56
Design Vehicle	Time Gap (t _g)	
Passenger Car	5.5 sec	Tbl 9-16, p 9-57
Single-Unit Tuck	6.5 sec	Tbl 9-16, p 9-57
Combination Truck	7.5 sec	Tbl 9-16, p 9-57
Time gap adjustments		
Add'l lanes to cross (1 assumed)		
Passenger Car	0.5 sec	See Notes to
Trucks	0.7 sec	Tbl 9-16, p 9-57
Site data		
Opposing Lanes (adj'd for x-wide median)	0.0	
Time Gap based on site data		
<i>Design Vehicle Gap+Adj for Add'l Opposing Lanes</i>		
Passenger Car	5.5 sec	
Single-Unit Tuck	6.5 sec	
Combination Truck	7.5 sec	
ISD to front along Major Road	ISD=1.47V _{major} t _g (ft)	Eq 9-1, p 9-45
Passenger Car	calculated ISD= 242.6 ft	
	design ISD= 245 ft	
Single-Unit Tuck	calculated ISD= 286.7 ft	
	design ISD= 290 ft	
Combination Truck	calculated ISD= 330.8 ft	
	design ISD= 335 ft	

The differences between Case F and Cases B1, B2 & B3 are reduced time gaps and no time gap adjustment for any minor approach upgrade. §9.5.3.6, p 9-58

SIGHT DISTANCE SUMMARY

Sight Distance Type	Governing Case	Car	SU Truck	Combo Truck
Stopping				
Without effect of grade		200	N/A	N/A
With effect of grade on left		200	N/A	N/A
With effect of grade on right		200	N/A	N/A
Intersection				
To Right	B1	335	420	510
To Left	B2/B3	290	375	465
On Major Road	F	245	290	335





* 5 feet measured to nearest lane line or centerline.

**15 feet measured from face-of-curb or edge-of-travelway.

S = Intersection sight distance in feet on drivers left and right for right turns, left turns and through traffic.
(See *2004 AASHTO Geometric Design of Highways and Streets* for additional sight distance requirements.)

(See [Appendix 5-3A](#), [Appendix 5-3B](#) and [Appendix 5-3C](#) for distance S.)

FIGURE 5.3-26 INTERSECTION & DRIVEWAY DEPARTURE SIGHT DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS

1. Right-Angle Intersections

Right-angle intersections are those whose legs meet at an angle of 88 to 90 degrees. For these right-angle intersections the sight distances shown in [Appendix 5-3A](#), [Appendix 5-3B](#) and [Appendix 5-3C](#) are to be used with [Figure 5.3-26](#) to calculate the sight triangle. Appendices 5-3A and 5-3B present the intersection sight distances for all street classifications which were determined assuming passenger car traffic. [Appendix 5-3C](#) presents the sight distance requirements for varying roadway widths and design speeds for passenger cars, single unit trucks and combination trucks. If high volumes of truck traffic are anticipated, sight distances given in [Appendix 5-3C](#) will be used. Sight distances for vehicles turning left from the main street should also be considered and calculated based on the *AASHTO Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*.

2. Skewed Intersections

For skewed intersections where the intersection angles are less than 88 degrees, sight distances must be calculated in accordance with the procedures described in *AASHTO's Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*. Skewed intersection design must include appropriate design for pedestrian crossings and the location of curb ramps.

3. Intersections Within or Near a Curve

Sight distance measurements, identified as S in [Figure 5.3-26](#), need to follow the curved street alignment when the intersection is within or near a horizontal curve.


4. Traffic Safety Triangles

Traffic Safety Triangles should be used as a means to limit the height of structures, vegetation and other improvements on corner properties immediately adjacent to intersections. **Safety triangles are not to be used as a substitute for intersection sight distance!** Safety triangles provide additional visibility around corners for all intersection approaches and should be applied to the design of perimeter walls and

landscape features. Items within the safety triangle cannot be higher than 18" measured from the roadway surface. [Figure 5.3-27](#) depicts the method used to determine the safety triangle location. The sight distance requirements contained in both [Figure 5.3-26](#) and [Figure 5.3-27](#) are applied at all corner lots.

5. Right-of-Way at Corners

A minimum of 25-foot radius rights-of-way shall be dedicated at street intersections to provide room for traffic control and sight distance.



Major Street Classification	X (in feet)
Parkway, Expressway, Arterials, Major Collector	25
Minor Collector	35
* Local Streets	35 / 60 / 70

* If the standard right-of-way (46 ft. local residential, 60 ft. local collector) is not available, the safety triangle (X) shall measure 60 ft. on local residential streets and 70 ft. on local collector streets from the centerlines of the streets.

FIGURE 5.3-27 TRAFFIC SAFETY TRIANGLE ON CORNER PROPERTY

E. Auxiliary Lanes

An exclusive turning lane permits separation of conflicting traffic movements and removes turning vehicles from the flow of through traffic. [Figure 5.3-28](#) and [Figure 5.3-29](#) depict the



INTERSECTION & DRIVEWAY SIGHT DISTANCE REQUIREMENTS

Six Lane Roadway

Design Speed	Sight Distance (S)					
	Passenger Car (ft)		Single Unit Truck (ft)		Combination Truck (ft)	
	TH	LT	TH	LT	TH	LT
25	350	350	470	455	540	530
30	420	420	560	545	650	635
35	490	490	655	635	760	740
40	560	560	780	725	865	845
45	630	630	840	815	975	950
50	700	700	935	905	1080	1055
55	770	770	1030	995	1190	1160

Three Lane Roadway

Design Speed	Sight Distance (S)					
	Passenger Car (ft)		Single Unit Truck (ft)		Combination Truck (ft)	
	TH	LT	TH	LT	TH	LT
25	260	295	340	375	415	450
30	310	355	410	450	495	540
35	360	415	475	525	580	630
40	415	470	545	600	660	720
45	465	530	610	675	745	810
50	515	590	680	750	825	900
55	570	650	745	825	910	990

Four Lane Roadway

Design Speed	Sight Distance (S)					
	Passenger Car (ft)		Single Unit Truck (ft)		Combination Truck (ft)	
	TH	LT	TH	LT	TH	LT
25	315	335	415	430	490	500
30	375	400	500	515	590	600
35	440	465	585	600	685	700
40	500	530	665	685	785	800
45	565	565	750	770	880	900
50	625	665	835	855	980	1000
55	690	730	915	940	1075	1100

Two Lane Roadway

Design Speed	Sight Distance (S)					
	Passenger Car (ft)		Single Unit Truck (ft)		Combination Truck (ft)	
	TH	LT	TH	LT	TH	LT
25	240	280	315	350	390	425
30	290	335	375	420	465	510
35	335	390	440	490	540	595
40	385	445	500	560	620	880
45	430	500	565	630	695	765
50	480	555	625	700	775	845
55	530	610	690	770	850	930

Notes:


- TH=Through Movement, LT = Turn Movement
- Design speed by roadway classification is shown in [Appendix 5-3A](#) and [Appendix 5-3B](#). Typically design speed is equal to the speed limit +10 mph.
- Refer to the 2004 AASHTO Geometric Design of Highways and Streets for additional information.



****Note:** Sight distance was measured based on a 15' setback from edge of curb with and offset of 5' to the right from the center of the driveway.



City Notifications – Mailing List Selection Map Shadow Ridge North





Additional Notifications:

- Interested Parties List
- Adjacent HOA's
- P&Z E-Newsletter
- Facebook
- Nextdoor.com
- City Website-Projects in the hearing process

Pulled Labels
January 11, 2022

Map Legend:

-  Site Boundary
-  Properties within 750-foot

Postcards: 154

18-UP-2021
51-DR-2021

From: [Cindy Mackey](#)
To: [Projectinput](#)
Subject: Ashler Hills Park - Case Number: 18-UP-2021
Date: Saturday, January 29, 2022 10:15:06 AM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

Once again I will submit my displeasure with continuing to go forward with the Ashler Hills Park:

#1: There are so many other areas where these funds can actually do some good ... first responders, police and fire departments, infrastructure, better traffic control, Scottsdale school system (WE NEED TEACHERS ... PAY THEM!) ... and the list goes on. We DO NOT need a park.

#2: Parking and traffic congestion: The current plan has cars entering after the traffic circle coming up Ashler Hills ... which means people are going to think they can park on the street (Ashler Hills/74th Way). That street can barely accommodate two cars (one in each direction) going up into our Las Piedras Development. If ANYONE tries to park on that street, we residents will suffer the inconvenience. The access to the parking lot needs to be BELOW that traffic circle.

#3: Noise and lights: From dogs, basketball games, pickle ball courts, bouncing balls, picnics ... etc. Late night lights from ball courts and park trails. Also the park trails extend too far north and are absolutely too close to the Las Piedras development gates.

#4: Security and Privacy: Who will maintain the security in the area? What are the hours supposed to be for this park. Who will monitor. Our development will now have exposure to outsiders from who knows where. How do we ensure our neighborhood's security and privacy?

I say once again ... we do not need this park. Direct these funds to areas of this city where it can do some good ... not just appease some dog and pickle ball enthusiasts! Thank you for considering my comments.

Cynthia Mackey
32767 N 74th Way
Scottsdale AZ 85266
clmackey@cox.net

From: [Larry Staab](#)
To: [Projectinput](#)
Subject: Ashler Hills Park - Case Number: 18-UP-2021
Date: Sunday, January 30, 2022 4:51:29 PM

External Email: Please use caution if opening links or attachments!

First of all my recommendation is to put the funds to use for our Scottsdale police force, fire department employees, public employees, school teachers, etc. GIVE THEM ALL PAY INCREASES.

This park (which we do not need) will cause parking and traffic congestion, unwanted noise, unwanted lights and our loss of privacy.

Parking & Traffic Congestion

Coming east on Ashler Hills Rd. from Scottsdale Rd. you come to the traffic circle which then becomes North 74th Way. This becomes 2-lane all the way to the Las Piedras entry gate. Are we allowing parking on both sides of the road plus the 70-parking spots? We will have a 1-lane road getting in and out of our development, total inconvenience. Also it makes more sense to put the entrance to the parking lot before the traffic circle.

Unwanted Noise & Lighting

Earlier information was that you would be keeping this park open until 10:00 PM daily. Dogs barking, late night basketball games, picnics, alcohol and crowd noise right next to our Las Piedras development. Note on mainly weekends we put up with motorcycle noise on Scottsdale Rd. through midnight leaving Cave Creek.

Security & Privacy

We have enough cars that come through our gates following homeowners without a passcode. We don't need park users being curious/nosey driving into and casing our development. There is additional risk of theft or damage within. Who will maintain the security of the area? How do we ensure our neighborhood's security and privacy?

Pickle Ball Courts

Your Site Plan is showing 8-Pickle Ball courts. How many other developments do you expect will use these courts? Would it not be appropriate for each development/retirement community to build their own courts and that includes us, Las Piedras?

Thanks for considering my questions and comments.

Larry Staab (Lot 30)

32767 N. 74th Way
Scottsdale, AZ 85266

lstaab@cox.net

Re: Case 18-UP-2021

February 12, 2022

Ms. Posler,

Please find attached the consolidated comments and requests of the property owners/residents of Las Piedras at Sevano Village, including 116 signatures representing 58 of our 64 properties.

In addition, we add the following supplemental comments:

We are unable to locate a list of criteria to be satisfied for approval of a Municipal Use Master Site Plan (MUMSP). The Applicant Submittal states: "Application is seeking approval of a Conditional Use Permit." We found the following guidance related to conditional use permits:

Conditional use permits may be granted only after the City Council has found as follows:

- A. That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare. In reaching this conclusion, the Planning Commission and the City Council's consideration shall include, but not be limited to, the following factors:
 1. Damage or nuisance arising from noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration or illumination.
 2. Impact on surrounding areas resulting from an unusual volume or character of traffic.

///

The burden of proof for satisfying the aforementioned requirements shall rest with the property owner. (Zoning Ordinance, Section 1.401)

Nuisance arising from noise and illumination and impact from traffic volume on surrounding areas are relevant to Case 18-UP-2021.

Section 1.403.S pertains to tennis clubs. While not directly on point, it is reasonable to conclude that public sport courts should not be permitted to be more impactful upon adjacent neighborhoods than private sport courts are permitted to be. We draw your attention to the following subsections:

S. *Tennis club.*

4. There shall be no shows, tournaments or other activity which would generate more traffic than is normal to a residential area, unless access is provided from an arterial street as set forth in the Transportation Master Plan and the Design Standards & Policies Manual.

///

7. Hours of operation may be controlled by the City Council.

We note that Ashler Hills Park will not be accessed from an arterial street. Thus, tournaments and other similar activities should not be allowed there, and importantly, the sport courts and parking lot should not be supersized to accommodate such activities.

Re: 18-UP-2021
February 12, 2022
Page 2 of 2

In addition – as would be required for a private tennis club – the park's hours of operation should be determined by and consistent with adjacent residential neighborhood characteristics; the hours should not be set according to a fixed, citywide policy that disregards local characteristics.

Finally, please provide us with a copy of the First Review Letter upon completion. It can be sent to parkcomments@gmail.com.

Thank you.

Elyse Flack, President
Las Piedras at Sevano Village Homeowners Association

November 1, 2021

This letter represents the consolidated comments and requests of the undersigned property owners/residents of Las Piedras at Sevano Village ("Las Piedras") regarding the latest proposed plan for the project known as Ashler Hills Park. The sections are not presented in order of importance.

Definition of Neighborhood Park

Scottsdale's General Plan 2035 provides the most current definition of Neighborhood Park:

Park of roughly two (2) to ten (10) acres in size, intended to meet the recreation needs of people living or working within a one-half mile radius. Neighborhood parks provide primary recreation services and facilities; are easily accessible and available to local residents; serve a single neighborhood or several neighborhoods, depending on the location of the park; are preferably located with or next to elementary schools, neighborhood centers, or other gathering places; and are accessed mainly by pedestrians and bicycles.

General Plan 2035 further specifies that the constituency of a Neighborhood Park is its surrounding neighborhood:

Policy R 2.1 Provide neighborhood parks that are easily accessible to local residents and provide recreational opportunities reflective of the surrounding neighborhood's needs and preferences.

Accordingly, when planning the development of a new Neighborhood Park, the City is to consider the recreational needs and preferences of residents within a one-half (½) mile radius (Figure 1 attached).

Directly Impacted Properties

General Plan 2035 also requires the City, in planning the development of a new Neighborhood Park, to specifically consider the impacts the park could have on nearby properties:

Policy R 1.8: Consider the impacts on nearby properties in the placement, renovation, and development of parks and recreation facilities.

Properties closest to the planned park will be most directly impacted. Thus, the comments and preferences of residents and owners of properties closer to the park must be given greater weight than those of more distant stakeholders within the half-mile radius.

Our community, Las Piedras, will be directly and significantly impacted by the development of Ashler Hills Park. The park parcel is contiguous with our southwestern border. The park parcel extends 490 feet – nearly one-third of its total length – "into" our community (Figure 2 attached). The park parcel is only 160 feet from the nearest home in Las Piedras. Ten homes are within 300 feet.

In addition, the park parcel and Las Piedras share a common ingress/egress route. It is the sole ingress/egress route for both. To reach or leave Las Piedras, we must drive around the park and past the park entry.

Any park development that occurs in the orange-shaded area of Figure 2 is virtually within our community. We appreciate that, in the current proposed site plan, "improvements" in this area are limited to the loop trail and existing path. We note that this area is in keeping with a designated focus of Neighborhood Parks: to preserve open spaces (Community Services Master Plan 2015). In addition, undisturbed portions of this area may count toward the development's Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) requirement.

We want to be clear that our concerns are not limited to the orange-shaded area. All park development that occurs south of the orange-shaded area is adjacent to and directly impacts our community. Noise, light, traffic and other impacts will not be contained within the park boundary.

The City has obviously received and is no doubt currently receiving many comments in favor of developing even more of the park area and adding even more pickleball courts. Many of those comments come from Terravita and Winfield. Terravita has 1,380 homes. Winfield has 511 homes/homesites. We have 64. We cannot compete numerically. However, Terravita and Winfield will not be *directly impacted* by this park. We will be. Under General Plan Policy R 1.8, the City must give our concerns greater weight.

In sum, per General Plan 2035:

- Public comments from residents within a one-half (½) mile radius must be prioritized over public comments from elsewhere in Scottsdale (definition of Neighborhood Park and Policy R 2.1).
- Moreover, among the comments of those within a half-mile radius, comments from residents of neighborhoods adjacent to the park site must be given the highest priority (Policy R 1.8).

Park Size and Scope

According to the Maricopa County Assessor and City Map Center,¹ APN 216-51-098 is 15 acres (653,228 and 653,217.89 square feet, respectively). The measuring tool on both websites confirms these numbers. According to the 2019 Bond Election materials and park planning documents, the park parcel is 17 acres. Does the park include two acres outside of APN 216-51-098, and if so, where are they? Or are the 2019 Bond Election materials and park planning documents inaccurate?

During public outreach in 2018 as part of the 2019 Bond process, the City presented to Las Piedras residents a Proposed Site Plan dated 1/24/18 ("1/24/18 Plan"). That site plan depicts development on the southern **2.8 acres** of the site. All built elements of the park clearly lie south of the southern 404 wash, with the "site perimeter concrete walk" roughly following the course of that wash.

¹ <https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/maps/parcel-information>

On November 10, 2020, the City Council was asked to approve the Architectural Services Contract for this park. The City Council Report for that action item states (bold added):

Most of the improvements are planned to be constructed on about **3 or 4 acres** at the **southern end** of the site. Staff envisions **the other areas of the site remaining in a more natural state**, with limited walking trails, seating nodes and shade structures.

The current proposed site plan was prepared under that contract. Yet, the area to be "developed" has ballooned – not from 2.8 to "3 or 4" acres – but **from 2.8 to 6.8 acres**. It has more than doubled in size. In fact, all the proposed "improvements," except the parking lot, lie beyond the site perimeter of the 1/24/18 Plan (Figure 3 attached).

The 1/24/18 Plan includes one (1) tennis court, one (1) basketball court, and three (3) pickleball courts – all located **south** of the southern 404 wash. The current proposed site plan includes one (1) basketball court and eight (8) pickleball courts – all located **north** of the southern 404 wash.

The parking area has grown in concert with the number of sport courts. The parking lot in the 1/24/18 Plan has 19 parking spaces. The parking lot in the current proposed site plan has almost quadrupled to 70 spaces.

The current proposed site plan is far different from the plan the City presented to Las Piedras residents on October 29, 2018 as part of the 2019 Bond outreach process. We understand that the 1/24/18 Plan is, as its title indicates, a proposed plan. However, the magnitude of the difference in size and scope – and the attendant, significant and additional impacts upon our quality of life and home values – leaves us feeling that the City pulled a bait-and-switch.

Las Piedras is the only neighborhood contiguous to the park and would be the most directly affected by overbuilding the park. We therefore request the City:

- Restore the scale of the park's developed area to that presented during the 2019 Bond outreach process (2.8 acres) and to certainly no greater than that specified when the City Council approved the Architectural Services Contract (3-4 acres).
- Limit the developed area to the southern end of the site as described in the City Council Report dated November 10, 2020 and depicted on the 1/24/18 Plan – preferably limited to south of the southern 404 wash.

Sport Courts

During public outreach in 2018 as part of the 2019 Bond process, the City presented to Las Piedras residents a proposed site plan that included one (1) tennis court, one (1) basketball court, and three (3) pickleball courts – all located south of the southern 404 wash. The current proposed site plan includes one (1) basketball court and eight (8) pickleball courts – all located north of the southern 404 wash.

At the Thompson Peak Park, the City provides three (3) portable pickleball nets that are used on the

basketball court. If the City does the same at the Ashler Hills Park, there would be effectively eleven (11) pickleball courts in use at the park.

Scottsdale Community Services Master Plan 2015 distinguishes between passive and active programming in Neighborhood versus Community parks:

Park Classification	Programming
Neighborhood	75% passive / 25% active
Community	65% active / 35% passive

General Plan 2035 defines active and passive recreation as:

Active Recreation - Leisure activities that use organized play areas including, playing fields, swimming pools, and basketball courts.
Passive Recreation - Leisure activities that involve less energetic, individual, or non-organized (i.e., team) activities, such as walking, bicycling, horseback riding, running, sitting, hiking, skateboarding, picnicking, card and board games, or simply enjoying the natural environment.

Nine to eleven sport courts represent a passive-to-active ratio in line with a Community Park, not a Neighborhood Park.

Scottsdale Community Services Master Plan 2015 distinguishes between revenue-producing facilities in Neighborhood versus Community parks:

Park Classification	Revenue-producing facilities
Neighborhood	None
Community	Limited

It is Las Piedras' understanding that pickleball classes, clinics, learning leagues, league play and tournaments are not permitted in Cholla Neighborhood Park. Likewise, they should not be permitted in Ashler Hills Park. Moreover, Ashler Hills Park should not be scaled – as it has been in the current proposed plan – to accommodate pickleball league play and tournaments.

Several neighborhoods located in whole or in part inside the one-half (½) mile radius already have or are constructing pickleball courts: Whisper Rock (3), Winfield (2), Terravita (2 + portable nets), and Scottsdale Heights (2).

As the City knows, an organized, vocal group is lobbying for even more pickleball courts in Ashler Hills Park (which the group refers to as "Scottsdale North Park"). The group is actively encouraging public comment from within and *outside* Scottsdale. The group has formed SPARC, a 501(c)(3), to raise tax deductible funds to "enhance the project." Scott Gaertner, a local real estate agent, describes that enhancement: "An example would be having private dollars pay to add more pickleball courts than the city is comfortable funding."

Is this why the number of pickleball courts has ballooned from three to eight (not including portable nets on the basketball court)? What is the City's position about forming a public/private partnership to fund pickleball courts? The City's project video states: "Types of improvements are limited to available funding." But is "available funding" limited to the \$6.1 million bond allocation, or is the City accepting private donations? Are Scottsdale's public parks for sale? Must nearby property owners raise funds to pay for passive recreational programming in order to preserve the peaceful enjoyment of our homes and protect our property values? This is disturbing on many levels.

Las Piedras requests:

- The number of sport courts be reduced to an appropriate number within the Neighborhood Park programming ratio of 75% passive / 25% active.
- That no sport courts be built any closer to Las Piedras than as depicted on the current proposed site plan.
- Confirmation that pickleball classes, clinics, learning leagues, league play, and tournaments will not be conducted or held at Ashler Hills Park.
- An honest, transparent conversation with the City regarding its position on forming a public/private partnership or otherwise accepting private money to pay for amenities in Ashler Hills Park.
- Confirmation that no intergovernmental agreement applies to Ashler Hills Park.
- Confirmation that public comments from outside Scottsdale will not be considered in the Ashler Hills Park planning process, including comments without an address.

Tennis Court

During public outreach in 2018 as part of the 2019 Bond process, the City presented to Las Piedras residents a proposed site plan that included one (1) tennis court, one (1) basketball court, and three (3) pickleball courts. In the current proposed plan, the tennis court has been replaced with five (5) pickleball courts. Some Las Piedras residents voted for the bond package on the belief that Ashler Hills Park would have a tennis court.

The City has only four (4) tennis courts north of Bell Road, the northernmost of which is at Sonoran Hills Park on Williams Drive. The City's Tennis Court Equity Map does not even extend as far north as Jomax Road.

The popularity of tennis soared during the pandemic (www.espn.com/tennis/story/_/id/30882614/). In 2020, recreational participation rose 22%, including a 44% increase in new players over the previous year. Entry-level racket sales went up nearly 40%.

Las Piedras requests the tennis court be restored in lieu of (not in addition to) the five added pickleball courts.

The City has addressed noise in the project FAQs as follows:

Will noise from the sport courts noise (sic) impact adjacent residential neighborhoods?

The sport courts are located along the west property boundary adjacent to the existing commercial development. This provides an ample buffer from the residential neighborhoods. Operating hours will be limited to dawn to 10 p.m.

Las Piedras appreciates that in the current proposed site plan, the sport courts are located along the west property boundary adjacent to the existing commercial development. However, for several reasons, we question whether this location will provide "ample buffer":

1. The sheer *number* and *type* of sport courts: nine (9) courts, including eight (8) pickleball courts. If, as at Thompson Peak Park, the basketball court can be converted, with portable nets, to three (3) pickleball courts, there could be eleven (11) pickleball courts in use at this park.
2. The City has not commissioned a Noise Study or a Noise Mitigation Plan.
3. It is an unproven **assumption** that this many courts of this type at this location will not disturb the peaceful enjoyment of Las Piedras residents.
4. The possibility that even more sport courts could be added. More courts would mean even greater cumulative noise and the possibility that courts could be located even closer to Las Piedras.
5. Noise is experienced and measured within a context. The ambient noise level in and around the park parcel is far lower than the ambient noise level in and around the three Scottsdale parks with pickleball courts. The ambient noise level in Las Piedras is *extremely quiet* at all hours and especially quiet in the early morning and evening. Pickleball noise must be considered relative to **our** contextual ambient level.
6. Like our dark sky, we value our quiet.
7. Pickleball noise in the early morning (from dawn/sunrise) and evening hours (to 10 PM) is particularly concerning.
8. There is no sound barrier – natural or man-made – between the proposed sport courts and Las Piedras. Pickleball noise will travel unimpeded across the open desert.
9. The granite mountain behind Las Piedras may amplify pickleball noise, reflecting it back into Las Piedras.

General Plan 2035 calls for the planning process to minimize noise pollution:

Noise - Any undesired audible sound, especially one that is loud or disagreeable.

Goal CD 6 Minimize light and noise pollution.

CD 6.3 Integrate noise considerations and abatement techniques into the planning process.

Where non-residential uses abut established and planned residential areas, General Plan 2035 ensures the protection of private property rights (bold added):

Land Use Element (bold added)

Whenever non-residential uses are next to established or planned residential areas, special care **must** be taken to ensure privacy and to **protect personal property**. Residential buffering and transition techniques include increased setbacks, landscaping, restricted land uses, diversion of traffic, **controlled noise** or light, height limitations, and transitional land uses (e.g., offices, medium-high density residential uses). Mixed-use areas can still provide a combination of housing and non-residential uses while **respecting** privacy and **personal property rights**.

Under Design Standards and Policy Manual ("DSPM") 2-3.100.L, the Zoning Administrator may require Special Impacts Analysis including:

4. Noise mitigation plan is the proposed measures to limit noise trespass on adjacent properties.

To ensure the continuing peaceful enjoyment of our homes and preserve our property rights, Las Piedras requests:

- Rather than assuming the proposed sport courts are a sufficient distance away to provide "ample buffer," conduct a thorough and unbiased Noise Study. Consider the number of courts (including the use of portable pickleball nets), type of courts, ambient noise levels on site and in Las Piedras, topography (including the mountain behind Las Piedras), time of day (including dawn/sunrise and evening hours), and any other relevant factors.
- Modify the park plan per the results of the Noise Study. Consider: fewer sport courts, different type of sport courts, shorter park hours, and incorporating noise mitigation measures into sport court design.
- In no event, should the number of sport courts be increased, nor should sport courts be built any closer to Las Piedras than shown on the current proposed site plan.

Dark Skies

Numerous City of Scottsdale plans, ordinances and design standards protect our dark skies. Starting from the top, General Plan 2035:

Goal CD 6 Minimize light and noise pollution.

CD 6.1 Support Scottsdale's dark sky areas and designation as an Outdoor Light Control City by reducing light pollution, glare, and trespass where possible, while still attending to public safety needs.

CD 6.2 Encourage creative, energy-efficient, and high-quality designs for outdoor lighting that reflect the character of the local context.

The Design Principles of the City's Exterior and Site Lighting Design Guidelines speak to several of our concerns with respect to the park:

- The use of lighting should ... reflect a balance for the lighting needs with the contextual ambient light level and surrounding nighttime characteristics of our community.
- Lighting designs should be designed to minimize glare and light trespass, to implement energy conservation, and to maintain dark skies.
- Full cut-off fixtures, mounting heights, and shielding should be utilized to effectively control glare and light trespass.

The ESL overlay confers specific protections:

ESLO 6.1070.G.1.f

Exterior lighting should be low scale and directed downward, recessed or shielded so that the light source is not visible from residential development in the area or from a public viewpoint.

DSPM 2-1.208.A.9-11

In the ESL areas of the city, ... the maximum height from finished grade to the bottom of the any [sic] exterior luminaire shall not exceed sixteen (16) feet.

In the ESL areas of the city, parking lots, site lighting, and building mounted exterior lighting should be reduced to security levels at 10 p.m., or 1 hour after the close of business, whichever occurs later. Exterior lighting shall be controlled by an astronomical clock and photocells.

In the ESL areas of the City, no lighting shall be permitted in Natural Area Open Space (NAOS) easements, vista corridor easements, scenic corridors, buffered setbacks, and/or desert scenic roadways setbacks.

Under DSPM 2-3.100.L, the Zoning Administrator may require Special Impacts Analysis including:

2. Outdoor lighting mitigation plan that includes the proposed measures to limit outdoor lighting trespass on adjacent properties.

Where non-residential uses abut established and planned residential areas, General Plan 2035 ensures the protection of private property rights (bold added):

Land Use Element (bold added)

Whenever non-residential uses are next to established or planned residential areas, special care **must** be taken to ensure privacy and to **protect personal property**. Residential buffering and transition techniques include increased setbacks, landscaping, restricted land uses, diversion of traffic, **controlled** noise or **light**, height limitations, and transitional land uses (e.g., offices, medium-high density residential uses). Mixed-use areas can still provide a combination of housing and non-residential uses while **respecting** privacy and **personal property rights**.

The Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) developed the concept of Ambient Lighting Zones to provide appropriate lighting design levels based on the context of the area. On Scottsdale's Ambient Lighting Zones Map (DSPM Figure 2-1.1), Las Piedras is located within Ambient Lighting Zone E-2 Estate/Rural Areas. Of this zone, DSPM states: "Lighting levels are generally low; there is often an expectation in the neighborhoods that the lighting levels remain low." Las Piedras is at the base of a small mountain located within Ambient Lighting Zone E-1 Intrinsically Dark Areas. DSPM describes this zone as: "There is little nighttime activity and few outdoor lighting sources."

We don't need the Ambient Lighting Zones Map to know our community is dark! Las Piedras strictly adhered to lighting standards during its development. We continue to preserve our darkness by, for example, prohibiting bistro, string and other hanging lights. These efforts, combined with low ambient light levels all around us, results in a very dark community which we value very highly. In full and vehement agreement with DSPM's description of Ambient Lighting Zone E-2: We have an expectation that our lighting levels remain low.

With respect to the Ambient Lighting Zones and lighting design, DSPM 2-1.209 states:

A. Consider the characteristics of the adjacent land uses in all lighting designs. **Maintain the existing ambient lighting level of adjacent residential areas.**

The project FAQs state: "All lights will be high efficiency 'full cut-off' fixtures which are designed to prevent light from spilling onto adjacent property." Full cutoff fixtures prevent direct upward light. When installed properly, they emit zero luminous intensity at or above horizontal (i.e., at or above 90° above nadir). As such, full cutoff fixtures reduce sky glow. Las Piedras fully supports the use of full cutoff fixtures.

However, direct uplight is only one form of light pollution. We are extremely concerned about glare and reflected uplight from below horizontal, i.e., between 0° - 90° above nadir. Everyone has experienced brightly lit sport courts at night. They are visible from far away, even in areas with far brighter ambient light levels than Las Piedras. Newer lighting technology certainly offers improved control over direct uplight and light spill, and we fervently support choosing the very best technology available. But no technology can eliminate the light pollution that will travel from the park into Las Piedras.

To reduce light pollution and protect our property rights, Las Piedras requests:

- The project adhere in the strictest fashion to all applicable City plans, ordinances, design

standards and design guidelines to preserve our dark sky and low ambient light level.

- Preparation of an Outdoor Lighting Mitigation Plan pursuant to DSPM 2-3.100.L.
- In addition to central control that shuts off sport court lighting at park closing, install on-site controls for each sport court. The on-site controls should be manual "on" / automatic "off" (timer or vacancy sensor). Such a control system will ensure lights are on only when a court is in use, reducing both light pollution and energy consumption.
- In no event, should the number of sport courts be increased, nor should sport courts be built any closer to Las Piedras than shown on the current proposed site plan.
- Park hours of 9 a.m. to 7 p.m.
- Allocation of a sufficient budget to lighting (design and system) to ensure the project meets and exceeds lighting standards for ESL and Ambient Lighting Zone E-2.
- Security level lighting: minimum number of fixtures, minimum height and minimum brightness.
- Any additional steps that must be taken to comply with DSPM 2-1.209.A ("Maintain the existing ambient lighting level of adjacent residential areas.").

Park Hours

What are the intended park hours?

Generally, all city parks are to be open sunrise to 10:30 PM.

Sec. 20-35. - Park hours; use. Hours for public use of all portions of city parks, including parking areas, shall be from sunrise until 10:30 p.m., unless authorized by permit issued by the city, or as otherwise provided by the general manager, pursuant to section 20-52 of this chapter.

The City's Ashler Hills Park project website states the sport courts will close at 10:00 PM:

- The lights will be centrally controlled and will have automatic timers to allow operation only from dusk until 10 p.m.
- [Sport court] operating hours will be limited to dawn to 10 p.m.

Las Piedras does not view operating hours of dawn to 10 PM as "limited."

DSPM provides specific guidelines for Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) areas such as ours:

In the ESL areas of the city, parking lots, site lighting, and building mounted exterior lighting should be reduced to security levels **at 10 p.m.**, or 1 hour after the close of business, whichever occurs later. [2-1.208.A.10]

Since a city park is not a business, we presume the Ashler Hills Park project website is correct and the lighting will be reduced to security levels by 10:00 PM. Likewise, we presume the park will be closed by 10:00 PM.

Sunrise in Scottsdale ranges from 5:17 AM to 7:32 AM. CivTech's Traffic Impact Statement predicts the park will generate "zero trips during the typical weekday AM peak hour" (7:45-8:45 AM). Hence, there is no need to open the park at dawn.

Las Piedras enjoys dark skies at night and a very low ambient noise level at all times, but especially from dusk to dawn. (See "Dark Skies" and "Noise" sections.) Early morning and nighttime park hours in particular would degrade the two most cherished aspects of our neighborhood: darkness and quiet.

For these reasons and those detailed throughout this letter, Las Piedras requests park hours of 9 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Traffic Burden

Las Piedras residents will be affected by the park-generated traffic burden on 74th Way, on Ashler Hills Drive, and at the traffic signal at Scottsdale Road/Ashler Hills Drive. The *only* route out of Las Piedras is 74th Way to Ashler Hills Drive to Scottsdale Road. The *only* route in to Las Piedras is Scottsdale Road to Ashler Hills Drive to 74th Way. The development around us is set; there is no possibility for an additional ingress/egress route in the future. Moreover, Las Piedras residents must pass through the intersection at Scottsdale Road/Ashler Hills Drive to travel anywhere from our homes and back (except The Summit).

The City has addressed traffic in the project FAQs as follows:

Will the park increase neighborhood traffic?

City of Scottsdale has completed a traffic impact study for the proposed project. The report prepared by CivTech Engineers concluded that the park will not significantly impact the existing traffic on the adjacent streets, including the intersection at Scottsdale Road.

However, the CivTech Traffic Impact Statement dated May 21, 2021 ("CivTech TIS") indicates it is not a traffic impact study:

This TIS is part of Floor Associates' application to the City requesting a rezoning of the project site. The purpose of this statement is to document the expected number of daily and peak hour trips generated by the site. CivTech does not expect this statement to be sufficient to serve [as] a Traffic Impact Study, which may be required later by the City for approval of the development.

Furthermore, the CivTech TIS does not draw any conclusions regarding traffic impacts on "adjacent streets." Instead, the statement presents conclusions only for the two "intersections" involved: a) the traffic signal at Scottsdale Road/Ashler Hills Drive and b) the site access.

With respect to the intersection at Scottsdale Road/Ashler Hills Drive, CivTech concludes that during three peak hours (weekday 7:45-8:45 AM, weekday 4:00-5:00 PM and Saturday 11:15-12:15), the westbound approach (i.e., from Las Piedras) is currently operating at level of service (LOS) D. Per Scottsdale's Transportation Action Plan 2021 and DSPM 5-1.801.B, LOS D is considered the *minimum*

acceptable level for signalized intersections. CivTech concludes that the westbound level of service will not deteriorate with the addition of site generated (i.e., park) traffic.

However, that conclusion is only as valid as the accuracy of CivTech's estimates. CivTech estimates, without explanation, that the site will generate **zero** trips during the weekday AM peak hour (7:45-8:45 AM). This is at odds with the webpages for Thompson Peak, Horizon and Cholla parks which all state: "Mornings are typically the busiest time for pickleball play at [park name]."

Furthermore, the CivTech TIS fails to consider the traffic to be generated by the development of APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A. Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way is approximately ¼-mile long between the eastern edge of The Summit and Las Piedras' entrance. Over that distance, the street ultimately will receive and carry traffic generated by four developments: Las Piedras, the park, APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A. A credible traffic volume study must include traffic from all four sources.

DSPM recognizes the need to include that data (bold added):

5-1.400.C. Analysis of Future Conditions

Future traffic demand estimates are developed by adding the estimated site generated traffic, **all** approved (or **potential**) **development in the area**, and current traffic volumes adjusted for general growth in the area.

APN 216-51-100 has not been platted, so a firm unit count is not available. However since traffic studies rely on assumptions, an assumption can be made that the developer will seek rezoning to a classification similar to surrounding properties. Las Piedras is zoned R1-5; Solstice at Sevano is zoned R-4. Thus, the resultant unit count could be in the range of 38 to 59 homes. See Figures 4 (R1-5) and 5 (R-4) attached.

APN 216-51-003A could be developed with APN 216-51-100 or separately. The unit count for the 003A parcel could be in the range of 27 to 43 homes, including the existing Empie House. See Figures 4 (R1-5) and 5 (R-4).

Combined, these parcels could generate traffic from 65 to 102 homes.

Finally, we note that the CivTech TIS does not include a safety analysis of the proposed site access. DSPM indicates safety shall be considered:

5-1.700 ANALYSIS

In addition to capacity analysis, several other transportation service-related factors shall be considered, including:

A. Safety

5-1.801 ESTABLISHMENT OF GOALS

A. Study recommendations and conclusions are intended to provide safe and efficient movement of traffic to and from, within and past, the proposed development, while minimizing the impact to non-site trips.

In sum, the impacts of site-generated traffic have not been fully assessed. Las Piedras requests further study including:

- analyses that take into account future traffic from development of APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A
- safety of the proposed site access for drivers entering the park, exiting the park, and passing the site access in both directions
- evaluation of our suggested alternative site access location (see "Safety Issues at Park Entrance" section)

Safety Issues at Park Entrance

DSPM 5-3.123 INTERSECTIONS (bold added)

To minimize conflicts and provide for anticipated traffic movements, each intersection must be evaluated based on individual characteristics and designed based on the following factors:

...

B. Physical factors such as topography, existing conditions, channelization requirements and **available sight distance**.

Las Piedras notes that the CivTech TIS does not include a safety analysis of the current proposed park access ("proposed access"). See "Traffic Burden" section.

At the park site, east-west Ashler Hills Drive turns to become north-south 74th Way. The northeast portion of that long turn has the shortest radius of curvature; this sharp curve is a blind curve (Figure 6 attached).

The proposed access location is a safety issue because it is too close to the blind curve; drivers on either side of the blind curve cannot see each other. More technically speaking, they do not have sufficient Stopping Sight Distance. The Minimum Stopping Sight Distance is 155 feet and 200 feet at 25 mph and 30 mph design speeds, respectively (DSPM Appendix 5-3A).

These four examples illustrate the problem:

- Driver A travelling N-E on Ashler Hills Drive and turning left into the park and Driver B travelling S-W on 74th Way cannot see each other until Driver B comes around the blind curve. At which point, Driver B is within 80 feet of the proposed access where oncoming Driver A is making a left turn across Driver B's travel lane. Eighty feet is roughly half of the required Minimum Stopping Sight Distance at 25 mph design speed.
- Driver C exiting the park via a left turn and Driver B travelling S-W on 74th Way cannot see each other until Driver B comes around the blind curve. At which point, Driver B is within 80 feet of the proposed access where Driver C is making a left turn across Driver B's travel lane.
- Driver D exiting the park via a right turn and Driver B travelling S-W on 74th Way cannot see each other until Driver B comes around the blind curve. At which point, Driver B is within 80 feet of the proposed access where Driver D is turning into Driver B's travel lane.

- Driver E exiting the park to APN 216-51-003A and Driver B travelling S-W on 74th Way cannot see each other until Driver B comes around the blind curve. At which point, Driver B is within 80 feet of the proposed access where Driver E is crossing Driver B's travel lane.

Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way is the only ingress/egress for Las Piedras. The same is true for the two parcels directly east of the park, APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A. Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way is the only route between these parcels and Scottsdale Road. Moreover, there is no possibility for an additional ingress/egress route for Las Piedras or these parcels in the future. Accordingly, the safety and navigability of Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way is of paramount importance to us and no doubt to the future residents of APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A as well. Accidents near the park access will at the very least impede traffic flow and may entirely shut down Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way – trapping residents and service providers inside or outside these neighborhoods.

Of course, when APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A are subdivided and built out, Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way will carry more daily trips than it does today. In the meantime, during buildout, there will be years of construction traffic. To safely and efficiently accommodate the increased load on the only access road available to these parcels and Las Piedras, it is imperative the park access be safe.

Accordingly, Las Piedras suggests an alternative location for the park access ("alternative access location") (Figure 7 attached). This location is far superior for the following reasons:

1. The alternative access location is further away from the blind curve and flanked on both sides by a longer, straighter section of road. Both sections provide a Stopping Sight Distance that exceeds the required Minimum Stopping Sight Distance (155 feet and 200 feet at 25 mph and 30 mph design speeds, respectively). Furthermore, unlike the proposed access, the alternative access location complies with the Minimum Tangent Approaching Intersection for a 25 mph street: a 100 foot straight section of road in each direction (DSPM Appendix 5-3A). In sum, the longer, straighter sections of road will allow drivers in all the scenarios described above (and others not described) to see each other from further away, resulting in fewer collisions.
2. At the alternative access location, there is sufficient space to install a left turn lane into the park in the eastbound direction. A left turn lane will a) increase safety, b) reduce collisions, and c) decrease impact on neighborhood traffic. N-E bound neighborhood traffic will be able to drive past the park access without slowing or stopping.
3. Between the western park boundary and Las Piedras, Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way has a single lane in each direction. Accidents at the park access can shut down the street, trapping us in or out of our community. Many Las Piedras residents have been here long enough to have experienced this during extreme flash flooding at Scottsdale Road. Fewer accidents means fewer occurrences where our one and only access route is closed, preventing us from reaching or leaving our homes.
4. Per General Plan 2035, Neighborhood Parks are intended to be "accessed mainly by pedestrians and bicycles." Currently, the bicycle lanes on Ashler Hills Drive terminate west of the traffic calming circle. Immediately east of the calming circle, the street is not wide enough to accommodate bicycle lanes. In other words, the bicycle lanes do not extend to the proposed access. However, the bicycle lanes will extend to the alternative access location.

The following General Plan 2035 policies support safe bicycle access to the park:

- B 3.1 Promote bicycle access from neighborhoods to schools, parks, recreational centers, and services.
- B 3.3 Minimize physical and regulatory barriers that would hinder improvements to bicycling.
- B 3.4 Work to reduce conflicts with vehicles, pedestrians, and other bicyclists by incorporating best practices for bicycles as a transportation mode in addition to a recreational activity.
- C 1.3 Reduce conflict points between various modes of travel, for example, where the paths of vehicles and bicycles, pedestrians, or equestrians, cross, diverge, or merge.

DSPM provides for site plan review with respect to bicycle safety:

- 5-1.704 SAFETY
- B. Pedestrians and Bicycles
The site plan should be reviewed to ensure that the ... external access points are designed for pedestrian safety and to minimize vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. ... These considerations should also be addressed for projects expected to generate significant bicycle traffic.

In sum, Las Piedras requests the City consider our alternative access location.

Too Many Parking Spaces

The parking lot in the 1/24/18 Plan had 19 parking spaces. The parking lot in the current proposed site plan has almost quadrupled to 70 spaces.

The Zoning Ordinance specifies the number of parking spaces required for each use:

Table 9.103.A. Schedule of Parking Requirements

Parks	Three (3) parking spaces for each acre of park area.
-------	--

Ashler Hills Park measures 15 acres. Thus, only 45 spaces are required; 70 spaces represents a 56% excess. (Even if Ashler Hills Park is 17 acres, only 51 spaces would be required; 70 spaces represents a 37% excess.)

The Zoning Ordinance parking schedule does not distinguish between classifications of parks, but General Plan 2035 and the Community Services Division Master Plan do.

Under General Plan 2035, parks of different classifications are accessed differently:

- Neighborhood Parks Accessed mainly by pedestrians and bicycles
- Community Parks Accessed mainly by automobiles and bicycles

Seventy parking spaces is an excessive number for a park that should be "accessed mainly by pedestrians and bicycles."

In fact, a 70-space parking lot is in line with a *Community Park*, not a *Neighborhood Park*. The Community Services Division Master Plan contrasts parking expectations for the two classifications:

Neighborhood Parks	Limited parking that is appropriate for neighborhood use
Community Parks	Sufficient to support optimal usage

Because *Neighborhood Parks* are intended to have "limited parking" and be accessed "mainly by pedestrians and bicycles," it stands to reason that three parking spaces per acre is the absolute maximum number required for a *Neighborhood Park*.

By any measure, seventy parking spaces is an excessive number for and incompatible with this *Neighborhood Park*.

Moreover, CivTech did not determine 70 parking spaces were needed. Rather, CivTech was told "the site will provide approximately 70 parking spaces." Under "Conclusions," the CivTech TIS states: "... it was assumed that 70 parking spaces would be sufficient for the park." CivTech did not consider whether fewer parking spaces would be sufficient.

In addition, on the current proposed site plan, the number of parking spaces has grown in proportion to the number of sport courts. Because the number of sport courts should be reduced, it follows that the number of parking spaces should be reduced proportionally.

Finally, it is incompatible with Environmentally Sensitive Lands to pave virgin desert for an oversized parking lot.² In a section unrelated to parks, the Zoning Ordinance cautions against this very situation:

The city recognizes that strict application of the required parking standards or ratios may result in the provision of parking facilities of excessive size or numbers of parking spaces. This results in excessive pavement and impermeable surfaces ... [9.104.F.1]

The excessive parking spaces proposed here should be eliminated.

In sum, Las Piedras requests the City:

- Restore the number of parking spaces to that presented during the 2019 Bond outreach process.
- Alternatively, reduce parking spaces commensurate with a reduction in the number of sport courts.
- In no event, provide more spaces than indicated by Table 9.103.A of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Mitigate the parking lot's visual impact by lowering its elevation and generously planting trees around its perimeter. (Locate the trees strategically to also provide shade over the parking spaces.)

² For example, DSPM 2-2.500.B. Minimize scarring of the natural topography.

Miscellaneous

Las Piedras requested project elevation drawings, or at least the proposed height of what is referred to on the project video as the "soaring" Pavilion. The City responded that elevations and heights are not available. We await a response as to the *proposed* height of the Pavilion as depicted in the four renderings and video on the project website. We need this information to evaluate and comment upon the Pavilion.

This park provides a prime opportunity to fully utilize the Greater Phoenix Green Infrastructure Handbook: Low Impact Development (LID) Details for Alternative Stormwater Management (2019) (www.scottsdaleaz.gov/design). This Handbook was developed for the City of Scottsdale and ASU's Sustainable Cities Network under City of Scottsdale program management.

Like our City's trailheads, the park should qualify for LEED Gold (or better) certification in line with Scottsdale's policy for all newly constructed public facilities.

Provide water bottle filling stations at all water fountains. Reasons: water conservation, reduced use of single-use plastic water bottles, reduced trash/recycling pickup from park, and public health (water fountains were closed during the COVID peak while bottle filling stations remained open).

Artificial turf has many environmental disadvantages and is not aesthetically in keeping with the local context. Instead, use a natural, drought-tolerant, non-traditional turf alternative for the artificial turf area.

Provide both covered and uncovered picnic table options for use in all seasons. Some covers could have slats oriented to provide both summer shade and winter sun.

Twin the Bins – all trash containers should be paired with recycling containers so the opportunity to throw something away is matched with an equally convenient opportunity to recycle it.

What's in a Name? For many years, this park site was known as "Sevano Village Park." The City now refers to it as "Ashler Hills Park." SPARC would like to see it renamed "Scottsdale North Park," presumably with the intent that the park should serve a wider area and thus have even more pickleball courts. Las Piedras does not support this name change. As a Neighborhood Park, the park's name should have a connection to the neighborhood itself.

Conclusion

This is very personal. It's about our homes – in the most personal sense. Many in our neighborhood feel their "nest" is threatened.

It's also about our property values. Since the bond election, we have already had residents sell their homes and leave Scottsdale because of this park. Those decisions were made in response to a far less

opprobrious site plan than the one currently before us. Many more homes will likely go up for sale if our concerns are not addressed.

So, we ask the City – our City – to take our concerns to heart. We ask for answers to our questions. We ask for a seat at the table. It appears SPARC already has a seat at the table. We, as adjacent property owners, ask for at least the same opportunity as this process moves forward.

Thank you,

The Undersigned Residents and Property Owners of Las Piedras at Sevano Village




Figure 1. One-half mile radius from park site (shaded red)




Figure 2. Park extends into Las Piedras, to within 160 feet of homes



Figure 3.
1/24/18 Plan (shaded purple) superimposed over current proposed site plan, showing expansion from 2.8 to 6.8 acres. In the current proposed site plan, all the proposed "improvements," except the parking lot, lie beyond the site perimeter of the 1/24/18 Plan.




Figure 4. Traffic sources

Future traffic demand estimates must include traffic generated from existing development, the park site and potential development. This ¼-mile section of Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way ultimately will receive and carry traffic generated by: Las Piedras, the park, and two undeveloped parcels east of the park (APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A). In this Figure, the two undeveloped parcels are depicted as if developed with R1-5 zoning.

Note: in this Figure, the park entrance is not shown in the location proposed by the City; rather, it has been moved to the alternative location suggested by Las Piedras.




Figure 5. Traffic sources

Future traffic demand estimates must include traffic generated from existing development, the park site and potential development. This ¼-mile section of Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way ultimately will receive and carry traffic generated by: Las Piedras, the park, and two undeveloped parcels east of the park (APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A). In this Figure, the two undeveloped parcels are depicted as if developed with R-4 zoning.

Note: in this Figure, the park entrance is not shown in the location proposed by the City; rather, it has been moved to the alternative location suggested by Las Piedras.




Figure 6. Blind curve safety hazard at City's proposed access (park entrance)

Drivers travelling S-W out of the blind curve and drivers entering and exiting the park would not see each other until they are within 80 feet of each other – a distance far short of the Minimum Stopping Sight Distance and the Minimum Tangent Approaching Intersection required per DSPM (Appendix 5-3A).



Figure 7. Alternative access (park entrance) location suggested by Las Piedras, including added left turn lane

Diana Hines

Signature

DIANA HINES

Printed Name

7487 E CAMINO RAYO DE LUZ

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Fred Hines

Signature

FRED HINES

Printed Name

7487 E. CAMINO RAYO De LUZ

Street Address

SCOTTSDALE, AZ, 85266

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Susan M. Harnois

Signature

Susan M. Harnois

Printed Name

32731 W. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Shelby H. Kinarsky

Signature

Shelby H. KINARSKY

Printed Name

7474 E CALLE PRIMORA VITA

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Pamela Peck

Signature

PAMELA PECK

Printed Name

7527 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Debra S. Carleton

Signature

DEBRA S. CARLETON

Printed Name

D.C. 7407

~~7527~~ E. CAMINO RAYO DEL LUZ Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address

Cynthia Mackey

Signature

CYNTHIA MACKAY

Printed Name

32767 N 74TH WAY
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Lawrence (Larry) Staab

Signature

LAWRENCE (LARRY) STAAB

Printed Name

32767 N. 74TH WAY (LOT 30)
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Rita Aragona

Signature

RITA ARAGONA

Printed Name

7425 E. Calle Primera Vista

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Kristi H. Chatham

Signature

Kristi H. Chatham

Printed Name

7406 E. Camino Rayo De Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Russell A. Chatham

Signature

Russell A. Chatham

Printed Name

7406 E Camino Rayo De Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Jana Cashin

Signature

Jana Cashin

Printed Name

7440 E. Calle Primera

Street Address

85266 Vista

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Jean Cortes

NEAN CORTES

Printed Name

3283 ~~B~~ N 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Richard Bonfanti

Richard BONFANTI

Printed Name

7550 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Deborah Rex Bonfanti

Deborah Rex Bonfanti

Printed Name

7550 E Camino Salida del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Shannon Bronz

Shannon Bronz

Printed Name

7598 E Camino Salida del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266




Signature

ADAM BECHTOL

Printed Name

7587 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address




Signature

Rebecca Murillo

Printed Name

7587 E Camino Salida Del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address



Signature

ALISA McMAHON

Printed Name

7454 E. CAMINO RAYO de LUZ

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

Michael Fiflis

Printed Name

7454 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Heidi Drier

Signature

Heidi Drier

Printed Name

32893 N 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Tom Drier

Signature

Tom Drier

Printed Name

32893 N 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

David Harwood

Signature

DAVID HARWOOD

Printed Name

32731 N 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Jeannie Kohn

Signature

Jeannie Kohn

Printed Name

7441 E. Calle Primera Vista

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

DM Cashin
Signature

D. Michael Cashin
Printed Name

7440 E. Calle Primera Vista Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address 85266

Ruth Isak
Signature

RUTH ISAK
Printed Name

7409 E. CALLE PRIMERA VISTA Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

Martha Goode
Signature


Martha Goode
Printed Name

7533 E. Camino Salida del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address

Stephen T. Goode
Signature

Stephen T. Goode
Printed Name

7533 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address


Signature

Steve SANBORN
Printed Name

7581 E CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

Eileen Sanborn
Printed Name

7581 E. Camino Salida Del Sol
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

Sherri Gironda
Printed Name

7457 E. Calle Primera Vista
Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

FRANK GIRONDA
Printed Name


7457 E. CALLE PRIMERA VISTA
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

SHERRIE JOHNSTON
Printed Name

7546 E. CAMINO PUERTA DEL SOL Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address


Signature


DEREK TALLON
Printed Name

7546 E. CAMINO PUERTA DEL SOL Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address


Signature

Willard Floney
Printed Name

32715 74th Way Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address


Signature

Susan Lindholm
Printed Name

32785 N 74th Way Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address

Patricia E. Gorman

Signature

Patricia E. Gorman

Printed Name

32749 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Thomas P. Prose

Signature

Thomas P. Prose

Printed Name

32749 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Marc Almgren

Signature

Marc Almgren

Printed Name

32821 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Alanna Almgren

Signature

Alanna Almgren

Printed Name

32821 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Constance J Vorpahl

Signature

Constance J Vorpahl

Printed Name

32879 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Thomas Vorpahl

Signature

Thomas Vorpahl

Printed Name

32879 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Bill Loeffler

Signature

Bill Loeffler

Printed Name

7605 E. Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Sandra Loeffler

Signature

Sandra Loeffler

Printed Name

7605 E. Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Tim Kohn

Signature

TIM KOHN

Printed Name

7441 E CALLE PRIMERA VISTA

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Dave Roesch

Signature

Dave Roesch

Printed Name

7598 E Camino Solida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

R. Coates

Signature

RON COATES

Printed Name

32838 N. 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Nicola J Berry

Signature

NICOLA BERRY

Printed Name

32838 N 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

James H Patterson
Signature

JAMES H PATTERSON
Printed Name

7569 E CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Brenda J. Patterson
Signature

Brenda J. Patterson
Printed Name

7569 E. Camino Salida del Sol
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Jennifer Iacovelli

Signature

Jennifer Iacovelli

Printed Name

7575 East Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

LOT 18 7599 E CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL SCOTTSDALE
85264


Elyse Flack ELYSE FLACK

Bruce Flack BRUCE FLACK

Mitchell Flack MITCHELL FLACK

Melissa Flack MELISSA FLACK

11/3/2021



Signature

CAROLINE TURNER

Printed Name

32713 N. 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature


KEVIN TURNER

Printed Name

32713 N. 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

CARLEE TURNER

Printed Name

32713 N. 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Marian Paoletti

Signature

MARIAN PAOLETTI

Printed Name

32874 N 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Wynn H. Paoletti

Signature

Wynn H. Paoletti

Printed Name

32874 N 74th WAY

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Willy
Signature

WILSON YU
Printed Name

7557 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Leanne Yu
Signature

LEANNE YU
Printed Name

7557 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Jennifer Zolan

Signature

Jennifer Zolan

Printed Name

32857 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

PATRICK CONLIN

Printed Name

7408 Cable Primeria Vista

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

Laura Hoffman
Printed Name

32839 N 74th Way
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

Joel Hoffman
Printed Name

32839 N 74th Way
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Craig Hurl

Signature

CRAIG HURL

Printed Name

7486 E CAMINO RAYO DE LUZ

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Anna Sousa

Signature

Anna Sousa

Printed Name

7486 E. Camino Rayo de Luz

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address




Signature

JEFF SITES

Printed Name

7438 E CAMINO RAYO DE LUZ Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address



Signature

Julie Sites

Printed Name

7438 East Camino Rayo De Luz Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Meilan Haehn

Signature

Meilan Haehn

Printed Name

7538 E. Camino Puesta Del Sol

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Jim S. Haehn

Signature

JEFFREY S. HAENH

Printed Name

7538 E. Camino Puesta del Sol

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

A. J. [unclear]

Printed Name

Joe LANKIAL

Street Address

7538 E CAMINO SALIDA

DEL SOL

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Ronna Lea Martinson

Printed Name

Ronna Lea Martinson

Street Address

7538 E. Camino Salida DEL SOL

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

Lyle R PARKER
Printed Name

32947 N. 74 Way
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266


Signature

LAUREL PARKER
Printed Name

32947 N. 74 Way
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Constance Bynum

Signature

CONSTANCE BYNUM

Printed Name

7422 E CAMINO RAYO DE LUZ, Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Mackenzie S. Quinonez

Signature

Mackenzie S. Quinonez

Printed Name

7407 E. Camino Rayo de Luz Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

John G. Carleton

Signature

JOHN CARLETON

Printed Name

7407 E. CAMINO RAYO de LUZ Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Kate B Scheer

11/5/2021

Signature

Kate B. Scheer

Printed Name

7568 E. Camino Salida Del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Daniel J. Scheer

Signature

Daniel J. Scheer

Printed Name

7568 E Camino Salida Del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

D. Quinn
Signature

Daniel M. Quinn
Printed Name

7532 E. Camino Puesta del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address
85266

Patrice Halloran
Signature

Patrice Halloran
Printed Name

7532 E Camino Puesta del Sol Scottsdale, AZ 85266
Street Address

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address
Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address
Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Victor Richard Postillon

Signature

Victor Richard Postillon

Printed Name

7592 Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Kerry Postillon

Signature

Kerry Postillon

Printed Name

7592 E Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Scott Kuechle

Signature

Scott Kuechle

Printed Name

7423 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Yuri Kuechle

Signature

Yuri Kuechle

Printed Name

7423 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address


Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266




Signature

ROBERT E OLIVA

Printed Name

7925 E. CALLE PRIMERA VISTA Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address



Signature


DAVID FLACK

Printed Name

32857 N. 74TH WAY

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address



Signature

SHEILA KANARISH

Printed Name

7424 E. CALLE PRIMERA VISTA

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address



Signature

Anne S Flack

Printed Name

32857 N. 74TH WAY Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Street Address

Gill Gillenwater

Signature

Powell B. Gillenwater, III

Printed Name

32911 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Izuru Hino Gillenwater

Signature

Izuru Hino Gillenwater

Printed Name

32911 N. 74th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

Braden Stephenson

Printed Name

7552 E Camino Puesta Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

Corinne Stephenson

Printed Name

7552 E Camino Puesta Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

Michael L Stephenson

Printed Name

7552 E Camino Puesta Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266



Signature

Kathy Stephenson

Printed Name

7552 E Camino Puesta Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

David Doak

Signature

DAVID DOAK

Printed Name

32856 N 14th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Tom Locati

Signature

Tom Locati

Printed Name

32929 N. 14th Way

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Ronald J. Milazzo

Signature

Ronald J Milazzo

Printed Name

7455 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

T. Burkhardt

Signature

Theresa Burkhardt

Printed Name

7593 E. Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

William Burkhardt

Signature

William Burkhardt

Printed Name

7593 E. Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Ann Kafka

Signature

Ann Kafka

Printed Name

7539 E Camino Salida del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Todd Kafka

Signature

Todd Kafka

Printed Name

7539 E Camino Salida Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Richard Schadeck
Signature

RICHARD SCHADECK
Printed Name

7563 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Sandra Schadeck
Signature

SANDRA SCHADECK
Printed Name

7563 E. CAMINO SALIDA DEL SOL
Street Address SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85266

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Kenneth R Johnston
Signature

KENNETH R JOHNSTON
Printed Name

7456 E CALLE PRIMERA VISTA
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Cyndy Johnston
Signature

Cyndy Johnston
Printed Name

7456 E Calle Primera Vista
Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Vincentanne Casale

Signature

Vincentanne Casale

Printed Name

7521 E. Camino Saluda Del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Kelly Czech

Signature

Kelly Czech

Printed Name

7470 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

William R Czech

Signature

William R CZECH

Printed Name

7470 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Baylee Czech

Signature

Baylee Czech

Printed Name

7470 E Camino Rayo de Luz

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Robert J Jastrzab

Signature

ROBERT J. JASTRZAB

Printed Name

7564 E. Camino Salida del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

Regina Jastrzab

Signature

Regina S. JASTRZAB

Printed Name

7564 E. Camino Salida del Sol

Street Address

Scottsdale, AZ 85266

[Handwritten mark]

Signature

MAUFRED BELLEN

Printed Name

7439 E. CAMINO BAYO
DE LUZ,

Street Address

STREET ADDRESS 43 152 445

[Handwritten signature]

Signature

ELKE A. BELLEN

Printed Name

7439 E. CAMINO BAYO
DE LUZ,

Street Address

STREET ADDRESS 43 152 445

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

STREET ADDRESS 43 152 445

Signature

Printed Name

Street Address

STREET ADDRESS 43 152 445

Ashler Hills Park
Virtual Public Meeting #2 Public Comment
March 31, 2022

This public comment is an addendum to the consolidated comments and requests of the property owners/residents of Las Piedras at Sevano Village ("Las Piedras") dated November 1, 2021 and signed by 116 property owners/residents.

With respect to the length of this document and our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments, please bear in mind that these are the comments of 116 individuals and the two documents collectively are equal in size to 116 short comments.

From Las Piedras' perspective, the proposed park plan has not changed since Virtual Public Meeting #1. Therefore, we reaffirm and reiterate our consolidated comments dated November 1, 2021 and supplement them as follows:

Safety Issues at Park Entrance

The Virtual Public Meeting #2 video states that, "based on community input, the plan was revised to shift the location of the parking lot entry." But the site plan in the video and on the project webpage does not depict a new parking lot entry location. We have been assured that the design team and Transportation Department are looking at the location of the entry and see many benefits to moving it westward. Las Piedras remains hopeful the entry will be relocated to one of the two locations depicted in the Transportation Department's conceptual drawings.

Are Scottsdale's Public Parks For Sale?

The Virtual Public Meeting #2 video states: "Types of improvements are limited to available funding." SPARC and Scott Gaertner continue to speak about raising private funds to "enhance the project," "fill any shortfall," and build *another* 8 pickleball courts. (Exhibits A and B) We again express our vehement objection to the proposition that the type and extent of a public park's amenities would literally and figuratively be "for sale" to private interests. That proposition is a slippery slope and a policy decision with consequences far beyond the number of pickleball courts in this park.

Visitor Volume and Park Scale

The Virtual Public Meeting #2 video explains why a Neighborhood Park is not an appropriate location for an off-leash dog park. We get it. As the video indicates, Thompson Peak Dog Park will be "on a major intersection, surrounded by parks and major roadways, [and therefore] is appropriate for a high volume of visitors." Chaparral Dog Park is "strategically surrounded by a water treatment facility, ballfields and open space, and a very busy Hayden Road" and thus is appropriately located to receive its 300,000 annual visitors.

With respect to access, Thompson Peak Dog Park will be located at the corner of two **Minor Arterials** and accessed via one or both of them. Chaparral Dog Park is accessed from a **Major Arterial**. By

contrast, Ashler Hills Park will be accessed by a **Local** rural/ESL street.

Clearly, Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park is not 300,000 visitors-a-year material. And yet, Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park, as currently proposed, could receive close to 300,000 visitors annually! According to pickleball advocates, there is demand for double the number of courts shown on the current site plan. And, like Chaparral Dog Park, it is very conceivable that pickleball players from "all over the area" and "nearby cities" will come to Ashler Hills Park to use the courts. So, if 8 pickleball courts are built and the basketball court doubles as 3 pickleball courts (using portable nets), presumably the 11 courts would be fully utilized. That means 44 pickleball players using the courts for an average of 16.1 hours a day. That's 258,566 park visitors a year for the pickleball courts alone. (Exhibit C) Realistically, sport courts are unlikely to be used in the middle of the day in the summer. However, that number does not include the visitors who will come to the park for its other amenities. Accordingly, with the currently proposed number of pickleball courts, upwards of 250,000 park visitors a year is a reasonable estimate.

The currently proposed size of the parking lot is another indication that the City is planning and building for high volume use at Ashler Hills Park. The City has requested 56% more parking spaces than required by the zoning ordinance. At the rate of two people per car who visit the park for a two-hour period, 70 parking spaces will accommodate 411,355 visitors a year. (Exhibit C) While it's unlikely the parking lot will be full in the middle of the day during the summer, this number does not include visitors who walk or bike to the park.

The point is: the number of pickleball courts and parking spaces on the current site plan would put Ashler Hills Park on a trajectory to serve on the order of 300,000 visitors a year. By the City's own admission, 300,000 is an excessive visitor count for a Neighborhood Park and this location.

In sum, there is a direct correlation between visitor volume and development scale (amenities built). We again implore the City to develop Ashler Hills Park to an appropriate scale for a Neighborhood Park and this site. (Please see our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments for specifics.)

Bona Fide and Weighted Public Comments

The Virtual Public Meeting #2 video states: "the first virtual public meeting generated 234 comments from the community as well as statements from some of the local Homeowners Associations." Our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments was not a statement from our homeowners association, but rather the comments of the 116 property owners/residents who contributed to and individually signed the letter. If our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments have not been counted as 116 comments, they should be. The same is true for this addendum.

In our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments, we raised these issues regarding the Ashler Hills Park planning process:

- Public comments from residents within a one-half (½) mile radius must be prioritized over public comments from elsewhere in Scottsdale (General Plan 2035 definition of Neighborhood Park and Policy R 2.1).

- Moreover, among the comments of those within a half-mile radius, comments from residents of neighborhoods adjacent to the park site must be given the highest priority (General Plan 2035 Policy R 1.8).
- Conversely, public comments from outside Scottsdale must be disregarded. While people from outside Scottsdale will be welcome to use the park, only Scottsdale residents, taxpayers, voters and property owners should have a voice in the planning process for this public-owned amenity. Accordingly, comments should not be considered that: a) do not provide an address; b) have a non-Scottsdale address; or c) have a Scottsdale mailing address that is not physically located within the City boundary.

In a Planning case Las Piedras participated in a few years ago, the Planning Department mapped the origin location of the public comments it received. Las Piedras requests that Capital Project Management map the public comments received throughout the Virtual Public Meeting process (#1 and #2). This will:

- a) ensure that only bona fide Scottsdale comments are considered in the Ashler Hills Park planning process,
 - b) facilitate proper weighting of the comments from within a one-half (½) mile radius, and
 - c) assure the highest weight is given to comments from neighborhoods adjacent to the park site.
- Please respond to this request.

Scottsdale Desert Parks Design Guidelines

One of our community members recently came upon the Scottsdale Desert Parks Design Guidelines.¹ These Guidelines support many of the requests Las Piedras made in our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments. The Guidelines apply to parks developed within the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance districts, especially those north of Jomax Road, and therefore apply to Ashler Hills Park. Some of the more pertinent portions of the Guidelines follow. Page numbers are in parentheses.

VISION

The ultimate image that should be fostered is that the park "grew" out of its site and has been there for generations. (3)

[In neighborhood parks,] design would emphasize the unique Sonoran Desert environment through minimal site disturbance and desert-responsive architecture. Lighting should be sensitively considered. (4)

LIGHTING

The Guidelines have a considerable amount to say about lighting. We have collected several relevant

¹ Architectural & Engineering Design Guidelines www.scottsdaleaz.gov/design
 Desert Parks Design Guidelines www.scottsdaleaz.gov/planning-development/long-range-planning/desert-parks-design-guidelines and www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Design/GL_DesertParks.pdf

statements in Exhibit D attached. The recurring themes are:

- limited
- low level (height)
- low intensity
- state-of-the-art, best available technology

Overhead lighting should be avoided except for parking lots and sport courts, and poles should be no taller than the minimum height needed to provide coverage. Low-level and low-intensity lighting may be used elsewhere with discretion. Bollards and landscape lighting are preferred over pole- or building-mounted lighting. Main path lighting should be low level and low intensity; minor pathways and trails should not be lighted.

In the Virtual Public Meeting #2 video, Chris Brown states that the "second illumination diagram shows the extent of the **pathway** lighting." This appears to be the 12 foot tall lighting referenced in the Virtual Public Meeting #1 video. Does the lighting plan call for 12 foot tall **pathway** lighting? If so, that is not consistent with the Guidelines.

SITING OF RECREATIONAL AMENITIES

Sport courts and parking lots should be located at a lower grade.

Facilities should be "dug in" and not "filled in" onto the site. (11)

If possible, courts should be slightly "depressed" within a landform to reduce the appearance of height, and create additional enclosure. (12)

But according to Sections A-A, C-C and D-D on Sheet Title C0.1 dated 11.9.2021, the sport courts and parking lot are to be constructed at or above natural grade ("existing ground"). As called for in the Guidelines, Las Piedras requests the sport courts and parking lot be "depressed" below natural grade.

PARKING LOTS - DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

- Landscape for parking lots must comply with and exceed minimum standards established by the City of Scottsdale. (27)
- All parking lots must be screened from public view through a combination of low walls, dense desert landscape, and berms. (27)

SCREEN WALLS AND EARTH BERMS

- Screen walls are less desirable in parks than earth berms, low seat walls, tubular steel fencing and plantings. (23)
- Where walls exceed a height of four feet use terracing. (23)

BUILDINGS/ARCHITECTURE

In general, building height should not exceed one story ... (18)

The proposed 28 foot height of the "soaring Pavilion" exceeds one story.

PRESERVE ZONES

A minimum of 25% of the park site should be left as undisturbed desert preserve. (39)

This guideline appears to be met. The NAOS calculations submitted on Case 51-DR-2021 indicate that the required and provided NAOS comprise 28% of the park parcel. Parenthetically, the Site Data on the same drawing answers our November 1 question regarding park size. The "Gross Lot Area" is 15 acres (not 17 acres as advertised in the bond election).

APPROPRIATE ACCESS

Neighborhood parks ... should have access from minor collector streets. (9) (underline added)

Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way is not and has never been classified as a Minor Collector. Nor is it classified as a Minor Collector in the Transportation Action Plan agendized for City Council adoption on April 5, 2022. Minor Collectors rural/ESL serve traffic volumes of 5,000 - 15,000 ADT. Local streets, in contrast, serve less than 5,000 ADT. Bottom Line: **The extent of development within this park must consider the level of access available.**

The CivTech Traffic Impact Statement dated May 21, 2021 ("CivTech TIS") projects 5,191 daily trips. That estimate exceeds the intended volume for Local streets and enters Minor Collector territory. However, as pointed out in our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments, CivTech underestimates the projected traffic volume. For example, CivTech a) concludes the site will generate zero trips during the weekday AM peak hour and b) fails to consider the traffic to be generated by development of APN 216-51-100 and APN 216-51-003A. Clearly, the actual traffic count will be higher than 5,191 daily trips, well into Minor Collector territory. As outlined in our November 1, 2021 Consolidated Comments, the traffic burden created by the park will have significant consequences for our community. **We implore the City to scale back the park development to a level commensurate with access from a Local street.**

There is precedent for considering the negative impact of proposed land uses, including their traffic burden, on adjacent residential neighborhoods. The Neighborhood Traffic Management Program is one example. While it appears the program primarily processes speed awareness and traffic calming requests, it also has a preventive component. Its goals include:

- B. Work to ensure that **proposed land uses**, and their **associated travel demands**, do not **negatively impact surrounding/adjacent residential neighborhoods**.

C. **Protect Scottsdale’s residential neighborhoods** from “unwanted” vehicle traffic.
“Unwanted” vehicle traffic is defined as any one of the following:
3. An **excessive volume of traffic on a residential local** or minor collector street.
[DSPM 5-9.100; bold added]

(While the preventive component should apply to all proposed land use cases, we note that Ashler Hills Drive/74th Way east of The Summit meets the program application criteria outlined in DSPM 5-9.001.)

We understand a park will be built at the Ashler Hills site. We are simply asking the City to follow its guidelines, standards and policies to ensure the site is **not over-developed** to the detriment of adjacent residential neighborhoods. Now is the time to prevent a scenario that would negatively impact Las Piedras – our quality of life and property values. Moreover, once the park is built, there's no solution. For both our neighborhood and the park, Ashler Hills/74th Way is and forever will be the one and only access. We have to live together; we must get this right.

Invasive Species / Fire Prevention

As part of the City's development of the park parcel, Las Piedras requests that the City remove *Baccharis sarothroides* (desert broom) and *Oncosiphon piluliferum* (globe chamomile, stinknet) prior to site disturbance. Scottsdale Fire is quite familiar with these two **highly flammable invasive species**. Their proper removal will not only create a more fire-resistant park and lower maintenance costs; it will make the City a good neighbor. Both plants demonstrate remarkable aerial seed dispersal. It's a veritable snowstorm on 74th Way when desert broom is in bloom and the wind blows. Globe chamomile produces a prolific amount of seeds that spread by wind and vehicles. Desert broom and globe chamomile must be removed prior to site disturbance because both species are opportunistic in disturbed soils.

More Pickleball Courts Than Picnic Tables

Finally, we note that in the plan presented in Virtual Public Meeting #2, there are twice as many pickleball courts as picnic tables. Hardscape Plan H102 calls for 8 picnic tables in the keynotes, but only 4 tables appear on the plan. Four picnic tables seems insufficient for a Neighborhood Park. The Scottsdale Community Services Master Plan 2015 lists the following Amenities for a Neighborhood Park:

Basic amenities for **picnicking** and for play. Restrooms are common, as well as occasional pavilions/shelters, small turfed areas, playgrounds, **picnic tables**, benches, landscaped areas, and limited sports fields. [bold added]

Thank you for your consideration of Las Piedras' Virtual Public Meeting #2 Public Comment.

From: Scott Gaertner Group <scott@scottgaertnergroup.com>

Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 9:45 AM

Subject: EXTERNAL: Scottsdale North Park Update!!



TIME TO MAKE YOUR VOICES HEARD!!



The virtual public meeting for the Scottsdale North Park that will be located behind the Summit is now available to be viewed.

The city refers to this park as Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park. The presentation below is a fantastic representation of what the city is proposing, and they want your feedback. The city will accept public comments on this presentation until the end of March.

They appear to have adopted our suggestion for multigenerational workout equipment, but they are still including only 8 pickleball courts. The demand would seem to suggest double that amount, and they are only using about 3 acres of the 17 acres available for Scottsdale North's only park. Private money can be raised to fill any shortfall.

Now is the opportunity to speak up about what you'd like to see in the park.

To watch the video and participate in the Virtual Public Meeting, click the link below: 📌

[**Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park**](#)

Don't forget, if you enjoy receiving these messages add us to your address book, and I am never too busy to help you or your referrals! Please give me a call at 480-634-5000 or send me an email at Scott@ScottGaertnerGroup.com and we promise to take great care of them!

Visit our website



Exhibit A



TIME TO MAKE YOUR VOICES HEARD!!

Only A Few Hours Left!!!

If you think 8 pickleball courts is not enough for a 15-acre park, you need to let the city know loudly.

The local residents immediately adjacent to the park are SCREAMING!



The virtual public meeting for the Scottsdale North Park that will be located behind the Summit is now available to be viewed.

The city refers to this park as Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park. The presentation below is a fantastic representation of what the city is proposing, and they want your feedback. The city will accept public comments on this presentation until the end of March.

They appear to have adopted our suggestion for multigenerational workout equipment, but they are still including only 8 pickleball courts. The demand would seem to suggest double that amount, and they are only using about 3 acres of the 17 acres available for Scottsdale North's only park. Private money can be raised to fill any shortfall.

Now is the opportunity to speak up about what you'd like to see in the park.

To watch the video and participate in the Virtual Public Meeting, click the link below: 📌

[**Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park**](#)



www.scottgaertnergroupp.com • 480-634-5000
Copyright © 2018 Scott Gaertner. All rights reserved.

Don't forget, if you enjoy receiving these messages add us to your address book, and I am never too busy to help you or your referrals! Please give me a call at 480-634-5000 or send me an email at Scott@ScottGaertnerGroup.com and we promise to take great care of them!

Visit our website



Sunrise in Scottsdale ranges from	5:17 am to 7:32 am	
2 hr 15 min spread		
1 hr 7.5 min midpoint	6:24 am	
6:24 am to 10:30 pm	16.1	hours/day
doubles on 8 courts + 3 portable courts	44	players/hour
	708.4	players/day
	258,566	players/year

Parking	70	spaces
6:24 am to 10:30 pm	16.1	hours/day
2 people per car; 2-hour visit	1127	visitors/day
	411,355	visitors/year

Scottsdale Desert Parks Design Guidelines - Lighting References

Page numbers are in parentheses; bolded text is bold in the original Guidelines.

Concept/Approach (32)

Because of the remote nature of this study area, an emphasis should be made to limit park lighting, yet address basic site safety requirements. Lighting, in general, should be low-level and low-intensity. Overhead lighting should be avoided except as necessary to light ballfields, courts, and parking lots. ... Where possible, bollards and landscape lighting is preferred over pole or building mounted lighting. During late evening and overnight hours when the park is closed, lights should shut off automatically to eliminate negative light impact to nearby residents.

Parking Lots (33)

- Pole-mounted light fixtures should be utilized in the parking lot to provide an appropriate safe light-level. **Pole-heights should be as low as possible while still providing adequate light coverage** (16 ft. is preferred as a maximum height).
- Lighting source should be shielded from view wherever possible, and should **minimize unnecessary light "spillage"**.
- For lighting cutoff and control, the city of Scottsdale will **use the best available and current technology**.

Courts (35)

- Basketball, Volleyball and Tennis Courts should be **lighted during evening park hours, and controlled to automatically shut off when the park closes**.
- Light poles should be **designed at a minimum acceptable height, with light source shielded to concentrate light on court surface**.

Shared Use Trails and Paths (36)

- **Main shared use path lighting should be low level and low intensity**; adequate to maintain an acceptable level of safety.
- **Minor pathways and multi-use trails should not be lighted**, except in specific designated areas with special safety requirements.

The Coalition of Greater Scottsdale



8924 E. Pinnacle Peak Road
Suite G-5 PMB 518
Scottsdale, AZ 85255
www.COGSaz.net
e: mails: cogsboard@cogsaz.net

Re: 18-UP-2021 and 51-DR-2021 ASHLER HILLS PROPOSED PARK

COGS supports the concerns of the Las Piedras owners and residents regarding the proposed Ashler Hills Park project.


- It is much more active than the city's definition of a Neighborhood Park.
 - Neighborhood Park policy is 75% passive and 25% active, this park appears to be the opposite.
 - Pickleball courts that produce noise and light in an area people choose to live because it is quiet and in a designated dark skies and ESL area of the city.
 - Measuring and reporting expected pickleball and basketball noise is appropriate and necessary.
 - Minimizing light trespass in all directions, horizontal and vertical, is critical.
 - Limiting hours is also critical.
 - Parking 70 spaces on the 15 acres exceeds the policy of 3 spaces per acre or 45 car parking spaces per policy and encourages far more intense uses than a Neighborhood Park would normally accommodate. Neighborhood Parks focus on pedestrian and bikes and not cars. Community Parks support optimal usage which this project was not presented to be.
- Las Piedras is directly and significantly impacted on their SW border.
- An official Traffic Impact Study must address the Ashler Hills/Scottsdale Road intersection, a major entry/exit into the Summit shopping center, Level of Service, and all additional concerns raised by Las Piedras.

Our Board of Directors have studied the Las Piedras at Sevano Village letter and accompanying signatures. **COGS fully supports its position.** We find it to be a comprehensive, factual, and constructively prepared position. We encourage the city staff to consider their requests with greater weight than subdivisions located at greater distances from the proposed park project that are not as negatively impacted.

Respectfully, Coalition of Greater Scottsdale Board of Directors

Marilynn Atkinson, Jim Davis, Stan Morganstern, Howard Myers,

Copper Phillips, Sonnie Kirtley and Andrew Scheck



The Coalition of Greater Scottsdale

8924 E. Pinnacle Peak Road

Suite G-5 PMB 518

Scottsdale, AZ 85255

www.COGSaz.net

e: mails: cogsboard@cogsaz.net

March 2022 and not in your packet for August 10, 2022 hearing ????

Re: 18-UP-2021 and 51-DR-2021 ASHER HILLS PROPOSED PARK

COGS supports the concerns of the Las Piedras owners and residents regarding the proposed Asher Hills Park project.

- It is much more active than the city's definition of a Neighborhood Park.
- Neighborhood Parks policy is 75% passive and 25% active.
- Established Neighborhood Parks do not permit classes, clinics, nor leagues and tournaments. These are in the current site proposal.
- Las Piedras is directly and significantly impacted on their SW border.
- The majority of the proposed active areas (courts etc.) are closer to Las Piedras subdivision.
- Planned natural spaces should be adjacent to Las Piedras and not concentrated on the other site areas.
- Park entry is a potential driving hazard to Las Piedra egress and ingress. There is a blind curve to be addressed.
- Measuring and reporting expected pickle, tennis and basketball noise is appropriate.
- An official Traffic Impact Study must address the Asher Hills/Scottsdale Road intersection. None is included in the current city report.
- Parking 70 spaces on the 15 acres exceeds the policy of 3 spaces per acre or 45 car parking spaces per policy. Neighborhood Parks focus on pedestrian and bikes and not cars. Community Parks support optimal usage which this project was not presented to be.

Our Board of Directors have studied the Las Piedras at Sevano Village letter and accompanying signatures. **COGS fully supports its position.** We find it to be a comprehensive, factual, and constructively prepared position. We encourage the city staff to consider their requests with greater weight than subdivisions located at greater distances from the proposed park project.

Respectfully, Coalition of Greater Scottsdale Board of Directors



The Coalition of Greater Scottsdale
8711E. Pinnacle Peak Road
PMB 220
Scottsdale, AZ 85255-3517
www.cogsaz.org
e: mails: COGS@cogsaz.org

To: Planning Commissioners

Re: 18-UP-2021 Asher Hills Park

Agenda Item #7 August 10,2022 hearing

With regard to the Ashler Hills Park, COGS—Coalition of Greater Scottsdale, would hope the Planning Commission would respect and consider the reason people move to this area and make sure this park does not negatively impact the quality of life they moved here to enjoy.

Infact, that is one of the criteria of the use permit, as noted in the zoning ordinance below (applicable language highlighted).

Sec. 1.401. Issuance

A. That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be materially detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare. In reaching this conclusion, the Planning Commission and the City Council's consideration shall include, but not be limited to, the following factors:

1. Damage or nuisance arising from noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration or illumination.
2. Impact on surrounding areas resulting from an unusual volume or character of traffic.

We would ask that the Planning Commissioners pay particular attention to mitigating the noise and light trespass from the proposed Asher Hills Park and further limit lighting hours to be more compatible with the surrounding residential uses. The goal is to make this park compatible with the area, not in stark contrast to it. Considerable effort was put into mitigating noise and light from the nearby Summit shopping center when it was designed and built.

We hope the same attention would be given to this community park use so it is compatible.

The COGS Board of Directors and its members

Marilynn Atkinson, Jim Davis, Sonnie Kirtley, Howard Myers, Stan Morganstern, Copper Phillips, Andrew Scheck, and Chris Schaffner

Ashler Hills Public Outreach Summary

Overview

A comprehensive public outreach strategy was used to communicate about and seek input the development of Ashler Hills Park. For the most part, outreach was focused on the residents and home owners associations in proximity to the park.

Project Website

The cornerstone of all communication was the project website. All mailings, newsletter, social media post and signage directed interested parties back to the website.

Sections include:

- Project Status
- Project Overview
- Public Outreach (including the hosting of the Virtual Public Meeting)
- Exhibits
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Public Comment Form

Virtual Public Meetings

The first Virtual Public Meeting was hosted on the project website in September and October 2021. The virtual public meeting consisted of a video presentation which introduced the overall project, then went over details of the conceptual plan. In addition, several frequently asked questions and answers were available for people to review as well as exhibits of project elements. Comments were received by a survey form and through the phone hotline phone number. The project generated 234 comments from the community. Additionally, the property owners/residents of Las Piedras at Sevano Village submitted consolidated comments and sent a letter which was signed by 55 residents.

A second Virtual Public Meeting was held in March of 2022. The meeting will present an updated conceptual plan based on the comment received during the public process and addressed neighborhood concerns and questions about the proposed park plan.

Project/Virtual Public Meeting Publicity

Mailing (Postcard Attached)

- 1,010 homes and business in proximity of Ashler Hills Park

Electronic Publications

- Scottsdale Update

HOA

- Information on the project and the meeting was communicated to the following Homeowners Associations: Solstice at Sevano, Sevano Village, Whisper Rock, Pinnacle Peak Ranchos, Ironwood Retreat and Terravita. Many of them assiste3d with virtual public meeting publicity.

Stakeholder Outreach

The Homeowner’s Associations in the vicinity of the park site have all been active in the planning process and were notified of the meeting. Additionally, an interested parties email list was developed during the planning process and bond outreach for the project and was used to update the community on the public process.

Board and Commission Meetings

The project will be reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission twice. The first meeting is informational and will serve as an update on the project and process. The second meeting will allow the commission to vote on the updated conceptual plans and take place in early 2022 after the second virtual public meeting.

Parks & Recreation Commission Update	December 15, 2021
Parks & recreation Commission Action Item	May 18, 2022

Ashler Hills Virtual Public Meeting #1 Comments

Virtual Public Meeting Fall 2021

COMMENT 1

Highest concentration of baby boomers in United States are in 85266. I would think a senior citizen exercise park as featured in AARP would be more of a health benefit to those that live in this area. And many of these over 50 have a dog so a dog park is needed and would be a good use of space.

COMMENT 2

My wife and I live near the proposed park site. While we are concerned about increased traffic on Ashler Hills, having tennis courts nearby will be a great addition to the limited court facilities in this area. Please, please, include at least two tennis courts in the park. I am part of a group of 25-30 players who struggle for court time elsewhere, and I look forward to the new courts in the park. To that end, the many Scottsdale voters in our group supported the bond issue. Thanks for your consideration of two courts in the park. And please make tennis and pickle ball as separate facilities.

COMMENT 3

I am reaching out to comment on the Ashler Hills project. I am in total support of this project. Let's get started on it right away!!!

COMMENT 4

I would love to see a large grassy area in the park where there could be evening concerts! Where people can spread a blanket or use low chairs, pack a dinner picnic and enjoy life, and maybe even dance!! There is no where near here to feel grass under you feet! (Except golf courses, which are off limits.) My former home town in Oregon held these types of concerts and they were so well attended. People loved them! I believe it is a much better use of space at Ashler Hills Park than the possible exercise equipment platform that has been suggested. Please see Foothills Park Lake Oswego on Youtube.

COMMENT 5

Love the look of the park. Would have loved to see a dog park and am not sure why this isn't feasible.

COMMENT 6

I WOULD LOVE TO HAVE A DOG PARK!!!!!!!!!!!! THERE IS NO PLACE CLOSE TO LET THE DOGS RUN!!! ALSO I WOULD LOVE TO SEE A PICKLEBALL COURT PUT IN!!!!!!

COMMENT 7

I understand the desire to keep the pickleball courts away from the residential area, but if the courts could be laid out in two groups of 4 it would help with "drop in" pickleball. Also, it would be beneficial to have a place for players to sit (shaded or unshaded, benches or seats) and a space to rack-up between games outside of the court areas.

COMMENT 8

Hard to believe that this park won't be done until 2023....but I'm still thrilled that there will finally be pickleball courts in North Scottsdale and we won't have to drive all the way to Thompson Peak!!!

COMMENT 9

Thank you for the work you have done on the park plan thus far. I think the renderings look nice, but there are not any components that I would use. I might use the walking trail a few times, but it looks to be rather short for my purposes. North Scottsdale has an older population, so it seems a neighborhood park should contain relevant activities. A rebounding wall would appeal to tennis players of all ages and to soccer players. This would be a small area where a person could practice alone using the wall as the opponent. A fitness circuit with exercises for adults and seniors would likely get more use than a playground.

COMMENT 10

Beautiful concept. VERY disappointed that the dog park is not being considered. There are more dogs than children/grandchildren in this area and no close dog parks. Dog parks offer a great way for older (and younger) residents to get some exercise and socialize while providing the same for their pups. I hope the sports courts will be pickleball as that is a huge up and coming sport and there are again, no courts nearby.

Appreciate all the work going into making this happen. Hope the feedback from the "neighbors" that will use the park are considered and a dog park and pickleball will be part of the final park. Looks to be plenty of space for both.

COMMENT 11

We voted for the park because a dog park was included. We might have opposed the park if we knew that one was not planned. I feel like it was a bait and switch operation. And I think the dog park should be included as first planned.

COMMENT 12

Hi,

Thanks for sharing the plan for Ashler Hills Park. It looks nice, I just have a few comments:

Name of park - I feel like the name Ashler Hills Park limits the scope of who can/will use the park. I feel Scottsdale North Park better captures the people who will use the park.

Sport courts - I feel 8 pickle ball courts is a lot. I would rather see 2 basketball courts and the rest pickle ball courts.

Thank you.

COMMENT 13

I live in Oregon I was told by a realtor that Scottsdale is such a dog friendly city but that there will be no dog area in the new park. Please reconsider this! Thanks

COMMENT 14

Please consider putting an off leash area for dogs in the new park-Scottsdale is considered to be such a dog-friendly city! Thanks

COMMENT 15

Thank you for eight pickleball courts, light and parking. I like that the lights go out at 10 pm and you located the courts closest to the shopping center to remediate noise. Thank you for preserving native saguaros and vegetation. I look forward to using this park often. As I live in the adjoining Las Piedras community, I am hoping construction traffic and noise will be minimal.

COMMENT 16

Great addition to our area.

COMMENT 17

The drop down regarding noise from the sports courts does not effectively provide an answer to that question. Noise from bball and pickle all is part of the nature of the game and there should be solidly planted areas and perhaps directional walls to funnel that noise away from residential areas. As an aside, noise from the increased traffic on Scottsdale blvd is creeping up and perhaps beyond the acceptable level and plantings along the "scenic highway" could certainly improve. But that is perhaps a story for another day, albeit an important one to quality of life for all of us.

COMMENT 18

I'm glad to see this land finally being developed. However, I think 8 pickle ball courts is excessive. This amount of courts will promote league play and tournaments. What will this do for neighborhood traffic and parking when lot fills up. My concern is how it will hinder my ability to get through to my neighborhood to get home. I would rather fewer pickle ball courts and add a bocce ball court. Activity for more people yet not large enough to promote leagues coming in and taking over the "neighborhood" park.

COMMENT 19

Looks like a great park! I am super happy about it going in this area. My kids and grandkids will love it!

COMMENT 20

I just got finished watching the video and looking at the planning and layouts for the new proposed Ashler Hills Park. When I visited the FAQ's page there are two areas that are not working properly.

1. When clicking on the question " Will noise from the sport courts impact the adjacent residential neighborhoods" the wrong answer comes up. I would like to see that answered correctly.
2. When trying to report the above issue I called the number listed as the hotline for to do so and it states that it if the hotline for the Bell Road Sports Complex. I think this needs to be fixed as it will lead to frustration on the part of anyone, like me, who calls it.

I am excited about the park rendering and will look forward to the meeting as I attended the prior one and I am glad the pickle ball is being incorporated here as an additional exercise option near us.

COMMENT 21

I would like to propose part of the Ashler Hills Park be designated as a dog park. North Scottsdale does not have a dog park nearby, and there are many dog owners in this area. I hope this will be something the project team will consider. Thank you ... Joy Houghton

COMMENT 22

Hello: I like your plans, BUT you really have to consider the demographics of this area. Not a whole lot of younger people here, so honestly, I think a basketball court will not be used. There are plenty of gyms with indoor basketball courts. Pickleball is a good choice.

Now, we do feel that a dog park is important. This can easily be accomplished by fencing on of the grassy areas. The nearest dog park is the Pinnacle Dog Park about 10 miles away. There are no other dog park areas nearby. If anything, favor a dog park which will be used, rather than a plain grassy area which will mostly be used for dogs anyway.

And a skatepark. For this area, that is a pretty funny suggestion.

COMMENT 23

I would like to see a dog park added to these plans. Currently I have to drive 20 minutes one way for a safe place for my dog to play. I was under the impression this park was to have an area for dogs.

COMMENT 24

I'm thrilled to have this park near my house! Thank you for including Pickleball courts as well!

COMMENT 25

I am in favor of the North Scottsdale park and as many pickleball courts as possible.

COMMENT 26

Looking forward to seeing this great project completed!!!

COMMENT 27

Dear Board members:

This park is very exciting and badly needed in the northeast valley. Please know that the pickleball courts will see by far the most use among the resources in the park, and plan accordingly. Pickleball is growing rapidly and attracting younger players and families so please take a bit of care and learn from the mistakes at older parks: not enough shade, not enough space to accommodate bystanders waiting to play.

So, please build small shade kiosks between the courts to allow for rest and social areas within the court area.

I strongly urge you to observe the pickleball play at Cholla and Horizon and Thompson Peak to see how dangerous and uncomfortable it can be for spectators there. Please do better!

Also, I think a dog park is entirely appropriate for a neighborhood park. The notion that one should drive 20 minutes or more to reach a dog park does not make sense. It wastes energy and time,

generates traffic, etc. A dog park is not loud and is not expensive to build. There's plenty of room for a 2 acre dog park on this site. Please reconsider this. Keep in mind that the dog park does not have to be grass: it could be a fenced off section of the desert area.

Thanks again!

COMMENT 28

Please consider speeding up the construction process. It should not take 20 months to build a park. Aim for completion 6 months from now, and incentivize the general contractor to get it done on time, with both positive and negative incentives. We've been waiting more than 2 years now - Citizens need this park yesterday!

COMMENT 29

It would be helpful to have a shady area and seating near the pickleball courts.

COMMENT 30

This is great news. There is a very real need for this facility and it will be a terrific asset for our communities.

COMMENT 31

We need more Pickleball courts so please include them in the plan

COMMENT 32

Thank you for all the continued support in implementing this project. I am so excited to have pickleball courts in North Scottsdale.
With much gratitude

COMMENT 33

The plans look amazing! No negative comments other than the sooner the better. One of the only negatives of this area is the lack of parks. Great work and good luck!

COMMENT 34

Will be anxiously awaiting the new Pickleball courts. Thank you for making this a priority.

COMMENT 35

I noticed that the only FAQ you didn't answer was about NOISE !! Very telling. Do you really have to light Basketball and Pickleball courts until 10:00 PM. The purpose of that is ??? I think this stinks. My wife and I will determine who voted for this and NEVER vote for those again.

COMMENT 36

I am so excited that pickleball courts will finally be built in north Scottsdale. I have so many friends who live north of me, and we love to get together for pickleball, but the courts we are forced to use are in terrible shape. Thank you, Scottsdale!

COMMENT 37

I am so pleased to hear that this project will begin in a year. It is much needed in North Scottsdale.

COMMENT 38

The Ashler Hills Park Project has been in the works for a long time. The parks creation will bring many needed park facilities to this area of Scottsdale. The rapid growth Pickleball as the fastest growing sport in the country requires facilities for local residents to play. We need this park ASAP

COMMENT 39

What a wonderful project for our area. Thank you. We are especially happy about the Pickleball courts

COMMENT 40

First of all when did the definitions of the designated parks change? This neighborhood park is more a community park than neighborhood park with basketball and pickle ball courts and 70 parking spaces?

A playground? Why? Who asked for this? All of the local neighborhoods to this park have their own recreation centers - some already have pickle ball and playgrounds for their grandchildren to use when visiting. Nearly all of the neighborhoods are retired residents who roll up and are asleep by 8 or 9 pm. Why do we have lighting that stays on until 10pm? The open session meetings were attended by persons who wanted a dog park at this location yet our voices were not heard evidently and politics intervened for pickle ball and the other amenities of this planned park. Our community is one of the most impacted and I am extremely disappointed in the city and feel like I was conned into voting for a park we are not getting and are getting another type of park that stretches the original definition of a neighborhood park. Our board meeting is this evening and I will be presenting the plan to the community and energize our residents for their input! Thank you!

COMMENT 41

From what I have read, there will not be a dog park in the Ashler Hills Park and several of us felt sure that it was supposed to be included. I thought we voted on getting one there. There is not a dog park within miles of our area and it is desperately needed. This area is mainly older folks and I don't really see a need for basketball hoops. Very disappointed if we don't get a designated dog area.

COMMENT 42

I think that we need additional park and pickleball facilities in Scottsdale. The pickleball population is constantly expanding. It serves all age groups and is a sport that families can play together. The pickleball community is a welcoming one where neighbors can meet each other and develop relationships. This will be a welcome addition.

Thank you

COMMENT 43

The park would be a wonderful amenity in this area as we don't have a park near by. Would appreciate trees to provide shade and paths for walking. A dog friendly park would be exceptional. The playground area should be shaded and a water feature would be wonderful for children. Thank you.

COMMENT 44

Very excited about this project and having a neighborhood park nearby. I'm an avid pickleball player and so happy the park will include 8 courts. The layout with 4 rows of 2 pickleball courts each is a great design. Looking at the renderings it's hard to tell how much space is allocated "between" the 2 courts. Can you please share what this distance is?

Also, on your website the question addressing the noise from the sports courts does not pop down and give an answer.

I've reviewed the video and all renderings it looks spectacular!

COMMENT 45

Yeah! More pickleball courts -- very much needed :-)

The link on FAQ regarding noise does not work.... could you please email me the text that is suppose to appear ? (It opens the link for plants)...

COMMENT 46

Glad City is adding more pickleball courts.... it looks like you have openings at the ends of the divider fencing at the baselines of the courts. I recommend there are gates that can be opened and closed since most pickleball that are not returned are usually in the corners of the courts.

Hopefully there is 8 feet behind baselines and 5 or 6 feet on the sides?

Can you send me drawings with dimensions of the pickleball courts?

Thank you :-)

COMMENT 47

I think that a park like this will be a favorable addition to the North Scottsdale area. There is a need for a family friendly recreation facility in this area. Proximity to neighborhoods, retail, restaurants, etc. is beneficial for park visitors and local businesses alike. Restrooms - definitely needed, shade structure - definitely needed, play structure/sport courts - definitely needed. Would be great if the paved pathway was a nominal distance "loop" for walkers/runners. (i.e. 1 mile loop, etc.) Thank you for sharing conceptual plans and providing explanations - looking forward to the development of this project!

COMMENT 48

I live in the adjacent Las Piedras Development.

My continued concerns:

- 1) TRAFFIC and PARKING! It is absolutely imperative no parking be allowed on Ashler Hills or on 74th Way. You can barely fit two cars up coming and going into our development as it is.
- 2) NOISE in the area. Lighted courts or any sports with "bouncing balls, etc" will disturb the residents of Las Piedras, particularly late in the evening.
- 3) If you must go forward, activities should reflect the demographics of the surrounding area ... the majority in this area is retired and senior citizens.
- 4) With increased activity adjacent to us, we are concerned about security for our neighborhood. How

will that be addressed?

Personally I still feel the City of Scottsdale could find a better use for the dollars that are going to be spent on this proposed project. Our government needs to address so many issues. Another park is certainly not the answer to anything. Thank you.

COMMENT 49

The plans and planning look excellent. I can envision us using the park often.

COMMENT 50

I am very happy that the funding for this neighborhood park has been approved. After watching the presentation and learning that Floor & Associates is designing the park, I am even happier. I know that it will be a great addition to the far North Scottsdale area.

I understand that a dog park is not allowed, but will people still be allowed to walk their dogs (on-leash) in the park area?

Thank you!

COMMENT 51

As abutters, we have a few questions.

Will the court lighting shut automatically if there is no usage, or is it preprogrammed to stay on until 10:00 PM?

Does someone maintain the restrooms and lock the doors at closing, or will they remain open for transients all night long?

Is there any consideration for closing the park at 9:00 instead of 10:00? It would be nice not to be impacted by traffic and noise at that hour.

Is it feasible to have speed bumps in the road?

How often will trashcans be maintained, and at what time? Early morning would be detrimental.

We look forward to your responses. Thank You!

COMMENT 52

Hello,

Ken and I have reviewed the virtual public meeting link. Our input would be to install two 25 mph speed limit signs one for Ashler Hills Drive for traffic coming from Scottsdale Rd towards the park entrance and the second for traffic on N. 74th Way going the opposite directions towards the park entrance. Currently there are no speed limit signs on Asher Hills Dr and N. 74th Way.

Speed limit signs would help slow down traffic on Asher Hills Dr and N. 74th Way for the safety of those coming into and leaving the new Ashler Hills Park parking lot.

We live in the Solstice at Sevano neighborhood.

Thank You

COMMENT 53

One tennis court would be nice, and one or two less pickle ball courts. Also 70 parking spots seems a bit excessive. Looking forward to it!

COMMENT 54

Requesting public flat grass area for playing pick up sports games like football and ultimate frisbee. These require flat grass the size of a soccer field. Consider for future development.

I also saw that dog park is not allowed in this space. Consider for future park area please.

COMMENT 55

Request for a local "splash park" with shade. The one in carefree is beat up and old, far away, and only for little toddlers. Our kids ages 4-12 would benefit from a local splash pad/park closer to use, similar to all of the amazing splash parks in phoenix area.

COMMENT 56

Please give us a dog park. None in this area.
Thank you!

COMMENT 57

This is a much needed addition to this neighborhood. We are especially excited about the addition of pickle ball courts.

COMMENT 58

Ashler Hills Park suggestions
1 pickle ball courts
2 Dog run/ Grassy area with shade
3 Play ground/ Path for walking around park area
4 Picnic Tables/ Ramada/ Barbeque
Thank you !!!

COMMENT 59

I'm so excited to have a walking path at this park. It's nice to have a playground for the kids and then be able to take a walk so I get some exercise also.

COMMENT 60

The plans are really beautiful. My husband and I are so excited about having a park in North Scottsdale. We are especially excited to have Pickleball Courts to play on with lights.

My only observation is that I don't see any shaded areas for people that are waiting to play. Everywhere we play Pickleball there are people waiting to rotate in the games (with Round Robin play) and so I think it would be important to have some shaded areas for people who are coming and going off the courts.

THANK YOU very much for making a wonderful park a reality for North Scottsdale,

COMMENT 61

This appears to be a well-designed and well-thought-out park. We currently live part-time in Colorado Springs, CO and part-time in Terravita. My wife and I are tennis players in Colorado Springs and have recently added pickleball to our recreational pursuits. We love pickleball. Colorado Springs built 16 pickleball courts in a central park about 7-10 years ago. It has been almost impossible to play there due to the amount of use it gets by young and old. A few months ago Colorado Springs finished 12 more courts in a southwest neighborhood which has only slightly improved the ability to get on a court easily. "Build it and they will come" certainly applies to pickleball courts in Colorado Springs. I don't see any reason that the same thing won't happen in Scottsdale. As you can see we are strong supporters of the pickleball courts and are somewhat concerned that 8 may not be enough. We certainly don't need outdoor work-out equipment as most residents who have that interest will be using nicer indoor facilities. Overall we think this is a good location and very practical design.

COMMENT 62

Great plan.. cannot wait for u to start it soon enough

COMMENT 63

My husband and I just moved to the area and are THRILLED to learn of this park being developed! We just wish an enclosed area for dogs would be considered. Even if the enclosed area would be a small space it would be terrific. If possible, please take this into consideration.

COMMENT 64

Please incorporate a fenced-in dog park in this approved park. The surrounding communities to the park have a majority of 'senior persons' and over 70% of them have dogs. They need an area where they can take their dog, and many of the owners want to let the dog run free, which requires a fence and gates.

test

test 2

COMMENT 65

The park plans look great! There definitely needs to be at least 8 pickleball courts. Each court needs to have it's own access, so players don't have to stop play on one court so that other players get through to play on another court. Also, if courts are side by side, there needs to be a fence between them, so balls don't roll onto another court during play, which interrupts other players.

Thanks for all your time & energy in making this park happen. It's very exciting.

COMMENT 66

This is a gorgeous park with many incredible amenities. My one and only concern is the increased need for watering the lawn areas that are being considered, and that we are currently in a drought situation.

I know that the idea of a park should include grassy areas but at this time, and in this drought, I feel this should be reconsidered and even possibly excluded. Please, this is a serious concern and something the entire state of Arizona needs to consider.

All grassy green park areas consume lots of water.

Think about how much water could be saved if this was eliminated.

COMMENT 67

Building this park in North Scottsdale is long overdue. After reviewing the rendering I believe that there should be the following items in order to make the park relevant for today and the future.

Build 12 pickleball courts - fastest growing sport in America

Provide shade for pickle ball players with benches

Build a gathering ares with shade for people waiting to play pickle ball

There should be fencing around the courts

Build a walking path with exercise stations around the park

COMMENT 68

I heartily endorse the development of the Ashlee Hills Park in North Scottsdale.

I believe at least 8 pickleball courts (ten would be better) with fencing around the courts to minimize runaway balls are appropriate. Fencing, at least 42" high, dividing the courts would also be a positive improvement.

I also urge that the design include benches and shade at the pickleball courts for waiting players.

Alignment of all the sport courts/pickleball courts be north to south would be preferable, to minimize the impact of sun in players' eyes during morning and evening play.

To facilitate uses of the park, I urge that there be work out stations around the walking path.

I also encourage that there be as much turf (grass) as possible, as well as other hearty desert trees and shrubs for the benefit of providing oxygen to the air. This must, of course, be balanced with landscaping maintenance requirements.

Seating and picnic areas, shaded as much as possible, are also desirable so families and friends can gather and enjoy the park.

Thank you.

COMMENT 69

1.) Courts should have benches and shade for people waiting to play.

2.) Courts should be oriented north south.

3.) Have more courts and have some designated for specific use i.e. some just pickleball, some just basketball et. al. (I have seen this at Thompson Peak Park.)

COMMENT 70

What happened to the dog park that was to be included . I think this is an essential part of the project.

COMMENT 71

We are so excited about have pickleball courts near us! Because none are available at this area-there will be big demand for use If you can do more that 8-I believe all would be utilized! We will need tables and benches and shady areas for those waiting. Fencing to prevent runaway balls is important. Thank you so much-I can't wait to use this facility.

We desperately need a covered play area for very young and then older children-and it needs to be shaded. Picnic tables and benches will encourage families to use this facility-again, we need this! I have no place to take my grandchildren-school areas are locked off.

COMMENT 72

I fully support the construction of the pickle ball courts and would like there to be 12 courts instead of 8. Pickle ball is becoming so popular that even with 12 courts, people will still be waiting to play. There should also be shading, a waiting paddles board, water, and benches to sit on. This will be a great addition to this part of Scottsdale as of right now there are no public courts nearby for people who live in this area. Most of us drive to Thompson Peak park which is a good 15 minute drive and always crowded.

COMMENT 73

The new neighborhood park plan looks very well thought out. I am looking forward to the new trails, seating and restroom facilities.

COMMENT 74

I'm so excited this project is finally underway!! We definitely need a MINIMUM of 8 pickleball courts. Having fences/nets to contain runaway balls would be ideal...also benches for waiting and paddle containers for order of play. A park similar to Thompson Peak would be great....water fountains, picnic tables opportunity for shade. Thanks for letting us get in our 2 cents worth!

COMMENT 75

Love the park, especially the pickleball courts. Here are my ideas to consider in the final planning:
- A pickleball waiting area (when courts are busy) with benches and a shade cover, as it can be very hot in the summer.

- The courts need fencing to keep the balls from leaving the area and interrupting others playing (just like any tennis courts would provide)

- Since pickleball is very popular and growing quickly, I recommend 4 more courts or a total of 12 courts to handle the large crowd that will want to play. This cuts down on waiting times and increases the number of people who could use the park.

Thank you for leading the development of this fine park that has been so long in waiting. Residents up here will be very supportive of this park and willing to help in any way to make it the best for Scottsdale.

COMMENT 76

Fantastic presentation and overall design, even taking the spectacular mountain views into consideration. It's exciting to see 8 pickleball courts are coming to North Scottsdale! The park entry structure offering shade and bathrooms is both beautiful and functional.

COMMENT 77

The plan looks amazing and would be a great addition to our community. Hoping for some shade around the Pickleball courts. Great job!

COMMENT 78

Omit 2 pickleball courts and add 2 tennis court. A dog park would be good too.

COMMENT 79

I believe more than 8 courts should be built. There are NO public Pickleball courts up here! Please add a shaded area with seating so players have a place to sit while waiting to play. Fencing around each court would be a GREAT asset to the courts!!! Thank you!

COMMENT 80

My interest in the Park is principally Pickleball. I currently play at Thompson Peak Park where there are 3 permanent courts and 3 portable courts and the place is packed every single morning and throughout most of the day. The proposed 8 courts should be viewed as a minimum. Also, having a shaded area close to the courts to sit between games is an absolute must. I would recommend a paddle staging area to assure that everyone knows who is up next in any play-in rounds. Fencing between courts will help speed up the games and reduce interference in others' games. Access to drinking water and restrooms is a must. That said, the proposed layout looks excellent and I can't wait to enjoy the park. We have nothing like this in North Scottsdale and it is needed and will be used extensively.

COMMENT 81

Very excited to see the plan for the park! I have a few questions:

- Is it possible to add 4 more PB courts?
- Will Paddle Saddles or some other device be provided to encourage players to queue up in order to play on a specific court? Concern there may be folks who may try to monopolize one or more courts and never allow others to play.
- Will courts be positioned in the north/south orientation to minimize glare from the sun?
- What will the hours for PB/basketball play? With lighted courts, will play be allowed up to 9 or 10pm?
- Are pets allowed in the park area?

COMMENT 82

I strongly favor as many pickleball courts as practical. There really are no public pickleball courts in North Scottsdale and it is the fastest growing sport in America. Rest areas and shade near these courts would be greatly appreciated.

COMMENT 83

Love the park concept, especially the pickleball courts. Be nice if there were more of them as the sport is gaining tremendous support. Like to also see water, shade and possible restrooms, but more courts would be my first choice.

COMMENT 84

It would be great if each court are fenced individually. For safety reasons
Thanks,

COMMENT 85

Great idea

COMMENT 86

I do not see how you can say this will park will not bring more noticeable traffic to the area and Scottsdale Road.

This is just false. With 70 parking spaces and 8 Pickle ball and a basketball courts.

It will bring more traffic to the area which has increased since this project was approved in 2019.

The noise will also increase and you all know that. So just putting up trees and plants will not fix the new noise pollution in North Scottsdale.

Lights should not be part of this project at all.

What about the night friendly skies that are disappearing in North Scottsdale. This will just add to light pollution. No matter what you try to do to shield the light ..light pollution will happen.

Look at the Summit which changed all the parking light. It is like daylight and you can see the glow over the Winfield Hill.

Shame on all of your for ruining the night friendly skies here.

This project is way too big for the area. Needs less parking, less pickle ball courts, no lighting for night play, more walking paths. Make it a day park on a smaller scale.

Help me understand why you want to put more asphalt down to heat up the summers in North Scottsdale.

You need as much open space to let the heat cool down into the desert over night.

Tell me how this project will not heat up the area with all the parking and courts.

You cannot because it heat up the area.

Scale back ,way back and preserve the land and area and no light pollution.

COMMENT 87

This is a GREAT project. It fits right in with the surroundings.

We llove the 8 pickleball courts with lighting for summer play. It is a brilliant design having them by the retail parking lot to the west, and having all courts face north-south to avoid sun glare problems.

The growth of pickleball in our community is meteoric and we need to stay up with demand.

Thank to you all for this project.

COMMENT 88

I moved to North Scottsdale BECAUSE of the abundant open space and less development!! Night sky friendly and the lower temperatures living in an environment with abundant open space to absorb the heat are why folks choose to live in North Scottsdale!! This park paves over the natural Beautiful desert and changes the whole feel and dynamic of North Scottsdale - we don't want to be like lower Scottsdale where every inch of land is developed into a commercial and residential cement desert!! To imply that there will not be an increase in traffic is laughable! I have noticed a 100% increase in traffic to this area since July 2018!! And since you are classifying this as a "Neighborhood Park" have you asked the local folks in this "neighborhood" rather than all of Scottsdale? We don't want this!! It will forever change the aesthetic of the area!! Increased traffic, increased noise, increased light pollution, increased temperatures, desert destruction !! Sometimes the most thoughtful thing to do is to do nothing at all - the best development is saying no to development!! LEAVE THE AREA IN IT'S NATURAL STATE!!!

COMMENT 89

I think the park at Ashler Hills should include 8 Pickleball courts since there are no public courts in north Scottsdale. Pickleball is very popular and would be an excellent amenity for residents in the far north. People are clamoring for more courts and this is an ideal location.

COMMENT 90

I approved this bond increase when I saw that it included this park INCLUDING A DOG PARK. It is very discriminatory that there is NO DOG park north of Thompson Peak, when most of the \$\$ tax base is North of Dynamite. This feels like a bait and switch and I will NOT vote for any other bonds with this behavior. There are 3 dog parks around the 101. Why do you ignore this far North taxpayers?

COMMENT 91

Since a lot of the communities have added a couple of pickleball courts, I think adding a couple of tennis courts would be an important addition.

There are NO public tennis courts in the area and there are plenty of communities in the area with no courts.

COMMENT 92

Love the park concept but it needs more than 8 pickleball courts. We would love to see 16 courts, ideally with fences between them. Put up some shade and benches for people who are waiting. We realize this seems like a lot but the sport is only growing and we'd be shocked if all 16 courts weren't in use during the morning and dusk hours.

Thank you for your efforts on this.

COMMENT 93

Looks like a great plan. The 8 pickleball courts will get lots of use by North Scottsdale residents; given the space available and small incremental cost, please consider 12 courts instead of 8. They will get used! Please also consider adding fencing around each pickleball court so that balls from one court don't roll onto the other courts which can be dangerous and cause injury. Please have benches that players can sit on as they await play.

COMMENT 94

City of Scottsdale Rep,

We are missing the mark here... please hear me out! The crowd up here like me (for the most part) are 60+. Our kids are grown and we have dogs we are crazy about. We really NEED and WANT a dog park. Small is fine and there looks to be plenty of room for a small dog park. Paths and trails taking up a lot of room? North Scottsdale has PLENTY of paths and trails already. You've done an amazing job on that but our nearest dog park is on Chaparral, 20 miles away!

Let's take a breath and see what people like me are saying before it's too late.

Please let me know you received this - thank you!

COMMENT 95

It will be a crime and a renegeing on the promise made many years ago regarding this park. we were promised a dog park and back then it was included. We really, really need one in North, North Scottsdale.

Please add the dog park back into this site.

Thanks,

COMMENT 96

We need a dog park up in the north end of Scottsdale. Please continue to put in our dog park! I heard that you have stopped that portion of the project and we need it. We have to travel 20 miles for a dog park.

COMMENT 97

Very excited to see the plans. Love the idea of 8 (or more) pickleball courts. N/S Exposure is great! so thankful for this project.

COMMENT 98

We definitely need more public pickle ball courts in the Scottsdale area. Ashley Hills Park sounds like a beautiful park that would be a fabulous addition to the Scottsdale area. Please add this venue to your list of parks to build. Thank you!!

COMMENT 99

I am very disheartened that the dog park will not be included in Ashler Hills Park. When money is allocated, how can you just decide to change what has been decided. There is nothing else close to us. Please advise.

Thank you

COMMENT 100

If at all possible, this park should have an area for dogs. There's really nothing within 15 - 20 miles.

COMMENT 101

Will there be a place to sit for those who are waiting to play pickleball? A Shaded area is awfully nice and a place to put your bags for paddles & balls etc. Also, how many gates/doors are there to access the courts? Every time someone enters, will it disturb the play of the closer court? A small pathway between every 2 courts would be a nice feature, so that the closer court is not interrupted every time. Also, will there be water fountains to fill bottles or drink from near the restrooms? After playing at Cholla Park and Horizon Park for the last 4-5 years, I wonder if 8 courts will be enough. Last Friday and Saturday, there were about 40-50 extra people waiting to play in the 32 available pickleball slots at Cholla (almost 80 using the facility. Of course, Horizon is closed right now, but the out of towners haven't arrived yet either. With Ashler Hills being the only public courts in north Scottsdale, it could be very crowded!

It looks beautiful! I'm glad to see Scottsdale catching up to the interest in PB!

COMMENT 102

Thanks for adding as many new Pickleball courts with sufficient shade and seating areas for waiting players. Please build all the courts North-South, never East-West because of the sun.

The sport is booming. I'm a certified teaching professional and a 5.0 tournament player. The average age of player has gone from mid-60s to mid-40s. The average age will continue to fall as we make more programs and courts available for juniors programs.

I honestly believe Pickleball will one day be an Olympic sport. Let's make Scottsdale one of the best Pickleball destinations in the world.

Plus, we don't need as much water as golf courses even though I love golf, too.

Any way, thanks again for building as many courts as possible OF QUALITY.

COMMENT 103

I am a Pickleball player who enjoys the game and meeting new players. Being able to play the game on courts that are both accessible and of a quality surface are very important to me. One of the main problems has been these last few years is the lack of court availability here in Scottsdale. More people are playing the game but unable to play more often due to lack of courts. More tennis players are starting to cross over which means tennis courts around the city aren't being used to their full capacity.

Pickleball is growing at an extremely fast rate which shows everyone that it's a sport that is embracing all ages and here to stay, which only begs for city parks to put in pickleball courts to accommodate the demand. The City of Scottsdale has begun to benefit from offering PB lessons to residents and that has brought in additional revenue and more interested players to use the small amount of courts that are now available. The money spent on resurfacing Cholla Park a couple of years ago has been very beneficial. Horizon Park which is presently in the resurfacing/additional construction of two more courts, will help the PB community but still presents overcrowding. Other Arizona cities have embraced the PB community by building or expanding court availability. As much as building eight courts seems to be enough to help the overcrowding, I hope that the board can see that adding more courts such as twelve to fourteen courts would enrich the status of the City of Scottsdale.

COMMENT 104

Hello, really excited about the project of having a neighborhood park. But, disappointed that you won't put a dog park there. It is much needed. I Hope you will reconsider it. Thank you.

COMMENT 105

I understand that a dog park is not part of the plan for the new Ashler Hills park. Please reconsider this. We really need a dog park up in North Scottsdale. The nearest one is close to 20 miles from here. Our furry friends deserve better. We need this added to the plan.

COMMENT 106

Hi,

Where is the dog park that was in the previous plan? Nearest dog park is over 20 miles away. We are NOT in favor of this plan without a dog park.

COMMENT 107

To Whom it may concern,

Really excited there is a park going in at Ashler Hills finally! Been waiting for it since I moved to neighborhood 8 years ago. Very disappointed that the dog park is not going to be built like originally

planned. :(

Why is the dog park not being built now? Our area up North here needs a dog park! The closest park is 20 miles away. Please reconsider and put in the dog park as well.

Thank you.

COMMENT 108

I would like to have an area set aside for a dog park.

COMMENT 109

I think it is wonderful that Pickleball is included in the planned neighborhood park!

It would be great if there benches and more importantly, shade provided for those waiting to play as, undoubtedly, this is such a popular sport!

Thank you!!

COMMENT 110

The information about the bond promised a dog park as part of this project. We currently have to drive to Phoenix's Pinnacle dog park while Ashley Hills will be about 5 minutes away.

I will never vote in favor of another bond if the dog park does not get built in the early part of this construction project because I believe the drafters of the plan misled me should this be the outcome. As a senior (over 70 years old) it will get more and more difficult to drive to Pinnacle Peak park much less drive to the park off Hayden and McDowell I believe.

COMMENT 111

I am excited that the Ashler Hills Park is finally moving forward. My comments mainly concern the pickleball courts. As I'm sure you appreciate pickleball is very popular, particularly outside, especially now with concerns over large gatherings in an inside facility. I feel that shaded seating should be incorporated into the design where possible, also stray balls are a major irritation between adjacent courts and a barrier should be considered.

COMMENT 112

I am very enthusiastic about the park planned for Ashler hills. I would suggest giving strong consideration to in creasing the # of planned pickleball courts in the park. Pickleball is now the fastest growing g sport in the US. Most public courts are oversaturated with players because of insufficient court time because of insufficient # of courts. Building more courts at this time will only reduce later costs of retrofitting the park in the future.

Please consider increasing the # of courts on your plan for the Ashler Hills park.

Thank you

COMMENT 113

We live in Winfield. Given the new construction between us and the park, will we have walking access to the park?

COMMENT 114

I fully support building more pickleball courts in Scottsdale. We are far behind in having enough courts for the people wanting to play.

COMMENT 115

- 1) If building pickle ball courts for public use, my recommendation is 12
- 2) Waiting benches in a shaded area would be awesome.
- 3) North-South is always best for outdoor court sports
- 4) Budget and space permitting, fencing is needed to control runaway balls and injuries to players on other courts who are unable to see oncoming balls.
- 5) Although I workout all the time, I don't think workout stations are necessary. Came from an area in So Cal where they were rarely used
- 6) I'm not aware of the demographics of the area, so I won't comment on playground equipment
- 7) My recommendation is more turf or materials other than concrete which radiates so much heat

COMMENT 116

Our biggest concerns are light pollution, potential crime increase and traffic/parking increase. We've enjoyed living in Las Piedras for 14 years.

- Park lighting will compound the light pollution already created by the Summit Shopping Centre.

- We selected our neighborhood due to its low crime rate and are concerned about increased crime rates.

- N. 74th Way is not a through street, it dead ends at Las Piedras security gate. What is being done to prevent drivers from using Las Piedras security entrance/exit as a turn-around area??? Will parking be allowed along 74th Way between the parking lot and Las Piedras community???

Thank you for your time and consideration.

COMMENT 117

The playground area for kids seems small.

Put a few benches around the walking paths.

Put benches and shade areas for the ball courts.

Put fences around the ball courts.

Align the pickleball courts north to south. The low western sun makes it hard for players facing west to see a ball.

Make sure there is plenty of picnic area.

Have dog excrement pick-up stations with bags at each end of the park

COMMENT 118

I reiterate my comments from the first time I submitted them:

This area does not need the added congestion.

This area does not need the additional traffic.

This area does not need the additional noise.

I worry about added threat to privacy and security in my development.

Originally (17 years ago!) this was to have a public library. I was all for it at that time. Now, I think it is a waste of monies that could be better spent with the police department, the transportation department to fix roads/bridges, or the school districts which are definitely underfunded.

Take a step back ... we don't need this park.

COMMENT 119

I know there are more households that have dogs than children in my abutting neighborhood. I really think a small enclosed green space for dogs would get more use than a basket ball court and all those pickle ball courts.

COMMENT 120

Fantastic plans. Could the plans be expanded to include more pickleball courts with lights? Thank you for asking the community! Can't wait till the project is completed.

COMMENT 121

Why stop at 8 courts when you have room for 12 or 16. 8 courts will become very crowded and folks will be asking for more very soon.

COMMENT 122

I left a prior comment but was just reviewing again... could the pb courts be oriented side by side rather than front to back... to make for a more connected feel?

COMMENT 123

You need to add more Pickleball courts!!

All courts are packed everyday with lots of wait times :(The most popular sport in the world and still not enough courts for all players!! Please add more courts!!

Thank you

COMMENT 124

Scottsdale definitely need more pickle ball courts... This is the fastest growing sport in the country and we are really lagging behind compared to other cities in the valley.

COMMENT 125

We desperately need as many courts as possible since the number of players both in Scottsdale and snowbirds coming to Scottsdale has expanded exponentially. With in the next year there will not be enough courts to satisfy demand. So building more courts is vital and thank you for all and any support

COMMENT 126

Pickleball is growing exponentially; fastest growing sport in America.

12-16 courts is recommended, especially for tournaments and money-raising events.

COMMENT 127

Pickleball is growing like crazy and Scottsdale is in desperate need of courts!

COMMENT 128

I'm in favor of building 12 pickleball courts.

COMMENT 129

The sport of Pickleball has been growing so rapidly since I started playing only back since December of 2020. And each day I've seen more and more new faces participating. We do need more courts here in North Scottsdale. It'll be tremendous if we can have 16-20+ courts in this new park. Thank you for making it happen.

COMMENT 130

Fantastic project. I believe there will be demand for 12 pickleball courts. All the existing pickleball parks are very overcrowded! Thank you.

COMMENT 131

We are very excited to have pickleball courts in North Scottsdale! There are no courts anywhere nearby. The closest courts are at Thompson Peak and they are extremely over crowded. We welcome the addition of as many courts as possible at Ashler Hills!!!

COMMENT 132

This looks like a well designed park that will be a nice addition to City of Scottsdale's other parks.

Scottsdale needs more pickleball courts. I'm excited to see pickleball courts included as part of this parks design. I support the addition of these courts.

COMMENT 133

As a 25 year resident of Scottsdale, my hope is for the City of Scottsdale, the Mayor and our Board of Directors to understand the growth of Pickleball in our Scottsdale community. At the existing parks with pickleball courts, those courts are currently getting more use then anything else in the park COMBINED, including playgrounds, baseball fields or basketball courts.

I'm in favor of as many courts as possible at Asher Hills and at all other future park projects.

The Scottsdale community would also be grateful if the Thompson Peak Park pickleball courts could be resurfaced without Basketball lines.

The basketball courts get little to no use compared to pickleball. There are also several other lighted, public basketball courts literally just yards away in Grayhawk Park.

Thank you,

COMMENT 134

This plan looks amazing, very appealing! We and many others we've spoken to think having some work out stations as you suggested would be great along the loop trail. The exhibits don't say how many picnic benches there are. Also, definitely there should be a fence around the pickle ball courts. It also seems like people love tennis up this way and we were told originally that it would be tennis courts. Perhaps consider one dedicated fully fenced tennis court. And yes, the idea of benches to sit and wait or watch along the perimeter of the courts makes sense. Thank you for your excellent planning and consideration of our input.

COMMENT 135

Please do add more pickleball courts, the ones you currently have are frequently over crowded & well used, much more so than tennis courts are. Out of town visitors are always looking for courts they can play on for free, leaving us local residents to seek out other options. Having benches and some shade nearby is also nice; the shade is welcomed especially during our hot summer months. The

idea of walk up play, (no reservations required) vs. having to make reservations is also nice. It would be wonderful for the City to consider converting some of the other tennis courts that seem to be very much under utilized, such as the ones in McCormick Ranch, into pickleball courts.

COMMENT 136

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I am among the many pickleball players in Scottsdale. We love the sport. We play everyday! Most days, the 8 courts at Cholla Park are full by 6:30am. This means 32 people are playing, and there are players waiting on the sidelines. On weekends, it is common for as many as 20+ players to be waiting on each side. This means 32 people are playing and possibly 50 are waiting. I would love to see more pickleball courts built in Scottsdale.

COMMENT 137

Based on the growth of pickleball in the area, along with lack of City of Scottsdale pickleball courts in the immediate area (closest being 15-20 minutes away), my first reaction is that the current design does NOT include enough pickleball courts. I believe an adequate number of courts to service the current demand would be around 12 courts, at a minimum. This is also evidenced by the overcrowding at the current City of Scottsdale pickleball facilities. I also think it would be prudent to incorporate in the design a waiting area for players, with shade and benches, to make it more accommodating when there are large crowds. Thank you for letting me voice my concerns and I look forward to playing pickleball at Ashler Hills Park for many years to come.

COMMENT 138

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. I am among the many pickleball players in Scottsdale. We love the sport. We play everyday! Most days, the 8 courts at Cholla Park are full by 6:30am. This means 32 people are playing, and there are players waiting on the sidelines. On weekends, it is common for as many as 20+ players to be waiting on each side. This means 32 people are playing and possibly 50 are waiting. I would love to see more pickleball courts built in Scottsdale.

COMMENT 139

The sport of Pickleball is exploding, many families are now enjoying this sport, together. Scottsdale pickleball courts have huge wait times, and it's only going to get worse when the Snowbirds get here. Please build more courts in Scottsdale. Thank You, Julie Cowan

COMMENT 140

We really need a dog park! If it can't go on this site, can it go someplace else. Please, please, please!

COMMENT 141

Looks like this will be a great facility and addition to the area. Disappointed that there will not be a dog park included as it is difficult to find a suitable location to run dogs in our desert landscape.

Two questions:

- 1) Will dogs be permitted in the park?
- 2) If private funding were available, could a dog park be included in the design?

COMMENT 142

I am disappointed to see that a dog park has been excluded from the plan. As a 30-yr resident of The Boulders, I have seen an increase of dog owner population through the years, and not only for short-term "snow birds" population. A feature such as this would greatly appreciated and utilized by residents year-round.

COMMENT 143

I am in support of adding pickleball courts. Thank you.

COMMENT 144

This park, along with sports courts, would be a great advantage to N. Scottsdale. There are no public sports courts in this area. Pickleball/basketball has to be played at Thompson Peak Park, which is always over crowded. This would also be great for Carefree/Cave Creek residents.

COMMENT 145

More Pickleball courts, North/South facing. Very few children in the surrounding developments. (The Boulders, Terravita, Winfield, etc) less turf
Thank you

COMMENT 146

I would really like to see 'adult' play equipment in the shaded area. I have seen videos of just such equipment and it is appropriate for all ages but designed to accommodate senior physical fitness.

COMMENT 147

I love the idea of 8 new Pickleball courts in north Scottsdale as we do not have enough public courts. Please include fencing around the courts, benches, a shade ramada and water fountains.
Thanks,

COMMENT 148

I'd like to see a space dedicated to a dog park. I acknowledge the statement in the FAQs that a dog park is typically included only in larger Community Parks that can accommodate larger service areas. However, merely because it is "typically" only included in larger parks does not prohibit dog parks in "smaller" community parks. Also, I have not found a definition of "larger Community Parks." The public should be told whether the difference in size between this park and a "larger CP" is significant enough to excuse Scottsdale from including a dog park here. Scottsdale needs to understand and appreciate that there are an increasing number of households with dogs, and that the dog park provides as much of a social opportunity, if not more, for dog owners than the dogs, and it also increases the sense of community. Scottsdale should not be so dismissive of the positive impact a dog park has on the community, and it is a shame that this opportunity is missed.

COMMENT 149

The original plan shown to the public a few years ago included a dog park for the Ashley Hills Park plan. The new plan has no mention of a dog park whatsoever in the northern part of Scottsdale we are void of any sort of dog park or recreation area for pets. This is an absolute travesty and needs to be corrected in this new city plan.

COMMENT 150

We have lived in our current home for 21 yrs and have been looking forward to a dog park in north scottsdale. Keep the dog park at the Ashler hill park. Thank you

COMMENT 151

Please build some courts. There are too few and what we have is so crowded. Surrounding cities have so much more opportunities

COMMENT 152

For years the North Scottsdale area has been underserved, in terms of recreational areas for residents. I believe the Ashler Hills Park has the potential to help remedy this situation, if done properly. The desire and need for pickleball courts in this area, where the population trends to be seniors 55 and older (the demographic most likely to use the courts), will continue to grow. This relates to the fact that pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports in the country. I believe Scottsdale has the opportunity to develop a pickleball, et al complex that will not only serve the current population of this area, but be one that will serve future residents in this area of high growth. Therefore thought should be given to developing at least 12 courts, with sufficient lighting, areas of shade and seating for players waiting to play. Despite the fact that many communities in the area have pickleball as an amenity, most do not have enough to meet the need of residents. A good example is Winfield where only two courts exist. Another community that is underserved is Terravita where no courts exist. The city of Scottsdale would be wise in not only considering the current needs of its resident, but the needs 10 and 20 years in the future. I urge the City of Scottsdale to make Ashler Hills Park a premier setting for pickleball in Maricopa County. Thank you.

COMMENT 153

I am a IPTPA level 2, Pickleball teaching profesional. Pickleball is going to be by far the most used aspect of this park. The 8 courts will not be near enogh. There will be more people waiting to play than people playing. All the citys are way behind in meeting the needs of the comunity as far as pickleball courts go. The closest courts to theese are at thompson peak. Three courts were built about 4 years ago and they have converted the basketball courts to 3 more courts, so now they have 6 courts. Most evenings and weekend mornings there are 20 to 50 people waiting for a court. Horizon park is adding two more courts right now, getting up to 10. But they will still have more people waiting for a court than playing on weekends. Adding four more courts or 12 total would be a huge benifet in many ways, and be used every day. It would also enhance the playing experience because there would be adequit courts to enable courts to be designated for different levels of play. Also designating chalange courts on the far north side would be a great idea. Also two shady areas just outside the courts with benches and slots to place the paddels for your place in line for a court or a chalange is very important. A little shade and a bench or two where the paddels are placed for people waiting to play would be a huge step forward in desiging courts correct. Also what is behind in court design is the space beetween courts and behind courts. Best I can tell, there is 7 feet of space on the sides and behind each court, on the artist rendering. This is fine if you are a non moble 70 year old. But now that more and more young people are taking on the sport, they can run down balls 10 to 15 feet off the court. Just because other courts are built too small for todays game, we do not have to make the same mistake. Adding one, two or three feet to all sides of the courts, especaly the back, would make them superior courts and bring a higher level of play. I would be happy to meet and take a person in design and show him the situation around the courts, and how there is no place to wait for a court. If anyone could contact me, I can show them what is needed, and we could do this right.

COMMENT 154

I understand that a dog park is not included. However, I think the most needed area is a dog park. The closest ones are miles away - south of the 101 freeway. I believe it would get far more use than pickle ball courts.

COMMENT 155

Nice Plan!

Any chance to incorporate a water feature or fountains? Always nice to hear water.

What about bicycle parking?

Perhaps a seating/viewing area to watch the basketball or pickleball players?

COMMENT 156

We need a dog park more than anything else! The number of citizens with dogs is immense! We need space for dogs to play.

COMMENT 157

Hi, I have been a Scottsdale resident, living 21 years in Ironwood Village before moving to Carefree, living just north of the Scottsdale line. As an Interior Designer, nature lover, new pickle ball player, with friends in the neighborhoods flanking the park, I am incredibly excited to know this park is being so beautifully developed. I LOVED the basic little park off of Legacy behind Ironwood Village... and enjoyed for many years playing tennis there. Luckily it had little use. With the rise of pickle ball popularity, and the seeming shortage of courts, I think 8-10 courts would be ideal. The layout looks good, and I am sure you have visited for design ideas the Troon park which is private, but accessible for viewing of the design, low walls/bench seats which are nice and no fencing which is fine, except with your back to back court layout, the fences between will be necessary. Perhaps when not used for basketball, this court could transition for pb, with lines?portable nets accessible? Love the design/bridge, shade structure... flows with the styling of the Gateway Trailhead which I considered my "home trails" for years! Thanks for providing more spaces for play, something we need more of! Happy to help in any way I can.

COMMENT 158

Would like to see public pickle ball courts included in the proposed park at Ashler Hills. I believe that the courts should be built for pickle ball only and have first class nets and fencing. Six to eight courts would probably be sufficient if room left for future expansion. Thank You Dennis Mitchell

COMMENT 159

I would like the addition of a dog park section...

COMMENT 160

Scottsdale desperately needs more pickleball courts so I would ask that you make this a concentration. Cholla and Horizon are both critically full in the mornings with up to 75-85 people at peak hours with long wait times for courts. This is the fastest growing sport and we need to please try to keep up.

COMMENT 161

a lovely design .

COMMENT 162

My husband and I would love to see workout stations around the walking path. Would be a great addition for residents of all ages. Thank you!

COMMENT 163

I would love to see a dog park included in the plan.
Thanks.

COMMENT 164

The design of this park is excellent. My only comment is that pickleball players need shade because most of the time there is an overflow of people so a group is usually waiting to get on the court. I just want to stress the importance of providing natural shade on and adjacent to the courts. Seating areas are also needed.

Thank you for addressing our concerns.

COMMENT 165

You can not have enough Pickleball Courts. Popularity across the country continues to grow across all age levels..... We welcome the new park! Thank you.....

COMMENT 166

We have had a home in the area for 6 years and just became full time. This new neighborhood park will become a wonderful and needed addition. We have grandchildren that visit from out of state and would certainly utilize it along with us .

I think the 2 turf areas are great for children to run and play (and fall) on a more padded surface.

I wouldn't mind seeing those area enlarged.

We are regular pickle ball players . The 8 courts are great. I would strongly encourage the planners to fence in the courts. Best for the players and non players alike to not have balls flying around.

I would put in benches adjacent to the court for players to rest between games, getting drink supplies and equipment , etc,

Shaded playground is a must and I hope it contains a good deal of equipment and the rubberized ground surface.

At the restrooms have water dispensers to replenish water bottles. More sanitary these days than a drinking fountain.

My wife and I strongly support this project and it will fill a nice void in this part of north Scottsdale.

If going forward they need volunteers for an ongoing committees of residents we would be interested.

Thank you.

COMMENT 167

I am in favor of constructing the park and of the plans. I especially like the building of the pickleball courts, as the sport is becoming very popular. It is also helpful that the courts will be lighted for evening play.

I would prefer fencing around the courts to prevent runaway balls, and shading and benches for people waiting to play.

Thank you for the plan.

COMMENT 168

I am very excited about Ashler Hills Park and am anxiously awaiting the opening!

Everything looks really good!

Following are a few suggestions that I think would really be great:

* Add 2 more pickleball courts. This sport has become so popular that I think they would be utilized more than any other areas of the park.

* Also, as a pickleball player, I think it would be very helpful to have the courts fenced to help prevent run-away balls.

* Also, to have some shaded benches on the pickleball courts would be very appreciated in the heat of the day!

Thank you for all of the information and for asking for resident input!

COMMENT 169

The rendering of the park looks wonderful. A few items that would improve the site would be fences between each 'two' Pickleball courts (to prevent runaway balls) and benches/covered area directly next to the courts.

It would also be great to have workout stations around the walking path.

I also hope that if this is a successful project and heavily used, that additional courts can be built in the future.

Overall it looks great! Thank you!

COMMENT 170

A community park is sorely needed in our area. Pickle ball courts are # 1 on my list.

It's a great sport to meet others and exercise.

COMMENT 171

Glad that we will have Pickleball in North Scottsdale. The other public parks are very busy. I think the park should have at least 8 courts and 10 would be better. Thompson Peak and Cholla both need more courts. Cholla often has more than 20 people waiting to play.

COMMENT 172

Naturally everyone would welcome and appreciate additional pickleball courts, but I understand this has been proposed before with no movement.

One other point. Why build new courts when the old courts are in disrepair? The courts at Thompson Peak need some work. There are courts with temporary nets that have black lines which are very hard to see. I offered to buy the paint and if necessary paint them myself, but nobody from Scottsdale ever got back to me.

Some of the courts with temporary nets have surface "buckling" problems that need to be repaired. If you need further advice, help, etc. feel free to contact me!

COMMENT 173

To connect all the surrounding neighborhoods better the public sidewalks should be extended to the Summit shopping center. Then the new park should have a connection to the Summit between the Target and grocery store. An additional basketball court or more baskets to the side of the court would be good.

COMMENT 174

I am in favor of pickleball courts, perhaps lighted, shade for waiting players. I am also in favor of tables and chairs for waiting. Will there be a basketball court or two? I am in favor of that, also lighted for night play. I also hope you are planning on building restroom facilities.

COMMENT 175

I am against any development of the park. I believe it will cause unwanted traffic and noise to my neighborhood. I also believe it will negatively impact property values in Las Piedras.

COMMENT 176

Given what is happening with pickleball all over the valley, especially Horizon Park and the addition of 2 more courts, why not expand the 8-court plan to 12 courts, plus paint pickleball lines on the basketball courts just like the ones at Thompson Peak. Provide temporary nets for the basketball courts also.

With the current controversy at Terravita across the road and the number of players residing there, we can expect high usage for these courts immediately.

Thank you for considering an expansion to the pickleball courts.

COMMENT 177

Please make pickleball focal part of park. Pickleball is fastest growing sport in American. The area needs pickleball. I highly support pickleball being added. at least 8 courts. also should be lighted with some sun protection.

regards

COMMENT 178

There's a need for at least 15 Pickle Ball Courts to facilitate future demand.

COMMENT 179

Please include 8 pickle ball court as part of this Park. It would be great exercise for those that can no longer play tennis but was outdoor activity with good competition.

thanks for your consideration.

Regards,

COMMENT 180

Overall the park design looks lovely. My suggestion is to consider adding more pickleball courts or plan no for later expansion. This is the closest park in 10 miles and I believe with the high concentration of retired or older citizens there will be high demand for time on the pickleball courts. I also support the senior designed exercise equipment which has been installed in another Scottsdale

park with higher concentration of seniors than school age children. With all the schools on 60th Street there is a high concentration of playground for children near by.

COMMENT 181

Like what I've seen this far but would prefer we build more than 8 courts given the multitude of Golden agers in the area and the way pickleball continues to gain popularity.

COMMENT 182

Dog park some trees seats half for small and half for big if possible

COMMENT 183

I play often at Thompson Peak park. A couple of take-a-ways from that experience.

1. Pickleball use in this new park will be heavy with large turn out.
2. There will be a substantial number of people waiting to play there turn. An adjacent gathering place is needed with view of courts to allow orderly transition when a game ends and a new group takes the court.
3. Courts should be arranged such that it is easy to shift groups from court to court when a game ends and a new group enters play. The side-by-side layout at Thompson Peak works well for this. Courts arranged end-to-end create traffic jams and difficult viewing.

COMMENT 184

Please consider adding more pickle ball courts.

Scottsdale is very short on pickle ball courts and people drive from great distances to use them. These will be very popular since there are no parks up in this area and Thompson Peak has the closest courts. Those courts are very overused and many of those people will spill over onto these new ones in North Scottsdale. There also is a great demand for a dog park in this area-it would be very popular. Thank you for your consideration-we are so anxious to have this facility in our neighborhood!

COMMENT 185

Thank you for putting a park in the neighborhood! We will definitely make use of the walking trails, pickleball courts and basketball courts!

COMMENT 186

I just heard about this new neighborhood park being built behind Target. I love the design and know this park will be used by many people in Scottsdale, Carefree, Phoenix and Cave Creek. With that in mind, and looking at the design of the pickleball courts; I am asking you to consider adding 4 more courts to bring the total to 12 courts. There is space for 4 more courts and looks like it would not impact nearby homes as well. We know there is a large group of pickleball players and more to come, as this is a growing sport in our area. The only courts nearby are at Thompson Peak and Horizon Park and as you know, they are quite busy and hard to get on to. So many people want to play but lack access to public courts. So please make it a 12 court park. Thank you for considering this request!
Sue Larson

COMMENT 187

This is a great plan! It's about time that this side of Scottsdale received some outdoor Pickleball courts. If the nearby residents had simply requested the zoning about this area prior to moving in,

they would have seen this coming! There shouldn't be any reason to stop this from happening, as the sport is gaining in popularity more and more every week!!

COMMENT 188

My husband and I are both avid Pickleball players. It has been a long unrealized dream to have accessible Pickleball courts near Terravita. We are excited to know courts are being studied at Asher Hills Park. Please consider as many as your budget will allow as it is true what they say... 'if you build it, they will come'. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

COMMENT 189

Eight pickleball courts are simply not enough to adequately service an area as large and as heavily populated as the northern Scottsdale area surrounding Ashler Hills Park. We ask that you properly build a minimum of 12 courts for this very popular sport.

Marshall & Lee Antonio

COMMENT 190

Pickle Ball has become so popular. The communities in North Scottsdale have high populations over 50 and it is that demographic where this sport is gaining so much popularity. We need at least 16 courts to meet the needs of this group. Please consider more than 8 courts. Thanks Anne McDonald

COMMENT 191

Please create as many public pickleball courts as possible as they are needed & will be used constantly

COMMENT 192

We live in Las Piedras at Sevano Village, which is the 64-home community adjacent to the proposed "neighborhood" park and directly impacted by it.

What is a Neighborhood Park?

Signs were posted on the park area for many years, describing this as a neighborhood park called "Sevano Village Park." Sevano Village is a platted subdivision that includes (1) the park property, (2) our community of Las Piedras, (3) a 78-home community known as Solstice at Sevano, and (4) a yet-undeveloped single-home community on the east side of 74th Way.

This is "Sevano Village Park," for the Sevano Village neighborhood. A 70-space parking lot and eight pickleball courts are not appropriate or called for in "neighborhood" park on land that is nestled among three small, private communities on a dead-end street.

Changing the name of the park to "Ashler Hills Park" is just part of this attempt to expand a "neighborhood" park into a broader, "community" park.

In the City's bond outreach presentations, and in all of the materials now distributed by the City to describe and seek comments for this park, it is clearly called out as a "neighborhood park."

The definitions and descriptions of a "neighborhood park" that we have found on the City's website include a statement that such a park serves a neighborhood within a half-mile of the park, and is

intended to be accessed primarily by pedestrians and by bicycles.

The presentation made during the bond election outreach – to support the development of this “neighborhood” park -- depicted one basketball court, one tennis court, and three pickleball courts, along with 19 parking spaces. This would be a reasonable allocation of courts and parking for a neighborhood park. This is what we relied on in making our vote for the bonds.

Is this a plan for a Neighborhood Park?

The plans that are being presented now are not for a neighborhood park, but rather for a regional pickleball facility – offering far more pickleball courts than are reasonably expected for the “neighborhood,” and thus clearly intending to draw users from far outside the area – upsetting the neighborhood balance and sacrificing the neighborhood in which the park is located and its security.

The “neighborhood” that is directly impacted by this park -- by its lighting, noise, parking and traffic -- would never require this number of parking spaces, and this number of pickleball courts. Eight pickleball courts might be appropriate at a park located at a major intersection, or in the middle of a larger, regional park, but not here, at Sevano Village Park.

Since the time of the bond outreach, the neighboring communities of Winfield, Terravita and Scottsdale Heights have all constructed (or are in the process of constructing) pickleball courts for their residents. There is less need for public pickleball courts in this area than when the bond proposal was originally presented to us.

Concerns About Noise, Traffic and Light.

- There is no indication that a noise study has been done for this project, to review how noise will travel up the mountain to the north and east and how physical noise mitigation and deflection features could be incorporated into the design. Yet, noise studies are required for approval of pickleball courts by private owners – such as recently undertaken by Terravita in connection with its development of 2 pickleball courts deemed sufficient for that community. Why should the City be exempt from this requirement? A noise study would include the impact of both the noise from the game, as well as from its participants. An 8-court pickleball park could have as many as 32 persons present and playing at any single time. A single tennis court would have only 2 or 4 players at a time.
- The noise study undertaken for Terravita expressly noted how the sound of pickleball play is sharp and high-pitched – plastic balls being struck by solid paddles -- and very different from tennis – soft balls being hit by racquets with strings. Many residents complained of the annoying sound of pickleball, the loud and boisterous nature of the game, and how the noise travels off the courts.
- Several years ago, a use permit for a night club at the Summit shopping center was declined because of the way sound from that enterprise would “climb” the adjacent mountain and adversely impact the community.
- There is no indication that a light study has been done for this area -- always understood to be a “dark skies” community. In addition, having a park open and lit until 10 or 10:30 at night is too late for, and inconsistent with, the neighboring bedroom communities. We strongly believe that, for this neighborhood (which consists largely of retired homeowners), the park should be “lights out” no later than 9pm.

- The traffic study appears to focus primarily on the impact of the park on the intersection of Scottsdale Road and Ashler Hills, and not on 74th Way as a dead-ending street that curves north and east – past the Boulder House, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places – toward Las Piedras at Sevano Village. There is no other way in or out of Las Piedras because of the mountain at the end of the internal streets.

Tennis Courts Would Reduce Parking, Traffic and Noise.

The drawings that were shown to us at the public outreach for the bond election showed a tennis court as part of the proposed neighborhood park. Although pickleball may be popular, it is not replacing tennis as a racquet sport. Tennis has soared in popularity as a result of the pandemic, with more people playing tennis now since tennis has been described as particularly safe during the pandemic because of its being an outdoor sport, as well as providing greater social distancing than during pickleball play.

There are no public tennis courts anywhere in this area, and the private communities with courts are now either restricting or closing off private tennis memberships. Incorporating a public tennis court or two into Sevano Village Park, in place of four of the proposed pickleball courts, would lessen the parking burden, lower the volume of noise from the pickleball activities, reduce traffic into and out of the park, and would provide a meaningful “neighborhood” amenity for this “neighborhood” park.

Kudos.

We understand and acknowledge that a park has always been intended for this area. Our concern is that the plans that have been developed show a concept that is not appropriate for the neighborhood. However, we believe that certain features of the proposed park are thoughtful and praiseworthy:

- The activity courts are well positioned against the Summit Shopping Center to the west, in order to deflect and absorb noise and light.
- The parking lot is well positioned to the south as being the most logical entry into the park.
- The walking trails to the north preserve the integrity of the adjacent desert area.

Additional Concerns.

- The height of the shade structure is not provided. Although we understand the need for a shade structure at the park, the City should provide information about the structure’s size for the neighborhood to be able to assess its impact on the mountain views while driving into the area.
- We understand the shade structure has been designed for a rusted, rustic feel – as a design concept that is popular and fashionable at this moment in time. A more timeless and practical look would serve the park (and the community) better.
- There are utility installations along 74th Way that should be shielded as part of the park development, but we have not seen this addressed.

Our suggestions for Sevano Village Park:

- The activity courts at this neighborhood park should consist of a basketball court, one or two tennis courts, and not more than three or four pickleball courts.
- Eight pickleball courts are not appropriate for a park in this area. This large number of courts will draw users far from the neighborhood, and is inconsistent with the concept of a neighborhood park.
- A substitution of one or more tennis courts for four pickleball courts will reduce the expected noise, traffic and parking in the neighborhood.
- A detailed noise study needs to be undertaken before the park proceeds further, with an emphasis on how the noise travels from the proposed pickleball courts up the mountain, and possible noise deflection and noise reflection opportunities.
- In any event, parking (which would include traffic) needs to be significantly reduced with respect to the neighborhood in which the park is located.
- Given the residential character of the neighborhood, court lighting at the park should end at 9pm.

We understand that comments are collected City-wide, and that the City's staff pays attention to the number of respondents, notwithstanding where those respondents may live. However, we suggest that the concerns and comments of residents who are most directly impacted by a project – its light, noise, security, traffic and parking – should be reviewed and considered carefully vis-à-vis comments from casual residents whose homes and life-styles will not be so affected. As the saying goes, they have no skin in the game. We do.

Respectfully

COMMENT 193

I suggest the following:

1. At least 10 if not 12 courts. Thompson Peak courts are always under a lot of pressure even before the Horizon closure. Ashler Hills park will serve a large pickleball population in that area and additional courts are appropriate.
2. There should be seating and/or shade structures for waiting players. At Thompson Peak there are benches along the inside of the courts which creates a lot of congestion and risk. Benches and shade structures along the perimeter of the courts would be safer.
3. The site plan is not clear that there is a complete perimeter fence around the basketball and pickleball courts. They should be completely enclosed to prevent balls running into the desert. Half walls should be between each court for safety
4. The turf areas are inevitably going to be used as dog parks even if not intended. There should be poop stations at intervals along the turf and walking paths.

COMMENT 194

There is an excessive number of parking spaces and pickleball courts for this small neighborhood park. The parking lights will be on all night and it will increase traffic in an area that currently has no access or exit.

The area is a low light area. Preserving this is important. If Terravita wants more pickleball courts they certainly have plenty of land in their neighborhood way across Scottsdale road to build them. They don't want the lights or noise so they hope they can push it into our quiet neighborhood.

It is important that the parking of cars in the park be on the far SouthWest end. Parking for 70 cars is excessive. 8 pickleball courts are excessive.

COMMENT 195

We support the Ashlee Hills park and pickle ball courts as a community gathering point . This project has been recommended, approved and known about for years . The elimination of the project because a developer did not tell their home buyers should not be a consideration even though now it's a point of view. This is a very worthwhile project .

COMMENT 196

My husband and I are residents in Las Piedras at Sevano Village. When we purchased our home, there were plans in place for a park behind the Summit Shopping Center. At that time, the plans showed a library and some sports facilities - all that were within reason. Now the city has decided to offer a plan that is completely contrary to what we were sold (bait and switch) which includes pickle ball lighted courts that you have deemed necessary to be available until 10:30 at night. Unless you are deaf, there is no chance of a bedtime prior to 10:30 due to the excessive noise they produce. In addition, your "now" plan includes a number of items that were never presented previously. What we are asking for is some common sense! Apparently, the library is no longer an option and clearly, placing these courts near residents is egregious at best and should be moved to an area away from homes and never be lit until 10:30 at night! The City Council is elected to SERVE the residents and LISTEN to their concerns rather than doing whatever you want. Elections have consequences as well. Hopefully you will "re-think" your proposal.

COMMENT 197

The size and scope are too large for the area.
My neighborhood (Las Piedras) is a "dark" area. No streetlights, etc.
There are way too many lights.
Too many courts.
Too many parking spaces.
10:30 is too late for having the park open.
Turn off the lights at 9.
Make the park more in tune with the age group that lives in the area. Very few children. Lots of Senior Citizens. Whatever happened to the idea of an Amphitheater?
Did I mention there are too, too many lights?

Thank you.

COMMENT 198

We live in Las Piedras and will be directly impacted by the new park. We feel that the no of pickle ball courts is excessive. And play should not go past 8:00 pm. As we all know, it is loud and we bought in this area to avoid excessive noise. I also feel that the parking lot size is too big for a park.

COMMENT 199

I think you have done a fine job preparing your plan for the NEIGHBORHOOD Park near Ashler Hills and North Scottsdale Road. There is one very significant change from your original proposal discussed at neighborhood outreach meetings a couple of years ago.

Here is my concern:

Increasing the number of Pickleball Courts to eight (8) is not in the interest of the nearby neighborhoods. The increased "interest" came from the huge subdivision called Terravita, several miles away. Terravita has a large number of TENNIS courts, and all over the country, underused tennis courts are being divided into TWO Pickleball Courts. It is understandable that Terravita would prefer to keep their tennis courts and have the Pickleball Courts over here in our neighborhood, because Pickleball is NOISY.

USA Pickleball Association (USA Pickleball) has been studying how to replace the hard plastic ball with something less NOISY, but they have had no success. Three Pickleball Courts is plenty for this Neighborhood Park - it is NOT a community park.

COMMENT 200

I am a full time resident. My concern is the number of parking spots allocated to the park. It is supposed to be a local community park so why do you need 75 parking stalls? Also, the number of pickle ball courts also seems to be excessive. If other communities are requesting pickle ball courts then let them build them in their own communities such as Terravita or Winfield. The lighting also concerns me why are they allowing the lights to stay on after the park is supposed to be officially closed in the evening. The traffic and car fumes also concerns me.

Thanks for your accepting my comments.

COMMENT 201

We have significant concerns regarding these plans. The traffic, parking, noise and lighting will impact our community of Las Piedras. The density of amenities and parking seems excessive. All of the community lighting is very unobtrusive, lighted recreation will not be consistent with our community or those around us.

We have always known that this area will have public use. This type of facility is not what has been indicated on the signage or what we have anticipated. Please know, that we are not in favor of this project.

Thank you for your consideration of our thoughts.

COMMENT 202

This plan is not consistent with what has been represented on the current signage on the property. The design seems excessive for the property. Seventy parking spaces will attract a variety of uses, not all related to the park usage. Trash, noise, overnight parking, ect. will most likely result from this large parking area. The lighting of pickle ball courts is truly inconsistent with all of the subtle lighting required in all of the surrounding communities.

We have been expecting public use on this property. However, a major sporting complex is not what has been represented.

Thank you for your time to review my thoughts.

COMMENT 203

I think there are too many pickle ball courts and parking places for an area such as this. Once the fad of pickle ball is over (like tennis) there will be unused space in both. There will also be a lot of noise and light. Reducing the number of courts and parking spaces will reduce cost.

COMMENT 204

The park will now be intrusive to our community.

COMMENT 205

I live in the Las Piedras neighborhood at the end of 74th Way and have some concerns about the scope of the proposed park (Ashler Hills Park). Initial plans seemed more reasonable and described what, I thought, would be a small neighborhood park. A small, quaint park sounded like a nice addition to our neighborhood. Open turf play areas, shaded playground, restrooms, walking paths/trails and even a few sports courts sound like a reasonable and welcome addition to the area. However, the new plans suggest a much larger park than initially discussed. The initially proposed 2.8 acres of developed land has seemingly expanded to 6.8 acres. The park times have expanded and the scope has almost tripled. For example, eight pickle ball courts and a 70-space lighted-parking area are among a few of the additions that I do not think make sense for our small neighborhood. Twenty-two foot tall lights on the sport courts, 16-foot tall lighting in the parking lot, and 12-foot tall lighting along the hard surface walkways is quite excessive. And, despite the park closing at 10:30 PM, there will be security lights turned on all night. The residents of our small community have grown accustomed to and appreciate our peaceful night skies and quiet, serene surroundings. In fact, a lot of us have moved out to this part of town because of those exact features. Also, plans suggest that the park will be open from sunrise until 10:30 PM, which raises the concern for a lot of increased noise and traffic in our small community. We only have one entrance to our community and increased traffic poses a problem, in my opinion. To believe that there will NOT be an unacceptable amount of light, noise and traffic, unfortunately, would be incorrect. Please respect the opinions of the members of our small community and reconsider the size and scope of this 'neighborhood' park. We are happy to work with the City of Scottsdale to find a more acceptable plan for a neighborhood park.

COMMENT 206

My wife and I own property in the area, first in Solstice in 2008, and now in Las Piedras since 2011. We were always aware of a proposed park in the area. But we were disappointed to see that the original plans for the park have grown to a much larger park than the original bond issue implied.

We believe a park with 70 parking spaces and 8 pickle ball courts is excessive for the communities in the area. The lighting for both the parking and courts is a concern. But an even larger concern is the noise created from 8 pickle ball courts. We are aware of the complaints from other pickle ball courts in the area and don't see how this development will be any quieter.

Please, consider, scaling back the size and scope of this community park considering the proximity of the two nearby neighborhoods.

COMMENT 207

When we purchased property, first in Solstice in 2008, and then in Las Piedras in 2011, we were always aware of a proposed park in the area. But we were disappointed to see that the original plans for the park have grown to a much larger park than the original bond issue implied.

We believe a park with 70 parking spaces and 8 pickle ball courts is excessive for the communities in the area. The lighting for both the parking and courts is a concern. But an even larger concern is the noise created from 8 pickle ball courts. We are aware of the complaints from other pickle ball courts in the area and don't see how this development will be any quieter.

Please, consider, scaling back the size and scope of this community park considering the proximity of the two nearby neighborhoods.

COMMENT 208

As a resident of Las Piedras, my home is directly inside our gate. I strongly object to the proposed park for the following reasons:

- The noise created by the basketball and pickle ball courts will definitely be heard in our backyard; it is very upsetting that this noise will happen from sunrise to 10:30pm.
- The lighting for the park will intrude on our beautiful view of the night sky; not just the regular lighting until 10:30pm, but the security lighting that will be on all night. Our community bylaws do include regulations with respect to downward lighting, so as not to affect the night sky.
- I understand that the residents of Terravita are pushing for the pickle ball courts. Having been a golf member at Terravita for 2 years, I know their amenities and usage well. It appears that, rather than expand their own pickle ball courts - likely because of noise and night lighting - they want to bring it over to our neighborhood.
- 70 parking spaces sounds like a lot of traffic and activity against our small, 64 home, community of Las Piedras.
- Most importantly, I am concerned about the affect this park will have on our property values. We all love our small, quiet community, and believe that this park will negatively affect the attractiveness of our location, and home property values.

Thank you,

COMMENT 209

Thank you for accepting comments regarding the park proposed for Ashler Hills, next to my community of Las Piedras. I have very strong concerns about the negative impact that the proposed park will have on my home.

I really think that my home property value will be negatively affected by the park because of noise, all-night lighting, traffic and the overall size of the project against our 64-home community.

- The lighting for the park will intrude on our beautiful view of the night sky; not just the regular lighting until 10:30pm, but the security lighting that will be on all night. Our community bylaws do include regulations with respect to downward lighting, so as not to affect the night sky.
- 70 parking spaces sounds like a lot of traffic and activity against our small, 64 home, community of Las Piedras.
- The noise created by the basketball and pickle ball courts will definitely be heard in our backyard; please, this noise cannot be allowed to happen until 10:30pm.

Thank you,

COMMENT 210

I've lived in Las Piedras for 18 years and this proposal is not what was previously slated for a neighborhood park. Increasing parking from 17 to 70 spaces and increasing pickle ball courts will have a very adverse effect on our neighborhood privacy and increase light pollution for many residents. I strongly oppose the park as currently planned. I would support a plan that is much closer to the original plan and a true neighborhood park as it was intended to be. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

COMMENT 211

We believe that 70 parking spaces is excessive for this park. This will cause excessive traffic and a bottleneck. There will be more likelihood of accidents from this.

The lighting which is 22 feet tall on the sport courts, 16 feet tall in the parking lot, and 12 feet tall along the hard surface walkways will be adding light pollution to our dark skies. You also noted that there will be security lighting all night.

COMMENT 212

I live in Las Piedras at Sevano Village, a 64-home community adjacent to the proposed neighborhood park, and will be directly impacted by the building of the park. Since moving here, I have been reminded by signage that this will be a neighborhood park ("Sevano Village Park"). It is my understanding that Sevano Village is a platted subdivision including (1) the park property, (2) our community of Las Piedras, (3) a 78-home community known as Solstice at Sevano, and (4) a yet undeveloped single-home community on the east side of 74th Way. Since the Sevano Village Park is for the Sevano Village neighborhood, it is inappropriate to include a 70-space parking lot and 8 pickleball courts. We are at a dead-end street, and traffic and security for our residents is a big concern.

In the City's bond outreach presentations, and in the materials distributed by the City to describe and seek comments, it is clearly called a neighborhood park. The City's website includes a statement that such a park serves a neighborhood within a half-mile of the park and is intended to be accessed primarily by pedestrians and by bicycles.

During the bond election outreach, a presentation to support the development of the neighborhood park depicted one basketball court, one tennis court, and three pickleball courts. Only 19 parking spaces were included. This is what I relied on in voting for the bonds. When I purchased my home, I knew there would eventually be a park; so it is something I looked forward to seeing and using. However, I never expected something so large that it would draw people from other neighborhoods and communities and create a traffic and security nightmare for our residents. I believe further studies are required and that the presentation made for the bond election should be the basis for the park.

Respectfully,

COMMENT 213

We are Las Piedras home owners and the community mostly impacted by the Aslers Hills Park Project. We are VERY concerned about the park proposal. The size of the developed portion of the park has grown immensely in the last 2 or 3 years. Worse is that much larger surrounding communities,

communities not impacted by noise and light pollution, high traffic and reduced property values, are strongly lobbying for more and more including more pickle ball courts than stated in the current project overview. Combine that with 70 parking spaces being excessive for a neighborhood park (another huge concern) and it seems the park is being developed with near-future growth in mind. Also, rumor has it that the park project overview is inaccurate and deceptive; park will close at 10:30 rather than 10:00 as stated, lights will not go dark at and 10:30 as suggested. It begs the question, what else are we not being told. There are only 64 home in Las Piedras and the community most impacted. We deserve to be told the truth and treated fairly.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

COMMENT 214

I am writing to express my deep concerns and fears about the recreation area going in at Ashler Hills and 74th street.

I live in Las Piedras at Sevano Village which is a small community of 58 homes. The proximity of this large park DEFINITELY impacts our small community negatively!! Please do not continue with this type of recreation park so near to us.

Below are a few of my concerns:

1. Traffic--How will this be monitored?
2. Noise
3. Traffic
4. Having this type of park is an open invitation to many STRANGERS coming into this area. How will this be monitored? Will there be a gate that can only be activated by sliding in a designated card which will be only given to a limited amount of people that live within a four mile radius of the park ????. The open and closing hours are too late into the evening

t6. Will the city put in a guard gated security to my neighborhood????

Our property values will drop by having this LARGE LIGHTED PARK so close. RELOCATE IT.

BAIT and SWITCH:

When we voted for the bond for the recreational area, this type of park was NOT divulged to our community. I would have been "out of my mind" to vote for this! I expected a small dog park and playground.

I can think of nothing positive that this park brings to my small, peaceful neighborhood.

This recreation area lowers my property value. I actually feel threatened by having this park so close to my home.

I understand that the neighboring communities find this park appealing. They are larger communities with higher population. Put this recreation area in their neighborhoods. Our community is quite small and, as I said, the closeness of this park to our community has a negative impact in everyway.

Find another location for this park. One that is closer to the larger neighborhoods.

Please, reconsider the size and location of this project.

Please do NOT proceed with this recreation area at Ashler Hills and 74th Street.

COMMENT 215

I live in Los Piedras at Savanna Village that is entered from 74th St. I am writing this letter to express my concern about the large recreation area going in there. The proximity of this park definitely invades our small and quiet community. I have 58 home owners, some of which are snow birds. I urge you to RECONSIDER the location of this park to one of the larger neighborhoods that are very close by and will have far more people from their area using this facility! I fear that this park will definitely lower our property value and increase the crime and mischief in our area. The very hours that it's open and it is open until late in the evening is an OPEN invitation to crimes and UNSAVORY activities.

The increase in traffic on our very small quiet road is also undesirable.

The lights will also have an effect on our beautiful dark night skies.

Bait and switch: For years we happily anticipated having a dog park in that location as well as a children's area and some walking trails.

COMMENT 216

I have concerns that this is going to be a very active park with a lot of competitive sports events. I also discern that it will effect our quiet neighborhoods where I live. There is no dog park in the design because you felt it was not needed. I see so many walkers with dogs that use the side walks on Asher Hills and 74th way street. ?? I feel and think that you need to look at all the neighbors in the area with them in mind. A sports park?? I am in opposition to the plan that this on your web site for the land use as proposed.

COMMENT 217

We feel the hours of park being open are too long; especially in the evening. It should close earlier 8pm as it's right by two quiet/dark neighborhoods.

The paddle ball courts would cause too much noise; I don't think people realize how far that noise carries. And again the 22 foot lights is too much.

These are quiet neighborhoods and we feel the park that goes in should be quieter and less intrusive. Thank you.

COMMENT 218

To whom it may concern,

When we committed to our property in Las Piedras at Savano Village a selling point by the builder in 2003 there were plans for a future library. Evidently not a consideration. What I'm understanding there will be a Neighborhood Park and not a Community Park. I would hope the voices of the people whose homes and property values that would be affected by the park's noise, lighting, parking and traffic will be heard.

Limited Noise

Parks to remain open until 10:30 PM? This means picnic groups, dogs barking, Pickle Ball courts Basketball court, Frisbee throwing and hopefully NO Skateboarding. The initial site plan was for 2.8 acres and now is 6.8 acres, more noise.

Pickle Ball Courts & Parking

Proposed 8-courts? Plus 3-proposed portable courts? Please have Terravita build their own courts, we don't use their amenities. This small Neighborhood Park does not have room for a community of 1,380 to use. Scottsdale Heights, a K. Hovnanian builder (55& over) nearby, did they invest in Pickle Ball courts for their residents? Also proposing 70-parking spaces is excessive and incompatible for this area.

Picnic Pavilions and Benches

Nothing has been mentioned regarding picnic facilities. Limited to certain amount of people? No office conventions. This can be a big factor.

Thanks for your consideration,

COMMENT 219

Hello

I'm opposed to the current plan for Ashley Hills Neighborhood Park.

Being a resident of Las Piedras at Sevano, this park will have a negative impact on property values and the neighborhood surroundings.

The proposed 70 parking spaces and 8 pickle ball courts are excessive for a neighborhood like Las Piedras. There doesn't appear to be a noise or traffic study produced to discuss the impact on 74th Way, which is the only entrance to Las Piedras.

Also, its not disclosed in the Plan, but there must not be any public parking allowed along 74th Way. The excessive traffic and parking will be disruptive to the residents of Las Piedras.

COMMENT 220

Shade, seating, and drinking water needed at sports courts. Wind buffering material on sport court fencing suggested.

COMMENT 221

Hello

I'm opposed to the current plan for Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park.

Being a resident of Las Piedras at Sevano, this park could have a negative impact on property values and the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed 70 parking spaces and 8 pickle ball courts are excessive for a neighborhood like Las Piedras. There doesn't appear to be a noise or traffic study to discuss the impact on 74th Way, which is the only entrance to Las Piedras.

Also, there is no light pollution study that has been conducted. Finally, its mentioned in the Plan, but there must not be any public parking allowed along 74th Way. The excessive traffic and parking will be disruptive to the residents of Las Piedras.

COMMENT 222

My wife and I were unaware of the plans for the Sevano Village/Ashler Hills Park Site and are concerned that, as residents of the area most impacted by this development, the City of Scottsdale has not made any notification to us about their plans and the resulting impact it will have on our community. We moved to Las Piedras, in part, because of the tranquility this community offers. In addition, the dark skies north Scottsdale, Carefree, and Cave Creek are known for was also a draw.

What could have been a reasonable community park has turned into a sports complex, with both basketball and pickle ball courts open until 10:30 p.m. This alone has the potential to increase traffic and noise in the area. The associated lighting for the sports complex will absolutely affect the dark skies this area is known for and create an eyesore for those whose property has views of the city lights in the distance.

We do not support Scottsdale's efforts and feel this is a development with good initial intentions, but one which has run amok with unnecessary expansions while catering to members of the community who aren't directly impacted.

We strongly oppose this development as currently presented.

COMMENT 223

We really have reservations about this park. We live right across the street in the development of Las Piedras. Our main concerns are the noise and the lights from the pickle ball courts. We are also concerned about the amount of traffic this will bring to our neighborhood. We would prefer not to have this park developed, or, if it is, would appreciate it if the hours were limited to a reasonable opening and closing time. Thank you.

COMMENT 224

I would like to know if you are planning to make it so that the pickleball courts have a rotation paddle holder so that everyone gets the chance to play. some parks do not have that and if you do not have 4 in your group you do not get to play.

COMMENT 225

As a resident of Las Piedras, I am strongly opposed to the size and scope of this project. It far exceeds the concept of a neighborhood park and the proposed hours of operation will be a huge disruption to our currently quiet neighborhood. I strongly urge re-consideration of number of pickle ball courts and hours of operation

COMMENT 226

I am absolutely against this park. There are too many existing parks and walking spaces, tennis courts already in the surrounding area. We do not need another huge concrete park next to concrete neighborhoods already dotting the landscape. Already the North Scottsdale area is looking like south scottsdale not only with the Ashler hills mall but developments that are sprouting all over the place. What are you thinking? Are your intentions to create another Southern California mess. You will change the landscape forever of North Scottsdale continually destroying the beauty with more concrete, more public parking, more houses. Have you not learned anything since Covid, protecting natural habitats and allowing desert space to be just that. What is the insanity of continuous building in Arizona to the point where you will have destroyed everything that is beautiful. Phoenix is already gone. North Scottsdale is all that is left of a beautiful desert environment. Not to mention the fact of the hundreds of gyms, tennis courts, squash courts, exercise clubs, pilates, barr...name it...it is everywhere on every street corner. We are living in a world of excess. How much is enough?. Leave the open space available so that younger generations can actually see what it is like to have a desert environment not slabs of concrete plastered on every street corner.. If anything, your council should

be reevaluating the exponential growth in favor of the environment, the natural habitat and beauty of what the desert was created for. I am absolutely against the building of anything on this land. Keep the land alive for future generations and their future thinking. It is the young people today who are more pro active on saving their green spaces, planting trees, and keeping nature alive than those in their 50's and 60's. I am infuriated that this is even a dialog. Absolutely against this absurd idea. Tennis clubs-check it out on Cave Creek Road, Pima Road, Scottsdale Road...Enough is enough. think Green, Think Smart and be Wise. Thank you.

COMMENT 227

I live in the Las Piedras neighborhood and felt compelled to contact the City of Scottsdale to oppose the Sevano Village/Ashler Hills Park plans. I have reviewed the plans on the City's website and have several concerns.

First and foremost, the Las Piedras community is most impacted by the traffic, noise, and light pollution which are associated with these plans. Regardless of what mitigation efforts you have, we will be the ones who will have to deal with these negative effects of the current plan. The amount of parking, 70 spaces, is absolutely ridiculous for what was supposed to be a community park. The hours of operation are much too late and listed as both 10:00 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. in different information made available by Scottsdale. I can only assume the time changed for some reason.

The design of the park is beautiful but the aesthetic is ruined by the addition of the pickleball and basketball courts, which are in conflict with the natural aspects of the design and almost appear to be an afterthought. We were taken by the natural beauty of this area and are disappointed the City has chosen to pursue a design which is in conflict with it. I hope you will reconsider the inclusion of the sport-elements in the design and instead move forward with one which embraces the natural features of the Sonoran desert.

COMMENT 228

I live in Solstice at Sevano Village, across from where the proposed Ashler Hills park is being built. While I am generally in favor of the park, I do have concerns about the parking lot number of spaces and having the parking lot across from our neighborhood's entrance gates. From looking at the rendition, I just want to make sure that the parking lot will be off the main road and hidden by trees and shrubbery. If the parking lot's visual impact is mitigated by trees and shrubbery around its perimeter and maybe lowered to further mitigate its visual impact from the street I am OK with the park being built. I think it will be great for the area.

Ashler Hills Virtual Public Meeting #2 Comments

Virtual Public Meeting March 2022

COMMNET 1

"Below continue to be my main concerns regarding the proposed Scottsdale Park right outside the Las Piedras Community. I have already expressed my concerns at the community meeting that was held at Winfield, and submitted them to the online comments section at the [Scottsdaleaz.gov/Ashler Hills](https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/AshlerHills) website several times.

- 1) Traffic and congestion. Besides regular increase in traffic, you just know there are idiots who will park on 74th Way. That street can barely accommodate 2-car traffic now. AND parking entrance should be BELOW that first traffic circle.
- 2) Noise, noise, noise ... from pickle ball and basketball courts, picnic areas, children, dogs, etc.
- 3) Late hours.
- 4) Lighted courts and intrusive lighting.
- 5) Security issues for our development and the area.
- 6) This is supposed to be a "neighborhood park?" Why should Terravita or any other community that is not within walking distance have any say so or input?
- 7) I am absolutely against any part of it being a dog park.

When we first moved here almost 17 years ago, I was for this project because it included a library. With the way things are today, there are much better uses for the monies being proposed and allocated for this park. There are also enough "walking trails" around this area already. A park is not necessary. I would much rather see the funds go toward teachers and our education system, first responders, police/sheriff departments, etc. We have so many other issues that need addressed.

Thank you.

COMMNET 2

It is critical to get more Pickleball courts in the area. If 8 is the most you can squeeze in, then great. Pickleball is exploding and we need as many public courts as possible.

COMMNET 3

Will it have a dog park? It is much needed!

COMMNET 4

Love the idea of having the shade structures for the sport courts - one next to each of the 4 sets of PB courts and 1 next to basketball. Being a regular PB player at Cholla, Horizon, and Thompson Peak Parks, I'd like to suggest a slight modification to these shade structures that better supports how I see the 8 PB courts being used. Cholla, Horizon and Thompson Peak use Paddle Saddles to hold paddles for players waiting to play next; Ashler Hills would likely want to do the same thing. The approach used at Cholla

and Horizon (1 saddle for beginners/advanced beginners for half the courts and 1 saddle for intermediate/advanced players for the other half) works much better than the approach used at Thompson Peak (1 saddle for all 6 courts regardless of skill level). Suggest you combine shade structures 2&3 and combine structures 4&5 and locate a paddle saddle on fence just outside each of these two larger structures. This way courts 1-4 can be used for beginner/advanced beginner play and courts 5-8 can be used for intermediate/advanced play. I suspect the cost of two slightly larger shade structures for PB may be slightly cheaper than four smaller shade structures. To see how this works in practice, please visit the three other parks to see how people congregate around/near the paddle saddles and visualize a shade structure enhancing these waiting areas. Kudos for implementing shade structures from the start.

COMMNET 5

Eight pickleball courts will be barely enough to meet current demand as this sport continues to grow. The plan might include a set aside for more pickleball courts in the future. So happy to have a City of Scottsdale park in the far North part of Scottsdale. When does the city plan to build a golf course in North Scottsdale? Thanks, Dennis Mitchell

COMMNET 6

I did not see any provisions to widen the access and egress to the proposed park. The traffic on the proposed roads is currently extensive and will get worse during construction and open use. Will the improvement in road(s) usage be improved with the proposed park?

COMMNET 7

Excellent presentation & FAQ's. Where would you place additional pickle ball courts should they be desired in future years?

COMMNET 8

"Looks like more pickleball courts should be built-this is a beautiful park to be added to the area. The playground is much needed. Please install pet stations."

COMMNET 9

Overall, I think the design and usage are great. It appears that there is still plenty of open space. Would a small amount of that be useful for a play-type area for the younger generation? It seems that there are more families moving into the area.

COMMNET 10

"There are no of leash dog parks, especially in North Scottsdale!! When will this be addressed????

COMMNET 11

I am extremely excited to see the development and completion of this park. It has been needed in North Scottsdale for some time. I am happy to see the consideration for dogs and dog walking. I also feel that due to the popularity of Pickle Ball Courts you should consider placing as many as possible. I

have frequented Horizon Park and used the Pickle Ball courts there. When building the courts, you need to place half fences between the courts as balls continuously will go into the neighboring courts disrupting play. This was not done at Horizon and would be a welcome addition at Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park.

COMMNET 11

Overall, I think that the plan looks great. I would like to see the team double the pickle ball court availability to 16. It appears as though there is plenty of room and north Scottsdale doesn't have access to pickleball courts like the other portions of Scottsdale. I would be willing to pay for this via a special levy or individual donation should cost be the issue. Thank you for your willingness to take comments.

COMMNET 12

I am delighted that we are getting a true park in this area. The plan seems well thought out and should fit nicely into our community.

COMMNET 13

Please consider putting in 16 pickle ball courts rather than 8. There are no public pickle ball courts at on the north side of Scottsdale. With only 8, there will always be too many people and pickle ball is only increasing in popularity among the older population that lives in North Scottsdale.

COMMNET 14

The pickle ball courts should be rotated 90 degrees. The sun shines in players eyes in the morning and evening as presented. DC Ranch is building two additional courts rotated 90 degrees from their two existing courts for this reason. Also a noise buffer would be appreciated. The sound of striking the ball is annoying. I'd hate to hear eight balls at the same time.

COMMNET 15

Please build more than 8 pickleball courts. Judging from the interest we've seen and the overcrowding at Thompson Peak, the park easily has room for at least 16 courts. I'm confident it will be extensively used.

COMMNET 16

Very good presentation and summary of the project status. Layout of the planned park looks great. In my opinion, 8 pickleball courts is enough. There are other pickleball courts in the area (private and public). Project schedule looks to be realistic. Project cost may be in jeopardy, with fast rising material cost inflation and labor costs.

COMMNET 17

"No need for a park. A waste of money, a liability issue for dogs, accidents, parking, etc.

A nice restaurant, a fresh market, and food would be better since area is becoming more populated. DO NOT WANT A DOG OR PICKLE-BALL PARK!"

COMMNET 18

"WE COULD DEFINITELY USE A NO-LEASH DOG PARK IN THIS PARK AS THERE ARE NONE IN OUR AREA.

SOMETHING SIMILIAR TO THE DOG PARK ON HAYDEN WOULD BE WONDERFUL. IT IS TOO FAR FROM

HERE TO BE ABLE TO GO THERE AND THERE IS NOTHING IN N. SCOTTSDALE."

COMMNET 19

"This looks beautiful!! It is going to be a wonderful enhancement to our community. THANK YOU.

I am so happy to see shading added on the Pickleball Courts. I know that costs are rising significantly, but it does look like there is some land to put additional Pickleball Courts. If public funds are not available could private funds be used? I know that there is interest in providing additional funds if needed. Or, consideration of a potential Phase II for additional courts that could be incorporated in the current plan.

Thank you for the amazing work that has been done on this project. Thank you for listening. Thank you for supporting North Scottsdale.

COMMNET 20

Thanks for planning this park! Pickleball is quickly growing in popularity, and the closest public courts are at Thompson Peak park. It is very crowded there. I suggest that the number of PB courts at Ashley Hills Park be increased to 12 or 16. We would be willing to contribute to the cost, if there is a way for the public to do so.

COMMNET 21

I would like to see a dog park included in these plans. There is nothing close by that people can allow their dogs off leash in a safe environment. Also, Pickleball has become a very popular sport so I feel 8 courts would not be enough.

COMMNET 22

"I think your design is absolutely perfect. It takes into consideration noise, lights, animals, parking.

I approve and commend your plans and forward thinking.

Thank you so much for this wonderful addition to our neighborhood."

COMMNET 23

I am very disappointed that you have not included a dog park as you had originally. There is such a need for one in our area. I understand that the space is there for one but it is not in the final one. Please please reconsider.

COMMNET 24

"Rather than one large shade structure, I would suggest a smaller shade structure at the entrance and adding shade structures for basketball and pickleball players waiting to play."

COMMNET 25

What's described here is a COMMUNITY park, not a NEIGHBORHOOD park. Driven by larger communities that are not impacted by the park and do not want their tranquility, safety and home values diminished, this project has repeatedly and deceptively morphed into something much larger than originally planned or approved. Deeply disturbed by our city and aforementioned communities.

COMMNET 26

"I have followed this project from the two meetings at Winfield, through the bond-funding legislation which I actively supported, to this plan.

I am an active tennis player, and supported the project because it promised two courts at its inception, and now we are stuck with 8 pickle ball courts and no tennis courts. I am disappointed, to say the least, and feel somewhat betrayed by the reversal which eliminates tennis courts.

The park plan looks excellent, in most respects, but this glaring omission is, indeed, a glaring omission.

Please reinstate the tennis courts which got this project started, There are no neighborhood public courts in Scottsdale north of Grayhawk, a long way from here, and that was the promise of this park.

I am a resident in Solstice at Sevano, nearby, and am very concerned about the amount and visibility of traffic coming west to Scottsdale Road from the park. Traffic from Las Piedras at present is somewhat hard to see from our exit gate because of vegetation, and I hope that visibility will be improved as part of the construction, to avoid collisions or near-collisions with park traffic.

Thanks for your consideration."

COMMNET 27

Looks awesome and we can't wait! Please connect the park to the Scottsdale Heights community so we can walk directly to the park. Thank you.

COMMNET 28

"I think it looks very nice!

Thank you! I'm very excited!"

COMMNET 29

I think the design is great. Hurry please and build! Can we get a court reservation system and prioritize the local neighbors? People from far and wide will be coming to use these courts.

COMMNET 30

My husband, John, and I were at all the earlier meetings re: Ashler Hills Park. A few years have passed and we now realize that the 6 pickleball courts that were suggested will not be sufficient. After seeing how the demand has increased in places like Thompson Peak park, and knowing we would be the only neighborhood park in North Scottsdale, we definitely will need 8 courts minimum....12 courts ideally.

Your design right now is beautiful, and we can't wait for Ashler Hills Park to be completed. THANK YOU!!!

COMMNET 31

I live in the new community Scottsdale Heights. Will there be a pathway from Scottsdale Heights directly to the park?

COMMNET 32

looking forward to the park being constructed Looks great. Hopefully it will not be de-railed. Thanks for the information. Can hardly wait to walk the grandkids to the park and use the exercise area.

COMMNET 33

The park looks beautiful. I won't mind the construction phase for the benefits it will provide. I have a question about the trees shown in the proposal pictures. Will they be mature trees or will there be a few years of growth needed to achieve the look in the proposal?

COMMNET 34

"I would really like to see 'senior playground equipment', easily used by multi-generations.
Thanks

COMMNET 35

I wish they would have carved out an area for a Dog Park w/shade... We could really use one up in this area...

COMMNET 36

i think it is strange to have 8 pickle ball courts and not ONE tennis court. Couldnt we do 6 pickle ball and 1 tennis?

COMMNET 37

"Please build more Pickleball Courts! 12 courts would be ideal. Can you put fences in between each court? If not, then fence a central walk way so you don't disturb the players on the other courts. Plan out where the paddle racks would be.
Thanks,

COMMNET 38

I understand cost may be a factor, but I would think we need more pickleball courts. For residents that don't have neighborhood courts, these will be the only public courts nearby. Everyone I know is looking for a place to play. There is a great need for many many courts!

COMMNET 39

"A major concern is that the restrooms will be locked every evening at 9:00, when the park closes. The proposed plan to keep lights on until 10PM will disturb the peace in the neighborhood, and in consideration of abutting neighbors, the park should close at 9PM.

Hopefully there will be some patrolling after hours to discourage teens and vagrants from lingering. Thank you for considering our needs!"

COMMNET 40

"It seems like this park has taken so long to come to fruition and now to learn it will take another full year or more to actually open, seems unreal. I know there have been challenges due to Covid, but can't wait to finally be able to enjoy this beautiful plan. I will enjoy using the adult exercise area and walking the trails for sure. I like the lighting being directed completely downward for our night skies since I live in Terravita and we are a dark sky community. I have concerns about the light and am hoping these lights keep it to an absolute minimum. With being open till 10:30, will the park have any security after dark to keep vandalism and other nefarious things under control? Our area has been seeing more crime in the last few years and it should be address before the park is opened to the public."

COMMNET 41

The park must respect neighbors with regard to noise (mainly from pickleball), lights including controlling light trespass and hours they must be shut off, and traffic. I also am not in favor of changing tennis courts for pickleball as tennis has been around a lot longer and is growing in popularity while pickleball is a novelty which may or may no last. Also a lot more courts are being added which means a lot more noise and possibly desire to keep lights on longer. Most of the developments in this area have their own facilities so the need is in question. I also think grass is out of place here, this is the Sonoran desert, and in an ESLO overlay, not a park in Florida.

COMMNET 42

"I down loaded the exhibit- does not really show where children's playground will be and what ages will be included. There is no children's playground in North Scottsdale!

Additionally, Pickle ball is a multi-generational sport! More courts will allow more play."

COMMNET 43

"There is strong demand for pickleball courts in North Scottsdale. I strongly urge the City to build more than the proposed 8 pickleball courts in the Ashler Hills Park. This is an excellent opportunity to show citizens and residents of the North Scottsdale area that the City supports their recreational interests. Please consider installing 4 to 8 pickleball courts in addition to the currently proposed 8 courts. Thank you.

COMMNET 44

With the growing number of people playing pickleball, please reconsider the number of courts your putting in.

COMMNET 45

ASHLER HILLS NEIGHBORHOOD PARK WILL BE A WONDERFUL ADDITION FOR OUR NORTH SCOTTSDALE NEIGHBORS..I WOULD BE REMISS IN NOT COMMENTING ON THE NUMBER OF PICKLEBALL COURTS PLANNED FOR THE PROJECT..I WOULD STRONGLY URGE THAT THE NUMBER OF PICKLEBALL COURTS BE

INCREASED AT LEAST TO THIRTY..PICKELBALL IS EXPLODING AND THE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IS INCREASING BY TEN FOLD..LET'S ACCOMMODATE THEIR NEEDS. WHILE I AM NOT A PICKLEBALL PLAYER I RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR MORE COURTS.. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION.....DON ARBOGAST

COMMNET 46

I am very excited to see a Neighborhood Park in this area. It is a wonderful addition. My biggest disappointment with the plans is the number of pickleball courts. As a very fast growing sport that I and my family have all recently begun to play..... I would expect many more courts than the 8 proposed. I moved from Minneapolis where the parks are all adding up to 24 courts if space allows. Those parks with 8 courts are consistently too busy and it is not unusual to have to wait behind 12 other players before being able to play. This has left families and players frustrated and disappointed. Please add as many courts as possible. I know they will all get used consistently and it will be the most used part of the park. Thanks for your consideration.

COMMNET 47

Please consider adding 8 more pickleball courts. Thank you.

COMMNET 48

"Amazing design and amenities!

We've been looking forward to this park since purchasing our retirement home in the Scottsdale, two years ago.

Pickleball is the fastest growing sport in the US (just look at the complex in Mesa!!) Is there room to add additional pickleball courts, if the current 8 prove to be not enough? If so, what is the process for consideration/expansion?

Are these courts 100% public, or there any agreements pending with outside organizations or associations, that will allow them to reserve one or more courts during particular days or times during the week?"

COMMNET 49

"8 courts not near enough. should be double that. fastest growing sport in USA. do it right the first time. plenty of room

COMMNET 50

The are not enough pickle ball courts. At lease 12 are rneeded and possibly 16+

COMMNET 51

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. This is an extremely carefully thought out and well-designed neighborhood park. I agree completely that an off-leash dog park requires different space and staffing (as is available at Thompson Peak/Hayden). Given the growing popularity of pickleball for individuals of

all ages however, I would recommend that the City consider expanding the number of pickleball courts from 8 to 12. There appears to be adequate space at the site for this. Alternative sources of funding could be explored if costs are the driving factor in limiting the number of courts to 8.

COMMNET 52

"In regards to Ashler park Pickleball courts. We are very interested in having more courts and can see that more than 8 courts would be highly beneficial.
Please consider our recommendation.

Thank you so much

COMMNET 53

PLEASE, please ...add more than the 8 pickleball courts as in the proposal. The local neighborhood would utilize double that amount. Hopefully you hear this loud and clear from my neighbors. This is a huge need for community and family.

COMMNET 54

"I am wondering what the policy for the restrooms will be:

Who will be responsible for cleaning them and how often?

Will the restrooms be locked at night?

There is a concern that this park could become a popular place for homeless people to ""make home"".

Thank you,"

COMMNET 55

"I don't feel 8 Pickleball Courts will be adequate for the demand in NorthScottsdale . The area is growing and now most players drive over 15 miles for competitive matches.

The surrounding private clubs will not be allowing visitors on their courts as they do not have enough courts don't and the only way to get a game is to drive about 15 miles. There is great demand up here; do it right and make enough courts the first time around."

COMMNET 56

"So glad this park is finally getting built. It will be a wonderful addition to our community. We need more Pickleball courts! 8 will be really undersized for the popularity of the sport and growth in North Scottsdale.

Please, please put in a dog park."

COMMNET 57

"Great project and extremely well laid out. Exciting addition to north Scottsdale life style. My only concern is the number of pickleball courts given the popularity of the sport and the available land. The


number of players is growing exponentially and the demographics of this area suggest we could use at least 5 more courts. Appreciate all you folks have done and this is a wonderful project for our area.

COMMNET 58

There should be at least double the number of pickleball courts. With only 8 courts there will be a back up of people hanging around to play all day. It is SO popular for all age groups and is even gaining in popularity as everyone learns the game. Definitely build 16 or more since you have the space at this time.

COMMNET 59

We need at least 16 pickleball courts



**City of Scottsdale
Parks and Recreation Commission**

*****AMENDED*****

*****Reworded Item 2 – at request of Staff**

Regular Meeting MARKED Agenda

Wednesday, June 15, 2022 – 5:00 p.m.

City Hall Kiva Forum

3939 N. Drinkwater Boulevard

Scottsdale, AZ 85251

As a member of the Scottsdale community, I will genuinely listen; speak respectfully; and be accountable for my words and actions.

CALL TO ORDER – 5:01 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Chair Kurt Jones, Vice-Chair Eric Kurland, Commissioners Maryann McAllen, Steve Masear, Susan McGarry, Teresa Kim Quale, Kristen Parrish

Present: Chair Kurt Jones, Commissioners Maryann McAllen, Steve Masear, and Kristen Parrish

Absent: Vice-chair Eric Kurland, Commissioners Susan McGarry and Teresa Kim Quale

One or more members of the Parks and Recreation Commission may be attending the meeting by telephone, video, or internet conferencing, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431(4)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Citizens may address the members of the Parks and Recreation Commission during Public Comment. This “Public Comment” time is reserved for citizen comments regarding non-agendized items. Arizona State law prohibits the Parks and Recreation Commission from discussing or taking action on an item that is not on the prepared agenda. Citizens may complete one Request to Speak “Public Comment” card per meeting and submit it to City Staff. Public testimony is limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.

Written comment cards are being accepted for both agendized and non-agendized items and may be submitted to City Staff at any time. Cards submitted after public testimony has begun will be provided to the Parks and Recreation Commission at the conclusion of the testimony for that item.

REGULAR MEETING

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING – [April 20, 2022](#)

Commissioner Kristen Parrish noted that Stephanie Tippet was not listed as in attendance. Correction was made to April 20, 2022 Minutes

Commissioner Parrish moved to approve the minutes as corrected; Commissioner McAllen seconded; the motion carried with a vote of 4-0, Chair Jones, Commissioners McAllen, Masear and Parrish voted in the affirmative; there were not dissenting votes.

Discussion and possible action

***** 2. ASHLER HILLS NEIGHBORHOOD PARK MUNICIPAL USE MASTER SITE PLAN – [View Report](#)**

Nick Molinari, Parks and Recreation Director and Chris Brown, FASLA, Partner with Floor Associates, will share a presentation detailing the municipal use master site plan (MUMSP) for Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park. The Commission shall make a recommendation to advise the City Council on its approval of the MUMSP for Ashler Hills Neighborhood Park.

Information, discussion and possible action

Commissioner McAllen moved to approve Ashler Hills Neighborhood Parks Municipal Use Master Site Plan as presented; Commissioner Parrish seconded; the motion carried with a vote of 3-0, Chair Jones, Commissioners McAllen, and Parrish voted in the affirmative; Commissioner Masear dissented.

3. INDIAN SCHOOL PARK FACILITY & BALLFIELD RESERVATION POLICY - [View Report](#)

Chris Walsh, Parks and Recreation Manager, will provide a presentation regarding the proposed reservation policy for ballfields and related facilities at the Indian School Park Complex. The Commission may choose to provide direction, suggestions and input on the proposed policy to staff for consideration and inclusion or may recommend approval as written.

Information, discussion and possible action

Commissioner Parrish moved to recommend the City Council approve the Indian School Park Facility and Ballfield Reservation Policy as presented; Commissioner McAllen seconded; the motion carried with a vote of 4-0, Chair Jones, Commissioners McAllen, Masear and Parrish voted in the affirmative; there were not dissenting votes.

4. DIRECTOR'S REPORT – [View Director's Report](#)

Nick Molinari, Parks and Recreation Director, will update the Commission on the status of current projects, programs, and upcoming events in the Parks and Recreation Department.

Information only

The Commission cannot discuss or vote on items not on the agenda, including items brought up in the Director's Report. If discussion or action by the Commission is required, the item should be placed on an upcoming meeting agenda to be consistent with the Arizona Open Meeting Law.

5. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Commissioners may provide a brief report about current events or activities related to the Parks and Recreation Department.

Information only

The Commission cannot discuss or vote on items not on the agenda, including items brought up as Commissioners' Reports. If discussion or action by the Commission is required, the item should be placed on an upcoming meeting agenda to be consistent with the Arizona Open Meeting Law.

6. POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Commissioners may make suggestions and requests for items they wish to be placed on a future agenda, but Commissioners may not discuss, deliberate, or take legal action on any matter in the "Possible Future Agenda Items" unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Possible motion to agendize matter(s) for future discussion and possible action

7. ADJOURNMENT – **6:42 PM**

Motion to adjourn the meeting

Commissioner McAllen moved to adjourn the meeting; Commissioner Parrish seconded; the motion carried with a vote of 4-0, Chair Jones, Commissioners McAllen, Masear and Parrish voted in the affirmative; there were not dissenting votes.



Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the Department Administrative Offices at 480-312-7275. Requests should be made 24 hours in advance, or as early as possible, to allow time to arrange the accommodation. For TTY users, the Arizona Relay Service (1-800-367-8939) may contact the Department of Administrative Offices at 480-312-7275.

SCOTTSDALE

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

MEETING NOTICE AND **MARKED** AGENDA



DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD

Linda Milhaven, Councilmember/Chair
Barney Gonzales, Planning Commissioner
Shakir Gushgari, Design Member
Michal Ann Joyner, Development Member

Doug Craig, Vice Chair
Ali Fakh, Development Member
Jeff Brand, Design Member

Thursday, July 7, 2022

One or more members of the Development Review Board may be attending the meeting by telephone, video, or internet conferencing, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431(4).

The City Hall Kiva (Kiva) is open to the public during Development Review Board meetings. Seating in the Kiva will be available on a first come, first served basis. Development Review Board meetings are also televised on Cox Cable Channel 11 and streamed online at ScottsdaleAZ.gov (search "live stream") to allow the public to listen/view the meeting in progress.

9:00 A.M.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD MEETING

City Hall Kiva Forum, 3939 N. Drinkwater Boulevard

Call to Order – 9:00am

Roll Call – Board Members Fakh and Brand absent

Public Comment – Non-Agendized Items

Citizens may address the members of the Development Review Board during Public Comment. Public Comment time is reserved at the beginning of the meeting for citizens to comment on non-agendized items that are within the Development Review Board's jurisdiction and is limited to a total of 15 minutes. Arizona State law prohibits the Development Review Board from discussing or taking any action on these non-agendized items. Speakers may submit a blue "Request to Speak" card in person prior to the beginning of the meeting. Public testimony is limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.

Written comment is also being accepted for non-agendized items and may be submitted in-person at the hearing or electronically [at the Development Review Board website](http://the Development Review Board website). Written comments submitted electronically will be emailed to the Development Review Board Members.

No spoken or written comment received at hearing regarding non-agendized items.

Administrative Report – Brad Carr, AICP, LEED-AP

1. Identify supplemental information, if any, related to the July 7, 2022 Development Review Board agenda items, and other correspondence.

Minutes

2. Approval of the June 16, 2022 Development Review Board [Regular Meeting Minutes](#).
Motion by Board Member Joyner to approve, 2nd by Vice Chair Craig. Motion passed 5-0.



Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting staff at 480-312-7767. Requests should be made 24 hours in advance, or as early as possible to allow time to arrange accommodation. For TTY users, the Arizona Relay Service (1-800-367-8939) may contact staff.

ACTION ITEMS

How the Action Agenda Works: The Development Review Board may take one vote to act on all items on the Continuance Agenda and/or Consent Agenda or may remove individual items for further discussion as appropriate. The Development Review Board takes separate action on each item on the Regular Agenda.

Persons interested in speaking on any agenda item may **submit a blue “Request to Speak” card in person prior to the beginning of public testimony.** Those wishing to speak are customarily given three minutes to speak on each item. Additional time may be granted to a designated speaker representing two or more persons (please submit cards together). Persons interested in submitting a written comment on any item may **submit a yellow “Written Comments” card in person prior to the beginning of public testimony or may submit electronically [at the Development Review Board website](#) no later than 90 minutes prior to the meeting.**

CONSENT AGENDA

3. [1-PP-2022 \(Sereno Canyon Phase 4E\)](#)
Request for approval of a preliminary plat to replat Sereno Canyon Plat Phase 4E, to establish 10 resort units on +/- 21 acres of a 350-acre site, as per Phase 4 of the Sereno Canyon Community Phasing Plan and Final Plat, for a site located generally between E. Alameda Road and the E. Pinnacle Peak Road alignment, at the intersection of N. 124th Street and N. 125th Street, with Resort/Townhouse Residential, Environmentally Sensitive Lands (R-4R ESL) zoning.
Staff contact is Jesús Murillo, 480-312-7849
Applicant contact is Jorge Garre, 480-596-1131

4. [37-DR-2020 & 8-PP-2020 \(Hawkins - CSOK\)](#)
Request for approval of the site plan, landscape plan, building elevations and a preliminary plat for a major subdivision to allow for a new office & retail development with 3 new buildings totaling approximately 15,300 square feet of commercial floor area and 3 commercial lots and 1 residential lot, all on a +/- 3.7-acre site located at the southwest corner of E. Shea Boulevard and N. 114th Street, with Central Business (C-2), Service Residential (S-R), and Single-family Residential, Planned Residential Development (R1-18 PRD) zoning.
Staff contact is Bryan Cluff, 480-312-2258
Applicant contact is Brittnee Elliott, 480-777-1078

5. [31-DR-2021 \(New Corporate Hangar for Set Jet\)](#)
Request for approval of a site plan, landscape plan, and building elevations for an approximately 16,270 square foot hangar and office building located at 15208 N. 75th Street, with Industrial Park (I-1) zoning.
Staff Contact is Katie Posler, 480-312-2703
Applicant contact is James Elson, 602-903-5311
Motion by Vice Chair Craig to approve Items 3, 4, and 5 on the Consent Agenda, 2nd by Board Member Joyner. Motion passed 5-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. **18-UP-2021 (Ashler Hills Park)**

Request for a recommendation from the Development Review Board to the Planning Commission and City Council regarding a Municipal Use Master Site Plan for a new park on a +/- 15-acre site located at the northwest corner of E. Ashler Hills Drive and N. 74th Way, with Multiple-family Residential, Environmentally Sensitive Lands (R-5 ESL) zoning.

Staff contact is Katie Posler, 480-312-2703

Applicant contact is Brad Walldorf, 602-312-7790

Motion by Vice Chair Craig to recommend approval 18-UP-2021 with recommendations regarding park hours and lighting, 2nd by Board Member Joyner. Motion passed 4-1, with Commissioner Gonzales dissenting.

Adjournment – 10:20am