CITY OF MARICOPA
PROUD HISTORY · PROSPEROUS FUTURE

39700 W. Civic Center Plaza
Maricopa, AZ 85138
Ph: 520.568.9098
Fx: 520.568.9120
www.maricopa-az.gov

STAFF REPORT

CASE NO.: PAD16-04

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council
Through: Martin Scribner, Development Services Director
Kazi Haque, Zoning Administrator
From: Ryan Wozniak, Planner
Meeting Date: April 17, 2018

Agenda Language:
Anderson Russell Planned Area Development (PAD) 16-04: Applicant Kelly Hall of Phillip Miller Consultants, LLC is requesting a rezone to Planned Area Development on approximately 776 acres generally located south of the intersection of Anderson Road and Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway. Discussion and Action.

REQUEST SUMMARY

The Mayor and City Council shall consider and possibly take action on Planned Area Development request PAD16-04 Anderson Russell PAD for approximately 776 acres generally located south of the intersection of Anderson Road and Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway; the request seeks approval of conceptual land use mixes and supporting proposal details as required by Article 510 of the Zoning Code. **Discussion and Action.**

Site Context:

THRU: MSIDD Canal; levees; Santa Cruz Wash; Ak-Chin Airport approach
NORTH: Union Pacific Railroad; CI-2 (Ak-Chin, Airport); CB-2 (County, Mobile Mini); SR (County, Saddleback Farms)
SOUTH: CR-3 PAD (County, Undeveloped Planned Community)
EAST: CI-2 (County, Undeveloped)
WEST: Undesignated (Ak-Chin, Undeveloped); GR (State Land, Undeveloped); CR-3 PAD (County, Undeveloped Planned Community)

PROPERTY LOCATION/AERIAL N↑



Property Zoned (existing):
CI-2 Industrial (throughout)

COUNCIL PRIORITIES CONSIDERED

- Transportation Connectivity
- Quality of Life
- Economic Sustainability
- Managing the Future
- Public Safety

APPLICANT

Philip Miller Consultants, LLC
16 Spur Circle
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
480-220-7393
khall@pmcaz.com

HISTORY SUMMARY

- **2008** Intergovernmental Agreement for Construction and Funding of Grade Separations:
  - May 27, 2008 Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) entered into an agreement with Pinal County, City of Maricopa, and city of Eloy to establish conditions for UPRR contributions to a limited number of grade separated crossings for roadway facilities crossing the UPRR ROW.
  - Anderson Road Is included in Exhibit A of the agreement.
  - The preface states that UPRR's desire to expand tracks within its ROW affects at-grade crossings.
  - It is unknown whether UPRR will support the widening of Anderson Road at-grade, but the City will reasonably cooperate with the developer in the request for review and approval of expanded facilities to uphold the transportation plans of the City and ultimately serve the proposed PAD.
- **2011/2013**:
  - *Annexations*.
    - In 2011 the city annexed (ANNX11-01) a 251 acre area. This annexation provided the very northwest corner of the subject site.
    - In 2013 the city annexed (ANNX13-01) the balance of the subject site.
    - Pre-Annexation Development Agreement (PDA) in place states under the section titled *3. General Plan Land Use Map Designation*, "*Owner shall provide evidence establishing the change in use is fiscally solvent and will not create a financial burden to the City*." Further the PDA anticipates some future combination of land uses to include Commercial/ Employment and Medium Density Residential (2-6du/ac) and to be regulated in a uniform manner consistent with land use regulations applicable to and governing the development of the property.
      - The PDA does not require the approval of PAD16-04. To deny the case would not violate the terms of the agreement.
  - *General Plan Amendment*.
    - In 2013 the city designated the entire subject site as Master Planned Community with Exhibit E-2 predicting uses of 154.96 acres of Commercial / Employment and 620.85 acres of Residential.
  - *Zoning*.
    - Following annexation, and pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes, the city changed the CI-2 Industrial Zone designation from County to the comparable CI-2 designation per the City's Zoning Code.
- **2014**: Applicant file PAD14-01 Anderson Russell Planned Area Development proposal. Over the course of reviews, the case number was re-issued as PAD16-04.
- **2017/2018**: On November 27, 2017, following the public hearing, a motion for continuance was approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission allowing another round of negotiation between the applicant and Staff. The summary of these negotiations are found in the memo titled "Staff update on Anderson Russell Planned Area Development (PAD16-04)" dated December 28, 2017. Access memo at the following link. This includes a letter from John Storm, Assistant Fire Chief, (memo, page 4) as to the effects that an inability to meet response time standards could have on the City.

PROJECT INFORMATION

To date, staff reviews have found the Anderson Russell Planned Area Development (PAD16-04) to not fully satisfy all the *Required Findings* of the Zoning Code, Article 510, regulating all proposed *Planned Area Developments*. Anderson Russell PAD is subject to regulations of the Zoning Code, the Subdivision Ordinance, Master Plans, and the General Plan (all referenced in Articles 207 and 510).

City Aerial and City Limits



Aerial and Site Description



Site Data:	
Current Zoning	CI-2 Industrial (converted from County to Municipal zoning after annexations)
Current Use	Agricultural / Undeveloped
General Plan Future Land Use	Master Planned Community (MPC) (link)
Proposed Zoning	PAD – Compliant with the General Plan Future Land Use Land Uses proposed within the PAD plan (see Exhibit G): • Single Family Residential [4.2 du/ac] • Medium Density Residential [6.5du/ac] • Specialty Product Residential (Cluster / Townhome / MU) [6 du/ac] • Business Park / Light Industrial • Commercial • Mixed Use – General (includes High Density Residential) [18 du/ac] • Mixed Use – G/N/H (excludes High Density Residential) o This is a hybrid combining all MU designations of the Zoning Code (General, Neighborhood, and Heritage) • Elementary School • Open Space
Property Location	Generally South of Anderson Road and Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy
Gross Acreage	Approx. 776 acres (gross) Approx. 683 acres (net developable area)
Residential Yield	2,100 – 3,570 units
Density (du/ac)	3 – 5.2 dwelling units per acre (net, based on developable area) By parcel (with residential units), densities range between 4.2 – 18 du/ac Specifics on land use allocations / densities are provided in Exhibit G
Open Space	Master Planned 116.39 acres (17%) The balance of open space to be made up with internal open space within parcels to yield a minimum of 22%
Site Conditions	There are numerous conditions adding to the potential expense of developing the subject property. Some conditions also come with promising assets to leverage for economic development as detailed in subsequent analysis. To overcome the potential expense, the assets of the site should include ambitious, comprehensive planning efforts.



Site Boundary

Site

The site makes up approximately 776 acres of agricultural or undeveloped land.
The parcels that comprise the site are as follows: 502-10-0020, 502-11-002B, 502-11-002A, 502-12-0020, 502-14-0010



Proposed Land Uses (Exhibit G)

Proposed Land Uses Summary

Land Use Summary	Acres
Single Family Residential	263.62
Medium Density Residential	105.68
Specialty Product	16.79
Business Park/Light Industrial	104.27
Commercial	29.69
Mixed Use - G (Includes RH Use)	25.45
Mixed Use - N (Excl RH)	8.67
Elementary School	12.15
Open Space (see below)	116.39
Total:	**682.71**

Open Space Summary	Acres
Parks	26.38
Trail	9.36
Open Space	24.95
Santa Cruz Wash	19.21
Monumentation	4.21
Landscaped Pathways / Streetscape	29.07
Power Line	3.21
Total:	**116.3**

The variety of land uses are accepted as meeting the intent of a Master Planned Community.

Site Conditions

Significant Design Solutions Required

The Anderson Russell PAD site has a number of different easements, Right-Of-Way (ROW) dedications, infrastructural, and hydrological impacts to the site that require design solutions. An introductory list has been provided for conditions that impact Staff's Analysis.



Runway Approach Excerpt

Avigation Easement (required)

- The portion west of Anderson Rd is in the approach paths (existing and future) of the Ak-Chin Airport
  - A stipulation regarding an Avigation Easement has been provided
- The proposed land uses under and immediately adjacent to the existing and future (planned) approaches have been revised to exclude residential units
  - This has been negotiated in cooperation with Ak-Chin staff
  - Ak-Chin reviewers remain unsatisfied with the intensity/density of the proposed land use within Parcel G

From the intersection of Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy looking south on Anderson Rd across UPRR

Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)

- To widen and improve Anderson Road across UPRR, such a proposal will require design approval from UPRR
  - A stipulation to this effect has been provided
- The built-out road section for Anderson Road would also require improved arms and signals
- Sound attenuation has been conceptually provided along with a commitment to sound attenuated construction of homes (Exhibit Q)

CAP canal, Intersections with roads circled in red

MSIDD canal (within CAP ROW)

- CAP Right-of-Way (ROW) runs inside the site boundary along the northern boundary and extends beyond the eastern edge of the site. This Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation & Drainage District (MSIDD) canal / infrastructure / ROW is federally protected and requires review and approval by MSIDD and Bureau of Reclamation (USBR) for any development within the ROW prior to construction.
- The proposal includes two (2) crossings
    1) Anderson Road crosses perpendicular with the canal, improvement plans to support the development require widening and may impact the existing underground pipe solution
    2) A Collector Road is proposed to cross the canal, creating a need for a long undergrounded pipe design where the road crosses the narrow portion, referred to later as the “pinch point” (see Exhibit J, Section F)
        - Alternatively, a road easement on State Land can be sought outside the canal’s ROW
- Timing: Formal approvals for designed crossings or encroachments of the CAP ROW shall be in place prior to Preliminary Plat approval.
    - A stipulation to this effect has been provided



Santa Cruz Wash is marked in green, potential future bridges are boxed in red.

Santa Cruz Wash

- At times, the SC Wash acts to divide land uses (e.g. Parcel M)
- Much of the property has the wash following a boundary of the property
- There is at least one bridge required to cross the wash where Anderson Road crosses. The PAD Narrative commits to improving the existing Anderson Road bridge (part 3g, page 24). When design of the bridge is considered, the costs for the half-street/bridge project and any additional lanes necessary to accommodate the traffic volumes as identified in the TIA will be assumed by the developer.
    - With bridge crossings, the City Engineer may elect, for public benefit, to widen the bridge beyond TIA requirements with the additional costs encurred by the City.
- The collector road near the southern boundary of the property is another likely bridge connection to Teel Road. (There will be additional analysis regarding Teel Rd later)
- If interconnection can be coordinated between the Anderson Russell community and the Santa Cruz Ranch community, it should be exercised and creates the potential of a third bridge across SC Wash.
- Trail improvements are planned along one side of the wash adjacent to the internal land uses proposed

An excerpt from the ATP (Exhibit K)

Arterial and Regional Roadway Alignments & Rights-of-Way

- Both Staff and Applicant have sought to plan roadway alignments during the course of this review. Alignments that still require more planning, engineering, and design are:
    - Val Vista Parkway
    - Teel Road (ex. ROW on property)
    - Russell Road (ex. ROW on property)
- To provide for adequate public facilities for transportation, staff may seek additional ROW dedication opportunities through the Final Plat review
    - A stipulation to this effect has been provided



Paved/Unpaved roads and fire stations (exerpt from incomplete exhibit from previous submittal)

Emergency Access (Fire/Medical + Police)

- Primary access to the site would come from the north; Secondary access to the site would come from the south
- The following is based on the analysis provided by Assistant Fire Chief, John Storm (memo attached)
- Primary Response for MFMD, from Fire Station 572 at 36390 W. Bowlin Rd.
    - Route:
        - Bowlin Rd eastbound to
        - Hartman Rd northbound to
        - Honeycutt Rd eastbound to
        - Murphy Rd southbound to
        - Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy eastbound to
        - Anderson Rd southbound across the double tracked UPRR facility to site
    - Distance: 8.5 miles
    - Time: 12 minutes (estimated)
- Secondary Response MFMD, from Fire Station 574 at 44925 W. Alterra Pkwy)
    - Route:
        - Alterra Pkwy eastbound to
        - SR-347 southbound to
        - SR-84 eastbound to
        - Anderson Rd northbound to site
    - Distance: 27 miles
    - Time: 24 minutes (estimated)
- **Future response possible from the +/- 2 acre dedicated site (location TBD)**
    - MFMD estimates a total of 12 million dollars for the development of a fully functional fire station with a 2.1 million dollar annual on-going personnel cost
- **Chief Stahl**, of MPD, notes concerns for coinciding events that could constrain emergency access, such as the flooded roadways and UPRR train traffic simultaneously restricting access (memo attached)



FIRM map of site

Flood Control

- Floodplain infrastructure is found to be deficient for development by Pinal County Floodplain Management
- **Response from Pinal County**
  "Based on the location of this property, it appears that levees have been constructed to control the flooding impacting this property. As the City of Maricopa's Floodplain Administrator, Pinal County would not permit or approve of the use of levees to contain the floodplains. Development of this property would require that an alternate solution be used to mitigate the flood hazard or that the proposed improvements would be built with the assumption that the levee failed to contain the flows in Santa Cruz Wash. In other words, buildings cannot be constructed in reliance on these uncertified structures."
- Parcel M is the only parcel with proposed development currently under "Zone A" of the FIRM map.
  - Zone A, defined: "Areas subject to inundation by the 1-percent-annual-chance flood event generally determined using approximate methodologies. Because detailed hydraulic analyses have not been performed, no Base Flood Elevations (BFEs) or flood depths are shown. Mandatory flood insurance purchase requirements and floodplain management standards apply."
    – fema.gov
- City Staff strongly recommends the flood control solution be designed comprehensively to adequately protect against flood hazard for all developable parcels. Such a design shall be approved by the City's Floodplain Administrator prior to approval of Preliminary Plat. The design may allow the development to be protected against flood hazard per an approved phasing plan, if desired.
  - A stipulation to this effect has been provided

STAFF ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED ANDERSON RUSSELL PAD

Reviews were conducted per the Planned Area Development Procedures as outlined in Article 510 of the Zoning Code. There is strong reference by code to other policies of the City such as the Subdivision Ordinance, General Plan, and Master Plans (containing policy on trails, open space, transportation, etc.).

Staff's analysis has been organized in the following (hyperlinked) sections:

General Plan References **13**
Staff Synopsis 13
General Plan Elements; A. Growth Area Element 14
General Plan Elements; B Land Use Element 15
Master Planned Community; Purpose 15
Village Center; Purpose 15
Mixed-Use Standards, as proposed with staff analysis 16
General Plan Elements; E Circulation & Connectivity Element 19
General Plan Elements; F. Economic Development Element 21
General Plan Elements; G. Parks, Recreation, & Open Space Element 22
General Plan Elements; H. Public Buildings, Facilities & Services Element 24
Zoning Code References **26**
Staff Synopsis 26
Planned Area Development District; Purpose (Sec. 207.01) 26
Required Findings (Sec. 510.04) 27
Conclusion **27**
Additional information **27**
EXHIBIT ATTACHMENTS **30**

GENERAL PLAN REFERENCES

The following references are found to be most applicable from *Planning Maricopa*, the City's General Plan, and have been applied through the review process to the full extent possible for this report. *Note: this is not an exhaustive list of all goals and objectives from the Planning Maricopa.*

The subject site is designated a **Master Planned Community (MPC)** in the Future Land Use Map and as identified as a required designation of the Pre-Annexation Development Agreement. The highly applicable elements, goals, and objectives have been included in this report for a comprehensive review and analysis.

Staff Synopsis:

The MPC designation requires a range of housing options and comprehensive site planning. Flexibility is provided for density ranges. This flexibility is offered with the expectation that urban design schemes complement the proposal.

Village Center is a relatively new term referenced in the narrative and *Planning Maricopa* (General Plan). Staff finds the PAD narrative does not apply adequate commitments to pedestrian-orientation and transit ridership concepts on par with the intended purpose of Village Center as defined in *Planning Maricopa*. Due to the absence of specific commitments, the term 'village center' in the narrative should not be confused to mean the same as the concept as defined in *Planning Maricopa*. To the proposal's credit, these opportunities exist with the mixing of uses, but the details have not been defined to support implementation.

Goals and objectives associated with the Growth Area Element do not prioritize this site for immediate growth. Growth areas have been identified to capitalize upon and leverage existing public infrastructure and alleviate the additional burden on public services, such as public safety and roadway and bridge maintenance. The *Growth Strategy* section prompts City officials and policymakers to consider long-term development plans to accommodate existing and future needs. The *Growth Strategy* section further offers strategies available to counterbalance any inefficient development pattern by charging development to offer significant emphasis on job creation, enhanced retail, and healthcare services reflective of the public's stated unmet needs. See *Growth Strategy*, *Commercial & Employment Growth*.

To the credit of the proposal, a Business Office park is part of the proposal (Parcels A, B, and D) at 104.27 net acres, offering up the raw opportunity for such commercial and employment growth if partnerships were coordinated. This use is adjacent to UPRR and southwest of the intersection of Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway, under the flightpath of the Ak-Chin Regional Airport, and adjacent to the MSIDD canal.

Safe and functional multi-modal transportation (inclusive of pedestrian and cyclist concerns) are open-ended issues to resolve at the time of Pre-Plat and should incorporate Safe Routes To School (SRTS) community design principles. The existing roadway circulation should be reconsidered with this goal in mind, rather than be the responsibility of a Transportation Engineer to later propose supplemental improvements for the existing circulation and land use concept adjacent to the school and central park.

General Plan Elements; A. Growth Area Element

Goal A2: link	**Achieve a balance in the community between jobs and housing.**
Objective A2.1:	Support land use requests that improve the balance between housing and employment within the Maricopa Planning Area.
Objective A2.2:	Assure that sufficient infrastructure is in place or necessary improvements are adequately planned and funded (i.e. remove from Vekol Wash, floodplain, adequate sanitary sewer and water supply).
Goal A3: link	**Evaluate annexation of land to accommodate the City's projected growth.**
Objective A3.3:	Ensure that smart growth concepts are applied to developments planned for annexed areas.

The goals and objectives of the Growth Area Element highlight the City's benefit to mixing land uses, offering employment uses, controlling long-term costs of infrastructure, and evaluating the cost effectiveness of development proposals. The applicant's answer to this charge is found in the narrative, *3c. Public Benefit of the Proposed Zoning*.

All development proposals are responsible for using industry practices, such as a Traffic Impact Analysis, to guide decisions for allocating a "fair share" of development costs caused from development to be the responsibility of the developer to either construct or provide financial assurances for such impact. However, these industry practices are inconclusive at measuring long-term impact to fiscal solvency when providing public services over a dispersed geography. As stated in the *Growth Strategies, "New employment development opportunities should be carefully considered when out of proximity to existing infrastructure and services. Innovative facilities and public service solutions are necessary to overcome the lack of infrastructure in underserved areas."* This is explained further in the "Efficient Utility Planning" and "Density to Cost Ratio" portions of *H. Public Buildings, Facilities & Services Element, Utility Services* (link).

General Plan Elements; B Land Use Element

Goal B1.1: link	**Identify and implement policies to develop multiple mixed-use village core areas with commercial and employment centers served by restaurants, retail shopping and cultural opportunities such as art districts and galleries.**
Objective B1.1.1:	Incorporate appropriate village center development within the various community Master Plans. Update Master and Strategic Plans, such as the PTOS and the Redevelopment Area Plan to provide policy guidance to reinforce the Village Center development pattern.
Objective B1.1.2:	Encourage certain areas of the City to rezone to mixed-use and higher density housing consistent with redevelopment plans and General Plan land uses.
Objective B1.1.4:	Develop a walkable community with commercial nodes and amenities for residents.
Objective B1.1.5:	Promote commercial and office development in close proximity to neighborhood nodes, along arterials, and other appropriate locations.

Master Planned Community; Purpose:

The Master Planned Community designation provides for large-scale (160 acres or more) master planned developments that include a true variety of residential products, including larger lots and smaller, attached housing, along with supporting commercial and employment land uses to meet the daily needs of the residents. Residential areas are to include adequate open space, schools, churches and neighborhood facilities. Overlay zoning in combination with comprehensive site planning provide for supporting infrastructure. MPC developments are expected to provide off-site infrastructure enhancements as necessary to offset development impacts including needed roadway, bridge and overpass capacity. The overall density is flexible to allow appropriate urban design for properties designated for Village Center. Overall densities for all residential dwellings in MPCs without a Village Center designation can range from 3.0 to 10.0 dwelling units per acre. link

The PAD narrative (download) references the term **Village Center** twice under Section *3f. Design Guidelines: Open Space and Single Family Residential. (pg. 18)*

Symbol for the Village Center:



Village Center; Purpose:

The Village Centers are the highest intensity urban area of the City, generally developing near intersections with regional importance for transit and connectivity. They are characterized by a cluster of community and neighborhood oriented areas with local commercial, office, entertainment, recreation, and mixed use spaces

serving the day to day needs of the surrounding groups of neighborhoods. These centers should contain public gathering spaces and/ or civic uses with a character and identity that reflects the special character of the area. Uses will be integrated to the maximum extent possible in order to encourage a pedestrian-oriented design and transit ridership. The density range should exceed 18 dwelling units per acre when located within a 1/4 mile walk to a transit station or stop. link

Staff is supportive of such an addition at this location due to the planned proximity of a Village Center in the Future Land Use map (within 3 miles of the site) and with the access to high capacity transportation routes (such as MCGH and the planned Val Vista Parkway). *Link to maps*

Goal B1.3: link	**Encourage mixed-use development.**
Objective B1.3.1:	Encourage the location of neighborhood commercial and mixed uses adjacent to or within residential communities. Implement 2014 Zoning Code provisions to encourage the infill of existing residential areas with neighborhood serving commercial uses.
Objective B1.3.2:	Encourage developers to take advantage of opportunities provided by mixed-use standards especially within the designated redeveloment areas and along transit corridors.
Objective B1.3.3:	Promote a variety of commercial and retail spaces to expand opportunities for small businesses.

Mixed-Use Standards, as proposed with staff analysis:

Mixed-use development has been described on Parcel G (50% of MU-G), Parcel M (MU-N), Parcel S-1 (MU-N), and Parcel BB-1 (MU-N). The other 50% of Parcel G (as proposed) has the option to not include ground-floor non-residential.

Parcel	**Land Use**	**Acres (% of Total)**
G (50% committed)	General Mixed Use	12.73 acres (1.64%)
M	Neighborhood Mixed Use	4.67 acres (0.6%)*
S-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use	2 acres (0.26%)
BB-1	Neighborhood Mixed Use	2 acres (0.26%)
All of the above	All of the above	21.4 acres (2.76%) combined
** Parcel M is in "Zone A" of the FIRM Map*		

With the revised condition (revised as part of negotiations since the continuance from November 27), Staff can see this commitment improving the proposal's commitment to Mixed Use Development. While mixing uses can be better managed with clear development standards and complementary circulation planning, this expectation can be a condition of approval and managed at the time of a Development Review Permit.

Goal B1.4: link	**Minimize conflicts between land uses.**
Objective B1.4.1:	Address land use compatibilities and incompatibilities when considering zone changes and development approvals.
Objective B1.4.3:	Based on noise, vibration and safety concerns strongly discourage residential development adjacent to high capacity roadways, airports, and railroad corridors.
Objective B1.4.9:	Avoid conflicts between airport operations and nearby development with specific attention to incompatibilities of residential uses and airport noise and safety.
Goal B1.6: link	**Coordinate land management and planning activities with neighboring Indian Communities, Federal, State and private interests.**
Objective B1.6.1:	Participate in regular meetings with Ak-Chin and Gila River Indian Communities to address land use and transportation issues and concerns.
Objective B1.6.2:	Communicate City general development priorities and goals in working with developers, landowners, Pinal County and State of Arizona officials.
Objective B1.6.4:	Facilitate the coordinated planning and reasonable development of State Trust Lands in the Maricopa Planning Area.
Objective B1.6.5:	Support the creation of functional master plans for regional systems including flood control and transportation.
Objective B1.6.6:	Encourage and support the development of public information materials regarding respectful interaction and travel within nearby Native American communities.

To minimize conflicts between land uses and coordinate land management activities with neighboring interests, early Technical Advisory Committee and ongoing outreach was coordinated by staff with the following stakeholders: Ak-Chin Indian Community, Pinal County, City of Casa Grande, State Land Department, Central Arizona Project, Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation & Drainage District (MSIDD), Union Pacific Rail Road, and utility companies.

Within *3n. Compatibility Issues and Solutions* of the narrative, the applicant proposes ways to mitigate the conflicts with neighboring interests. A summary of coordination is as follows:

Ak-Chin Indian Community has been actively involved in protecting the approach for the airport immediately northeast of the Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy and Anderson Rd intersection (which requires an avigation easement upon Final Plat). The proposal has been revised to eliminate housing within and immediately adjacent to the defined approach for the existing (and planned future) airport. However, the intensity of the development of Parcel G is still of concern for the reviewers. The applicant makes their case for the approach and compatible uses in the narrative, *3o. Residential Use in the Airport Approach Surface.*

Pinal County has been involved in considerations of transportation planning and floodplain management.

Casa Grande has been involved in considerations primarily with the planned corridor for Val Vista Parkway and potential impacts to the entitlements within their planning area.

The **State Land Department** has reviewed the proposal, and has no protest. Planners with the State Land Department, Michelle Green and Mark Edelman, have verbally expressed openness to an easement across the State Land parcel to improve circulation. More coordination with regard to this easement would be required.

Central Arizona Project has Right-of-Way along the property; communication with Tom Fitzgerald revealed that the CAP regulatory responsibilities completely rest with the local irrigation district.

MSIDD was contacted for comment on the alteration implications of the canal for which MSIDD engineers responded that any construction within the easement requires formal submittal for review and approval from MSIDD and the US Bureau of Reclamation.

Union Pacific Railroad reserves formal response on the implications for facility widening of Anderson Road until the City decides on the entitlement of this proposal.

Casa Grande School District, which serves this area, has agreed to serve this community and the site dedication fits their needs.

For **utilities**, most concerning of utility services is the length of infrastructure required by Global Water to serve the proposed development. See the narrative for *3p. Proposed Water Summary* and *3q. Proposed Wastewater Summary* for the extents of such infrastructure. Beyond the physical infrastructure, the rights to serve the property through the Arizona Corporation Commission (CC&N extension) have not been applied for or granted to Global Water. However, Staff has received a letter noting Global Water's intent to serve the property.

Goal B2.1: link	**Partner with developers to identify innovative strategies for providing housing diversity for all ages and income levels.**
Objective B2.1.4:	Evaluate aesthetic design standards for housing to assure the provision of unique and quality housing choices.
Objective B2.1.5:	Encourage certain areas of the City to rezone to mixed-use to permit higher density housing consistent with Master Plans, Strategic Plans, and the Village Center planning concept.
Objective B2.1.8:	Expand housing options to include live/work and other mixed-use.

Goal B2.2: link	**Assure the development of a diverse housing stock in both dwelling type and density.**
Objective B2.2.1:	Identify and use available tools, including area specific plans, zoning and subdivision standards, to promote housing diversity in both type and lot size for existing and future PAD's.

Housing diversity proposed meets the intent of a Master Planned Development (MPD) and complies with regulations, per the Subdivision Ordinance, and the required findings of the Zoning Code. The noteworthy requirements for a MPD are as follows:

> Sec. 14-3-6 requires an MPD of 320+ acres to have a minimum of three (3) distinct residential districts.
> Sec. 14-5-4 requires an MPD of 640+ acres to have a minimum of four (4) "distinctly different" residential lot standards.

Compliance with these MPD standards can be found in the Land Use Plan (Exhibit G) and *3e. Development Standards* of the narrative. Note standard for RS-3, RS-4, RS-5/Cluster, MU-G, MU-N, RH designations with deviations allowable under the PAD.

General Plan Elements; E Circulation & Connectivity Element

Goal E2.2: link	**Develop an efficient and safe intra-city road network, including a hierarchy of roadways, which meets the long-term vision of the citizens.**
Objective E2.2.1:	Fully implement the recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan (and subsequent adopted transportation related plans) on roadways within the City, including the adoption and implementation of a Complete Streets policy and associated roadway and infrastructure standards.
Goal E3.1: link	**Create safe and functional pedestrian ways and bicycle routes as an alternate mode of travel throughout Maricopa.**
Objective E3.1.1:	Fully implement the recommendations of the Transportation Master Plan (and subsequent adopted bicycle and pedestrian related plans (Safe Routes to Schools Master Plan)) on roadways and paths within the City, including the adoption of a Complete Streets policy and roadway standards.

One impasse between staff review and the applicant's proposal was regarding the community design of the central park, school, and Specialty Product as it funnels a large traffic volume through the internally proposed road circulation immediately adjacent to these uses. *See Exhibits G and J.*



Immediately surrounding the Elementary School site (Parcel T) and the Community Park is a One-Way Street concept (Exhibit J, Roadway Section "E").

Staff acknowledges there is evidence that one-way streets have safety advantages over two-way streets, however, the safety gained from the narrower street section is expected to be negated by the traffic volumes from the significant number of residential lots that will be collected by the main spine of the community that flows through these streets. Further, a tree-lined street is required.

Staff recommends avoiding this condition altogether, where the School site and the Community Park site are accessible to a large portion of the community without having to cross the primary collector of the development and to abide by SRTS practices.

The arterial streets adjacent to the community have been a point of much analysis and discussion with the proposal. Those points will be listed by the roadway and the intersecting conditions to be aware of as future development occurs.

Anderson Road intersects with Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway (MCGH), Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the MSIDD canal, and the Santa Cruz Wash. Each intersection requires design and constructed improvements.

The intersection with MCGH will be signalized and further improved with phasing as defined in a **Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA).** The TIA is to be revised, resubmitted, and accepted with a Preliminary Plat (Pre-Plat) application and review. The applicant will receive back the TIA submitted with the PAD proposal with comments to be considered with that revision. The revised TIA will need to be to the satisfaction of the City Engineer, per the Subdivision Ordinance requirements.

The intersection with UPRR will require eventual widening with phasing as defined by the revised TIA. Anderson Road improvements and widening across the UPRR ROW requires review and approval by UPRR and the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC). Approvals with all review agencies will be required prior to approval of Pre-Plat.

The intersection with the MSIDD canal and CAP ROW require eventual widening with phasing as defined by the TIA. Anderson Road improvements and widening across the CAP ROW requires review and approval by MSIDD and the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). Approvals with all review agencies will be required prior to approval of Pre-Plat.

The crossing of the Santa Cruz Wash will require a bridged crossing. The developer is responsible for the allocable share of the bridge improvement to serve the property, as defined by the approved TIA. Additional improvements (a wider bridge) could be required by the City, but coordination and financial credits to the developer can be arranged at the time of design and review with improvement plans due at the Final Plat application.

All facility improvements shall include bike lanes to fulfill Goal E3.1 of *Planning Maricopa*.

Access to Teel Road has been undetermined since the alignment of Teel Road is insufficiently studied at this time. However, the section line and reserved ROW for Teel Road does exist at the southern property line of the subject site (as found on the ALTA). All exhibits produced by the applicant <u>assume</u> the alignment will exist south of the property line. This assumption has not been supported or rebuked at this time by the City's transportation plans. A formal determination will be made prior to Pre-Plat approval, including a determination regarding bridging where the Collector Road may cross the Santa Cruz Wash. Further ROW dedication for Teel Road may be required.

The applicant relies on language proposed as a stipulation that emergency access will be agreed to at a future review/approval of the Preliminary Plat. Red arrows indicate an unacceptable condition, while the purple arrows indicate a potential improvement for emergency access routes (satisfying the 2-points of access, but by itself does not resolve response times). Staff seeks another access to the south end of the property to the satisfaction of the Maricopa Fire and Medical Department. Note that Phase 3 runs south just over 1 mile in distance.



Val Vista Parkway is expected to align west of the MSIDD canal to avoid crossing it. Due to the canal existing outside the property's eastern edge, it is expected that Val Vista Right-of-Way dedications will not be sought from the Anderson Russell property. However, the ATP study calls for the Val Vista Parkway to follow the Russell Road alignment. Russell Road alignment is on the eastern edge of the subject site with 33 feet of ROW. Staff stipulates that the ROW may be needed depending upon further engineering of the parkway's alignment (these conditions can be found on the ALTA).

Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway will be improved by the applicant to ensure adequate level of service (LOS) and will include intersection and signalization design. Any additional improvements beyond assuring adequate LOS and intersection redesign/signalization will need to be incorporated in the City's CIP plan.

General Plan Elements; F. Economic Development Element

Goal F4.3: link	**To be a community recognized by site selectors as having developable shovel ready sites and the tools to satisfy the needs of companies in our targeted industries.**
Objective F4.3.1:	Partner in the development of office space.

With 104.3 acres of Business Park and 29.69 acres of Commercial land uses proposed within the first phase of the development, the proposal does help to achieve the goals of the Economic Development Element of *Planning Maricopa*.

It should be recognized, as with the Glennwilde development, the non-residential portions of the community may lag behind in vertical development. A phasing plan requires improvements to parcels to be "shovel-ready" for development to occur, but not necessarily with buildings erected before development can progress to succeeding phases. All this is to say, depending on market forces, Parcels A – F of Phase 1 may or may not generate jobs or sales tax before housing is developed in later phases. (See Phasing Map, Exhibit I)

General Plan Elements; G. Parks, Recreation, & Open Space Element

Goal G1.c.1: link	**Trails and open space design requires emphasis on walkability and connectivity across the property complete with connections to adjacent properties.**
Objective G1.c.1.3:	City to acquire land dedications or easements adjacent to or within communities, appropriately scaled for planned trails.
Objective G1.c.1.4:	Future developments should incorporate open space, trails, and recreation as an integral design element, providing direct access and visibility to open space corridors from public ways.

Goal G1.c.2: link	**Incentivize mixed-use and higher density housing in select locations consistent with redevelopment plans, special area plans, and the General Plan Land Use goals.**
Objectives G1.c.2.1:	Update the City's Subdivision Ordinance to incentivize multi-family housing and mixed-use development where appropriate and when adjacent to public open space or a public park. Properly zoned properties within 1/8 mile of a public park of 5 acres or larger should be considered ideal candidates for such an incentive.
Objective G1.c.2.2:	Plan for Town Square Parks within urban/village cores providing opportunities for parks, civic buildings, schools, and gathering spaces to serve as the heart of the village. Park design should reinforce the special character of the specific community it serves.

Goal G3.a.2: link	**Design future wash improvements as an integral open space element to surrounding development.**
Objective G3.a.2.1:	The Design of communities and neighborhoods abutting or including washes shall integrate the wash corridors as a functional design component and include amenities and trails to accommodate pedestrians, runners, cyclists, (and equestrians when designated as such) as a means to access schools, neighborhoods, and commercial uses.

Objective G3.a.2.2:	Designs of the washes are to include diverse amenities, recreation, and destinations throughout the corridor.
Objective G3.a.2.3:	The washes are to continue to serve as valuable wildlife habitat and corridors for native plant and animal species.
Objective G3.a.2.4:	Washes should be designed to provide direct and frequent access from trails to abutting neighborhoods and roadways.

With the proposed development occurring adjacent to the Santa Cruz Wash, the Pedestrian Circulation and Trails Master Plan, Exhibit N, includes multi-use trails on the top of the embankment areas along the wash noting a "20' easement with 9' concrete and 4' soft DG" trail section. Where there is open space across the wash, rather than connect to these areas with bridges, the proposal elects to preserve them for natural open space areas (see Exhibit M).

The **Parks, Recreation, and Library Committee (PRL)** were consulted for technical advisement for this proposal, and the Committee supported staff's recommendations that:

- a safety-focused Master Street Plan should be improved to better integrate the Community Park and the School site into the rest of the community, and,
- despite the incomplete sidewalk detail of the Pedestrian Circulation Plan (Exhibit N), sidewalks shall be mandatory on both sides of all street sections, and
- Parcel G should explore character-enhancing open space design standards, and
- a multi-use trail should run south of Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway along the entire north edge of the community (see red arrow, right), and
- crossings of the runnel (see Exhibits Q and R) shall be frequent and comply with ADA standards to ensure the feature does not become an impediment to non-motorized circulation.

General Plan Elements; H. Public Buildings, Facilities & Services Element

Goal H2.a.1: link	**Maintain a community in which all residents, businesses and visitors are safe.**
Objective H2.a.1.1:	Ensure all future development infrastructures include fiber-optic, proper ingress and egress for efficient public safety including bicycle paths and pedestrian crossings.
Objective H2.a.1.4:	Ensure the MFD delivers seamless services to the community.

Goal H2.a.2: link	**Maintain a community in which all residents, businesses and visitors are safe.**
Objective H2.a.2.6:	Achieve optimal staffing levels and facilities, located in strategic areas throughout the City to provide efficient public safety response.

There have been a number of previous points made as to the remoteness of this site. The Goals under H2 of *Planning Maricopa* further emphasis the need for Maricopa Fire and Medical Department (MFD) and Maricopa Police Department (MPD) to weigh in on this matter. Both departments have prepared memos for in their review of this case.

Goal H5.1: link	**Ensure new development provides the resources to establish the infrastructure and services needed to serve that development.**
Objective 5.1:	Enhance the programs, policies and fees that put infrastructure in place, in a timely manner, to meet the demands of new residents and visitors in Maricopa.
Objective 5.2:	Ensure that development impact fees (DIF) and other funding mechanisms are comprehensive, up to date, and designed to require new growth to pay for itself.
Objective 5.2:	Future DIF studies should clearly define vehicles, equipment, operations costs and level of service (LOS) standards. The City budget should closely coincide with the established LOS.
Objective 5.4:	The City of Maricopa seeks to facilitate productive cooperation between the school districts, fire district, utility providers, special districts, tribal communities, county and state agencies and the development community for the betterment of our citizens. It is imperative that growth be prevented from penalizing the quality of life of existing and future residents. Developers should ensure that the expansion of public facilities is adequate to maintain quality service levels, with appropriate exceptions when in the public interest. A lack of adequate fire facilities, police services, school facilities, roadway, utility infrastructure, drainage capacity, wash enhancements or open space could preclude development in certain areas of the city.

Goal H5.1 and subsequent Objectives pose the biggest challenge to this proposal. The challenges are found on both the public administration of such policy as well as from the private developer to commit to adequate and costly infrastructure associated with such policy when supporting services over a dispersed geography. The City's Development Impact Fees do not consider the potential Capital Improvement Projects associated with this newer portion of the City (e.g. Maricopa-Casa Grande Hwy improvements).

This is explained further in the "Efficient Utility Planning" and "Density to Cost Ratio" portions of *H. Public Buildings, Facilities & Services Element, Utility Services* (link).

The best guidance that staff has for review with regard to fiscal impacts and expected costs associated with future development on the subject site was analyzed with the annexation (ANNX13-01). Per the Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) done with the annexation, the costs associated with this PAD proposal will likely exceed the costs to service the development scheme envisioned at the time of ANNX13-01, based on increased residential units. A copy of the FIA and staff response with adjustments is found in the exhibits.

The applicant was offered the opportunity to update the FIA and include an objective assessment of the impact of the $200 donation (see stipulation 3(h)), as detailed in point 2 of the Staff update memo (dated 12/28/17). The cost to the applicant would have been $3,875, but the invitation was declined.

ZONING CODE REFERENCES

The following references have been administratively applied through the review process to the full extent possible for this report.

Staff Synopsis:

A single phase of any PAD development, in isolation, shall not advance in subsequent reviews without the adequate facilities, services, and suitable physical conditions being established (or demonstrably capable and conditionally approved) to support the entire ("harmonious unit") Planned Area Development proposal.

Regarding consistency with the General Plan, *Planning Maricopa,* and its previously listed Goals and Objectives, staff finds deficiencies making for insufficient commitments to meet *Required Finding, Sec. 510.04.A.*

Regarding adequate transportation facilities in conjunction with adequate public services so not to be detrimental to public health, safety, or welfare, staff finds insufficient commitments to meet *Required Finding, Sec. 510.04.C.* For rationale, see memos from both MFD and MPD.

Regarding providing a more efficient use of land and site design greater than that which could be achieved through the application of base district regulations, staff finds insufficient commitments to meet *Required Finding, Sec. 510.04.F.*

Rationale for not finding *Sec. 510.04.F*: To indulge the finding associated with *site design greater than that which could be achieved through the application of base district regulations,* consider the Mixed-Use General standard that first floor uses must be non-residential. By conflating the designation of Mixed-Use with the designation of High Density Residential, the expectation of first floor non-residential uses becomes very unpredictable. The compromise offered by the applicant is to offer 15% of the land area of Parcel G to truly uphold Mixed-Use designation first floor non-residential uses. Please refer back to page 15 of this report to find Mixed-Use Standards and analysis for more detail on this deficiency.

Planned Area Development District; Purpose (Sec. 207.01)

The specific purpose of the Planned Area Development (PAD) District is to provide opportunities for creative development approaches that will achieve ***superior community design, environmental preservation, and public benefit****, in comparison to subdivision and development under Base District regulations. The intent is to accommodate, encourage, and promote innovatively designed developments involving a mixture of residential and/or non-residential land uses, which* ***form an attractive and harmonious unit of the community****. Such a planned development may be designed as a large-scale separate entity,* ***able to function as an individual community, neighborhood, or mixed-use development****; as a small-scale project which requires flexibility because of unique circumstances or design characteristics; or as a transitional area between dissimilar land uses. This District is consistent with and supports the provisions of the Subdivision Ordinance and accommodates both Planned Area Development and Master Planned Development subdivisions, which conform to the guiding principles, general provisions, and specific requirements for such development established in the Subdivision Ordinance. (****emphasis*** *added)*

Required Findings (Sec. 510.04)

A PAD Plan and re-zoning PAD District shall only be approved if all the following findings are made:

A. *The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, the Subdivision Ordinance, and any applicable specific plan or master plan, including the density and intensity limitations that apply;*

B. *The subject site is physically suitable for the type and intensity of the land use being proposed;*

C. *Adequate transportation facilities and public services exist or will be provided in accordance with the conditions of PAD plan approval, to serve the proposed development and the approval of the proposed development will not result in a reduction of traffic levels of service or public services so as to be a detriment to public health, safety, or welfare;*

D. *The proposed development will not have a substantial adverse effect on surrounding land uses and will be compatible with the existing and planned land use character of the surrounding area;*

E. *The development complies with applicable adopted design guidelines; and*

F. *The proposed development carries out the intent of the Planned Area Development provisions by providing a more efficient use of the land and an excellence of architecture and site design greater than that which could be achieved through the application of the base district regulations.*

CONCLUSION

Planning & Zoning Commission concurred with staff's findings of PAD16-04, proposal of Anderson Russell Planned Area Development, to be insufficient in the *Required Findings* of the Zoning Code per the details of staff's analysis. Based on the deficiencies of *Required Findings*, Planning & Zoning Commission recommends **denial of PAD16-04 Anderson Russell Planned Area Development** as proposed.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Ultimately, the decision authority rests with the City Council. If the Council decides to approve PAD16-04, staff recommends such approval to be subject to the following stipulations:

1. Per the Zoning Code, Sec. 510.06.A, the PAD approval is valid for two (2) years. If a Preliminary Plat application is not completed and accepted within the two (2) year period, the City Council may rescind the PAD Plan in accordance with ARS 9-462.01.E. Additionally, extensions are permitted in accordance with Sec. 510.06.B.

2. The Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) submitted with PAD16-04 has deficiencies and is not accepted or approved by the City Engineer as part of PAD16-04. The TIA will need to be revised per the review comments provided with the PAD16-04 review at the time of Preliminary Plat application.

3. Prior to the approval of the Preliminary Plat, the following conditions shall be met:

    a) Anderson Road improvements within UPRR ROW needed to support the Master Planned Development (PAD16-04) shall be reviewed and approved by UPRR and the ACC. Improvements directly associated with the development will be supported by phase associated with an approved TIA and UPRR approval. The applicant will be responsible for the costs of improving Anderson Road to the extent that the need for such improvements is caused by the development within PAD16-04 as reflected within an approved TIA.

    b) Anderson Road improvements within CAP ROW needed to support the Master Planned Development (PAD16-04) shall be reviewed and approved by MSIDD and the Bureau of Reclamation (USBR). Improvements directly associated with the development will be supported by phase associated with an approved TIA and MSIDD approval. The applicant will be responsible for the costs of improving Anderson Road to the extent that the need for such improvements is caused by the development within PAD16-04 as reflected within an approved TIA.

    c) An engineered Floodplain solution needed to support the Master Planned Development depicted in PAD16-04 (the Master Floodplain Solution) shall be reviewed and approved by Pinal County Floodplain Administer. The development of the Master Floodplain Solution shall be permitted to support phases of the development, if the approved design permits.

    d) The Anderson Road improvements as it crosses the Santa Cruz Wash (bridge committed in the narrative) shall be established in coordination with the City Engineer with a cost share allocable to the impact associated with the development of PAD16-04 as determined by the approved TIA.

    e) Two points of access to each phase will need to satisfy the review by the Police Department and Maricopa Fire and Medical Department. Improvements to ensure two points of all-weather access will be the responsibility of the applicant.

    f) The Master Planned Development (PAD16-04) shall revise internal roadways to reduce potential conflicts between motorists and non-motorists through improved routes to the Community Park and School site to the satisfaction of the Development Services Director.

    g) Right-of-way design shall be provided to support the Transportation Plans of the time of application.

    h) A $200 donation per housing unit shall be defined by a separate agreement. The intent of the donation is to benefit emergency services (MFMD and MPD).

4. Prior to the approval of the Final Plat, the following conditions shall be met:

    a) If two points of access (as stipulated in #3.e.) require an additional bridge across the Santa Cruz Wash at the south end of the property, it shall be the responsibility of the developer to include improvement plans at the time of Final Plat and include all-weather access to the satisfaction of Maricopa Fire and Medical Department.

    b) A final determination with regard to the Fire Station location, parcel configuration, improvements, and timing for service needs to be finalized and to the satisfaction of the Maricopa Fire and Medical Department.

c) Improvement plans shall include all Multi-Use Trail connections of Exhibit N and additionally the full length of the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway (as described under General Plan Element analysis of this report).

d) Improvement plans and financial assurances shall support all conditions listed under #4 and be the responsibility of the applicant.

e) Improvements to the Community Park shall be constructed with the improvements associated with Parcel Q, per Exhibit G. Certificates of Occupation will be withheld in Parcel Q until improvements to the Community Park are accepted.

f) Further subdivisions and development proposal on Parcel G requires a Development Review Permit to further refine the Mixed-Use character proposed with open-ended conditions described within the PAD16-04 Narrative under *3e. Development Standards*. The subdivided Parcel G shall have improved access and infrastructure adequate for the density and intensity depicted in the PAD16-04 concept. The Development Review Permit shall be reviewed in accordance with the procedures of Article 505 of the Zoning Code. The applicant guarantees that at least 50% of Parcel G is to include ground floor retail.

g) An Avigation easement shall be coordinated either as part of the Final Plat or as a separate instrument that recognizes Federal Aviation Rules, Part 77 Surfaces.

5. Human remains and artifacts have been found in the Maricopa area. Per "Public law 101-601, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act" and "Public law 41-865 disturbing human remains or funerary objects; rules; violation; classification; definitions", a person can be guilty of a class 5 felony if he/she intentionally possess, sells or transfers any human remains or funerary objects that are excavated or removed. In the event that human remains and/or artifacts are discovered during construction, Ak-Chin has requested that the developers stop immediately and contact the Ak-Chin Cultural Resources Office before any further construction continues.

6. After recordation of the plat and Pinal County has assigned an assessor parcel number, the applicant shall be responsible of applying for an address request for all single family residential lots.

7. All roadway and infrastructure improvements shall be in accordance with the current City of Maricopa standards and/or subsequent standards that are developed by the City, as approved by the City Engineer and installed by the developer.

8. Prior to issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant shall submit and secure all required applications, plans with supporting documents (submittals), approvals and permits from the applicable federal, state, county and any other agencies as applicable.

9. The development and operation of the proposed Facility shall be in accordance with all applicable Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) requirements, if applicable, and other regulatory agencies rules and regulations.

10. The applicant/property owner shall have met and complied with all applicable fire codes under the IFC codes observed at the time of application, including amendments, as well as related National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA) guidelines, to the satisfaction of the Maricopa Fire and Medical Department. Emergency access shall be maintained throughout the construction of the project to the satisfaction of Maricopa Fire and Medical Department.

EXHIBIT ATTACHMENTS

1. Narrative
2. Exhibits (all)

Aerial Photo of Boundary Property	Exhibit A
Existing Zoning Map of Property and Adjacent Lands	Exhibit B
City of Maricopa General Plan Land Use	Exhibit C
One Mile Radius Surrounding Area Map	Exhibit D
Existing 300' Adjacent Ownership Map	Exhibit E
Proposed Zoning Plan	Exhibit F
Land Use Plan Concept C	Exhibit G
FIRM Map	Exhibit H
Phasing Map	Exhibit I
Master Street Plan	Exhibit J
Regionally Significant Routes Plan for Safety & Mobility (East West Preferred)	Exhibit K
Val Vista Parkway Corridor Alternative	Exhibit K.1
Existing and Proposed Future Road Conditions	Exhibit L
Open Space Master Plan	Exhibit M
Pedestrian Circulation and Trails Master Plan	Exhibit N
Open Space Lighting Master Plan	Exhibit O
Sign, Entry and Wall Master Plan	Exhibit P
Entry and Wall Concept Details	Exhibit Q
Open Space Character Sketches	Exhibit R
Non Residential / Mixed Use Character	Exhibit S
Paseo Cluster Lot Architectural Prototype	Exhibit T
Typical Products on Medium Density Land Use	Exhibit T.1
Typical Products on Medium Density Land Use	Exhibit T.2
Typical Apartment Products on Mixed Use Land Use	Exhibit T.3
BNC/Anderson RussellPre-Annexation Development Agreements	Exhibit U
FAA RPZ Figures and Tables	Exhibit W
FAA Approach Surface Figure and Table	Exhibit W
Maximum Possible Runway Protection Zone	Exhibit X
Maximum Possible Approach Surface & Approach Surface Slope	Exhibit Y
Off Airport Land Use	Exhibit Z.1
City of Scottsdale Airpark	Exhibit Z.2

3. Memo from Chief of Police
4. Memo from Assistant Fire Chief
5. Letter from Ak-Chin Indian Community
6. Staff Update Memo: including "Risk and consequences of reduced public services" – Letter from John Storm, Assistant Fire Chief

The following attachments may be considered extraneous:

7. ALTA Survey
8. Traffic Impact Analysis
9. Pinal County Floodplain Review
10. Fiscal Impact Analyses from ANNX13-01 (per ORD13-17 as "Attachment D")

-- End of staff report –