TXT20-04: Exhibit B

COMMENT SUBMISSION #1

A new entry to a form/survey has been submitted.

Form Name:	Maricopa Participates TXT20-01
Date & Time:	12/21/2020 1:08 PM
Response #:	2
Submitter ID:	1449
IP address:	72.194.185.56
Time to complete:	3 min. , 36 sec.

Survey Details

Page 1

Please note any feedback submitted will be a part of public record. If you do not receive confirmation of your submission within three business days please contact the case planner Rudy Lopez at Rodolfo.Lopez@Maricopa-AZ.gov or 520-316-6986.

1. First and Last Name

Darren Glidewell

2. Email Address

dglidewell@scottcommunities.com

3. Address

2221 W Baseline Rd Suite 101

4. Please detail any questions, comments, or concerns you have regarding the project.

Increasing the notification area from 300 feet to 600 feet will put an undo burden on anyone needed to notify. This once again is just more un-needed bureaucracy that will do nothing but add extra burden and it will not help anyone on either side.

Thank you,

COMMENT SUBMISSION

City of Maricopa Zoning Code
Proposed Revisions – Review & Comments from P. Chapados
Prepared 1/8/2021

18.135.080 – Heritage District Advisory Committee (HDAC)

Section deleted – why? What is the justification for eliminating input from this group, particularly in light of section .090. Is there a specific problem or challenge that has been identified or an issue that needs resolution? If so, what? If not, what advantages and/or disadvantages does eliminating input from the Heritage District offer?

The Heritage District is a targeted redevelopment area within the City, and one experiencing significant growth and change over time. The input of a committee specifically designed to empower resident and business owner input within the Heritage District should be a positive, not something to eliminate. Resident and business "buy in" and support is also critical. A significant number of residents and businesses have been in Maricopa for more years than the current staff or Council, so why not include their input somehow?

What is the last item reviewed by the HDAC? What was their input? Were there challenges or other issues related to the HDAC?

18.135.090 – Technical Advisory Committee

A. Creation and Purpose – specifies the committee acts in an "advisory capacity", but from what perspective? Is this intended to be from a creative/design or administrative/compliance perspective? In my opinion, these are separate issues which should be made clearer if this committee is codified. Is there a reason why this cannot be accomplished through policy?

B. "...power to review...and make recommendations..." Isn't this a duplication of what staff does? It appears to add another layer of government to an already complex and sometimes lengthy process. If not, what's different about this committee? Isn't comprehensive review already a part of our process? If this is just codifying a group and clarifying scope of responsibility, what prompted codifying a "technical" committee" versus what we have now?

C. membership:

- Zoning Administrator
- Planning Staff – all of them?
- City Engineer
- Community Services Director? Why? – unless there is something specific related to parks, trails, open space or recreation, why is this director included?
- Emergency services
- Irrigation districts Who? Does this include Maricopa Flood Control District?
- Water companies
- Sanitary districts
- School districts – to the best of my knowledge, all of Maricopa is MUSD20. Are there other applicable districts? Why include schools other than when it impacts the type of business being proposed on a neighboring property. Also, who from the district: Superintendent? School board? Faculty? Other? What role will review/input from the school district play? Is this necessary? Why/why not?
- Utility companies (water already listed, so who? Electric? Cable? Gas?)
- MEDA representative – with economic and community development being the #1 priority for Maricopa, why is this group not included? These are business people and

other prominent individuals with the knowledge and expertise to be of value to the review process. They are another non-city group whose input should be included.

- Public Works – traffic flow and connectivity are important and directly correlate to issues of public safety and transportation. Why not include someone from public works?

18.135.110 Table

References like this table are extremely "user-friendly" and helpful. They serve as a great reference tool for additional review and comprehension.

Ch. 180.120.080 Day Care Facilities

A. 1-b Pick-up and drop-off

Include/require additional information to be provided. One of the most frequent complaints received from residents is traffic congestion and on-street parking, resulting in vehicular "blind spots" when people walk between vehicles. Depending on the specific location of the facility, there may be additional challenges regarding access, pick-up and drop-off in particular.

HOAs will be one of the entities who will have to deal with any complaints (noise, traffic, property maintenance, etc.) HOA Board input should be part of the "review" process for the purpose of a) letting the HOA know about the existence of the facility, and b) providing the HOA Board with information so that any HOA-related enforcement action can be made with all pertinent information.

B.2 In-home day care facilities

Screening of outdoor play areas – prohibited in the front yard should be specified

Ch. 180.120.280. Food and Beverage Sales

A. Shopping carts

"Shopping cart" needs more definition. Does this apply to only those items on wheels or otherwise "mobile"?

1-3 system prohibiting the removal of shopping carts from the site

How does this impact a retail space within a large complex? The burden for containing shopping carts per retailer must be a balance if that space is located within a larger retail establishment where such compliance does not exist or has not been addressed. This could result in "over-reaching" and setting unrealistic requirements for a smaller retailer.

Heritage District retail – future development in this area would not lend itself to having such a requirement.

Ch. 18.140.020 Application Submittal and Review

C.1. Payment waiver and refund of application fees – schedule of fees

Fee waivers are the sole discretion of the city manager or designee. Under what circumstances would a fee waiver be granted? Why is there no additional input or provision for recommendation to deny a waiver not included?

If this language stands, then all applicable bodies who approve or amend should be made aware of this possible outcome. Ex. Council, P&Z, committees, "Technical Advisory Committee", etc.

COMMENT SUBMISSION

Ch. 180.040.050 Neighborhood Meetings and Notifications

The requirement to provide a Spanish-speaking and ASL interpreter, if requested, for all public meetings should be included. It's not enough to just do the notification in Spanish.

Ch. 18.75.050 Alternative Design

This appears to be a "universal loophole" clause. Why is it necessary to include such a vague statement, particularly when balanced against other language that is minutely focused on restrictions and or requirements of various elements or procedures?

Is this basically saying that the City of Maricopa has guidelines and expectations, but we'll consider **anything?** That seems to be contradictory to established documents: 2040 Strategic Vision, other codes, Design Guidelines & Standards, etc.

Language should protect the integrity of previous decisions and directions and not create an "anything goes" with some qualifying language.

For example: The Zoning Administrator shall evaluate, and possibly accept or recommend to the decision-making body, alternative design requirements to meet the intent and the spirit of the code.

The Zoning Administrator may (change from shall – why make it required?) consider for additional review alternative design requirements that meet or exceed established design and or development standards or complement desired development for the City of Maricopa.

Ch. 18.80.040 South Bridge Overlay

Same as above comment

The concepts presented in this new section are intriguing. The only observation is that these design standards and/or expectations be in compliance with changing accessibility or ADA standards, maximizing accessibility, connectivity, and movement.

Ch. 18.90.050 Parking Lot Landscaping

No revisions suggested but my comment is that landscaping should not interfere with access/movement in or out of any parking space. The diagrams used show landscaping encroaching into parking spots. With ever-changing designs in vehicles, access, and the ability to get into or out of a vehicle should never compromised because of landscaping. It happens now and doesn't need to.

Also, in the diagrams used, landscaping is shown under a covered parking structure. This seems unnecessary and over-reaching.

Does our code specify that no landscaping elements should be placed next to handicapped parking spaces? If not, it should.

Ch. 18.95.20 General Requirements

5. Alternative Compliance

See previous comments at 18.75.050

COMMENT SUBMISSION #2

Ch. 18.105.070 Alternative compliance w/ minimum parking requirements
G. Alternative requirements
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.30.050 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.35.060 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.40.050 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.45.050 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.50.050 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

Ch. 18.55.050 Alternative design
See previous comments at 18.75.050

General comments:
I appreciate staff's continued efforts to maximize efficiency and understanding of the general public and others of our Zoning Codes. I also support being open to reviewing and considering "alternative design" requests, but I would like to see additional language related to expectations of any proposed "alternatives" and the expectation that they not sound so "open-ended" but rather "demonstrate compliance and/or consistency with the intent of approved or established documents such as the 2040 Strategic Vision, Design Guidelines, Master Parks, Trails & Open Space or General Plan documents.

Maricopa is still a relatively young city with lots of open/undeveloped land. Things will change and evolve over time, and our documents and codes must maintain a degree of fluidity and flexibility to accommodate those changes without losing sight of our goals and vision.

We must also be cognizant of the impact of COVID-19 on "business as usual", allowing for adaptability to be made efficiently and effectively, if and where needed. This is particularly relevant for all sections addressing pedestrians, parking, safety, and capacity.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Thanks to everyone in Development and Community Services who participated in these revisions and for your continued dedication to keeping Maricopa great.

Submitted by Peg Chapados, former Vice-Mayor, City of Maricopa