

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

October 22, 2001

The General Development Committee of the City of Mesa met in the lower level meeting room of the Council Chambers, 57 East 1st Street, on October 22, 2001 at 9:00 a.m.

COMMITTEE PRESENT

Claudia Walters, Chairman
Jim Davidson
Mike Whalen

COUNCIL PRESENT

Bill Jaffa

OFFICERS PRESENT

Mike Hutchinson

1. Discuss and consider the status of the Downtown Redevelopment Program.

Interim Neighborhood Services Manager Bryan Raines and Redevelopment Director Greg Marek addressed the Committee regarding this agenda item. Mr. Marek provided brief historical background information on this issue and stated that in 1984, the Downtown Redevelopment Area, the original City limits bounded by University Drive, Country Club Drive, Mesa Drive and Broadway Road, was established. He explained that in 1999, the City Council approved the area's expansion to include north to 6th Street, west to Extension, east to Hobson and south to Crescent Avenue.

Mr. Marek advised that since the Downtown Redevelopment Area's inception, 23 redevelopment sites have been created, and currently, seven sites remain either under development or available for development. (See Attachment 1) Mr. Marek explained that the City has also undertaken a variety of other projects including the Main Street Streetscape improvements, the Mesa Aquatics Center, the Mesa Arts Center, the pedestrian pathway, and the expansion of various City facilities. He added that in conjunction with the redevelopment process, five Mesa neighborhoods have been designated as historic districts.

Mr. Marek displayed graphics in the Council Chambers and provided the Committee with a brief overview of the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan. He noted that the purpose of the Plan is to provide direction for the City's redevelopment and development activities. Mr. Marek stated that the Plan would create an urban village within the square mile redevelopment area consisting of governmental, commercial and residential areas, an urban campus, and pedestrian pathways which would link activity centers and parking facilities.

Mr. Marek outlined the three major components of the Concept Plan as follows:

1. Promoting residential development.
2. Encouraging governmental/professional office developments.
3. Developing cultural and entertainment activities, including retail.

Mr. Marek added that a five-year Action Plan was also prepared as a companion document to the Concept Plan.

Mr. Marek explained that due to the current downturn in the nation's economy, it is staff's recommendation that the Redevelopment Office evaluate the preparation of a development strategy for the downtown redevelopment areas which would be based on the Mesa Town Center Concept Plan guidelines. He emphasized that the strategy would focus on retail recruitment, business retention and downtown expansion, and that it would also define various development options within the existing redevelopment sites that are currently available. Mr. Marek noted that the strategy would assist both the Redevelopment Office and the Mesa Town Center Corporation in their ongoing efforts to redevelop the downtown area.

Committeemember Davidson thanked staff for their presentation.

In response to a question from Committeemember Davidson, Mr. Marek clarified that staff does not anticipate that the City will initiate any new development projects for at least a year, and said that it would be more feasible to prepare an overall development strategy for the seven available redevelopment sites.

Committeemember Davidson expressed concerns regarding the lack of documentation in the Committee's packet relative to affordable housing in the Town Center area. He urged staff to more thoroughly address this issue at a future Council Study Session.

In response to a question from Committeemember Davidson, Mr. Marek assured the Committee that staff is currently conducting stringent Code enforcement in the Town Center area. He also noted that staff is considering drafting modifications to the Zoning Ordinance that would reflect retail and commercial uses that are more compatible with the Concept Plan.

Mr. Marek spoke further relative to the Concept Plan and zoning issues.

Committeemember Whalen urged staff to seek a professional consultant to design and broker Site 17. He also expressed concerns that the Concept Plan designated Main Street as the future site of the light rail transit line and questioned whether that is the most appropriate location. Committeemember Whalen stressed the fact that if the City does not develop an urban village in the Town Center area, it will be developed somewhere else. He also requested input from staff relative to the aging Mesa Centennial Center. Committeemember Whalen voiced support for the preparation of an overall development strategy for the downtown area.

Chairman Walters stated the opinion that affordable housing in the Town Center should be "transparent," and blend into the environment. She also voiced support for modifications to the Zoning Ordinance regulating "ground floor" retail, but stressed the fact that churches should be restricted from ground floor locations on Main Street. Chairman Walters added that she

supports staff's recommendation to prepare an overall development strategy for the downtown redevelopment areas and also to focus on the designation of additional historic neighborhoods.

Discussion ensued relative to the process of designating a redevelopment site.

Committeemember Davidson reiterated the fact that opportunities exist to build innovative affordable housing in the downtown area. He also requested clarification from staff relative to the manner in which the Council would address infill and redevelopment issues outside of the Town Center area.

In response to a question from Committeemember Whalen regarding the status of Site 21, Mr. Marek clarified that at the present time, the direction of Council is to develop retail on the ground floor of the building, with the remainder of the property designed for office space. He added that although his office has received inquiries regarding the property, the building still remains available to developers.

Committeemember Whalen stated the opinion that relative to Site 21, he would be in support of more office space and less retail development. He also urged the implementation of dust control standards at Site 17.

Mr. Marek stressed the fact that although the Concept Plan is the City's vision for the Town Center area, an essential element of the overall strategy is to solicit input from the development community and the private sector to determine their needs in an effort to create a successful and prosperous downtown area.

Chairman Walters stated that although she would support residential development in the Town Center, she would be opposed to housing that is specifically designated as affordable housing.

Chairman Walters thanked staff for their presentation.

2. Discuss and consider the Concept Plan for the proposed pedestrian pathway north of Main Street and east of Center Street and consider Phase One.

Redevelopment Director Greg Marek, Redevelopment Planner Tony Felice and Landscape Architect Steve Stettler addressed the General Development Committee regarding this agenda item. Mr. Felice stated that the purpose of today's discussion is to respond to questions posed by the Committee at its April 9, 2001 meeting including whether the Downtown Pedestrian Connection Plan could be implemented in phases and also which elements of the project could be constructed utilizing the Transportation Enhancement Funds Grant (TEA-21).

Mr. Felice advised that as a result of follow-up discussions with representatives of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), the entity that administers the TEA-21 funds, it was determined that the City should first develop an overall concept plan for the pedestrian pathway, which is consistent with priorities outlined in the Council-adopted Town Center Concept Plan. He added that pending adoption of such plan, the City could implement the pathway improvements in phases within budgetary constraints and grant fund availability.

Mr. Felice provided the Committee with an overview of the Downtown Pedestrian Connection Plan. He explained that the project calls for the development of an overall design for a north/south pedestrian pathway beginning at the Mesa Arts Center with a mid-block crossing of Main Street to be included as part of the Phase 4 Streetscape Project, continuing north within the Lewis Street alignment, through the government center campus, across 1st Street, past the Library, the existing MAC, and Centennial Center, with a terminus near the Mesa Amphitheater at 3rd Place. He added that Phase 1 of the Plan is projected to run from Main Street north along the Lewis Street alignment to 1st Street.

Mr. Felice commented that the TEA-21 grant funds, which will cover a majority of the projected costs, may only be used for pedestrian-oriented improvements. He emphasized that any vehicle-related demolition or improvement costs (parking lot restriping), which occur as a result of the project, will be funded by the City of Mesa.

Mr. Felice reported that Phase 1 of the project will be primarily funded from the TEA-21 grant (\$536,361), with the remainder derived from the City of Mesa (\$52,829). He advised that for FY 2001/02, \$480,000 of the TEA-21 grant funds have been earmarked for the project, but noted that it is not anticipated that the full amount of funds will be expended since construction drawings must still be developed and approved by ADOT.

Discussion ensued relative to the coordination of the Downtown Pedestrian Connection Plan in conjunction with the completion of the Phase 4 Streetscape project.

In response to questions from Chairman Walters and Committeemember Whalen, City Engineer Keith Nath said that it is anticipated that the district cooling system will eventually extend its supply and return lines from Main Street to 1st Street and that the completion of such a project would be coordinated with the Downtown Pedestrian Connection Plan to ensure that the pathways are not unnecessarily torn up. He assured the Committee that although cost estimates for such a project have yet to be determined, staff will provide the Council with the necessary information when it becomes available.

Committeemember Whalen expressed support for the concept plan for the Downtown Pedestrian Connection and stated the opinion that it will effectively link various structures in downtown Mesa.

It was moved by Committeemember Davidson, seconded by Committeemember Whalen, to recommend to the Council that the Concept Plan for the proposed pedestrian pathway north of Main Street and east of Center, as well as funding for Phase 1 of the project, be approved.

Chairman Walters stated that although she is in favor of the motion, she would like to be provided cost estimates for the extension of the supply and return lines for the district cooling system from Main Street to 1st Street. She emphasized the importance of ensuring that City projects in this area are completed prior to the construction of the pedestrian pathway.

Mr. Felice assured the Committee that the Redevelopment Department will coordinate all phases of the pedestrian pathway project with other City projects in the downtown area to ensure its successful completion.

Discussion ensued relative to the pedestrian pathway's compatibility with existing and future land uses.

Carried unanimously.

Chairman Walters thanked staff for their presentation.

3. Hear a status report on the Desert Uplands Ordinance Update Process.

(Councilmember Jaffa arrived at the meeting at 9:43 a.m.)

Planning Director Frank Mizner, Senior Planner Jo Ferguson and Planner II Wahid Alam addressed the Committee relative to this agenda item. Mr. Mizner thanked staff for their efforts and hard work in compiling all the information contained in the Committee's packet.

Mr. Mizner reported that in 1999, the City Council adopted two ordinances to regulate commercial and residential development in the Desert Uplands Area. He explained that Ordinance #3693 amended Mesa's Subdivision Regulations by expanding the geographic coverage of the Desert Uplands Area, changing various design standards, and strengthening the City's requirements to inventory and preserve native plants. Mr. Mizner added that Ordinance #3694 amended the City's Building Regulations by adding new requirements for a grading permit within the Desert Uplands Area.

Mr. Mizner stated that subsequent to the adoption of the two ordinances, numerous projects were developed in the Desert Uplands Area, and that at the direction of the Council, staff has endeavored to further update/supplement the current development standards.

Mr. Mizner briefly outlined the comprehensive process which staff has undertaken to modify the proposed Desert Uplands Development Standards, including the solicitation of input from staff, the development community and area residents. (See Attachment 2) He added that the proposal will provide enhanced design flexibility relative to public streets, streetlights, storm water retention, drainage facilities, sidewalks and landscaping. (See Attachment 3)

Mr. Mizner displayed graphics in the Council Chambers to illustrate examples of well-designed and poorly designed residences and commercial facilities which currently exist in the area.

Chairman Walters commented that although it is not the usual practice of the Committee to allow public input, she invited Bill Puffer, President of the Spook Hill Neighborhood Action Association, to offer a neighborhood perspective relative to the proposed modifications.

Mr. Puffer thanked Chairman Walters for the opportunity to address the Committee. He explained that the primary objectives of the residents in the Desert Uplands Area are to retain a low-density residential environment and to preserve the unique character of Mesa's Upper Sonoran Desert area. He also stated that although staff's proposed modifications are primarily technical changes to the City Code, it is imperative that City inspectors engage in more aggressive enforcement activities. Mr. Puffer also commented on a variety of issues including increased native plant preservation; medium density in the residential development category as opposed to the maximum allowed; a reduction in street lighting requirements on public streets in

lower density developments; flood control; sewer service, and the elimination of “bonus” density in Planned Area Developments (PAD).

Chairman Walters thanked Mr. Puffer for his input.

City Engineer Keith Nath briefly responded to a series of concerns previously expressed by Mr. Puffer.

In response to a question from Chairman Walters, Mr. Nath clarified that there are no requirements for Maricopa County residents who currently utilize serviceable septic systems and are annexed into the City, to hook into the City’s sewer system. He noted, however, that when the septic systems are no longer operable, the County would not reissue additional septic tank permits and the homeowners would be required to obtain City utility services.

Committeemember Davidson expressed support for the proposed modifications to the Desert Uplands Development Standards; voiced concerns that the issue of traffic calming in residential areas was not more thoroughly addressed, and requested that the City Attorney’s Office research the current requirement of safety rails on headwalls.

In response to a question from Committeemember Whalen, Mr. Mizner clarified that in accordance with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Maricopa County Health Department, Mesa is required to pave all City streets, and residential areas in the County which are annexed into the City must also conform to the same dust control standards. He added, however, that Mesa does not require the pavement of residential driveways.

Mr. Mizner commented that staff recognizes the fact that much of the Desert Uplands Area remains in the County or is already zoned or developed which makes it difficult to enforce design guidelines. He noted, however, that in recent years, staff has presented the Council with a number of County referrals to apprise it of upcoming County zoning cases that involve City utilities or annexation issues.

Committeemember Whalen concurred with Mr. Puffer’s comments regarding lower densities in PADs and the suggested 400-foot spacing between streetlights, and also suggested that the findings of the Drainage Master Plan Citizens’ Committee be incorporated into the proposed modifications.

Councilmember Jaffa spoke in support of Mr. Puffer’s proposed modifications to the design guidelines. He also expressed concerns regarding a variety of issues including permanent walls and view walls; staff issuing permits on two-story homes which obscure scenic views in adjacent developments, and proposed fencing modifications.

Further discussion ensued relative to blading permits, proposed landscaping between sidewalks and curbs, and the necessity for increased enforcement of the Desert Uplands Development Standards.

Chairman Walters requested that staff conduct research relative to street lighting standards in Phoenix and Scottsdale. She also stressed the importance of adequate overhead lighting at traffic control signs in the Desert Uplands Area and requested that further discussion occur in

the future relative to the issue of perimeter walls and allowing wildlife to travel more freely. Chairman Walters voiced support for the proposed modifications to the Desert Uplands Development Standards and urged staff to "stand firm" on their commitment to enforce such guidelines and not bend to the wishes of developers.

Mr. Mizner stated that in the next few weeks, staff will present a final draft ordinance for Council approval.

4. Adjournment.

Without objection, the General Development Committee meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the meeting of the General Development Committee of the City of Mesa, Arizona, held on the 22nd day of October 2001. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

BARBARA JONES, CITY CLERK

pag

Attachments

General Development Committee Report

Date: October 22, 2001
To: General Development Committee
Through: Mike Hutchinson, City Manager
From: Bryan Raines, Neighborhood Services Manager
Subject: Discuss the Status of the Downtown Redevelopment Program
Council District 4

Purpose and Recommendation

The purpose of this report is to discuss the status of the Downtown Redevelopment Program with the General Development Committee.

Background and Discussion

A formal redevelopment program has existed in downtown Mesa since 1984 when the Downtown Redevelopment Area, which was the original City limits bounded by University Drive, Country Club Drive, Mesa Drive, and Broadway Road was established. The Redevelopment Area was later expanded by City Council in March 1999 to include the area north to 6th Street, west to Extension, east to Hobson, and south to Crescent Avenue (see Exhibit 1, Map of Redevelopment Area).

During the past few years several plans have been prepared for the downtown area, including the *Vision Plan* for Downtown Mesa (1994) and the *Connections Report* (1995). Since it's completion many of the action items in the *Connections Report* have been implemented. The most recent plan, the *Mesa Town Center Concept Plan and Action Plan*, were approved by City Council in 1999. Additionally, a *Retail Recruitment Plan for Downtown Mesa, Arizona* was prepared in 1999.

Redevelopment Project Sites and Redevelopment Projects

Since 1984, twenty-five redevelopment sites have been created by the City Council in the Redevelopment Area (see Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3, Redevelopment Project Sites table and Redevelopment Sites map, respectively). Of these twenty-five redevelopment sites, seven sites remain either under development or available for development.

GDC REPORT

Page 2

These are as follows:

- Sites 7: Components on this site consist of the bank building, gateway park, parking garage and a restaurant which were developed initially. The City of Mesa has acquired the Tri-City property and is developing plans for reuse improvements. Three additional pads remain available for development.
- Site 8: This site consists of the administrative offices for the Mesa Public Schools, a parking garage and the future location of the Mesa Arts Center. Reuse or replacement of the previous retail along main will be made available at a later date.
- Site 17: The 30 acre site previously designated for development of the Mesa Verde project. This site will be the subject of a future master planning project.
- Site 21: Previously the Bank One building, the asbestos in the building has now been abated and the building remains available to developers interested in rehabilitating the structure.
- Site 22: Being developed by the First United Methodist Church. Construction of the Family Life Center should begin construction in early 2002 and continue through mid-2003. The church has discussed plans for additional facilities on the site.
- Site 24: Currently in the process of land acquisition for the development of a 77,000 sq.ft. mixed use retail, office and warehousing complex.
- Site 25: The City continues to work with the Tribune on their expansion plans. The parties who previously indicated an interest in developing the site continue to work independently on determining the financial feasibility of developing Class A office space and a parking structure, outside of the exclusive negotiating period.

In addition to the Redevelopment Project Sites, a number of other notable projects have been initiated by the City since 1996. These projects are identified in Exhibit 4, Map of Downtown Redevelopment Projects and include the Main Street Streetscape improvements, Aquatics Center, Mesa Arts Center, Pedestrian Pathway, and various City facility expansions. As part of the redevelopment process, five neighborhoods have been designated as historic districts.

Mesa Town Center Concept Plan

To assist in planning for redevelopment sites and redevelopment projects, the City Council directed staff to prepare a Concept Plan for downtown to help provide direction for our redevelopment and development activities. This plan (see Exhibit 5, *Mesa Town Center Concept Plan*) was approved by City Council in 1999.

The Concept Plan is based on developing an Urban Village within the square mile redevelopment area. This urban village has a commercial core between Country Club Drive, Mesa Drive, First Avenue, and First Street, with the most intense uses and density in the area between Country Club Drive and Serrine Street. An urban campus runs from the northeast quadrant to Broadway Road and Center Street intersection. Activity centers and parking areas are connected by a series of pedestrian pathways and linkages.

The three components supporting the Concept Plan are:

1. Promoting residential development
2. Encouraging governmental and professional office developments
3. Developing cultural and entertainment activities, including retail.

To implement the Concept Plan, an Action Plan (see Exhibit 6) was prepared as a companion document that identified projects on a priority basis that should be undertaken in order to achieve the objectives of the Concept Plan. The Action Plan currently serves as the basis for the Redevelopment Division's work program (see Exhibit 7, Office of Redevelopment & Historic Preservation 2000 Annual Report).

Summary

During this time of market volatility, it is recommended that the Redevelopment Office evaluate preparing an overall development strategy for the downtown redevelopment area which would follow the guidelines of the Concept Plan. This strategy would focus on the three goals of retail recruitment, business retention and downtown expansion and help to define (re)development options using economic viability as a component. It is anticipated that this strategy would help focus and coordinate the activities of both the Redevelopment Office and the Mesa Town Center Corporation, and it would allow us to continue to proactively redevelop the downtown area.

GDC REPORT

Page 4

Along these lines, Redevelopment continues to work with the Building Safety Division to develop a rehabilitation code for existing buildings that, if adopted, could influence greatly our ability to successfully implement the strategies mentioned above.

Greg Marek, Redevelopment Director

Bryan Raines, Interim Neighborhood
Services Manager

Paul Wenbert, Deputy City Manager

Mike Hutchinson, City Manager

Attachments:

- Exhibit 1 Map of Redevelopment Area
- Exhibit 2 Redevelopment Project Sites table
- Exhibit 3 Redevelopment Project Sites map
- Exhibit 4 Map of Downtown Redevelopment Projects
- Exhibit 5 Mesa Town Center Concept Plan
- Exhibit 6 Mesa Town Center Concept Action Plan
- Exhibit 7 Office of Redevelopment & Historic Preservation 2000 Annual Report

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

Date: October 22, 2001
To: City Council
Through: Mike Hutchinson, City Manager
Paul Wenbert, Deputy City Manager
From: Jack Friedline, Development Services Manager
Frank Mizner, Planning Director
Subject: Status Report on the Desert Uplands Ordinance Update Process

Council District: District 5

Purpose and Recommendation:

This report will provide the Council with information regarding the status of the Desert Uplands Ordinance update process. Attached is a proposed amendment to the Subdivision Regulations for Mesa's Desert Uplands area for Council consideration.

Background:

City Council adopted two ordinances on September 21, 1999 which changed the way new development was to proceed in the Desert Uplands area of Mesa. Ordinance #3693 amended our Subdivision Regulations by expanding the geographic coverage of the Desert Uplands area, changing numerous design standards from recommendations to requirements, and strengthening our requirements to inventory and preserve native plants. Ordinance #3694 amended our Building Regulations by adding new requirements for a grading permit within the Desert Uplands area. Since the adoption of the two ordinances mentioned above there have been a number of projects built in the Desert Uplands area. City Council on numerous occasions has expressed dissatisfaction with the current development standards and has directed staff to update and supplement the current standards for the Desert Uplands area.

Discussion:

A. Staff Input

Development Services (Transportation, Planning, Engineering, Building Safety, and Solid Waste) and Fire Department staff met numerous times to discuss and review the current subdivision standards for the Desert Uplands area. Major issues were identified under the categories of drainage, street design, preservation of native plants, field inspections, plan review process, implementation and development within county islands. Staff recognized that much of the Desert Uplands area is either: a) still in unincorporated Maricopa County; or b) already developed or zoned. In reality there is little land that is not already developed, zoned or platted.

Obviously our regulations will only apply to that area under our jurisdiction, or for those areas requesting utility service. The challenges of limiting mass grading and utilizing the building envelope concept (maximum disturbance of 40% of individual lots) for higher densities (higher than R1-35) with smaller lot sizes (less than 35,000 sq. ft.) were discussed.

Staff also identified the need for more flexibility for public street standards. After many challenging sessions staff agreed on a list of proposed amendments to the current Subdivision Ordinance for the Desert Uplands area of Mesa.

B. Development Community Input

Staff presented the recommendations at a regular Development Forum meeting. Suggestions from the development community were received both during and after the meeting. At the time the draft amendment was presented at the Development Forum meeting the document included requirements for colored concrete (sidewalks and curbs) as well as a restriction to limit initial subdivision grading to streets, utilities and retention areas only, regardless of lot sizes.

Due to input received from City staff and from the development community regarding the difficulty of long term maintenance of colored concrete (fading, color matching for repairs, possible patchwork appearance and increased replacement costs) this requirement for public streets was deleted. Voluntary use of alternative pavement materials and colors is still encouraged provided a homeowners association accepts responsibility for repairs, replacement and maintenance.

The site grading limitation requiring all lots to be cleared on a lot by lot basis was recognized as infeasible except in low density, building envelope type development (R1-35, R1-43). This is due to the need to recontour sites to drain to retention areas and to remove or stockpile soil in order to build pads for home lots in the R1-6 through R1-15 densities.

The draft amendment proposes reduced public right-of-way widths (except in R1-6 and R1-9 densities) and reduced pavement sections. These standards are comparable to the private streets that have typically been constructed in the Desert Uplands area. The provision of detached sidewalks for local private streets addresses a concern often expressed by residents who are forced to walk in the streets in Desert Uplands communities built without sidewalks. The amendment identifies that future private streets would now adhere to the same standards proposed for public streets, with the exception of sidewalk allowed on one side of the street.

The 5' planting area between curb and sidewalk is intended to contain both salvage and new trees. The landscape strip is reduced to 3 1/2' in width in the R1-6 - R1-9 densities to keep the right-of-way at 50' commensurate with local public street right-of-way in the balance of the City. Staff is concerned that this dimension is inadequate to accommodate trees and should be increased to 5'. This would necessitate the right-of-way width to be increased to 53' for local public streets in the Desert Uplands.

A summary of the discussion at the Development Forum and the written comments received from the Association of Contractors is attached.

C. Resident Input

This draft document was also provided to the Spook Hill Neighborhood Action Association (formerly Spook Hill HOA). Attached is a letter from Mr. Bill Puffer, President of the Association. Mr. Puffer documents a number of suggestions, questions and general comments. Also attached is a staff memo responding to Mr. Puffer's letter.

Summary:

The creation of a unique character for Mesa's Upper Sonoran Desert area, whether for residential or commercial development, is not a simple task. First of all, much of the area is not under our jurisdiction. Secondly, much of the area has already been developed, for better or worse. Finally, quality development in this area, or anywhere else for that matter, involves the long-term sustained cooperation between the private development community and the public sector. Development patterns are also strongly influenced by a wide variety of external market forces.

Recommendation:

Attached is a draft amendment to the Subdivision Regulations for the Desert Uplands area of Mesa. Given Council direction, staff can revise the recommendations to accommodate Council suggestions and present the final draft ordinance amending Section 9-6-5 at a future Council meeting. There is no need for a hearing by the Planning and Zoning Board since this is not in the Zoning Ordinance.

- Attachments:
1. Staff proposal of Subdivision Regulation amendment for Desert Uplands.
 2. Input from development community.
 3. Input from Spook Hill Neighborhood Action Association.
 4. Current Desert Uplands development standards - Section 9-6-5 of subdivision regulations. (Ordinance 3693)
 5. Map showing the Desert Uplands area of Mesa.

Frank Mizner,
Planning Director

Jack Friedline,
Development Services Manager

Paul Wenbert,
Deputy City Manager

Mike Hutchinson,
City Manager

Proposed Modifications to Desert Uplands Development Standards

Presented below for review and comment is a draft of suggested modifications to the current Desert Uplands Development Standards. The intent of this update is to:

- a) create a unique character that will be distinctly known as a "Desert Uplands" type of development;
- b) encourage pedestrian traffic along public local streets; and
- c) provide private developers additional options for public local streets.

These modifications will be incorporated into the Subdivision Regulations (Section 9-6-5) and where appropriate, the Offsite Improvement Regulations (Section 9-8).

NOTE: ALL EXISTING DESERT UPLANDS DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS PER ORDINANCE #3693 AND #3694 WILL STILL APPLY, EXCEPT THOSE REVISED HEREIN.

LOCAL RESIDENTIAL STREETS - PUBLIC

Zoning	Lot size, SF	R/W	CL to BC	Parking	Curb	Sidewalk	Water Main	Street* Light
R1-6 to R1-9	6000+ to 9000+	50'	17.5'	Both sides	2' Roll	4' width, detached 3.5'	1' behind curb	2.5' behind curb
R1-1515000+	47'	14.5'	One side	2' Roll 4' width, only		1' behind detached 5'	4' behind curb	curb
R1-3535000+	43'		12.5'	none	2' Roll	4' width, detached 5'	1' behind curb	4' behind curb
R1-4343560+	30'	12.0'	none	3' Ribbon	none	1' behind	none curb	

Homeowners association to be responsible for maintenance of landscaping between the curb and sidewalk. HOA CC&Rs to require garbage/recycling barrels to be placed in the street adjacent to the curb, not in the landscaped area. This is to avoid damage to landscaping.

* Streetlights located at 2.5' behind curb allowed only when streetlights and water lines are on opposite sides of the street.

- Reduce centerline radius to 200' minimum and curve length to 75' minimum to allow a more curvilinear 25 MPH street design.
- At "tee" intersections:
 - * Reduce the required intersection tangent length to 150' minimum, or
 - * Allow a 300' radius for a terminating 30 MPH street, or
 - * Allow a 200' radius for a terminating 25 MPH street.
- Require landscape medians (tracts) at subdivision entrances and adjacent to open spaces. Require landscape islands (tracts) within cul-de-sacs. Medians and islands cannot obstruct access to lots, impair visibility at sight triangles, or obstruct drainage, and are to be located pursuant to Fire Department and Development Services Department access requirements. HOA to own and maintain tracts.
- Encourage integral colored concrete and alternative sidewalk and pavement materials subject to City review and approval. Materials such as stamped concrete or exposed aggregate may be utilized. HOA would be responsible for maintenance of special concrete or pavement sections.

- Require landscaping consisting of trees with limited canopies and shrubs (50% of the trees to be 24' box, new or salvage) within the 3.5' to 5' landscape strip between the curb and sidewalk.
- Require garbage/recycling barrels to be placed in the street adjacent to the curb.

LOCAL RESIDENTIAL STREETS - PRIVATE

- Same standards (detached sidewalk, landscape strip with HOA maintenance) as for public local streets, except sidewalk required on one side only in the R1-6 through R1-35 zones.

NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR STREET (NOT MID-SECTION AND NO LOT/ HOME ACCESS) - PUBLIC

- 80' right-of-way, 34' face-of-curb to face-of-curb, no on-street parking, and 5' sidewalks detached a minimum of 4'. Increase face-of-curb width to 48' at intersections with arterial streets and adjacent to school sites, parks, or activity centers. Minor residential collector street lighting shall use poles with a 30' maximum mounting height and a light level as near as possible to an average 0.37 foot candles with a 6 to 1 average to minimum ratio.

DRAINAGE AND RETENTION BASINS

- Require headwalls to be designed to blend in color, surface treatment and shape with surrounding landscaping. Headwalls should be flared or sloped to follow the contours of the basin or channel. MAG headwall standards shall be modified and enhanced in shape, texture, material, and color to blend with the surrounding landscape.
- Require alternative designs for safety rails such as wrought iron to match theme walls, boulders, pilasters, etc., and alternative designs for inlet/outlet grates. Alternative safety rails to be minimum 42" high. Inlet/outlet grates are required on 24" diameter pipes and larger.
- Man-made channels and existing natural washes conveying flows from adjacent properties must remain separate from retention basins.
- Retention basin design:
 - * Incorporate the design layout with the overall site landscaping plan including amenities, access, planting, etc. Provide landscaping in all areas of the basin (slope, transition area, bottom, etc.).
 - * Introduce a transitional area between the top of the retention basin slope and the edge of sidewalks, street curbs, parking spaces, driveways, or parking screen walls.
 - * Utilize a variety of side slopes and contouring, and vary radii between top and bottom of slope for smooth transition. Incorporate major horizontal and/or vertical slope change every 100' of linear slope length.
 - * No more than fifty percent (50%) of the street frontage shall be used for retention basins.
 - * Where retention basins occur along arterial streets, provide berms along fifty percent (50%) of the basin frontage. Berms are to be 4:1 (horizontal to vertical) maximum slope, two (2) feet high.
 - * Side slopes may be steeper than 6:1 adjacent to streets (public or private) and pedestrian walkways if a 5' transition area no steeper than a 6:1 slope is provided. Side slopes over 5' feet away from the street/walkway can be proposed as steep as 4:1.
 - * Vertical walls will be considered subject to aesthetic and engineering review and may be used for up to 25% of the perimeter of the basin. Walls retaining over 2' of soil require structural design. Walls with over 2' drop-off require railing. Walls retaining water require waterproof design.

PROTECTED AREAS - NATIVE PLANTS

- Require salvage and reuse of all cacti on the development site.
- Require the posting of a cash bond of \$5,000/ acre (total site area) to ensure non-disturbance of required open space areas.
- During construction, require fencing of preserved natural washes, undisturbed open space and sensitive areas as identified in approved site plans/preliminary plats and construction drawings. Require fencing to be installed and inspected prior to any site preparation, grading, plant removal or construction. Fencing is to display signage indicating **"protected area - no access."**
- To preserve riparian zones, undisturbed areas shall extend, as determined by the City, beyond the banks of significant washes including those regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS ARE NOT INTENDED TO BE WRITTEN INTO THE ORDINANCE:

ENFORCEMENT

In previous discussions regarding the Desert Upland, a recurring theme has been the lack of adequate inspections to ensure compliance with adopted regulations. The following are possible alternatives for consideration.

- Hire inspectors to ensure that the standards unique to the Desert Uplands are upheld. This includes inspection during fencing, plant inventory and plant salvage process; maintaining plants in an on-site nursery; and replanting.
- Establish an environmental penalty for violations, including cessation of issuance of building permits and/or a hold on occupancy until the disturbed area is restored per approved plans.

PROCESS

The following are steps that can be implemented immediately by staff without the need for Council action or Code amendment. The intent is to better coordinate our initial review process in order to ensure compliance with adopted regulations.

- Require applicants to provide specific details and cross-sections for all roadway, retention basin, wash stabilization, and drainage structure design and submit a NPPP (Native Plant Preservation Plan) with the first formal submittal to the City for Board consideration (i.e., Planning and Zoning Board, Design Review Board).
- Require an NPPP submittal as part of the overall improvement plan package (currently two sets) which may be included with landscape and irrigation plans. This would eliminate the current practice of reviewing the NPPP separately from other improvement plans and also allow the field inspectors to look at one approved set of drawings which includes the NPPP.
- Require total barrier fencing at protected areas, not just rope or plastic tape.

I:Jo/Draft Modifications to Desert Uplands Development Standards.doc