

DH4 / #37

APR 14 2016



MEMORANDUM

Planning Division – CC Memo No. 16-037

DATE: APRIL 14, 2016

TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

THRU: MARSHA REED, ACTING CITY MANAGER *MR*
JEFF KURTZ, PLANNING ADMINISTRATOR *JK*
KEVIN MAYO, PLANNING MANAGER *KA*

FROM: DAVID DE LA TORRE, AICP, PRINCIPAL PLANNER *KA FM DD*

SUBJECT: GPA14-0001 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Request: Public hearing for public input and discussion, followed by adoption of the public hearing draft plan titled, “Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined”.

Applicant: City of Chandler

Lead Consultant: Peggy Fiandaca, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission, the Citizen’s Advisory Committee, and Planning Staff recommend approval of the draft General Plan, together with the revisions listed in the attached addendum.

BACKGROUND

State statutes require cities to adopt or re-adopt, and voters to ratify, a general plan at least once every ten years. The current general plan was adopted and ratified in 2008. The City initiated the process of updating the general plan a couple of years sooner in order to address changing trends and factors that are facing Chandler. The general plan, which consists of comprehensive and broad development policies and community goals, is required to include 17 elements ranging in a variety of subject matters such as land use, conservation, recreation, water resources, and safety. Figure 1 on page 1 of the draft provides a complete list of all of the required elements and the sections in the document where they are addressed.

PROCESS SUMMARY

The process of updating the general plan officially commenced in December, 2014, when the City Council approved a contract with lead consultants, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc. In February 2015, the Mayor and Council appointed 23 residents to the Citizen’s Advisory

April 14, 2016

Committee, which met 6 times from March 2015 to February 2016, providing input and guidance to the consultants and Planning Staff.

Most of the year 2015 was devoted to soliciting input from Chandler's citizens through a variety of events and briefings (see attached Engagement Summary). These included a series of public forums referred to as Vision Fest, from May 12 through 16, open house-style planning labs, classroom exercises with students, and participation in various public events such as Art Walk, Operation Backpack, and the Mayor's Listening Tour. To date, there have been over 60 opportunities for Chandler citizens to provide input on the general plan. Additionally, there have been opportunities to participate in online surveys, and citizens have always had the option to submit comments through the Website and social media, which has been encouraged throughout the process.

A regional resource team was convened twice during the process; first, before the plan was drafted to gather input regarding regional initiatives, and again afterward, to obtain feedback on the draft. This group provided an opportunity for adjacent municipalities, Gila River Indian Community, and regional entities such as Maricopa Association of Governments, Valley Metro, and Greater Phoenix Economic Council, among others to participate and provide input during the process. State statutes require that a copy of the draft general plan be submitted to specific regional entities for review and comment during the sixty-day review period.

The sixty-day review period, is a statutory requirement to allow public review, and review by regional entities, at least sixty days before notification of the first public hearing. The sixty-day review period was held from December 21, 2015, through February 19, 2016. During this time, four public meetings were held, including one that focused on North Arizona Avenue, to gather feedback from the public. All of the comments received during the sixty-day review period were recorded in the attached 60-Day Review CAC Comments matrix, which also identifies revisions that were made as a result of those comments.

As required by state statutes, the Planning Commission held two public hearings at different locations to promote citizen participation. The first public hearing was held on March 9, 2016, at 6:00 p.m. and was held at Tumbleweed Recreation Center, Cotton Room North. The second public hearing was held on March 16, 2016, at 5:30 p.m. and was held in the City Council Chambers.

The "Public Hearing Draft Plan, March-April 2016" distributed to Council and Planning Commission is a clean, revised copy containing all of the revisions from the sixty-day review period. Comments received after the end of the sixty-day review period, including comments received during the public hearings with the Planning Commission, are recorded in the attached Public Hearing Draft Plan Comments matrix. Staff has acknowledged receipt and discussed the comments with the commenters, none of which necessitate revisions to the draft general plan.

DRAFT GENERAL PLAN SUMMARY

This update is not a complete overhaul of the existing general plan. Rather, it's a refinement of policies that address new trends that are affecting Chandler. Many of the existing policies that have served Chandler well have been carried over into the draft general plan. Some existing

policies were revised and new policies were added based on input received from the extensive public outreach that was conducted.

Additionally, the update incorporates recommendations from studies and new policies that the City has undertaken since the adoption of the current general plan in 2008. These include recommendations from the Mayor’s 4-Corner Retail Committee (2012), South Price Road Employment Corridor Study (2013), Water Allocation Policy (2015), and Adaptive Reuse (2015).

While the draft general plan looks completely different than the current general plan, most of the policies are the same. Major changes between the current and draft general plans are identified in the attachment titled “2008 vs 2016 Draft General Plan”.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INPUT SUMMARY

One of the most important aspects of the update process is public outreach and participation. For this reason, special attention was given to the Public Participation Plan, required by state statutes and adopted by City Council in February, 2015. The participation plan outlines a variety of traditional and creative methods to provide effective and continuous public participation. The methods, listed below, far exceed the level of public outreach of any previous general plan update:

Social Media (Facebook, Twitter, Nextdoor)	Email notifications to Registered Neighborhoods & HOAs
City Website & Online Surveys	CityScope newsletter (utility bills insert)
Print advertising (City page on Santan Sun News and Wrangler News)	YouTube videos
Chandler 11 Bulletin Board	Direct mailings to property owners (N. Arizona Ave. meeting)
Planning Lab, Vision Fest, Public Meetings / Forums	Student input in classrooms (Chandler H.S., Hamilton H.S., Bogle Junior High, and San Marcos Elementary)
Briefings to various City committees, boards and commissions	Organizations such as Downtown Chandler Community Partnership, and Chandler Chamber of Commerce
Press releases / Newspaper articles	Public Events (Artwalk, Mayor’s Listening Tour, Operation Backpack)

The following is a summary of reoccurring themes received from the public during the entire process. In parentheses are the policies/sections in the draft where they are addressed:

- Residents desire to have more restaurant and entertainment choices in downtown (see Downtown Chandler Policies 1.2.1, p. 34)
- There is support for continuing to redevelop downtown and North Arizona Avenue with developments consisting of higher densities and mixed-uses (see Downtown and North Arizona Avenue Policies 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, p. 34)

April 14, 2016

- Residents are concerned about too many apartments South of the Santan Freeway (see urban residential density locational criteria, which is limited to downtown and other specific areas, p. 16, and policies 1.1.2.k-m, p. 26-27, to protect or transition to existing neighborhoods)
- Residents would like their existing low density neighborhoods to be protected from higher density or incompatible land uses (see Housing and Neighborhood Policies 1.1.2.k-m, p. 26-27)
- Residents would like new recreational amenities to meet the needs of changing demographics (see policies 1.6.3e-f, p. 66)
- Residents expressed support of encouraging health and wellness initiatives (Healthy Chandler section, p. 64)

During the sixty-day review period, Planning Staff met with several stakeholders to discuss their comments which resulted in revisions identified in the 60-Day Review CAC Comments matrix. After meeting with Staff, one of the stakeholders, Dean Brennan a Chandler resident representing the Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities, wrote a letter addressed to the Planning Commission, stating their support of the draft General Plan, which is attached to the Staff Memo.

CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE VOTE REPORT

On February 22, 2016, the Citizen's Advisory Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval of the draft general plan with revisions identified in the 60-day review comment matrix (these revisions have been incorporated into the "Public Hearing Draft Plan").

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE REPORT

Motion to Approve

In Favor: 5 Opposed: 0 Absent: 2 (Pridemore & Baron)

Although Chairman Pridemore and Vice Chairman Baron were absent, they each prepared a statement in support of the general plan that was read into the record in their absence. After hearing comments from a Chandler resident, Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the draft general plan, subject to minor revisions identified in the attached Addendum.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Planning Commission, the Citizen's Advisory Committee, and Planning Staff recommend adoption of the public hearing draft of Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined, together with the revisions listed in the attached Addendum.

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to approve Resolution No. 4948, adopting the public hearing draft of the Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined, together with the revisions listed in the attached Addendum as recommended by Planning Commission, the Citizen's Advisory Committee, and Planning Staff, and placing the General Plan on the August 30, 2016, election for voter ratification.

CC Memo No. 16-037

Page 5 of 5

April 14, 2016

Attachments

1. Resolution No. 4948
2. Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined (Public Hearing Draft Plan)
3. Addendum to the Public Hearing Draft Plan
4. Public Hearing Draft Plan Comments
5. Engagement Summary
6. 2008 vs 2016 Draft General Plan
7. Letter of support from Dean Brennan, Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities
8. 60-Day Review and CAC Comments

RESOLUTION NO. 4948

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, REPEALING THE CHANDLER GENERAL PLAN, ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL ON JUNE 26, 2008 AND RATIFIED BY VOTERS ON NOVEMBER 4, 2008, AND ALL SUCCESSOR AMENDMENTS THERETO, AND ADOPTING A NEW GENERAL PLAN IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH TITLE 9, CHAPTER 4, ARTICLE 6, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES; AND DIRECTING THAT THE CHANDLER GENERAL PLAN ADOPTED BY THIS RESOLUTION, BE SUBMITTED TO THE VOTERS FOR RATIFICATION AT AN ELECTION TO BE HELD ON AUGUST 30, 2016.

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Arizona Revised Statutes, the General Plan is required to include seventeen (17) specified elements; and,

WHEREAS, the City has been actively updating its General Plan to comply with State requirements; and,

WHEREAS, this plan included an extensive public participation plan adopted by Council in February 2015; and,

WHEREAS, the City has provided opportunity for official comment by various public bodies, agencies and jurisdictions at least sixty (60) days prior to giving notice of public hearings, all in accordance with the Arizona Revised Statutes; and,

WHEREAS, the Chandler General Plan adopted by this resolution replaces the Chandler General Plan adopted by the City Council on June 26, 2008, and ratified by voters on November 4, 2008 and successor amendments thereto; and,

WHEREAS, all State of Arizona legal requirements for amending and adopting the General Plan have been met, including two (2) public hearings held in different locations by the Planning & Zoning Commission on March 9, 2016, and March 16, 2016;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona, as follows:

SECTION I. That the Public Hearing Draft Plan of the Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined, as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission, is hereby adopted together with the revisions in the Addendum, to replace the City's current General Plan, subject to voter ratification.

SECTION II. That the Chandler General Plan 2016; a vision refined, as adopted by this resolution on April 14, 2016, be placed on the ballot of the next regularly scheduled municipal election scheduled for August 30, 2016, for voter ratification.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona, this _____ day of _____, 2016.

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

MAYOR

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above and foregoing Resolution No. 4948 was duly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of Chandler, Arizona, at a regular meeting was held on the _____ day of _____, 2016, and that a quorum was present thereat.

CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

CITY ATTORNEY



Addendum to the Public Hearing Draft Plan
Revisions to the Public Hearing Draft Plan March - April 2016

Page Number	Revision
23	Update Median Home Value infographic with the following data from the U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey 5-year estimates (2010-2014): Chandler, \$220,700; Arizona \$162,900
42	2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence: "Land use planning and traffic management are interrelated and, when effective, address the needs of multiple transportation modes while also accommodating people's needs (e.g., improved crosswalks, wider sidewalks, raised intersections for pedestrian safety, traffic calming).
65	2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: "Chandler is focused on getting residents active by providing recreational facilities strategically place- located geographically throughout the city."
95	3rd paragraph, last sentence: "...and the collection of sales taxes on residential property rentals have all <u>, or</u> potentially could impacted municipal financing options."

Public Hearing Draft Plan Comments

March -April 2016

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Commenter	Comment
3/9/2016	Public Hearing	Frank Piani, Representing the owner of Food City Shopping Center located at NEC Arizona Ave & Ray Rd	It is crucial to maintain full access on Arizona Avenue and Ray Road to the retail property. A retail property in the City of Mesa has suffered due to limited access following the construction of light rail. We don't want that to happen to this shopping center.
3/15/2016	Email	John Gordon, Harsch Properties	Harsch would like the opportunity to work with the City to determine if residential zoning might be a more appropriate use for all three of Harsch properties.
3/16/2016	Email	Darr Tillman, Resident	We are seeing so many apartment complexes in Chandler being built. We need more parks now because it's starting to look too dense with apartments and commercial real estate. We need more green spaces and activity centers for our residents. South East corner of Ocotillo and Alma School has new SFH and Snedigar park next to it. Granted there are soccer fields and a small playground area but most of the land is dry grass/weeds. We need more walking paths, trees, parks scattered around in south Chandler. I live in Fulton Ranch and people from outside our neighborhood use our walking paths which is fine but this suggests we need more. The Hamilton athletic dept. has the students run thru Fulton Ranch, because that is all they have close to the school.
3/16/2016	Public Hearing	Moe Wakefield, Resident	I am concerned about how the General Plan update can protect and preserve my neighborhood, when it says that the future of development in Chandler will be infill and redevelopment. The policy in the General Plan to protect the low-density character of large lot neighborhoods will not help when other policies encourage the compatible mix of housing types, encourage a range of housing types and provide for a variety of housing choices for all income levels. The General Plan is not user friendly. An average person of the City of Chandler can not read this and understand it in the same way that City Staff does. This is a specialized document that in my view, gives developers an unfair advantage. I would like to see more security out of this plan and I would like to see it strengthened to the point that if you have an existing area plan, that they don't come in and just change it arbitrarily.

Engagement Summary

The following summarizes outreach and engagement activities as part of the General Plan Update effort. Online engagement tactics are included as are individual stakeholder meetings and briefings; formal committee meetings are *italicized* and public engagement events are noted in **bold**. This list will be continually updated as the process evolves.

Date	Meeting	Location	#*
March 1, 2015	Chandler Chamber Policy Committee Briefing	Chandler Chamber of Commerce	
<i>March 3, 2015</i>	<i>Citizen's Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Chandler Police Department (Main)</i>	2
March 6, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	6
March 11, 2015	Teen Leadership Presentation	Council Chambers	
March 2015	Poll: Neighborhoods	Online	61
April 3, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	14
April 15, 2015	Chandler Chamber Board of Directors Briefing	Chandler Chamber of Commerce	
<i>April 20, 2015</i>	<i>Citizens Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Desert Breeze Police Substation</i>	
April 23, 2015	Downtown Chandler Community Partnership	City Hall	
<i>April 29, 2015</i>	<i>Regional Resource Team</i>	<i>City Hall</i>	
April 2015	Poll: Transportation and Connectivity	Online	82
May 1, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	9
May 12, 2015	Vision Fest: Downtown Drop-In Charrette	Chandler Police Department (Main)	18
May 12, 2015	Vision Fest: San Marcos Elementary, 5 th Grade Class	San Marcos Elementary	23
May 12, 2015	Vision Fest: Chandler High School, 11 th Grade Class	Chandler High School	19
May 12, 2015	Vision Fest: Vision Workshop	Chandler Library	7
May 13, 2015	Vision Fest: I-10/Loop 202 Drop-In Charrette	Sunset Library	2
May 13, 2015	Vision Fest: Price Road Corridor Drop-In Charrette	Desert Breeze Police Substation	1
May 14, 2015	Vision Fest: Bogle, 7 th and 8 th Grade Classes	Bogle Junior High School	99
May 15, 2015	Vision Fest: Airpark Drop-In Charrette	City of Chandler	3
May 15, 2015	Vision Fest: North Arizona Avenue Drop-In Charrette	Community Center	4
May 16, 2015	Vision Fest: Vision Workshop	Chandler Library	7
May 19, 2015	Vision Fest: Hamilton High School, 10 th Grade Classes	Hamilton High School	≈234
May 26, 2015	Vision Fest: Visioning Questionnaire	Online	54
May 2015	Poll: Economic Development	Online	80
June 2, 2015	Parks and Recreation Board	Council Chambers, Council Conference Room	
June 5, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	4
June 9, 2015	Neighborhood Advisory Committee	Neighborhood Programs Conference Room	
<i>June 15, 2015</i>	<i>Citizen's Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Chandler Police Department (Main)</i>	<i>1</i>
June 2015	Poll: Community Health	Online	33
July 15, 2015	Economic Development Advisory Board	City Hall	
July 17, 2015	Art Walk	TechShop	
July 18, 2015	Operation Backpack	Chandler High School	
July 30, 2015	Transportation Commission	Transp. & Dev., South Atrium Conference Room	
July 2015	North Arizona Avenue/Alternative/Policy Questionnaire	Online	127
July 2015	Poll: Downtown Chandler	Online	411
August 7, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	2
<i>August 17, 2015</i>	<i>Citizen's Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Chandler Police Department (Main)</i>	
August 20, 2015	Downtown Chandler Community Partnership	City Hall	
September 1, 2015	Intel Community Stakeholder Advisory Panel	Intel Chandler Boulevard Campus	
September 16, 2015	Mayor's Listening Tour	Sanborn Elementary School	
October 2, 2015	Planning Lab	McCullough-Price House	
October 14, 2015	Airport Commission Briefing	Chandler Municipal Airport	
October 21, 2015	Staff Workshop	Downtown Library, Copper Room (2 nd Floor)	
<i>November 16, 2015</i>	<i>Citizen's Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Chandler Police Department (Main)</i>	

Date	Meeting	Location	#*
November 16, 2015	Council Micro-Retreat	City Council Chambers, Conference Room	
<i>November 17, 2015</i>	<i>Regional Resource Team</i>	<i>City Hall</i>	
December 16, 2015	Planning Commission Briefing	City Council Chambers	
January 19, 2016	Public Meeting: Review Draft General Plan	Env. Education Center, Desert Painted Room 112	
January 20, 2016	Economic Development Advisory Board	City Hall	
January 21, 2016	Public Meeting: N. Az Ave Policy Review	Downtown Police Community Room	
January 26, 2016	Public Meeting: Review Draft General Plan	Desert Breeze Police Community Room	
January 27, 2016	Public Meeting: Review Draft General Plan	Downtown Library, Copper Room (2 nd Floor)	
February 2, 2016	Parks and Recreation Board	Council Chambers, Council Conference Room	
February 10, 2016	Airport Commission Briefing	Chandler Municipal Airport	
<i>February 22, 2016</i>	<i>Citizen's Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Downtown Library, Copper Room (2nd Floor)</i>	
February 26, 2016	Chandler Chamber Policy Committee Briefing	Chandler Chamber of Commerce	
March 8, 2016	Neighborhood Advisory Committee	Neighborhood Programs Conference Room	
March 9, 2016	Teen Leadership Presentation	City Hall	
March 9, 2016	Planning and Zoning Commission	Tumbleweed Rec Center, Cotton Room North	
March 16, 2016	Planning and Zoning Commission	City Council Chambers	
April 14, 2016	City Council	City Council Chambers	

*reflect the number of individuals that signed in (not required) and/or counted; for CAC meetings, the number reflects public observers

Last updated March 9, 2016

The following are the major differences between the 2008 and 2016 draft General Plans:

Subject	2008 General Plan	2016 General Plan
Document Format: (State law requires 17 elements to be included in Chandler's General Plan)	Each element is its own chapter, except 4 of the elements have been paired into 2 chapters, totaling 15 chapters. Due to overlap in element subject areas, there is a considerable amount of duplication and policies concerning similar subject matters are scattered throughout the document.	In order to create a general plan that is streamlined, concise and easier-to-read, the document has been organized around 3 guiding principles and corresponding core values. The 17 elements are addressed throughout the document as identified in Figure 1 (page 1) of the draft general plan.
Healthy Chandler	The general plan indirectly promotes healthy practices with policies promoting bicycle and multi-use paths, parks and other recreational amenities.	Healthy Chandler, a new section, is introduced to directly promote the health and well-being of Chandler's citizens. New policies in this area include encouraging access to healthy food, pedestrian-oriented developments to encourage walking, bicycling and transit use, and encouraging partnerships with private recreational facilities and medical providers to provide education and health/wellness programs.
Future Land Use Plan		All future land use designations are the same. The map is simplified with the following changes that do not affect land use designations or policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Illustrative references to the 3 large area plans are removed. A textual reference will remain on the map. • Commercial nodes are removed as they do not provide any difference in policy to properties located within or without commercial nodes. • Changed "Residential" to "Neighborhoods" to better reflect the variety of land uses allowed.

Subject	2008 General Plan	2016 General Plan
Growth Areas	<p>3 types of growth areas are identified: Revitalization Growth Areas include North Arizona Avenue, Downtown and East Chandler Boulevard.</p> <p>Large Growth Areas include Airpark Area, South Arizona Avenue and South Price Road.</p> <p>Growth Expansion Nodes include the Mall/Hospital, McClintock/Chandler Blvd, and I-10/Ray Rd.</p>	<p>No longer distinguishes between types of growth areas. All growth areas are simply identified as a "growth area".</p> <p>South Arizona Avenue, McClintock/Chandler Blvd, and I-10/Ray Rd growth areas are removed because they are mostly developed or have received zoning entitlement.</p> <p>New growth area (Loop 202/I-10) is identified to plan for potential redevelopment into more dense employment uses to take advantage of the key location next to the future South Mountain Freeway.</p> <p>Major policy changes for individual growth areas are identified below.</p>
North Arizona Avenue Growth Area	<p>North Arizona Ave is identified as a high capacity transit corridor. Policies promote transit oriented development with mixed uses and higher densities.</p>	<p>Continues to identify North Arizona Ave as a high capacity transit corridor, and continues to encourage the development of higher densities, mixed uses and pedestrian-oriented projects.</p> <p>Identifies future steps that the city may take to further refine the vision for North Arizona Avenue. These include, continuing to study the potential for high capacity transit, creating an area plan, and determining the appropriate level of supporting transit services.</p>
South Price Road Corridor	<p>Reserves the corridor for large single users on campus like settings, on parcels generally not less than 15 acres.</p> <p>More flexibility allowed within Innovation Zones.</p>	<p>Incorporates the following recommendations from the South Price Road Employment Corridor Study (2013): Continue to emphasize campus like settings, preserve and enhance the corridor aesthetics, encourage intensive utilization of remaining available land, allow for multiple tenants on a single parcel. Minimum 15-acre size policy is removed. Innovation Zone concept is removed as it is no longer needed with new policies.</p>

Subject	2008 General Plan	2016 General Plan
Transitional Employment Corridor (area located between Arizona Ave and the railroad, between Willis Road and Hunt Highway)	The current general plan designates this area as Employment, and refers to the Chandler Airpark and Southeast Chandler Area Plans for more specific land use designations. In short, the area has been planned primarily for Employment uses with options for some residential. Currently, the corridor is characterized primarily as residential with some commercial and employment.	This is a new policy in the draft, located in the text of the Employment land use description that formalizes the flexibility needed for Council to determine the most compatible land uses in the future. Appropriate land uses will consider conditions such as adjacent land use, parcel size, and transitioning techniques.
Densities 18+ du/acre	18 dwelling units per acre has been the maximum residential density allowed, except higher densities are allowed in downtown, along high capacity transit corridors and in regional commercial areas	As recommended by the Mayor's 4-corner retail report, the areas where higher densities (18+ du/acre) can be considered is expanded to the infill incentive district (bounded by Pecos Road on the south, Price Road on the west and the city's limits on the north and east). The greater densities would be eligible as an incentive to redevelop older underutilized commercial corners. Redevelopment projects would need to transition to adjacent land uses.



February 26, 2016

Members of the Chandler Planning and Zoning Commission

The Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities (AALC) is writing to express our support for the *Chandler General Plan 2016: A Vision Refined*. The AALC represents a broad range of planning, public health, transportation, and government professionals throughout Arizona with a focus on encouraging communities to incorporate health into public policy. During the past few years, the AALC has reviewed numerous general plans (cities and towns) and comprehensive plans (counties). The AALC has provided feedback and suggestions for incorporating healthy community goals and policies into those plans.

The Chandler General Plan serves as the foundation for promoting a livable, healthy community for Chandler residents. The AALC applauds the emphasis placed on creating a healthy community and the value placed on livability in the Chandler General Plan. We're encouraged by the inclusion of the "Healthy Chandler" section in the Plan and the recognition of the role the physical environment plays in providing a healthy lifestyle for all residents.

The Plan responds to the build-out of Chandler by focusing on placemaking and emphasizing the preservation and enhancement of existing neighborhoods; recognizing the need to provide diverse and affordable housing; and maintaining the long-term vision for strengthening the key role of Chandler as a major employment center. These critical areas of focus are supported by an emphasis on increased transportation options through the development of "an environmentally friendly, multi-modal transportation system" and the introduction of "complete streets" design concepts.

The AALC extends our compliments to city staff and the consultant team who have done an excellent job incorporating the community vision that will help create a more livable, healthy Chandler. We want to specifically thank city staff and the consultant for their commitment of time spent reviewing the large number of comments submitted by the AALC and the respect extended to the AALC in the responses provided to those comments.

The Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities urges the Commission to respond favorably to the community vision set forth in the *Chandler General Plan 2016: A Vision Refined* and forward a recommendation for adoption to the City Council.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Dean Brennan".

Dean Brennan, FAICP
Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities Advocacy Committee Coordinator
429 W. McNair Street
Chandler



GENERAL PLAN UPDATE *a vision refined*

60-Day Review CAC Comments

Updated: 2/19/2016

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
2/10/2016		Staff	2	Fix green box; under Phase 4 – update from three to four	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
2/10/2016		Staff	3	Under Reader's Guide, 3 rd line delete comma after general plan and add comma after policies, specific area plans, or ordinances...	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
2/10/2016		Staff	4	Tips chart – change "As a policy document, the general plan..."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	5	Page 5 – Community Foundation in section titled Strong Foundation – ambiguous term, what do we mean by it? Also, "community infrastructure" – is this referring to buildings, streets, utilities? Is it more focused programs?	GP modified by adding "(land use and development, Housing & Neighborhoods, Design & Aesthetics, and Growth Areas)" under Strategic Community Building; under Focused Stewardship, add "(Conservation & Environmental Planning, Air Quality, Noise & Lighting, Flood Control, Energy and Water)"; under Strong Community Foundation add "(Public Services & Facilities, Public Safety, Cultural Resources, Schools and Financial Institutions)".	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	6	2 nd paragraph – rework sentence – The Zoning Map is distinct from the city's Future Land Use Map in the level of specificity. The Land Use Map provides a general depiction of future land uses and the Zoning Map is a parcel-specific identification of approved development rights.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	13	1995...discourage "cookie-cutter" homes (remove extra quotation-mark)	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	15	Page 15, first paragraph under Community Placemaking, last sentence suggest modifying - "...shopping centers sit vacant and suitable for redevelopment or adaptive reuse; overbuilt retail centers with excess space that is vacant; or undeveloped parcels waiting for development.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	15	Page 15, second paragraph under Community Placemaking – modify third line - "...collectively creates spaces, both publically and privately-owned, where people	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	17	Page 17 – What about home based businesses or the prospect of home conversion (e.g. Roosevelt Row) to become residential business, community art space, or other abandoned home conversion?	GP modified by inserting the following paragraph after the 1st paragraph: Residential conversions, that is, the conversion of single family homes to commercial or office uses may be considered subject to compliance with the Residential Conversion Policy. Homes fronting a major street are eligible for such conversions and should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood as provided in the Residential Conversion Policy. Conversions may be considered for homes that do not front a major street when they are located within the Adaptive Reuse Overlay District (see Conservation, Rehabilitation and Redevelopment section).	Elaboration / Clarification
1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	17	Page 17 – The term "pad users" is used, but is not all uppercase, and there is no acronym defined in the glossary, it is later used on page 19, the acronym is expanded and it is all uppercase, is this the same term? If so, it should be all uppercase and the acronym expansion should be on page 17 instead of 19 (in the Mid-rise development policy bullet 1)	GP modified by changing the last sentence to read "Freestanding pad users located..." to delineate the difference between pad and PAD	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	17	Page 17 – Public facilities, offices and institutional uses – suggested elaborating to include special attention to pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure. Provided examples	GP modified by deleting the word "traffic" from the last sentence	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	18	Page 18 – Infrastructure/Mobility – change to read - "...pedestrian and bicycle amenities..."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	18	Page 18 – Infrastructure/Mobility - Suggest adding text about limited parking standards.	Discussed with commenter- suggestion is regulatory in nature and not appropriate in general plan text.	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	18	Page 18, Under Employment: reword last 2 sentences in 1 st paragraph: Major employers, knowledge-based industries, and industrial/business parks are allowed within Employment. A compatible mix of industrial support uses and residential..."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type	
15	2/10/2016	Staff	18	Page 18, reword 2 nd to last line: "This area is unique in the Employment designation because it is characterized by a mix of..."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
16	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	19	Page 19 – Suggested adding text about "Guidance on Safe Routes to Parks"	Discussed with commenter. This is adequately addressed on page 48 under section on Pedestrians and Bicycles. Added text in second sentence – A comprehensive and safe parks system.	Elaboration / Clarification
17	2/10/2016	Staff	23	Under Neighborhoods and Housing – 1 st paragraph – delete sentence "People define..."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
18	1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	23	Page 23: Sources of Aggregate: Can this be clarified. What type of "aggregate" is this referring to rock quarries? In "Neighborhood and Housing" does the term "diverse housing stock" refer to pricing or does it refer to style, look and feel? In the final paragraph "one child less than 6 years" is an odd statistic, is it more regional than age/child? E.g. are there particular parts of Chandler that are less affluent than others and this is more reflective of the lower income levels than the actual age (child less than 6 years old or adult greater than 62 years old).	GP modified by adding the following sentence after the 1st sentence under "Sources of Aggregate": Aggregate refers to coarse particulate material used in construction, such as sand, gravel, and crushed rock (American Community Survey 2013...)	Elaboration / Clarification
19	1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	23	Page 23: In "Neighborhood and Housing" does the term "diverse housing stock" refer to pricing or does it refer to style, look and feel? In the final paragraph "one child less than 6 years" is an odd statistic, is it more regional than age/child? E.g. are there particular parts of Chandler that are less affluent than others and this is more reflective of the lower income levels than the actual age (child less than 6 years old or adult greater than 62 years old).	GP Modified by adding reference to source: According to the American Community Survey 2013...)	Elaboration / Clarification
20	02/10/16	Staff	24	Change 2 nd paragraph 3 rd line – (rent or mortgage plus utilities)	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
21	1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	24	Page 24, final paragraph – "Low income and minority households." – Do low income and minority go hand in hand? If no, can we just say "low-income"?	GP modified by clarifying source for comment, "According to the 2015-2016 Annual Action Plan submitted to HUD..."	Elaboration / Clarification
22	1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	25	Page 25, first paragraph – "without homeowners' associations in low and moderate income neighborhoods" Correction, the neighborhood academy is available to all Chandler residents in both traditional and HOA neighborhoods, regardless of income level.	GP modified by replacing text with the following: "The city offers two neighborhood academies; an HOA academy for residents who want to learn about the laws that govern HOAs, and a Traditional Neighborhood Academy for non-HOA residents who want to improve the quality of life in their neighborhood and create neighborhood identity. The academies work to create..."	Elaboration / Clarification
23	2/10/2016	Staff	26	1.1.2.e - ...continuing to implement programs...	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
24	1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	26	Page 26: In item H, can we also mention bicycle pathways and lanes? Housing and neighborhoods item C – also mention parks and recreation; in addition can we also add grocery stores? This speaks to the food island issue that many lower income neighborhoods have.	GP modified as suggested (per Dean Brennan's comments)	Elaboration / Clarification
25	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Suggested modifying 1.1.1.a - ...support community building and a healthy lifestyle while ensuring...	Discussed with commenter. This section focuses on defining land uses and development. Similar text/policies are in the Healthy Chandler chapter.	Elaboration / Clarification
26	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Suggest new policy for mixed-use development.	Discussed with commenter. Not needed because GP provides guidance for mixed-use locations (1st paragraph, page 17). The City has adequate implementation tools to support mixed-use development.	New Policy
27	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.c to read – Improve pedestrian and bicycle accessibility to and within Growth Areas.	Discussed with commenter. The suggestion limits the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
28	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.d to read - ...development goals and provide connectivity with housing and commercial areas nearby to reduce vehicle trips and encourage employees to be active.	Discussed with commenter. Suggestion changes the intent of the policy. Similar policies are in the Connecting People section.	Elaboration / Clarification
29	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.e – change word – ensured to assured	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
30	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.f – to read – ...infill projects that are designed so as to provide opportunities for residents to lead a healthy lifestyle.	Discussed with commenter: Change would modify policy intent. Already addressed in the Healthy Chandler section.	Elaboration / Clarification
31	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.h – to read – Emphasize pedestrian and bicycle connectivity to transit facilities.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
32	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.1.i – to read – ...transit stop locations to encourage pedestrian and bicycle trips as an alternative to use a vehicle.	GP modified with a bit of change from what was suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
33	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2.a – to read – ...a safe, affordable housing...	Discussed with commenter: Suggestion limits the intent of policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
34	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Add new policy – Promote the integration of affordable housing in new infill development.	Discussed with commenter: Policy already addressed on a broader scale.	New Policy
35	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2.c – to read – ... health clinics, recreation spaces, and healthy food establishments).	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
36	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2.d – to read – ...other special-needs populations.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
37	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2.h – to read – ...investment in the process of providing for affordable housing.	GP modified – Continue to encourage...	Elaboration / Clarification
38	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2i to read - ... neighborhood and mobile home community maintenance policies and codes.	Discussed with commenter:	Elaboration / Clarification
39	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	26	Page 26 – Suggest a new policy – Encourage more tobacco-free public and private housing to reduce exposure to second hand smoke, maintenance costs, and risk of fires.	Discussed with commenter: Policy too regulatory for a general plan.	New Policy
40	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 26 – Modify 1.1.2.j – to read - ...quality neighborhoods through establishments of a rental housing inspection program.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
41	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.l – to read - ...land uses through the development of land use transition guidelines.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
42	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.m – to read - ...improve transition, including pedestrian and bicyclist connectivity, between...	Discussed with commenter: Doesn't make sense here.	Elaboration / Clarification
43	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Suggest combining Policies 1.1.2.l and n	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
44	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.o – to read – Maintain, and where needed, improve infrastructure as neighborhoods age.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
45	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.p – to add 2 nd sentence – Initiate a pro-active approach to code enforcement.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
46	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.q – to read – civic engagement and a healthy lifestyle.	Discussed with commenter: Doesn't make sense to add here. Already addressed in Healthy Chandler section.	Elaboration / Clarification
47	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.r – to add 2 nd sentence – When appropriate, prepare new neighborhood plans to guide preservation and community enhancement.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
48	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.2.s – to read – Foster organization of and development of homeowners; association (HOA) and support the organization of traditional non-HOA neighborhoods.	GP modified differently than suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
49	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Proposed Policy – Invest in local-serving facilities to support revitalization of neighborhoods and improve the quality of life for residents.	Discussed with commenter: Not certain what is meant by local-serving?	New Policy
50	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Proposed Policy – Establish a community-wide walkability standard of 1/4 mile for access to neighborhood services, transit, and recreational facilities.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	New Policy
51	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.3.a – to read – ...gateway development, interactive recreational facilities, and ...	Discussed with commenter: Not certain what is meant by interactive recreational facilities?	Elaboration / Clarification
52	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – question – Form-based code?	Discussed with commenter: Not the intent of policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
53	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – modify 1.1.3.c – to read – ...cultural amenities by encouraging public art as a component of major private developments.	Discussed with commenter: Too limiting.	Elaboration / Clarification
54	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.3.d – to add – ...enrichment and diversity ...	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
55	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 – Modify 1.1.3.e – to read – ...visual arts facilities and expand the program to include all city capital projects.	Discussed with commenter: Against current city policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
56	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	27	Page 27 Modify 1.1.3f – to read - ...site design with an emphasis on recognition as a leader in creating a healthy community.	Discussed with commenter: Doesn't belong here.	Elaboration / Clarification

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type	
57	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	28	Page 28 – 1 st paragraph – add sentence to 5 th line after “residential” – Where appropriate, new development is encouraged to occur in mixed-use projects.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
58	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	28	Page 28 – Modify text – under Downtown Chandler – delete “The” Downtown “area” from the first line.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
59	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	28	Page 28 – Modify text – under Downtown Chandler – line starting Downtown with higher densities. ADD - and transit-oriented development that contribute to a healthy lifestyle.	Discussed with commenter: See page 68 1.6.f	Elaboration / Clarification
60	1/21/2016	Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	32	Add more discussion about the importance of creating a walkable environment along North Arizona Avenue.	Discussed at public meeting	Elaboration / Clarification
61	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	32	Page 32 – Under North Arizona Avenue – add text to end of first paragraph – ...redevelopment and development of currently vacant parcels.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
62	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	32	Page 32 – Under North Arizona Avenue – second paragraph add “enhancement” after “... the maintenance, enhancement, and preservation.” in the third line.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
63	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	32	Page 32 – Under North Arizona Avenue – modify third paragraph – delete – “As part of this effort” and restate – The city will develop...	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
64	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	32	Page 32 – Under North Arizona Avenue – modify third paragraph by adding sentence to the end – ...enhancements that will provide a comfortable physical environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Discussed with commenter: Too limiting.	Elaboration / Clarification
65	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	32	Page 32 – Under Chandler Airpark – add – Identify limited locations for mixed-use projects that incorporate high density residential in Chandler Airpark, South Price Road, Medical/Regional Retail, Loop 202/I-10 to provide opportunities for employees to live close to their job to encourage walking and bicycling.	Discussed with commenter: It seemed an odd placement under Chandler Airpark for this text.	Elaboration / Clarification
66	2/10/2016		Staff	34	Spacing issues	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
67	1/6/2016	Email	Michael Pollack, MAP International Management, Inc.	34	Page 34, Paragraph 1.2.2, which reads: “g. Redesign North Arizona Avenue to encourage high-capacity transit, incorporate bike lanes, and provide wide, shaded sidewalks.” The General Plan contemplates continued study of high-capacity transit. For example, Paragraph 1.4.2.a on page 54 recites a policy to “Continue to study high-capacity transit corridor development.” The following change would make Paragraph 1.2.2 more consistent with these policies: “g. Continue to study high-capacity transit, incorporation of bike lanes, and wide, shaded sidewalks for Arizona Avenue.”	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
68	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2a – to read – ...with employment, retail, and high density housing and require mixed-use development at appropriate locations.	Discussed with commenter: The intent of an area plan is to tie down specific densities and locations.	Elaboration / Clarification
69	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.b – to read – Require developments be designed with pedestrian and bicycle-oriented elements.	GP modified by adding “bicycle-oriented” but kept “Promote” instead of Require.	Elaboration / Clarification
70	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.c – to read – ...as a multi-modal, mixed-use employment corridor.	Discussed with commenter: Suggested change already addressed elsewhere.	Elaboration / Clarification
71	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.d – delete “innovative” and add - ...intensity and building height adjacent to adjacent residential.	GP modified by deleting “innovative”. No other change made.	Elaboration / Clarification
72	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.e – to add 2 nd sentence – Consider expanding program to focus to encourage the interim use of vacant land for the growing of food.	Discussed with commenter: Not needed. This can be done today without the suggested addition.	Elaboration / Clarification
73	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.f – to read – ...access to healthy food, including providing options for the growing of food, and small household items.	Discussed with commenter: Changes intent of policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
74	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	34	Page 34 – Modify 1.2.2.g – to read – ...shaded sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities.	GP modified to read – Continue to study high-capacity transit, incorporation of bike lanes, and wide, shaded sidewalks for Arizona Avenue as suggested by Pollack.	Elaboration / Clarification
75	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	35	Page 35 – Modify 1.2.2.h – to add - ... art, landscaping, and enhanced walkability and bikeability.	Discussed with commenter: Not the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
76	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	35	Page 35 – Modify 1.2.2.i – to add - ...density housing to locate in this high capacity transit corridor.	Discussed with commenter: Not the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
77	1/21/2016 Letter & 1/21/16 Public Meeting	Dean Brennan	35	Page 35 – Add Policy – Prepare a North Arizona Avenue Area Plan to serve as a guide for future development and redevelopment.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy.	New Policy
78	2/10/2016	Staff	37	Page 37, 1 st line under Adaptive Reuse: change "program" to "overlay district"	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
79	2/10/2016	Staff	38	South Arizona Avenue Entry Corridor Study – 3 rd line change - ...mixed-use development to promote live-work-entertainment lifestyle.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
80	2/10/2016	Staff	39	Page 39, 1 st bullet point under Major study recommendations: period after South Arizona Avenue. And delete "and on selected sites in the immediate neighborhood."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
81	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.a – to read – ...Infill Incentive District, and other appropriately designated redevelopment sites, when the site...	Discussed with commenter: Suggestion changes the policy's intent.	Elaboration / Clarification
82	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – 1.3.d – Isn't this addressed in Policies b and c?	Discussed with commenter: Adaptive reuse can occur outside the infill incentive district.	Elaboration / Clarification
83	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.e – to read – Target diversified, including mixed uses, ...	Discussed with commenter: Doesn't make sense, please clarify intent.	Elaboration / Clarification
84	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Question – can a map of historical designated sites in Chandler be included in the GP?	Discussed with commenter: The Commercial Historic Area is identified in the downtown map, page 31.	Elaboration / Clarification
85	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.h – to read – ...to preserve, maintain, enhance, and improve properties.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
86	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.i to add – ...identity, including the agricultural heritage of Chandler.	Discussed with commenter: Have not received wide support for preserving agricultural heritage. If there is support for this in the future, this policy would still support such initiatives.	Elaboration / Clarification
87	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.k – to read – ...city facilities, including pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, ...	Discussed with commenter: The city follows ADA requirements.	Elaboration / Clarification
88	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	41	Page 41 – Modify 1.3.l – to reach – ...development adjacent to, or in proximity to, high-capacity transit corridors.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
89	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	41	Page 41 – Item E "diversified redevelopment" – What is meant by this term.	GP modified as follows: 1.3.e Redevelop vacant, underutilized commercial/retail properties into different uses that reduce commercial saturation, support other existing commercial properties, and helps revitalize the area.	Elaboration / Clarification
90	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	41	Page 41 – Item f "historical architectural gems" – Can we add a map with the Chandler historical areas?	GP Modified: Policy 1.3.e revised "...architectural "gems", such as those located in the Commercial Historic District (see Downtown Districts and Public Buildings map), and integrate..."	Elaboration / Clarification
91	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	41	Page 41 – Item L – "Transit-oriented development" is defined on page 47, perhaps we should move that definition here since this is the first occurrence of this term.	Discussed with commenter: Transit oriented development is introduced on page 20.	Elaboration / Clarification
92	1/19/16 Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	41	Page 41 – Might consider a policy that states that as areas redevelop the city evaluate the need for public services and recreational facilities.	GP modified Policy 3.1.j on page 85	Elaboration / Clarification
93	2/10/2016	Staff	42	Add to text something about Title VI – consistent with Policy 1.4.2.i	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
94	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	42	Page 42 – Suggest new policy – Require new development, and where appropriate, existing development to satisfy local complete streets design standards.	Discussed with commenter: Page 54 – Policy 1.4.1.f – Chandler's standards results in complete streets.	New Policy
95	2/10/2016	Staff	45	Add source to Table 1	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
96	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	46	Page 46, paragraphs 1-2 – "Retrofitting existing roadways in older parts of Chandler where roadway width is insufficient will be difficult" – Main roads (such as McClintock) that do not have bike lanes should be identified and a plan developed – can there be mention made of the roads that do have plans to expand/include lanes? The traffic calming measures should be pulled into a table similar to that in Table 1.	Discussed with commenter: Transportation Master Plan, which provides more specific policy address these issues.	Elaboration / Clarification
97	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	46	Page 46, The traffic calming measures should be pulled into a table similar to that in Table 1.	GP modified by adding an informational box on the margin of the page that identifies different types of traffic calming measures.	Elaboration / Clarification
98	2/10/2016	Staff	47	Add source to Table 2: Check LRT = 600 passengers	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
99	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	47	Page 47, final 2 paragraphs – Rural Road is an odd street for transit given that it dead ends @Rural & Chandler Blvd. and becomes Scottsdale Rd. The Transit Oriented development paragraph (final paragraph) should be moved to the appendix and defined or located on page 41 with the defining term.	Discussed with commenter: High Capacity Transit Corridors were studied and designated in 2003 (study identified on page 48). Rural Road provides an important regional connection to the north (Tempe).	Elaboration / Clarification
100	2/10/2016	Staff	48	Add "railroad" in 3 rd to last line of paragraph after Union Pacific.	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
101	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	48	Page 48, 2 nd to last paragraph – "Development Projects" include language specifying the type of additions that are made for pedestrians and bikes, e.g. racks, access pathways instead of full walls along major streets, etc.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
102	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	50	Page 50 – Table 3 formatting is cut off in printing.	Discussed with commenter: May be a printing/formatting issue.	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
103	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	53	Page 53, paragraph 1 – "supports tourism" does it really support tourism? Do commercial flights come in through Chandler municipal airport or is this an aspirational statement? The graphic is not very helpful/impactful, it would be nice to include the type and frequency of annual operations.	GP modified by deleting "and supports tourism", and elaborating more on airport operations (type of flights, etc.)	Elaboration / Clarification
104	2/10/2016	Staff	54	1.4.1.c – add 's' to freeway	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
105	1/19/16 Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	54	Page 54, Policy F – Shade and seating should also be along collector streets that connect to transit stops. Additionally along canals and trails.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
106	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	54	Page 54 – Modify 1.4.2f – add – lighting	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
107	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	54	Page 54 – Add Policy – Require transit oriented development (TOD) to satisfy minimum density and intensity development standards to support the local transit system.	Discussed with commenter: More specific policies such as those suggested will be determined during area plan preparation.	New Policy
108	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – change title to Pedestrians and Bicyclists	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
109	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Working with the Chandler Unified School District, Gilbert Unified School District, Mesa Unified School District, Kyrene Elementary School District, and Tempe Union High School District, develop safe walking routes and disseminate walking maps through neighborhoods to all schools.	Discussed with commenter: Already addressed in Policy 1.4.3.h	New Policy
110	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Include tree and shade canopy as critical infrastructure along pedestrian and multi-use paths.	Discussed with commenter: Already addressed in Policy 1.6.1e page 68	New Policy
111	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Encourage use of signage, maps and other wayfinding methods for pedestrians and bicyclists.	GP modified as suggested	New Policy
112	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Incorporate the use of multi-modal level of service measures in transportation.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy	New Policy
113	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Prioritize street sweeping along bike paths and bike routes within street maintenance operations.	Discussed with commenter: Too programmatic for general plan policy	New Policy
114	1/21/2016 Letter	Dean Brennan	55	Page 55 – Add the following new policy – Encourage appropriate location of key community destinations to increase connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists.	Discussed with commenter: See page 26 1.1.2.c and page 68 1.6.h	New Policy

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
115	2/10/2016	Staff	56	Figure 11 – Add Chandler to key, also check on footnote	GP modified as suggested.	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
116	2/10/2016	Staff	59	Check Figure 15 – what are these numbers? Percentages? Clarify	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
117	1/25/2016	Email	59	Page 59 – The graphic only compares Phoenix, which is odd, because figure 58 compares all of the other East Valley cities. I get that it is sparse constraints, but if we are going to make comparisons, we should be consistent.	Discussed with commenter. Will check on this.	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
118	1/25/2016	Email	62	Page 62, paragraph 4 – Why no mention of the other School Districts, e.g. Kyrene, Mesa? Kyrene is an A-rated district.	GP modified by adding reference to Kyrene School District and clarifying CUSD largest in (enrollment?, geographic area?)	Elaboration / Clarification
119	1/25/2016	Email	63	Page 63, Item 1 – Consider listing high speed fiber/etc. and network as infrastructure here as it is no longer a luxury, it is a necessity on the order of all utilities listed.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
120	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Modify 1.5.a – comment – Focus on the concept of Healthy Chandler as a key component of the recruiting process.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic for general plan policy. Added text on page 64 – replaced sentence starting “The Mayor’s healthy . . .” with the following “Chandler’s focus on healthy living is attractive to businesses looking to relocate. A city’s quality of life for their employees is important as well as the company’s ability to attract skilled employees.” A community health focus.	Elaboration / Clarification
121	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Add “vacant” to policy 1.5.b	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
122	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Add sentence to 1.5.f – Provide connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists to provide visitors with options for beings.	Discussed with commenter. Not needed because we are improving connectivity for everyone.	Elaboration / Clarification
123	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Add sentence to 1.5.h – Identify potential interim uses for vacant parcels such as market and community gardens.	Discussed with commenter.	Elaboration / Clarification
124	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Modify 1.5.i – to read - . . . water and multimodal transportation system) . . .	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
125	1/21/2016	Letter	63	Page 63 – Modify 1.5.m – add sentence – Consider the opportunities for farmers markets can serve as small business incubators.	Discussed with commenter. Added text under Access to Healthy Food on page 64 as last sentence – Farmers markets can also serve as small business incubators supporting new entrepreneurs with customer exposure for their products.	Elaboration / Clarification
126	1/21/2016	Letter	64	Page 64 – Healthy Chandler – include a sentence highlighting the trails system as well as the pedestrian systems that exist as a result of the extensive sidewalk infrastructure system in Chandler. Include a policy that expresses the potential for preparing Health Impact Assessments.	GP modified but did not include a specific policy. Added sentence end of 1 st paragraph – The city will strive to monitor and measure the healthy impacts of policies, plans, programs, and projects.	Elaboration / Clarification
127	1/25/2016	Email	64	Page 64, paragraph 3 – “Full-service grocery store” language is very much a recommendation, this should be strongly worded to imply that policy should be built around this, as is the case with parks in a square mile, etc.	GP amended by adding the following text to policy 1.6.a, page 68, “. . . food supply and nutrition within close proximity to residential neighborhoods”.	Elaboration / Clarification
128	2/10/2016	Staff	65	Blue box text is cut off – fix	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
129	1/25/2016	Email	65	Page 65, paragraph 1 – Why isn’t the environmental center mentioned, is it not part of Parks and Rec? (Veterans Oasis Park is mentioned on page 70).	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
130	1/25/2016	Email	65	Page 65, add text about the regional and community parks (tumbleweed park, veteran’s oasis park, desert breeze, Snedigar sports complex, Espee park and the range of amenities that they provide – urban lakes, splash pads, ball fields, ramadas, etc.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
131	1/19/16	Public Meeting	68	Healthy Chandler – Consider language regarding shade along canals and ensure connectivity of destinations along trails and/or canals.	GP modified, Policy 1.6.e on page 68	Elaboration / Clarification
132	1/21/2016	Letter	68	Healthy Chandler Policies – page 68 – Propose grouping policies	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Proposed goal – Maximize the benefits to community health in all recreation offerings.	Discussed with commenter.	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Modify 1.6.a – to read – Provide access to healthy food and support nutrition programs and projects that encourage healthy eating.	GP modified: Policy 1.6.a (keeping revisions in response to Eshe's comment) "Encourage access to healthy food within close proximity to residential neighborhoods and support nutrition programs and projects that encourage healthy eating."	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Modify 1.6.b – add - ...gardens particularly for underserved neighborhoods.	Discussed with commenter. Intent is to keep the policy broad.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Modify 1.6.c – add - ...consumption and investigate the potential for establishing a food hub.	Discussed with commenter. Intent is to keep the policy broad.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Proposed Policy – Encourage the development of urban agriculture through policies and programs that focus on local food sourcing. Work with local companies and hotels to purchase locally produce, fresh, chemical free, produce.	Discussed with commenter: We have not received wide support to preserve urban agricultural operations.	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Proposed Policy – Establish a communitywide walkability standard of ¼ mile for access to healthy food.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic for the GP.	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Proposed Policy – Prepare a healthy lifestyle plan and establish a healthy food advisory committee.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic for the GP.	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.e – to read – Add shade, mile markers, wayfinding, health tips and other amenities...	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.f – to read – Encourage pedestrian and bicyclist-oriented...	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Add sentence to 1.6.g to read – Explore opportunities to convert parks to smoke-free or to develop designated smoking areas.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic for the GP.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.h to read – Enhance and expand the existing system of linked...	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.i to read – Maximize and promote the...	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.j by adding to the end of sentence – and identify opportunities to establish smaller neighborhood parks.	Discussed with commenter. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan handles these issues.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Replace 1.6.k with the following: When renovating or redeveloping parks and recreation facilities consider: - Amenities that support healthy activity and social interaction in older populations. - Facilities that minimize playground accidents. - Creating new and enhancing existing safe non-motorized connections between parks, schools, other destinations and neighborhoods to promote walking and biking.	Discussed with commenter. Too specific for the general plan.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 - Modify 1.6.l – Comment: These are all passive and do not promote walking, which in the case of seniors, is probably the best exercise. They also don't promote social activity, which is also important to seniors. Frankly, these also don't meet the needs of teens. Why call these types of amenities out?	Discussed with commenter. These suggestions came directly from the public input received during the process. Modified text to read – Expand recreation facilities and health and wellness programs (both active and passive) and local unique offerings that address amenity gaps and changing demographics.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.m – to read - ... services and facilities and space for other neighborhood activities.	GP modified to read ... services, facilities, and other neighborhood activities.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.n – to read – Pursue partnerships/collaborations with ...	GP modified as suggested.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – Modify 1.6.o – to add to end of sentence – ... including information on nutrition and healthy eating.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic for the GP.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – New Policy – Encourage the integration of specific programs to educate people about health and leading healthy lifestyles into recreation programming.	Discussed with commenter. Addressed in Policy 1.6.l	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – New Policy – Integrate opportunities to promote health into the city's parks and recreation master plan.	Discussed with commenter. Too programmatic.	New Policy
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	68	Page 68 – New Policy – Inform people about the benefits of exercise with interpretive signing along canals, trails and paths.	Discussed with commenter. Modified 1.6.e addresses this issue.	New Policy

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
2/10/2016		Staff	71	Last paragraph – period after Maricopa County in the second line.	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
1/25/2016	Email	Eshe Pickett	72	Page 72 – Question – are residents in floodplain areas notified of the subsidies?	GP amended by rewording the second sentence to state that Chandler's participation in FEMA's rating system reduces flood insurance premiums	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	73	Suggest deleting 2.1.c – doesn't support this chapter.	GP modified as suggested. Similar policy already included on page 76 (2.2.d)	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	73	Page 73 – Modify 2.1.a – to add to end – ...specifically seniors and low income residents.	Discussed with commenter: Limits the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	73	Page 73 – Modify 2.1.b – Change "Support" to "Implement" and Change "efforts" to "regulations"	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	73	Page 73 – Modify 2.1.c by adding to end of sentence – ...including distributed solar power generation.	Discussed with commenter: Limits the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	73	Page 73 – Modify 2.1.d by adding to end of sentence – that support both physical and mental health.	Discussed with commenter: Limits the intent of the policy.	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	73	Add new Policy: "Encourage adequate buffering, shielding, or proper site planning to help mitigate noise and lighting disturbance to sensitive land uses."	GP modified as suggested	New Policy
2/10/2016		Staff	74	Last paragraph, add sentence about carbon footprint to align with the policy – ...efficient building design in order to reduce the carbon footprint. A carbon footprint is historically defined as "the total sets of greenhouse gas emissions caused by an organization, event, product, or individual." Public outreach.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
1/16/2016	Website	Steve Fanning	76	On page 76 of the draft general plan, item 2.2b states, "Identify corridors to co-locate new utilities, such as existing utility corridors, railways, canals, and transportation routes." While I generally agree with this statement and strongly agree with the need to define future growth utility corridors, I don't see any maps with the defined corridors in the draft general plan. So what purpose does this statement serve? Is it simply to say the city's policy is to identify corridors and that they will in some future city Council meeting? I'm glad we are moving forward on this topic, but I'd like to understand the exact routes or process to define them so that I may participate.	Responded via email with the following: "The GP does not define specific routes for utility corridors. Chandler's General Plan has always been very broad and not site specific, even when addressing future land use. Other processes separate from the General Plan, will determine specific utility corridor routes. One example of such a separate process is the current initiative by SRP to extend power lines. The intent of policy 2.2.b on page 76 of the draft General Plan (Identify corridors to co-locate new utilities, such as existing utility corridors, railways, canals and transportation routes) is to suggest existing corridors (railways, existing utility corridors, etc.) that may be more appropriate for utilities. In SRP's example, their process of identifying a specific utility route for the new power line would take this policy into consideration and through that process, identify a specific route."	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	78	Replace first paragraph, page 78 (this information is from the city's Drought Plan (4/20/15): "Chandler has a diversified water supply. Salt and Verde River water supplies come from the SRP, Roosevelt Water Conservation District and new conservation storage (NCS) constructed at Roosevelt Dam. Salt and Verde surface water is stored in reservoirs and delivered through a series of canals to the city's Pecos Surface Water Treatment Plant. SRP can also pump groundwater through a series of wells for distribution."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
2/10/2016		Staff	79	3 rd paragraph, 2 nd line delete "and" – ...and incorporate updated information	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type
166	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	84	General Note – Notably absent is a "disaster preparedness and response" section. I think it is important to address what happens in the event of a natural or manmade disaster in a single section. There are items sprinkled throughout, but I think it is worth considering consolidating those into a single area. Places that touch on this: Page 77 – Drought Management, Page 95 – Maintenance & Safety – This section is really important, but hardly provides any solid content and there is space to do so. Recommend expanding this to better outline the city's vision for safety and maintenance as, right now, this seems like an afterthought. Areas to think of including: combine police, first responders, map, pulling them out of where they are – map page 90	GP modified by elaborating on the Emergency Operations Plan, page 84: "Safety" section on Page 84.	Elaboration / Clarification
167	2/10/2016	Staff	85	3 rd line change – As the South Price.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
168	2/10/2016	Staff	85	Add to first paragraph, after 2 nd sentence page 85: ...will be required. Developments will need to incorporate safety design principles and continue to provide adequate access for emergency response personnel as the city grows taller and denser: South Price Road.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
169	1/19/2016 Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	86	Page 86, Policy J – Change to read – Ensure public services meet community needs at build-out or during redevelopment.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
170	2/10/2016	Staff	87	Fix orange box text cut off	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
171	2/10/2016	Staff	88	Under "Technology", 2nd paragraph, change last line - ...congested roadways and accidents.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
172	2/10/2016	Staff	90	Page 90, Public Buildings and Facilities Map – add to text in the legend "See Downtown Districts and Public Buildings Map (Growth Areas section)"	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
173	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	93	Public Schools Map is oddly located. It should move to after page 94.	GP modified as suggested.	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo
174	1/25/2016 Email	Eshe Pickett	94	Page 94, paragraph 5 – Consider expansion of programming, partnerships with Parks & Recreation.	GP modified as follows: Last sentence on page to be 1 st sentence of new paragraph – As populations and demographics shift, and the number of charter schools increases, school districts might need to transition the use of some facilities. The city should continue its partnership with school districts and evaluate the potential reuse of those facilities for the expansion of programs or services that might be needed for residents in the area.	Elaboration / Clarification
175	2/10/2016	Staff	94	Add sentence to 1 st paragraph under schools – "UofA offers classes in the Downtown Chandler Community Center."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
176	1/19/16 Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	96	Page 96 – Consider including a policy about the Community College being an economic engine and provides important workforce training. Consider adding the Community College to the schools map.	GP modified - Policy 1.5.1 on page 63. Community College is already included on schools map	Elaboration / Clarification
177	2/10/2016	Staff	97	Page 97, 1 st line of 2 nd to last paragraph, change to "Chandler's system development fees and financial needs."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
178	2/10/2016	Staff	98	Page 98, 3.3.b, change impact fees to "system development fees"	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
179	2/10/2016	Staff	101	Page 101, reword the definition of Adaptive Reuse to the following: The process of reusing underutilized buildings for a purpose other than which it was originally built for. The Adaptive Reuse Overlay District is a zoning district that facilitates the reuse of underutilized properties by modifying site development standards that otherwise make the reuse of those properties economically unfeasible.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
180	2/10/2016	Staff	101	Page 101, Amendment, Major – reword to: Any proposal that would result in a substantial alteration of the land uses and/or policies of this general plan, and complies with the criteria identified in the Amendments section of this general plan.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
181	2/10/2016	Staff	101	Page 101, delete definition of American Association of State Highway and Transportation officials	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
182	2/10/2016	Staff	102	Page 102, delete 2 nd paragraph under Commercial Office	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
183	2/10/2016	Staff	102	Page 102, reword definition of Chandler Municipal Planning Area to: Municipal Planning Area – Expanded territory, beyond the current municipal boundaries, which encompasses unincorporated parcels, which in the future may or may not be incorporated into the city, and for which the ultimate boundary is established by intergovernmental agreements with adjacent municipalities.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification
184	2/10/2016	Staff	102	Page 102, delete definitions for Community Development Block Grant, County Island, and Community Emergency Response Team.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type	
185	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 102, reword Capital Improvement Plan as follows: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) This document serves as a multi-year planning instrument to identify needs and financing sources for public infrastructure improvements. It also informs City residents of how the City plans to address significant capital needs over the next ten years.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
186	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 103, delete definitions for Creative District, Development Entitlements, and Healthcare Related Uses	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
187	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 103, reword title of Development Fees to: System Development Fees	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
188	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 103, reword definition of Elements to: The principal components, or topical subjects required by state statutes to be addressed in the general plan.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
189	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 103, reword definition of Growth Area to: An area that is particularly suitable for planned multimodal transportation and infrastructure expansion, and improvements designed to support a planned concentration of a variety of uses, such as residential, office, commercial, tourism and industrial.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
190	2/10/2016	Staff	103	Page 105, reword definition of General Plan to: A comprehensive set of broad policies that guides development, and an expression of the community's vision and aspiration. State law requires the general plan to be updated or readopted at least once every 10 years, and must be ratified by voters after Council adoption. The number of elements required to be addressed varies according to the population size. Chandler's general plan is required by state law to address 17 elements ranging in subject (e.g., land use, water resources, safety, public buildings and facilities).	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
191	2/10/2016	Staff	104	Page 104, delete definitions of Innovation-Based Companies, and Innovation Zones.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
192	2/10/2016	Staff	105	Page 105, reword definition of Land Use to: Designations for how properties are to be used. The general plan designates broad land use categories (see Future Land Use Plan) that allow a variety of more specific land uses within each broad category. Area plans, such as those referenced in this general plan, identify planned locations for more specific land uses.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
193	2/10/2016	Staff	105	Page 105, reword definition of Large Office Development to: Large Office Developments are characterized by taller, more intense, multistory buildings, corporate offices, or multi-tenants.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
194	2/10/2016	Staff	105	Page 105, add the following sentence to the definition for Mid-Rise Development: "Such building heights must be reviewed and approved following the guidelines in the Mid-Rise Development Policy."	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
195	2/10/2016	Staff	105	Page 106, reword definition of Planned Area Development to: A tailored zoning designation that accommodates the flexibility needed for varying circumstances and is utilized to fulfill the policies and objectives of the general plan. Hence, one PAD zoning designation may vary considerably from another.	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
196	2/10/2016	Staff	106	Page 106, delete definitions of Residential Development Entitlements and Residential Enterprise Zone	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
197	2/10/2016	Staff	107	Page 107, delete definition of Vision Statement	GP modified as suggested	Elaboration / Clarification	
198	2/10/2016	Staff	Entire Plan	Throughout document need consistency with title: City of Chandler Transportation Master Plan Update 2010 - Pages 46 (2x), 48 (2x), 49, 50, 115. Could probably delete City of Chandler.	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo	
199	2/10/2016	Staff	Entire Plan	Throughout document need consistency with: Capital Improvement Program (CIP) - Pages 8, 9, 65, 75, 97, 98. CIP Definition on page 102	GP modified as suggested	Formatting, Grammar, or Typo	
200	1/14/2016	Website	Adam Smith	N/A	Greetings, I'm very concerned about the news of potential development in Chandler involving more apartment complexes. There are already several complexes with hundreds of units, yet additional proposals are actively being discussed? One is apparently on the SE corner of Chandler Heights and AZ Avenue. I understand there is another on McQueen and Germann. I cannot fathom why our city government would consider approving these developments. The number of units is staggering for such a small area of the city. I'm concerned about traffic, crime, and quality of life in our city. Please do not approve complexes that are billed to be "luxury" residences, when these development quickly deteriorate and bring a host of issues and problems. The developments on the NE corner of AZ Avenue and Queen Creek are monstrosities. We don't need more of the same.	PSA sent Thank You - Referred to David de la Torre. The GP addresses this issue by requiring transition and compatibility between new and existing developments (policies 1.1.2.k-n, pages 26-27).	General (Not Page Specific)
201	1/15/2016	Email	Moe Wakefield	N/A	See attached - Provided as a separate attachment because the comment size exceeds the maximum row height allowed in ms excel.	Discussed with commenter: Met with Moe to talk about how the GP is applied to rezoning cases such as the hypothetical example provided.	General (Not Page Specific)
202	2/8/2016	Email	Moe Wakefield	N/A	See attached - Provided as a separate attachment because the comment size exceeds the maximum row height allowed in ms excel.	Discussed with commenter: Prior to the 60-day review period, David discussed the issue with Moe and together crafted policy 1.1.2.k Protect the low-density residential character of large lot neighborhoods. (already in the GP, p. 26)	General (Not Page Specific)

All Comments
Sorted by Page Number

Date	Comment Submittal Method	Comment Received From	Page Number	Comments	Action Taken	Comment Type	
203	2/11/2016	Email	Moe Wakefield	N/A	See attached - Provided as a separate attachment because the comment size exceeds the maximum row height allowed in ms excel.	Discussed with commenter: Prior to the 60-day review period, David discussed the issue with Moe and together crafted policy 1.1.2.k Protect the low-density residential character of large lot neighborhoods. (already in the GP, p. 26)	General (Not Page Specific)
204	2/18/2016	Email	Moe Wakefield	N/A	See attached - Provided as a separate attachment because the comment size exceeds the maximum row height allowed in ms excel.	Discussed with commenter: Prior to the 60-day review period, David discussed the issue with Moe and together crafted policy 1.1.2.k Protect the low-density residential character of large lot neighborhoods. (already in the GP, p. 26)	General (Not Page Specific)
205	1/15/2016	Email	Stephen Mason	N/A	I was hoping to see more specific details regarding the neighborhood directions-specifically the rumor going around that the City will attempt to deed over the alley splits to the homeowners. And accompanying that would be taking away our trash collections in the alleys and reducing the container sizes. Any discussions/plans in that direction? I understand it has been suggested.	Responded via email. Policy "J" on page 41 of the draft that states that any future treatment of and/or elimination of alleys will be worked out together with neighborhoods and property owners. A specific treatment of alleys is not suggested in the GP.	General (Not Page Specific)
206	1/18/2016	Website	Gary Arriero	N/A	Hi! We have been south Chandler residents for over 5 years & absolutely love our town! As great as it is, though we do have two concerns/suggestions for the GP: 1) We would like to see more restaurants and shopping in south Chandler to accommodate all the housing (especially high density apartments) going up. These really seem to be in short supply & most existing restaurants already have wait times even during the week. The town we moved from had a "restaurant-row" & we feel the space on the NW corner of Gilbert and Queen Creek would be ideal for something like this. Our second concern is accessing the 202 westbound from Gilbert Rd northbound. It is almost impossible to drive from Queen Creek Rd to the 202 entrance ramp without getting stopped by each traffic light in that span of Gilbert Rd, including the 2 lights before and after the 202 bridge. With all the office spaces and other business opening near the airport this will only get worse. Thanks for hearing our concerns!	PSA sent Thank You Referred to David de la Torre. Downtown policies support more restaurants and shopping (p. 34). Policy 1.4.1.c states, "Provide a comprehensive street network that allows residents to get to the regional freeway efficiently". The City will continue to strive to make the streets transportation system as efficient as possible.	General (Not Page Specific)
207	1/19/2016	Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	N/A	The 60-Day Draft Review Plan is excellent. I have specific policy comments that I shared at the January 19 th Planning Forum, but will also submit my suggestions in writing. Well Done!	Discussed at public meeting.	General (Not Page Specific)
208	1/19/2016	Public Meeting	Meeting Attendee	N/A	Mentioned concerns at Public Meeting - Concerned about the intimidation for citizens to be able to make comment or influence the development process. Concerns: traffic, safety, policing, schools, affordability, maintenance, valuing more than the Price Road Corridor, air quality, water, doing the general plan now when we are doing a special census, vacancy creates problems, retail trends are changing, commercial north, and what is our "Plan B" when the next crash occurs again.	Discussed at public meeting.	General (Not Page Specific)
209	1/21/2016	Letter	Dean Brennan	N/A	Submitted letter dated January 21, 2016 on behalf of the Arizona Alliance for Livable Communities (AALC) and the Arizona Partnership for Health Communities (APHC)	Met with Dean to discuss comments on February 4, 2016	N/A
210	1/15/2016	Website	Heather McGinn	N/A	To whom it may concern: I would like to express my concern with the plan of adding more apartment complexes. I am concerned about taking up every last open field in Chandler and adding a multitude of complexes will add to overcrowding, increased traffic, possible issue with school capacity and increase in crime. We have a great community but the building has really exploded in the past year and think we need to take a step back.	PSA sent Thank You Referred to David de la Torre. The GP addresses this issue by requiring transition and compatibility between new and existing developments (policies 1.1.2 k-n, pages 26-27).	General (Not Page Specific)



Fwd: Public Meetings to Review the Draft General Plan
Moe Wakefield

to:

David.delaTorre, peggy

01/15/2016 04:40 PM

[Hide Details](#)

From: Moe Wakefield <savetheranchettes@gmail.com>

To: David.delaTorre@chandleraz.gov, peggy@psaplanning.com

History: This message has been replied to.

1 Attachment



pic20193.gif

Thank you David,

I see that cases before the City Council are already causing people to cite the provisions of the Draft General Plan (DGP) as if those provisions were already enacted, as well as the existing General Plan (GP). Based on what I observed at last night's Council meeting, the DGP already appears to be a factor considered by the Council in deciding current zoning cases under the GP.

What I need to know.

I have some questions about the scope of the existing GP and the DGP that I would like to have answered by the City and the DGP consultant(s) hired by the City. I have previously provided you and at least one consultant with copies of prior e-mails I sent to the City Council concerning the previous attempt to redevelop 3 to 4 of the ranchettes (large home sites) in my neighborhood in the SE corner of Alma School and Germann Roads between Alma School and Hartford Street to the east.

Like the prior e-mails I sent, I would like to have this e-mail and any response to it included in the DGP record and considered by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) as well as by the City Council.

Hypothetical rezoning/redevelopment case.

I am not seeking any legal opinion or interpretation of any GP and/or DGP provision. I only ask that the City and its consultant(s) in the GP update process cite for me the specific GP and DGP sections and page numbers that would govern any rezoning/redevelopment attempt under the following hypothetical example:

1. A Ranchette Neighborhood is developed (prior to City annexation) with 26 individual lots (about 2.5 acres each) zoned for single family homes on 1-acre lots and with agricultural (AG-1) zoning which permits farming activities, including the keeping of animals like horses, cows, sheep, etc. The neighborhood has SRP flood irrigation.
2. After annexation the City adopts an Area Plan (AP) which formally adopts the previously established 1-acre single family residential lots and AG-1 zoning for the Ranchette Neighborhood in question. Future developers are presumed to be competent enough to investigate and know what the AP allows before they buy any ranchette property.
3. Because the top tier of ranchettes would have ranchettes at or near the intersection of two streets that would later be widened and become major arterial streets, three different sets of land speculators buy up 7 ranchettes near that intersection for the purpose of redeveloping them as commercial property. All of the previously constructed (and inhabited) homes on 6 of the 7 ranchettes, together with fences, corrals, barns, sheds, swimming pool, etc. were removed and the land left empty and unoccupied. Only the home on the seventh ranchette still exists, and it is now used as rental property. The renter currently has 3 to 4 horses at this home.
4. Despite the pre-existing AP that the City clearly knows about, the City knowingly allows 2 of the ranchettes at the very corner of the intersection to be redeveloped as a commercial gas station, convenience market, and car

2/19/2016

wash. These are the only ranchettes that received any zoning change. The car wash makes an audible (industrial) sound that can easily be heard throughout most of the remaining Ranchette Neighborhood.

5. The commercial redevelopment of the two ranchettes prevents the remaining 5 speculator-owned ranchettes from being redeveloped commercially, because they have no access to both major arterial streets. The separate owners of 4 of these ranchettes, and then the owner of only 3 of them, apparently agreed to allow them to be rezoned as "affordable" homes for low-income families. The redeveloper essentially argued that the carwash noise destroyed the value of the land for any higher valued land use, and that only poor people would accept homes next to a noisy carwash without complaint because they had no option for any better quality homes.

6. The redeveloper's attorney then talks about the possibility of building only 16 homes in the \$500,000 range on three ranchettes, and the City orders the redeveloper to withdraw its application for 28 homes on those 3 lots and to file a new application. After 6 months no reapplication is filed, but someone claiming to be the agent of all 5 ranchette owners announces the intent to build a gated community with 28 homes in the \$500,000 to \$600,000 range on them.

Thank you,

Moe Wakefield

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <David.delaTorre@chandleraz.gov>

Date: Wed, Jan 13, 2016 at 2:48 PM

Subject: Public Meetings to Review the Draft General Plan

To:

Dear Chandler Resident or Stakeholder,

You are invited to participate in the upcoming public meetings listed below to learn about and comment on the draft General Plan. If you are unable to attend any of the meetings, you may submit comments or questions to david.delatorre@chandleraz.gov. You are receiving this message because of your previous interest in the update of Chandler's General Plan. Please notify david.delatorre@chandleraz.gov if you would like to be removed from the mailing list.

The draft General Plan and related information is available online at www.chandleraz.gov/GPupdate

January Public Meeting Dates:

Jan 19, 2016, 6:00 PM, Public Meeting #1: Environmental Education Center, Painted Desert Room, 4050 E. Chandler Heights Rd. Chandler, AZ 85249

Jan 21, 2016, 1:00 PM, N. Az Ave Meeting: Downtown Police Community Room, 250 E. Chicago St. Chandler AZ 85225

Jan 26, 2016, 1:00 PM, Public Meeting #2: Desert Breeze Police Community

Room, 251 N. Desert Breeze Blvd. Chandler AZ 85226

Jan 27, 2016, 6:00 PM, Public Meeting #3: Downtown Library, Copper Room
(2nd Floor), 22 S. Delaware St. Chandler AZ 85225

Public Hearing Dates:

The following public hearing dates have been scheduled for formal consideration and vote by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council as required by state law:

March 9, 2016, 6:00 PM, Planning Commission Public Hearing #1, Tumbleweed Recreation Center, Cotton Room North, 745 E. Germann Rd. Chandler AZ 85286

March 16, 2016, 5:30 PM, Planning Commission Public Hearing #2, Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago St. Chandler AZ 85225

April, 14, 2016, 7:00 PM, City Council, Council Chambers, 88 E. Chicago St. Chandler AZ 85225

August 30, 2016 - Primary election

David de la Torre, AICP, Principal Planner
Planning Division
City of Chandler
ph: (480) 782-3059
fax:(480) 782-3075

(Embedded image moved to file: pic20193.gif) Think Green ... Turn off
your computer when you leave.



PLEASE STOP ILLEGAL MEETING

mayor&council, Jay.Tibshraeny, Nora.Ellen,
Moe Wakefield to: Kevin.Hartke, Rick.Heumann, Rene.Lopez,
Terry.Roe, Jack.Sellers, Dave.Bigos

02/08/2016 09:23 AM

Cc: searl, Taylor Earl, Erik.Swanson, David.delaTorre, Marsha.Reed,
Kay.Bigelow, Scott.McCoy, Jeff.Kurtz, peggy, "Coppola, Christopher"

To the Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers of the City of Chandler:

1. PLEASE STOP THE ILLEGAL NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SET FOR TONIGHT IN CONFLICT WITH THE CITY COUNCIL'S MEETING, AS EXPLAINED BELOW IN PART I. This e-mail contains my response to the notice of Garrett-Walker Homes (GWH) to publicly present a rezoning/redevelopment proposal for 3 ranchettes (of about 6.7 acres) in the Ranchette Neighborhood near the southeast corner of Alma School Road and Germann Road in Chandler. GWH has scheduled another (the fifth) neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment meeting for 7:00 p.m. on Monday (tonight), 02/08/2016 at Hancock Elementary School at 2425 S. Pleasant Drive, in Chandler. GWH's meeting notice improperly identified previous application files (**APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029**) that were withdrawn by order of the Council on 07/09/2015 which required submission of new applications. City staff did not (or could not) tell me what the correct application numbers are.

Please include two prior e-mails in the latest Serenade rezoning/redevelopment record.

2. This e-mail incorporates by reference all of my objections to any ranchette rezoning/redevelopment, as specified in two prior e-mails to the Chandler City Council on November 13, 2015 (now designated **1-EM-11/13/15**) and on 12/07/2015 (now designated **2-EM-12/07/15**) that also commented on the **Chandler Cobblestone Auto Spa** upgrade project (no.**PDP15-0011**), as approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission ("Commission") on Wednesday 11/18/2015, and by the Chandler City Council on Thursday, 12/10/2015. Both the City and GWH's attorneys should have received my e-mails and thereby had actual notice of the Cobblestone carwash noise issue, but showed no interest in seeking any noise mitigation. This noise issue lies at the core of the Ranchette Neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment controversy that has been ongoing since 2013.

3. In **2-EM-12/07/15-Paragraph 3** I asked that both prior e-mails in question be added to the case record of any future rezoning/redevelopment attempt in the Ranchette Neighborhood. I again restate that request and reconfirm the notice in **2-EM-12/07/15-Paragraph 4** that I do not accuse or imply that anyone connected with any current or past rezoning attempt has committed any illegal or improper act worthy of severe criticism or any legal penalty. I believe that the specific facts that I present are accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. My focus is on the need to encourage the adoption of better procedural safeguards to protect and preserve Chandler neighborhoods (and their residents) against unreasonable rezoning/redevelopment pressures.

Please add this e-mail to the public comments record for the current update of the Chandler General Plan.

4. This e-mail, like the prior 1-EM-11/13/15 and 2-EM-12/07/15) e-mails, is also being sent to Chandler's coordinating City Planner, David de la Torre, and City consultant, Peggy Fiandaca (Partners for Strategic Action), as a public comment to the current upgrade of the City's general land use plan. I believe that the land redevelopment strategies (exemplified by this case) that would destroy a truly valuable, unique, and irreplaceable neighborhood established by the City in 1997 when it adopted the **Carino Estates Area Plan**, and provides clear notice of the need to adopt meaningful safeguards to preserve and protect City neighborhoods against aggressive redevelopment tactics. All prior developers/redevelopers buying ranchette lots (initially of about 2.25 acres each) only built homes in accordance with the one family home per acre zoning established by the Area Plan. GWH is the first to seek a very self-serving (i.e., profitable) redevelopment that will utterly destroy the Ranchette Neighborhood.

I.

PLEASE STOP THE IMPROPER NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, 02/08/2016!!!

5. I just cannot believe that the City would allow GWH to call another neighborhood meeting when GWH has clearly failed to obey the City's order of 07/09/2015 that required the withdrawal of **APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029** with submission of a new application and development plan, plus legal re-advertising. So where is the compliance? Please send me a copy of the published re-advertisement. Attachment A1 contains a staff recommendation dated 06/17/2015 upon which the Council's final order of 07/09/2015 was based. In pertinent part the staff recommendations stated:

Planning Staff recommends a withdrawal for the purpose of re-advertising. The development team has been working on design alternatives resulting in a plan that substantially reduces the number of lots from what was previously advertised. **An updated application and development plan will be submitted in the near future.**
[Emphasis Added]

6. So here we are six months later and apparently no new application has been filed and there is no development plan and no alternative house designs available. On 02/03/2016 City staff told me there are no new home designs submitted (I don't believe any new design work has even started) and that the only remedy would be to just allow GWH to hold another neighborhood meeting later. Without the new application with information ordered by the City's order of 07/09/2015, there is absolutely nothing new for anyone to review and decide upon. GWH has absolutely nothing new to present at any meeting. The whole purpose of the ordered withdrawal was to allow GWH to provide the promised upgrade of its homes (from \$300,000 to \$500,000 in value) and now it has nothing to present. Building only 16 of the \$300,000 homes (instead of the 28 (or even 26 homes) for which the house design work has been done, should be viewed as simply a "rape of the land" for a redeveloper's financial profit.

7. Thus, GWH has been allowed to call a totally useless meeting, in direct violation (I believe) of the City's final decision of 07/09/2015 requiring resubmission of a new application. What better proof of the contemptuous indifference inherent in the existing zoning procedures to the rights and interests of City residents? The City appears to be unable to stand up to the developers/redevelopers. The only penalty they ever seem to get is an opportunity to schedule yet another public meeting and impose further inconvenience and stress on neighborhood residents. GWH never objected to or appealed the 07/09/2015 City order terminating its prior applications **APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029**, and cannot now cite these withdrawn application numbers as legal authority to "sneak in the back door" to reopen those applications by a new meeting notice citing only the withdrawn applications. What kind of City legality required GWH to withdraw the formerly advertised notice for 28 homes and to reapply for the 16 homes it now wants, but then allows it to reopen the withdrawn applications by citing them as authority for a new neighborhood meeting notice. The City needs to promptly stop this "charade" that has just become too bizarre for words. Allowing that meeting to be held only "rewards" GWH's apparent inability or unwillingness to comply with an unequivocal City order.

8. GWH's neighborhood meeting set for Monday, 02/08/2016 is in direct conflict with the next City Council meeting that is normally held only on one Monday a month. The Council knows that I routinely attend Council meetings. I am trying to be an informed citizen who understands City operations. However, **I now have to choose between a worthwhile civic involvement at a Council meeting, or going to a totally useless and unnecessary (and I believe illegal) neighborhood meeting** just to rebut any erroneous information that might be presented there.

PLEASE ALLOW ME TO ATTEND TONIGHT'S COUNCIL MEETING BY STOPPING THE CONFLICTING GWH MEETING AND NOT ALLOWING IT TO BE RESCHEDULED UNTIL GWH DOES THE NEEDED DESIGN WORK FOR ITS NEXT PROPOSAL, FILES A NEW APPLICATION, AND SUBMITS THE NECESSARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN THAT IS AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC REVIEW.

II.

GWH'S BIZARRE REDEVELOPMENT ATTEMPTS TO DATE.

9. E-mails **1-EM-11/13/15** and **2-EM-12/07/15** summarize the rezoning/redevelopment history of the Ranchette Neighborhood, and better explain my reasons for objecting to any further rezoning/redevelopment attempt for 5 ranchettes (numbers 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) located on the south side of Germann Road immediately to the east of the Cobblestone Auto Spa, which is at the southeast corner of the intersection of Alma School Road and Germann Road.

10. All of the 5 ranchettes once had single family homes on them that were occupied by their owners and later by tenants. The ranchettes still have Salt River Project flood irrigation rights and agricultural zoning, which permits the keeping of horses, cows, chickens, and other farm animals at any home built on any of them. On February 27, 1997, Chandler adopted the **Carino Estates Area Plan** (see **1-EM-11/13/15 Paragraph 25** and **Attachment 4**), thereby

giving notice to land developers that the minimal residential lot size for the Ranchette Neighborhood was one acre per single family residence.

11. However, the 5 ranchettes now in question were thereafter purchased and resold a number of times by a chain of land speculators who initially intended to redevelop them as commercial property. The homes and other improvements on all but Ranchette no. 7 were eventually demolished, with no attempt or intent to ever restore them as ranchette home sites.

Starting in 2013, Garrett-Walker Homes (GWH) made several unsuccessful redevelopment attempts involving the following facts:

A. **Application DVR13-0024:** The initial GWH "neighborhood redevelopment meeting" was conducted on 08/13/2013. GWH proposed to redevelop Ranchettes 8, 9, 10, and 11 into a 40 home redevelopment called **AVVENTURA**. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 18, 19, 24** and Attachment A22. The Ranchette Neighborhood residents have never accepted any GWH proposal, but GWH keeps coming back. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 23 and 24**.

B. **Applications APL14-0009** (Carino Estates Area Plan Amendment) and **DVR14-0029** (Serenade) were filed in 2014, thereby replacing the Avventura proposal. I never knew why Avventura "disappeared" suddenly with no City order of withdrawal. GWH replaced its Avventura agent with a law firm that conducted the second neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment meeting on 09/04/2014 for 28 "**SERENADE**" homes ("**SERENADE I**") on Ranchettes 9, 10, and 11. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraph 24, and Attachment A24**. At this meeting I understood GWH staff to vigorously argue that the Cobblestone Carwash noise essentially destroyed the value of the land for any better purpose than as homes for low income people who could not afford any quieter neighborhood, and who would never complain about carwash noise. At this meeting GWH's attorney disclosed the existence of GWH's carwash noise mitigation study, that I have unsuccessfully asked for a copy of ever since that time.

C. GWH then hired a new attorney that scheduled a third neighborhood redevelopment meeting for 12/18/2014, but I know of no neighborhood resident who ever got a copy of the meeting notice or who ever attended this meeting. Neither I nor anyone I know of learned of the third GWH neighborhood meeting until about 03/13/2015, after City hearings were already set for an April 15, 2015 (Planning and Zoning) and a May 14, 2015 (Council) hearing. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraph 24**. A City sign bearing these hearing dates was promptly posted on Ranchette 10, but never updated, and was never removed until 01/16/2016, after I strongly complained to the City about the continued posting of irrelevant information.

D. A "make up" (fourth) neighborhood meeting for a 26-home (**SERENADE II**) redevelopment (in the alleged \$300,000 price range per home according to GWH's attorney) for Ranchettes 9, 10, and 11 was then conducted by GWH's second attorney on 04/02/2015. At this meeting GWH's attorney also promised to disclose to me the carwash mitigation noise study I had asked for since September of 2014, but that pledge has also never been honored and I was never told why. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraph 24**. On 02/03/2016, City staff also told me that the City would request the carwash noise study from GWH. Following the 04/02/2015 meeting, GWH's attorney then asked for and got the City hearings continued to June 17, 2015 (Planning & Zoning) and July 9, 2015 for the Council hearing in order to have more time to seek an agreeable compromise project with the residents. Yet, no further neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment meeting

was ever scheduled.

E. At an informal meeting in a neighborhood home on 05/12/2015, the same GWH attorney told neighborhood ranchette owners that he would try to persuade GWH to build only 16 homes (I understood him to claim that GWH's engineer said each home could be sold for \$500,000) on Ranchettes 9, 10, and 11. The site plan he showed (but refused to provide any copies of) bears a strong resemblance (in my mind) to the attached A2 site map that I received from the City on 02/03/2016 as an e-mail attachment, after my e-mail complaint of 01/28/2016 to City staff and the Council about the lack of any information provided by GWH for the 02/08/2016 (fifth) neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment meeting. GWH's second attorney also held a second informal meeting with neighborhood residents in May of 2015, but I did not attend it because I did not get timely notice of it due to an e-mail problem. I believe the second meeting addressed substantially no new zoning issue.

F. Based on staff recommendations (Attachment A1), the City Council adopted (on 07/09/2015) Resolution No. 4861, (APL14-0009 Carino Estates Area Plan Amendment), and Ordinance No. 4631, (DVR14-0029 SERENADE), that required that these Serenade applications be withdrawn and that new application be filed and advertised. But GWH presumably did nothing over the past 6 months; on 02/03/2016, City staff told me that GWH did not submit house plans for the 02/08/2016 meeting tonight because the design work is not done (and I assume not even yet started) and will not be available by tonight's scheduled neighborhood meeting. See Paragraphs 5 thru 8, above

G. While GWH's Serenade proposal was withdrawn and not re-advertised, the Chandler Cobblestone Auto Spa got City approval on December 10, 2015 for site layout, building modifications (including additional parking), shade canopies, monument signage, and building color upgrades. To get this approval Cobblestone had to conduct a neighborhood meeting (held on 10/14/2015) to facilitate public comment and inquiry into the nature and scope of the proposed upgrade.

H. At the Cobblestone neighborhood meeting on 10/14/2015, Scott Ward of Ward Development appeared and claimed to represent the owners of Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, comprising about 10 acres of adjacent ground to the east of Cobblestone. He also claimed to have 30 years of experience as a developer. He conducted the first GWH neighborhood meeting in 2013. See Paragraph 11.A. above.

I. Mr. Ward claimed that a request to build 28 homes, reportedly in the \$500,000 to \$600,000 price range, in a gated community on a 10-acre parcel of land (comprising Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) would be submitted to the City, and that the existing rental home on Ranchette 7 would be demolished. Under the current Carino Estates zoning, only a maximum of 10 homes (each on a minimum lot size of one acre) can be built. He also offered an unspecified amount of money to Cobblestone to help pay for the mitigation of carwash noise, a clear admission I believe of the unfavorable impact of carwash noise upon any proposed higher density residential redevelopment.

The true scope of any Serenade redevelopment.

12. I firmly believe that anyone who claims that the intended scope of the **Serenade III** redevelopment is only 16 homes on Ranchettes 8, 10, and 11, has to be very mistaken. If 3 ranchettes can be rezoned for 16 (instead of the currently allowed 6) homes, the adjacent two ranchettes (7 and 8) cannot be prevented from getting the same rezoning for at least 10 more, and possibly even 12 more homes. If the City's existing neighborhood preservation laws cannot prevent the loss of any Ranchette to redevelopment, they can't protect and preserve any other City neighborhood. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 32 thru 37**

13. If approved, the proposed rezoning/redevelopment would destroy the entire Ranchette Neighborhood, which would now be in transition from a very low residential density to a significantly higher density neighborhood. The land speculators would return to buy up more ranchettes for redevelopment that would only stop when the ranchettes were gone. The financial rewards of redevelopment are obvious. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 38 thru 41**. Attachment A2 is the **Serenade III** site map that shows a truncated street (Pelican Drive) that is clearly intended to facilitate the further redevelopment of ranchettes to the east. **Serenade I and II** had the same truncated street. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 38 thru 41; Attachments A24 and A25**.

14. Both GWH and the City must clearly realize that the redevelopment of any of Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 will first consume all of them and then spread throughout the neighborhood. If **Serenade III** is ever approved, GWH would have 3 years to start construction, or more than enough time to rezone Ranchettes 7 and 8, (which could not be denied rezoning), and add them to the project that would consume by redevelopment all 5 ranchettes, or about 45% of the residential ranchettes on Germann. It is easier to "hide" the total impact of the scope of the intended redevelopment by trying to initially only redevelop 3 ranchettes, or 27% of the total residential ranchettes on Germann. However, once all five ranchettes have been rezoned, the street layout in the **Serenade III** site map probably becomes irrelevant because once density and the house design and appearances have been approved, how the streets are arranged can (I assume) be changed at will by the City with no need to solicit any input from the neighbors. We will be back to the **Avventura** plan to create a dangerous and unsafe 4-way intersection with the Chandler Christian Church driveway. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 42 thru 45**.

15. I assume a two-prong attack has been the objective all along. The 40 house **Avventura** proposal (10 homes per ranchette) on 4 ranchettes became the 28 house **Serenade I** proposal (9.3 homes per ranchette) on 3 ranchettes, and would be a 46.6 home project on all five ranchettes. Now, the 16 home **Serenade III** proposal (5.3 homes per ranchette) on 3 ranchettes could become the 26.66 home project for 5 ranchettes. But despite the verbal (only) promises we got that the 16 (initial) homes would be a gated community of quality high-class homes in the \$500,000 range, I understood City staff to say that GWH hasn't done the necessary house design work, and that such work probably won't be done until sometime later. See Paragraphs 5 thru 8, above. So after 6 months GWH isn't ready to go to a neighborhood meeting with anything but the previous **Serenade I** house designs? **So who is kidding who?** I believe that **Serenade III** could well become Chandler's first "gated slum."

16. Both Chandler and GWH's attorney, plus Scott Ward, and the owner of Ranchettes 7 and 8 were sent copies of my e-mails **1-EM-11/13/15** and **2-EM-12/07/15**, and I believe both e-mails were delivered to all. These e-mails gave notice of the previous GWH allegations regarding detrimental Cobblestone carwash noise impacts, but no one apparently cared enough to investigate the matter further. Mr. Ward only made what I considered to be a pro forma offer to financially assist in mitigating the carwash noise. See Paragraph 11.H, and 11I, above. So if **Serenade** (or any variation of it) is approved, future home owners would

arguably be required to waive any legal right to seek reduction of carwash noise. See: **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 16 thru 19**. Future Serenade owners and residents, even if they might only be low income people, might someday wonder why the City "sold them out."

The City would get all the noise complaints and political fallout; Cobblestone would get all the blame and damage to its business reputation; the Ranchette neighborhood (especially on Germann) would be destroyed by redevelopment. This would leave only the "redeveloper" to "cry alone all the way to the bank."

The only noise and neighborhood preservation solution is large size residential lots.

17. Both the **Carino Estates** Area Plan (one single family home per acre) and the City's **AVALON** zoning decision of 10/19/2015 (See:

<http://chandleraz.gov/content/CurrentResults.pdf> for **AVALON**

DVR15-0013/PP15-0006) require a large-lot solution here. Large lots are the only way to ensure that a quality residential redevelopment will occur on Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. **AVALON** had airport noise so great (far greater than the Cobblestone carwash) that any home built had to be certified as "sound proof for aviation noise." Also, in order to preserve the rural character of an adjacent row of ranchette homes on large acreages (as large and as close as the ranchette homes on Kingbird), the City required **AVALON** to have very large lot sizes for land that had never (like the Ranchette neighborhood) been developed and had its residential zoning set by an area plan. Yet the remaining and occupied ranchettes on Germann also require the same protection and preservation that **AVALON** would require for the adjacent ranchettes on Kingbird Drive.

18. Thus, the 12.23-acres in **AVALON** only got 14 custom home sites (for noise proof homes), or 0.87 acre per home. **Serenade III** (of 6.7 acres) wants 16 homes where **Carino Estates** zoning would only allow 6 homes and the **AVALON** ratio (homes per acre) would only allow 7 homes. **Carino Estates** zoning only permits 10 homes on the 10 acres in Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, while the **AVALON** ratio would only allow 11 homes. There is no rational basis for abandoning the **Carino Estates** zoning.

19. Any notion that a major arterial street like Germann now changes the **Carino Estates** zoning and **AVALON** ratio is arbitrary nonsense. When it widened Germann Road the City preserved the Ranchette neighborhood by building underground SRP irrigation pipe and privacy walls with space for individual ranchette driveways onto Germann for 8 of the 11 residentially zoned ranchettes on Germann. These City-preserved ranchettes are just as worthy of preservation under **Carino Estates** and **AVALON** as the adjacent ranchettes on Kingbird. Only Ranchettes 9, 10, and 11 were excluded from similar benefits because they were openly held for speculative redevelopment. Restoring ranchette homes under **Carino Estates** zoning avoids substantially all the infrastructure costs of **Serenade III**, plus the traffic safety problems identified in **1-EM-11/13/15, Paragraphs 42 thru 48** that the City and GWH have never responded to.

20. On the north side of Germann across from Ranchettes 9, 10, and 11 is only one home (older than any home on Ranchettes 1 thru 11) with an individual driveway onto Germann and a large SRP irrigated lot. There are a total on 4 homes on the north side of Germann

(across from Ranchettes 1 through 11) with City-built irrigation systems and privacy walls with driveways onto Germann. On the south side of Germann (i.e., the Ranchette Neighborhood) there are 8 driveway gaps in the City-built privacy wall to allow direct driveway access to Germann. These homes (on the north and south side of Germann) are the rural-home site neighborhood that developed before annexation into the City of Chandler. With no Serenade redevelopment to obstruct traffic, I can enter onto Germann Road from my home as easily as northbound traffic on Hartford St. can enter onto Germann. The ranchette homes on Kingbird Road (a dead-end street south of Germann) have some difficulty (I believe) in entering onto Alma School Road, especially going southbound.

III.

Desireable mitigation for any ranchette redevelopment on Germann.

21. I believe that Chandler already knows whether it intends to allow the destruction by redevelopment of the Ranchette Neighborhood, especially the ranchettes on Germann. In the event that redevelopment has already been decreed, I would ask for mitigation measures to protect the property values, privacy, and residential security of the remaining Ranchette Neighborhood owners and residents on Germann and on Kingbird. This list includes, but is not limited to, the following:

A. **A privacy wall preventing any access to the alley from the redeveloped Serenade neighborhood.** GWH promised this concession at the 2013 neighborhood meeting. This alley has potentially dangerous irrigation structures, and must be left unobstructed for important neighborhood purposes.

B. **No two-story homes.** With all the large lots GWH claims to be willing to provide in order to provide a high-quality gated neighborhood, there is no reason for two-story homes that facilitate invasion of the residential privacy of adjacent ranchette residents. As noted above, however, GWH has apparently not yet done any design work for any of the Serenade III homes in question, and has nothing to show the remaining neighborhood and should not be holding any neighborhood meeting now.

C. **Surrounding privacy wall.** Other HOA neighborhoods on Germann and Hartford have privacy walls on these streets, and the City essentially gave us no choice when it built privacy walls on our properties. There is no reason that any Serenade redevelopment should not be required to be consistent with the remainder of the Ranchette Neighborhood on Germann.

D. **No access roadway to Germann forming a de-facto 4-way intersection with the Chandler Christian Church (CCC) driveway on Germann unless a traffic-control light is installed for roadway and pedestrian safety purposes.** The initial Avventura proposal clearly intended to create such an unsafe intersection, and any Serenade III redevelopment will result in the same rezoning for all 10 acres in Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 and the likely creation of such a new intersection.

E. **No phased redevelopment of Ranchettes 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.** Attachment A2 contains a site map with a truncated street that proves the intent to expand eastward onto all five ranchettes. None of these current owners of these five ranchettes have apparently ever attempted to restore any ranchettes under existing rezoning, and their only opportunity for any profitable redevelopment now depends on eventually including all 5 ranchettes into the same development. Proper and safe site design (street and sewer design, etc.) requires that all 5 ranchettes be simultaneously redeveloped. See 21A thru D, above.

F. **An emergency 911 second entrance.** The 40 Avventura homes on 4 ranchettes provided for a second 911 emergency entrance, and such a second entrance is presumably needed for the reasons stated in 21.E., above.



TOTALLY BIZARRE ZONING PROCEDURES

Moe Wakefield

to:

mayor&council, Jay.Tibshraeny, Nora.Ellen, Kevin.Hartke, Rick.Heumann, Rene.Lopez, Terry.Roe, Jack.Sellers, Dave.Bigos

02/11/2016 05:46 PM

Cc:

Stephen Earl, Taylor Earl, Erik.Swanson, David.delaTorre, Marsha.Reed, Kay.Bigelow, Scott.McCoy, Jeff.Kurtz, peggy, "Coppola, Christopher"

Hide Details

From: Moe Wakefield <savetheranchettes@gmail.com> Sort List...

To: mayor&council@chandleraz.gov, Jay.Tibshraeny@chandleraz.gov,

Nora.Ellen@chandleraz.gov, Kevin.Hartke@chandleraz.gov,

Rick.Heumann@chandleraz.gov, Rene.Lopez@chandleraz.gov,

Terry.Roe@chandleraz.gov, Jack.Sellers@chandleraz.gov, Dave.Bigos@chandleraz.gov

Cc: Stephen Earl <searl@ecllaw.com>, Taylor Earl <tearl@ecllaw.com>,

Erik.Swanson@chandleraz.gov, David.delaTorre@chandleraz.gov,

Marsha.Reed@chandleraz.gov, Kay.Bigelow@chandleraz.gov,

Scott.McCoy@chandleraz.gov, Jeff.Kurtz@chandleraz.gov, peggy@psaplanning.com,

"Coppola, Christopher" <Chris.Coppola@arizonarepublic.com>

To the Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers of the City of Chandler:

1. This e-mail contains my continuing protest to any rezoning/redevelopment attempt by Garrett-Walker Homes (GWH) to rezone and redevelop any portion of the existing residential Ranchette Neighborhood on the south side of Germann Road to the east of the Alma School Road and Germann Road intersection. GWH's last-filed applications in 2014 for construction of a new residential development (to be called **Serenade**) in the Ranchette Neighborhood on Germann are identified by the City as **APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029**. I believe these applications were terminated by an order of the City Council on **07/09/2015**.

2. I know of no new rezoning/redevelopment applications filed by GWH since 07/09/2015, and my inquiries to Planning and Zoning staff have credibly informed me that no new GWH Serenade applications were received as of Tuesday, **02/09/2016**. As of today the City's own website (at <http://www.chandleraz.gov/default.aspx?pageid=331>) lists no left-over 2014 cases, but only the following (2015) cases as the current zoning cases:

1. Sharp Contracting PDP15-0005
2. Bogle House DVR15-0023
3. Verizon Wireless ZUP15-0007
4. Canal View Homes DVR15-0027
5. Villas at Chandler Airpark DVR15-0031
6. Parkview Place DVR15-0032
7. The Enclave DVR15-0034
8. San Tan Plaza PDP15-0006
9. San Tan Super Storage & Industrial PDP15-0010
10. First Credit Union Plaza PDP15-0017
11. Frye Rd Business Park DVR15-0033

12. Verizon at Congregational Church of the Valley ZUP15-0006
13. Towneplace at The Met PDP15-0014
14. Rhythm PDP15-0016
15. Santan Office Campus DVR 15-0041

3. Nevertheless, by a letter dated **01/22/2016**, GWH's attorney sent written notice to residents of the Ranchette Neighborhood of a fifth neighborhood rezoning/redevelopment meeting for 7:00 p.m. on Monday 02/08/2016 at Hancock Elementary School at 2425 S. Pleasant Drive, in Chandler. GWH's meeting notice identified previous application files (**APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029**) as the current zoning cases. Yet these applications were withdrawn by order of the Council on **07/09/2015**, which required submission of new applications. Worse yet, City staff also provided e-mail notice of the meeting date and time, and admitted that the cited application file numbers were incorrect but indicated that any problem would be "fixed" in the future simply by rescheduling another neighborhood meeting. City staff still have not given me any current application numbers.

4. On Monday 02/08/2016 I filed e-mail objections to the scheduled GWH neighborhood meeting with the Mayor and Council, City staff, and GWH's attorney. I explained my objections to the legal authority of the redeveloper and/or the City to call such a meeting, and I objected to the fact that the scheduled meeting prevented me from attending the City Council meeting set for the same date and time. This e-mail (now designated **3-EM-02/08/16**) incorporated two prior e-mails also filed with the City. These were my e-mails of 11/13/2015 and 12/07/2015, now designated **1-EM-11/13/15** and **2-EM-12/07/15**.

Please include my e-mails in the Serenade and Chandler General Plan update files.

5. I again ask that this e-mail and the three e-mails identified in Paragraph 4 above be included in any current and future Serenade file that may exist. I also ask that this e-mail and the three e-mails identified in Paragraph 4 above also be included in the case record of public comment to the upgrade of the City's general land use plan now underway. I am also sending this e-mail to Chandler's coordinating City Planner, David de la Torre, and to the City's consultant, Peggy Fiandaca of Partners for Strategic Action. I think that these four e-mails provide a sobering view of the "brutal" rezoning/redevelopment war that City residents must fight to protect the survival of their neighborhoods against financially lucrative redevelopment plans. However, I still incorporate by reference the "no personal blame" viewpoint expressed in **3-EM-02/08/16** paragraph 3.

6. Unlike most prior neighborhood meetings, I saw no City representative present to accurately explain correct City rules and policy or to report the outcome of the meeting and the massive neighborhood opposition to any Serenade proposal. So I am expressing my continuing opposition to the legality of the meeting and the accuracy of the information presented. I cannot rely only on verbal assurances, and there clearly has been no development plan filed with the City. GWH's attorney had no objective new inform to give us, but only his opinions, which I did not find substantiated by any documentation. In short, I honestly believe that the City knowingly allowed (and assisted) GWH to schedule and conduct a useless meeting just to play "mind games" with us and wear down opposition to any redevelopment.

7. I understood GWH's attorney to declare the following:

- A. **Applications APL14-0009** (Carino Estates Area Plan Amendment) and **DVR14-0029** (the 28-home Serenade proposal) are still open and unclosed, even though the meeting notice said that only 16 homes are to be built.
- B. **GWH is not giving up.** Either they or some other developer (who may not be as generous to us) will keep applying for rezoning/redevelopment.
- C. **All of the ranchettes on Germann are now an “endangered species” doomed by the widening of Germann to 6 lanes.** Only the ranchettes on Kingbird can be saved EVEN THOUGH THEY WILL BE TOTALLY SURROUNDED BY HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT!!

Is there anyone to speak for the City and answer the redeveloper’s assertions now and not someday in the future?

8. Or will the City just continue to stonewall this matter and allow the redeveloper to proceed in total disregard of all the City’s claimed policies for neighborhood preservation/rehabilitation? The City itself locked in the existing land use for the Germann ranchettes when it widened Germann Road. In doing so it renovated the neighborhood by building privacy walls, driveways on City property, and sliding driveway gates at each home. It also constructed an underground pipe irrigation system (of questionable quality) on all but two ranchettes. Eight of the ranchettes on the south side of Germann have privacy walls and driveways connecting to Germann. Seven ranchettes have sliding driveway gates, and nine ranchettes have SRP irrigation piping for agricultural, flood irrigation purposes. On the north side of Germann there are four homes with privacy walls, driveway connections to Germann, sliding driveway gates, and piping for SRP flood irrigation to each home.
9. One City employee suggested to me it would be great if all the driveways on Germann were sealed off and a new access roadway provided from “the south.” This is impossible because the City-built irrigation system along the privacy wall absolutely requires access to each ranchette on Germann in order to successfully irrigate any of those ranchettes. Also, “access from the south” means running a new (and unnecessary) street down the alley (which must be preserved for agricultural purposes only), and destruction of the irrigation ditch distributing SRP flood irrigation to the Ranchette Neighborhood homes on Kingbird, and destruction of the neighborhood water well, and destruction of the south wall and loss of parking spaces at the Cobblestone Auto Spa. That would be an expensive project.
10. Moreover, I believe that any new street access for the Germann ranchettes from the south should meet the definition of “gifting,” which I understand to be the illegal use of City money to build improvements that substantially benefit only private property owners wanting to redevelop. I also believe that GWH and the City continue to ignore the impossible road access problems any new Serenade street connection to Germann would create. However, running a new access street down the alley would not be about promoting roadway safety on Germann, since the four homes on the north side of Germann would get no similar protection. Such a project would also beg the question of whether the City was admitting that it designed and built an unsafe roadway when it widened Germann Road between Alma School Road and Hartford Street.
11. Prior to the 07/09/2015 City order withdrawing (and terminating?) the last filed Serenade application, it was my understanding that GWH promised to submit an application for 16 homes (instead of the prior 28 homes) worth at least \$500,000 apiece. So where are the new home drawings? City staff tell me GWH has submitted no new application package, including

development plan with home designs. I believe that GWH had substantially no objective information to present at last Monday's meeting at which only 9 to 10 residents showed up to protest any redevelopment. So if all of the neighborhood owners and residents did not attend an illegally called (I believe) meeting and approve the 16 to 28 new-home concept for the ranchettes, does that mean that GWH is now "free" to revive the 28 to 46 home plan for which the initial home design work has already been completed? See **3-EM-02-08-2016, paragraph 15**. I believe that GWH has submitted no new development plan and home design work because it doesn't really believe that it can sell \$500,000 homes next to the noisy Cobblestone carwash. I also believe that any GWH proposal would most likely become Chandler's first gated slum.

12. Will the City now allow GWH to revive and go to hearing on its home designs submitted under applications **APL14-0009** and **DVR14-0029**? If so, I believe the City's action would be most improper and arbitrary, since I know of no attempt ever made to determine the impact the **Carino Estates** Area Plan and the **Avalon** hearing decision should have on any Serenade project. We will be back to the \$300,000 designs for "low-income" families who I understood GWH to once claim will never complain about the Cobblestone carwash noise because they cannot "afford" any better neighborhood environment.

Thank You

Moe Wakefield



CORRECTED COPY SUBMISSION OF 02/16/2016

Moe Wakefield

to:

David.delaTorre, peggy

02/18/2016 04:48 PM

Cc:

mayor&council, Stephen Earl, Taylor Earl, Erik.Swanson, Marsha.Reed, Kay.Bigelow, Scott.McCoy, Jeff.Kurtz, "Coppola, Christopher"

Hide Details

From: Moe Wakefield <mgw.moementum@gmail.com> Sort List...

To: David.delaTorre@chandleraz.gov, peggy@psaplanning.com

Cc: mayor&council@chandleraz.gov, Stephen Earl <searl@ecllaw.com>, Taylor Earl <tearl@ecllaw.com>, Erik.Swanson@chandleraz.gov, Marsha.Reed@chandleraz.gov, Kay.Bigelow@chandleraz.gov, Scott.McCoy@chandleraz.gov, Jeff.Kurtz@chandleraz.gov, "Coppola, Christopher" <Chris.Coppola@arizonarepublic.com>

1 Attachment



A1-Meeting Notice.pdf

Below is the same e-mail I submitted to you for the General Plan Update comment file. There were 3 small typo errors where I failed to cite Paragraphs 26 thru 29. I am now submitting this corrected copy.

Thank you.

Moe Wakefield

To the Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers of the City of Chandler:

1. This e-mail contains my specific objections to the rezoning/redevelopment efforts by Garrett-Walker Homes (GWH) to rezone and redevelop any portion of the existing residential Ranchette Neighborhood on the south side of Germann Road to the east of the Alma School Road and Germann Road intersection. It also contains my recommendations for avoiding similar problems in the future. See Paragraphs 26 thru 29, below.
2. This e-mail incorporates by reference the following e-mails sent to the City Council and staff, and others:
 1. My e-mail of 11/13/2015, now designated **1-EM-11/13/15**.
 2. My e-mail of 12/07/2015, now designated **2-EM-12/07/15**.
 3. My e-mail of 12/08/2016, now designated **3-EM-02/08/16**.
 4. My e-mail of 02/11/2016, now designated **4-EM-02/11/16**.
 5. This e-mail of 02/16/2016, now designated **5-EM-02/16/16**.

Please include my e-mails in the Serenade and Chandler General Plan update files.

3. I again ask that this e-mail, along with the prior e-mails identified in Paragraph 2, above, be included in any current and future regarding the Ranchette Neighborhood. I also ask that the same e-mails be included in the public comment record for the upgrade of the City's general land use plan now underway. I am sending this e-mail to the coordinating City Planner, David de la Torre, and to the City's consultant, Peggy Fiandaca of Partners for Strategic Action. A 12/21/2015 e-mail from David de la Torre invited me to submit comments on the proposed new Chandler General Plan by 4:30 p.m. on 02/19/2016. I believe the facts surrounding the intended redevelopment of my neighborhood provide compelling reasons for "upgrading" City safeguards for protecting Chandler neighborhoods against ruthless redevelopment. See Paragraphs 26 thru 29, below.

4. It is still my intent, as expressed in 3-EM-02/08/16 paragraph 3, to be as respectful and objective as I can under the stresses created by GWH's ongoing attempts to obtain a profitable redevelopment that I truly believe would ultimately cause the destruction of the Ranchette Neighborhood. I still try to maintain a reasonable "no personal blame" approach, even for actions that I believe are unwise, improper, or even flagrantly illegal. I truly believe that the City has inadequate procedural safeguards that have permitted the conduct that I want to see changed. See Paragraphs 26 thru 29, below.

Why I spoke out on this matter at the Council meeting on Thursday, 02/11/2016.

5. I was voicing my alarm at what I believe to have been the action by unknown City staff that permitted GWH to hold what I still believe was an illegal "Neighborhood Meeting," under color of City zoning law, on Monday, 02/08/2016 at 7:00 p.m. I was thereby denied the opportunity to attend the City Council Meeting set for the same date and time. I believed I needed to be at the GWH meeting to learn what GWH's position might be, and to also be of assistance to my neighbors who believed that the meeting notice they got was legal and that they had to attend or else risk City approval of unwanted GWH rezoning and redevelopment for the Ranchette Neighborhood.

6. I believe the GWH meeting held on 02/08/2016 was not accidentally scheduled for a City Council meeting night, since I customarily invite all Councilmembers to all of our neighborhood meetings. At the 04/02/2015 Neighborhood Meeting both a Councilmember and a City planner attended the meeting and witnessed the demeanor and presentation by GWH's attorney. At the 02/08/2016 "neighborhood" meeting no councilmember could come, and I know of no city planner who came (for reasons that were never explained) to witness what I considered to be GWH's objectionable "hard sell" presentation.

7. I do know what political insignificance feels like. My petition that the GWH meeting be stopped so that I could attend the City Council meeting was ignored. I believe that total indifference was shown to my legal right to meaningfully participate in a legal City Council meeting. From my point of view, what I ask for never seems to be granted, and what the redeveloper asks for never seems to be denied. I feel that I have either been made the object of a "cruel and disrespectful prank" or made the object of total ridicule and contempt. I have spent hours trying to draft persuasive e-mails that would explain my views as best I could. In some cases I have spent all night on the computer.

The responding e-mail from Jeff Kurtz.

8. My e-mail request (3-EM-02/08/16) that the Monday, 02/08/2016 GWH meeting set for 7:00 p.m. be stopped was sent at 9:23 a.m. on 02/08/2016 because that was when I finished it after spending most of the night working on it. My request to stop the meeting was totally ignored. To the best of my recollection and belief, the only official response I have yet gotten (particularly any City response of significance) to any of the e-mails listed in Paragraph 2, above, was an e-mail from Jeff Kurtz on 02/11/2016 at 6:06 p.m., or just before the Council meeting at which I spoke. His e-mail did not dispute my belief that the GWH meeting was illegal, but appeared to justify rezoning meetings held before submission of a formal rezoning application and legal publication (i.e. "advertisement") by the City as being a "common" (i.e., customary) and "encouraged" practice. I believe that this was a shocking admission that destroys any appearance of impartiality by the City in rezoning matters.

9. I believe Jeff Kurtz is a planning supervisor for the City. I know that he is one of the planning staff assigned to the General Plan update effort. I personally consider him to be a knowledgeable and likable City employee whose opinions often tend to make sense to me. His e-mail stated:

Moe,

To provide the clarity for everyone copied on your email I wanted to respond and restate for you the status of the development activity. A rezoning request for the property has not been filed by the property owner. This week on Monday the property owner's representative held a neighborhood meeting. Holding such a meeting is very common and encouraged.

We all expect a rezoning request to be filed in the near future. When and if the application is filed we will tell you it was filed and be assured that a formal neighborhood meeting required as part of that zoning request will be held. We will make sure that the neighborhood meeting is held on an evening that doesn't conflict with a Council meeting.

Jeff

The total destruction of City credibility for impartiality in zoning/rezoning proposals.

10. This matter has to be a severe embarrassment for the City. Who will ever believe any neighborhood notice in the future when (as here) the Neighborhood Meeting notice does not attach a copy of the advertised rezoning application? Attachment A1 is the meeting notice, dated 01/22/2016, initially received by e-mail from City staff. Only the first 2 pages of this notice were later received by U.S. mail from GWH's attorney. That notice proposed construction of 16 homes on three ranchettes, yet claimed to be acting under color of City zoning law pursuant to previously filed applications APL14-0009 and DVR14-0029 (Serenade I) that was initially filed in 2014 for 28 homes. I just do not understand how GWH's attorney could have claimed in good faith on 02/08/2016 that these two 2014 applications were still valid. See: 4-EM-02/11/16, Paragraph 2. The City's order of 07/09/2015 (See: 3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraph 5) withdrew those applications and required another "advertisement" based on a staff memorandum which stated in part:

Planning Staff recommends a withdrawal for the purpose of re-advertising. The development team has been working on design alternatives resulting in a plan that substantially reduces the

number of lots from what was previously advertised. **An updated application and development plan will be submitted in the near future.** [Emphasis Added]

11. Notwithstanding its own staff memorandum, City staff e-mailed me and others notice of the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting (see Attachment A1) with no mention of the lack of any reapplication/re-advertisement that the City now admits (see Paragraph 9, above) never happened, but asserts that it is o.k. (“common and encouraged”) to call such meetings when the redeveloper promises to file a new application someday. I will believe that the GWH meeting of 02/08/2016 was not uniquely intended for just my neighborhood when the City provides a list of all the other “common” meetings held under color of City law without any application and advertised legal notice. During the two and a half-years of GWH’s attempt to redevelop my neighborhood, none of the prior 4 meetings were to my knowledge scheduled without a current application and legal advertisement.

12. Consequently, I believe that the City is essentially working arm-in-arm with GWH, and simply ignores any GWH mistakes, no matter how egregious. We have to find out on our own and protest on our own. The zoning process is totally adversarial in nature. The City appears to be an “indifferent spectator” to a very unequal war by the redeveloper’s attorney on neighborhood residents. We are left on our own to discover and complain of any illegality, and even then complaints appear to fall on deaf ears. Both the City and GWH’s attorney had to know there had been no reapplication/re-advertising, but no one bothered to warn us. I can only wonder if City planning staff have not already decided “death by redevelopment” for our neighborhood, and intends to allow GWH to “win.” I just do not think this matter could have “festered” for two and a half years like this without some kind of City support and encouragement. So how many more GWH meetings will be called (without any reapplication/re-advertisement) so that GWH’s attorney can browbeat us into submission?

The appearance of potential City indifference to neighborhood preservation.

13. Attachment A1 to **1-EM-11/13/15** contains staff documentation (from 2001) that acknowledged the existing residential zoning (that GWH wants to change) under the **Carino Estates** Area Plan; however, staff only recommended denying approval of the Cobblestone Auto Spa rezoning on the grounds that it would prevent a deeper commercial redevelopment of the adjacent ranchettes. True to its current practices, the City did not then advise local ranchette owners and residents of the **Carino Estates** Area Plan. This meant that the three ranchettes that GWH now wants to redevelop for higher-density residential use were denied commercial redevelopment by the Cobblestone rezoning. GWH does not deny that the three ranchettes in question were once developed properties with occupied single-family homes on them before speculators purchased them for commercial speculation and rendered them uninhabitable by destroying all homes and other improvements on them. When commercial redevelopment became unfeasible, residential redevelopment was tried beginning in 2013.

14. Even though GWH does not deny that it is not the owner of record for the 3 ranchettes in question, it now wants rezoning approval to redevelop them for higher-density residential use. These are clearly unique, valuable, and irreplaceable ranchette properties that should be preserved under current City zoning. See: **1-EM-11/13/15** Paragraphs 23 thru 29, and Paragraphs 32-37. Only large-lot preservation under **Carino Estate**, zoning, or at least under the City’s Avalon decision of 10/19/2015 (See: <http://chandleraz.gov/content/CurrentResults.pdf> for AVALON DVR15-0013/PP15-0006), should be allowed. See: **3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraphs 12 thru 20.**

15. Without large-ranchette lots on Germann, the eventual destruction of the ranchette homes on Kingbird is also assured. Under the City's definition of "neighborhood," all of the existing residential ranchettes on Germann and Kingbird, as well as the Cobblestone Auto Spa, are part of the same neighborhood. Any residential redevelopment on Germann could not be denied for all other residential ranchettes in the neighborhood.

Was the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting intended to be a politically "orchestrated" public relations event?

16. It is puzzling that after 7 months with no new application resubmission containing development plan and house views for public review and for City approval, that GWH now decided to spend so much time and money mailing GWH meeting notices to all the home owner organizations (HMO) and individuals shown in Attachment A1 to this e-mail. It appears obvious that a big crowd was expected. The two neighborhood meetings held at Hancock Elementary School on 08/13/2013 and 09/04/2014 were held in the School's much smaller Media Center, which still had more than enough room for the residents of our neighborhood. But the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting was held in a small auditorium that I had never seen or known about.

17. I have heard developers talk about the "proactive strategy" of soliciting the support of HMOs and surrounding neighbors. I know what was in my notice from GWH, but no one but the staff for GWH's attorney would know what was sent to anyone not in the Ranchette Neighborhood. However, if there is a slug of e-mails to the City favoring redevelopment, I will suspect that others were sent different notices than I received, and I think I would also then know why the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting was not stopped. Stopping the meeting would have likely been extremely embarrassing for GWH.

18. As it turned out, I thought the number of attendees at the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting were rather few, and that 9 or so neighborhood residents attending the meeting outnumbered all other attendees, and occupied all the time and attention of GWH's attorney with their objections to the GWH proposal. I know of no neighborhood resident favoring the GWH proposal. Nevertheless, my e-mail of 02/08/2016 (3-EM-02/08/16) was also sent to my neighbors. Since the City does not deny that the meeting was illegally called, and that a new GWH application was never received, it cannot count the meeting attendees as being the representatives of the many neighborhood residents who did not come. In short, the meeting was basically a total waste of every one's time and attention.

19. GWH has simply failed to submit an application for 16 homes in the \$500,000 price range as it promised it would do last year. GWH's attorney erroneously claimed that "16" homes was the "magical number" worked out with Kingbird residents last year, but the attending Kingbird residents nearest the proposed redevelopment site vigorously denied any such agreement was ever reached. I simply do not believe that GWH really believes that it can build and sell 16 \$500,000 homes in a gated community next to the Cobblestone carwash, and I think that is the reason why it has not filed a new redevelopment application.

The 02/08/2016 GWH meeting only confirmed three admissions from GWH.

20. In 2014 GWH's attorney said it wanted to "reach out" to the neighborhood and meet informally anywhere with anyone. Two informal neighborhood meetings with GWH's attorney were held in May of 2014. See: 3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraph 11(E). At the 02/08/2016 GWH

meeting its attorney verbally promised: 1) that there would be no access to the alley from the Serenade redevelopment site; 2) all 16 homes would be single story; and 3) GWH was obligated to build the site plan identified in my e-mail of 02/08/2016. See: **3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraph 11 (E)**. Item 3 is simply not credible for the reasons already explained in my e-mail of 02/08/2016. See: **3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraph 12 thru 16** The 02/08/2016 GWH meeting presented nothing new that could not have been presented informally at a neighborhood home or by e-mail. It was a complete waste of everyone's time and attention, and in my mind can only make sense if it was just political posturing. See: Paragraphs 16 and 17, above.

The City appears to abandon neighborhood residents to the developers/redevelopers.

21. For two and a half years I feel that our neighborhood has been abandoned to GWH by the City, and GWH has no restraints upon what it does to us or what it tells us. GWH's attorney can't give us legal or technical advice, because it does not represent us, and City staff is so busy pretending to be "impartial" that it is no real help either. City staff has given us some information, but then doesn't attend the 02/08/2016 meeting and GWH's attorney tells us the City is wrong on every point. There is no one willing and/or able to truly speak for the City and tell us what options are available to us. GWH's attorney cannot be impartial and any rezoning/redevelopment is clearly an adversarial process. But we have no independent and unbiased "judge" to seek help from, and we have no way to verify the reasonableness and accuracy of what GWH's attorney says.

22. The City expects GWH (an adverse party) to independently perform unverifiable public participation functions that are normally done by governmental entities themselves. GWH has thus become part of the official City operation even though it has an interest that is clearly contrary to that of many, if not most, neighborhood residents. This is so wrong and unfair to neighborhood residents. So GWH prepares and mails out all meeting notices, and conducts all meetings and presents only its propaganda with no input or correction from any City representative, who may not even attend the meeting and just rely on GWH's report of what happened.

23. For example, GWH's attorney scheduled one neighborhood meeting for 12/18/2014, but failed to mail notices to neighborhood residents. See: **3-EM-02/08/16, Paragraph 11(C)**. Unaware of the mailing error, City staff erroneously assumed, without any attempted independent verification by the City, that there were no longer any neighborhood objections to GWH's intent to build 26 to 28 homes on 3 ranchettes, and set the date for the two City hearings. It then took about 3 months before the neighborhood and the City staff learned of the lack of the Neighborhood Meeting notices. I can only wonder how many redevelopments might have happen because a redeveloper somehow failed to invite adversely impacted parties to a neighborhood meeting.

24. When the "make up" neighborhood meeting on 04/02/2015 (attended by a City Councilmember) disclosed unmistakable neighborhood opposition that apparently neither the City nor GWH wanted to deal with, City staff recommended withdrawal and reapplication (see Paragraphs 9 thru 11, above) which was ordered by the City Council decision of 07/09/2015. So here we are, seven months later, with no new rezoning/redevelopment application. Yet the City still allows GWH to schedule another adversarial "Neighborhood" Meeting under color of City zoning law in order (I believe) to just "bully us" some more with adversarial propaganda that no City representative is present to hear or get concerned about. This is my interpretation and

belief regarding the purpose of the 02/08/2016 GWH meeting. I can “guess” of no better purpose for that meeting.

25. If the City intends to destroy the Ranchette Neighborhood on Germann by redevelopment, it should tell us why and not send GWH’s attorney, whose client has no interest in neighborhood preservation, to tell us that we will become extinct. The City should explain why the **Carino Estates** Area Plan and the Council’s Avalon decision of 10/19/2015 (see Paragraph 14, above) does not prevent GWH from building more than 1 home per acre.

Recommended updates for the Chandler General Plan.

26. **INDEPENDENT ZONING OMBUDSMAN TO ASSIST IMPACTED NEIGHBORHOODS.** I believe the City’s existing rezoning/redevelopment mechanism is anything but fair and impartial for neighborhood residents. The closer the City gets to “build out” the more “desperate” the redevelopment pressures will become. In our neighborhood land speculators bought up at least five ranchettes that had existing and occupied homes on them. All homes and improvements on four of them were then removed, and the owners never allowed any new construction under existing zoning. Their intent was to hold out for rezoning and the “big bucks” of redevelopment. If rezoning is allowed here it will surely spread throughout the entire neighborhood and ultimately destroy the existing residential neighborhood. If the redevelopers can thereby be rewarded for destroying the existing Ranchette Neighborhood, no neighborhood in Chandler is safe from similar redevelopment in the future.

27. **REAFFIRM STRONG NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION VALUES.** I am concerned that the draft General Plan does not reflect even the same intensity of support for neighborhood preservation, as expressed in the current General Plan, such as:

A. Chandler's neighborhoods will provide a variety of housing types from single-family homes in very low-density areas to urban settings including lofts in mixed-use developments. In all cases, unique neighborhood character, exceptional municipal services and superior amenities . . . will make Chandler neighborhoods among the most desirable places to live.

B. The current GP states a goal to ensure a variety of housing choice for all income levels which includes the protection of existing low-density neighborhoods, as the Ranchette Neighborhood has clearly been designated under the **Carino Estates** Area Plan. Preserving neighborhoods is a top City priority; neither infill, redevelopment, nor new construction should detract from residential security, privacy, and property values. See GP p. 32. The GP also confirms the City’s goal to preserve and revitalize older neighborhoods by respecting the character of traditional neighborhoods and encouraging them to preserve and improve upon the positive qualities that make each area unique; traditional neighborhoods emphasize common social interests and have unique residential character. GP pp. 57-58.

28. **DECIDE “UP FRONT” IF A NEIGHBORHOOD IS GOING TO BE PRESERVED AGAINST REDEVELOPMENT.** Chandler should already know if it intends to preserve the Ranchette Neighborhood against GWH’s intended redevelopment, and should be able to articulate why any redevelopment should (or should not) be allowed. City staff says that anyone can ask for rezoning, but any neighborhood resident should likewise be able to also request a prior “neighborhood preservation” decision before the cost and time needed to prepare and submit engineering and architectural plans is incurred. To “play the game” that the City has to allow

any property owner to perpetually petition for redevelopment and submit engineering and architectural plans for approval is to admit that there is no "neighborhood preservation" and that any submission for redevelopment that is currently "in fashion" and wanted by the City will be approved, even if it causes the destruction of the existing neighborhood.

29. **CITY SUPERVISION OF THE MAILING OF NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING NOTICES.** To avoid the irregularities that may occur when mailing notices of neighborhood meetings, developers/redevelopers should prepare the notices, leave them unsealed, and bring them to City staff for inspection and confirmation that everyone is properly included. There is a postal station about a block away from the City planning and zoning department.

Respectfully submitted,

Moe Wakefield