

#68

JUN 26 2008



Chandler • Arizona
Where Values Make The Difference

MEMORANDUM **Planning and Development – CC Memo No. 08-122**

DATE: JUNE 11, 2008

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

THRU: W. MARK PENTZ, CITY MANAGER
 DOUG BALLARD, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
 JEFF KURTZ, ASSISTANT PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

FROM: DAVID DE LA TORRE, PRINCIPAL PLANNER *DDT*

SUBJECT: GPA07-0002 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE
 Approval of Resolution No. 4195

Request: The public hearing is for public input and discussion regarding the update of Chandler's General Plan, followed by adoption of the Final Draft General Plan.

Applicant: City of Chandler

Consultants: Rick Counts, Community Sciences Corporation
 David Williams, Willdan

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission and Staff recommend approval of Resolution No. 4195, adopting the Final Draft General Plan dated June 26, 2008.

BACKGROUND

The current General Plan was adopted by Council in 2001 and ratified by voters in 2002. At that time, the General Plan was updated to comply with Growing Smarter and Growing Smarter Plus legislation that required fifteen (15) elements to comprehensively address growth related issues. The legislation, which is still in effect, requires that the General Plan be updated at least once every ten years. However, due to the fast growing pace of the City in 2001 it was stated that the General Plan would be updated in five years rather than ten. The need to update the General Plan sooner rather than later also became more apparent within the last few years when it became evident that the City was approaching various stages of build-out.

About the Public Involvement Process

In accordance with State statutes, on June 14, 2007, Council approved a Public Participation Plan establishing written procedures for encouraging public involvement during the General Plan update process (Resolution No. 4084). Accordingly, the update process has utilized a multi-media approach and has been heavily based on citizen participation. A variety of notification techniques were used to advertise public forums and briefings including:

- Press releases
- Direct mail (utilized for the two Stakeholder's Forums only)
- Web site (<http://www.chandleraz.gov/generalplanupdate>)
- Email list-serves
- Bilingual flyers (English and Spanish) distributed at the downtown library, ICAN, Salvation Army, Community Services of Arizona, Chandler Christian Center, and sent home with Galveston Elementary School students for the Neighborhood Planning and Redevelopment forums
- Community events
- City telephone lines – On hold recorded message
- City cable television - Text announcement and Chandler In Focus show
- Agendas posted with the City Clerk's Office
- Legal notices in the newspaper (for public hearings only)

Since the public participation process began in August 2007, forty (40) public forums, briefings, and other events were held and presented many opportunities for Chandler's citizens to learn about the update and provide input (see attached Public Meetings List). Meetings were held in different locations to promote citizen participation throughout the City. Some events such as the first three kick-off meetings and the Energy and Green Building Forum were especially well attended. Other events included presentations to stakeholder groups such as the Intel Community Advisory Panel, the Chandler Chamber of Commerce, Chandler Neighborhood Link, and Valley Partnership.

A Citizen Oversight Committee consisting of twenty-two (22) residents representing Chandler's diverse population, met regularly to guide Staff and the Consultants through the update process. All of the Committee meetings were open to the public and were advertised on the Web site mentioned above as well as with the City Clerk's Office.

Comments received from the public forums, Oversight Committee meetings and the Web site were compiled by the Consultants and utilized to draft the General Plan elements. Subsequently, the drafts from the Consultants were extensively reviewed by City Staff, including representatives from all departments to ensure that they are thorough, accurate, and properly integrated statements of City growth policies. The revised drafts were then presented to the Citizen Oversight Committee for review and further editing. Surveys that were distributed at the public forums and an on-line survey were utilized to develop the Vision Statement that is located in the Introduction of the draft General Plan. Thus, the process that was utilized to create the draft General Plan is based on citizen input.

In accordance with State statutes, the draft General Plan was distributed to adjoining jurisdictions, state and county planning departments, and submitted to the City Council, Planning Commission, and others at least sixty (60) days prior to the notification of this public hearing. For a complete list of agencies and organizations that received a copy of the draft General Plan for review, please refer to the attached Sixty Day Statutory Review Distribution List. As of the time of this writing, Staff has only received one response in writing from the agencies on the distribution list. The response from the Maricopa Association of Governments is attached for review.

General Plan Hierarchy and Relationship to Zoning

As described on page 11 of the draft, the General Plan is a strategic plan consisting of broad policies that address the many implications of City build-out and sustainability needs. Area plans, facility plans and other adopted studies supply more detail that is consistent with the broad direction in the General Plan. Finally, zoning, capital improvement program and the City's budget are tools that implement the more specific plans.

The broad and strategic nature of the General Plan is evident in the Future Land Use Map, which contains 4 general land use categories: Residential, Commercial, Employment and Recreation / Open Space. Policies in the text of the Land Use Element provide criteria for evaluating where various intensities of the broader categories may be considered. Per State statutes (ARS§9-462.01.F), all zoning ordinances and zoning actions are required to be consistent with the adopted General Plan. Thus, the broad policies in the General Plan are implemented directly by zoning actions, which require extensive neighborhood notice and opportunities for public participation.

It is important to note that adoption of the draft General Plan will not amend or supercede any previously adopted area plans or zoning actions. Staff does not foresee any major conflicts, however, when more detailed area plans are found to be in conflict with the policies in the General Plan; the more specific planning document will be followed. Subsequent area plan amendments or updates may be programmed to resolve any identified conflicts.

Transportation and Water/Waste Water Master Plan Updates

Concurrently with the General Plan update, the City is in the process of updating the Transportation Master Plan and the Water and Waste Water Master Plan. In the hierarchy of adopted City plans, these two master plans are in the tier below the General Plan consisting of more detailed facility plans. City Staff and consultants have coordinated with each other throughout the General Plan update process. The Transportation Master Plan update will also address bicycle user plans in more detail. The two master plans are expected to be taken to Council for their approval sometime after the new General Plan has been adopted.

DISCUSSION

As stated previously in briefings to City Council, the new General Plan represents a fundamental shift in development policies for the City as it transitions from a rapidly growing suburb to a major urban center. The following list identifies the major differences from the 2001 General Plan by subject:

1. Land Use (Sustainability and Economic Development):

While the current General Plan includes goals and statements addressing sustainability and economic development, the proposed General Plan emphasizes selectivity regarding the land use decisions that still remain, with particular consideration given to sustainable development, achieving a balance of land uses, and the fiscal impact upon the City (service costs vs. the revenues achieved). The case for protecting economic development areas and sustainability is made in several of the elements in the draft General Plan, but is most prevalent in the Cost of Development, Land Use, Growth Areas, and Housing elements.

- Importance is placed upon revenue generating land use, recognizing that the land resource that remains for economic development is limited and strategic, and should not be sacrificed for new residential development. The Cost of Development Element in the draft General Plan identifies the comparative ratios of City revenues to expenditures by land use category, illustrating the greater costs incurred by the City to serve residential uses, and hence the importance of achieving balance between residential and employment development.
- The Land Use Element of the draft General Plan includes specific goals and objectives targeting economic development.

2. Density and Intensity:

References from the 2001 General Plan for maintaining the City's low overall density and low profile building form have been replaced by opportunities for greater development intensity in appropriate locations, such as downtown, regional commercial areas, and high capacity transit corridors.

- A new residential category has been added---Urban Residential Density (exceeding 18 dwelling units per acre).
- Reference is made to the City's updated (2006) Mid-Rise Development Policy, which describes eligible locations for such development and the various considerations to be made.

3. Transportation:

The Circulation Element of the draft General Plan emphasizes the importance of placing high intensity land uses in transit corridors within walking distance of alternative modes of transportation such as bus rapid transit and light rail.

4. South Price Road Employment Corridor:

Both the 2001 and the draft General Plan maintain the vision for large single users on campus-like settings on parcels that are generally not less than 15-acres. The draft General Plan goes on to say that parcels less than 15-acres may be considered when they are part of a larger innovation zone as described in the Growth Areas Element

5. Growth Areas:

Unlike the 2001 General Plan, the draft General Plan categorizes three (3) different types of growth areas: Large Tract, Growth Expansion Nodes, and Revitalization/Infill Growth Areas. Distinguishing different types of growth areas signifies the shift from rapid growth on large tracts of land to a greater focus on redevelopment and infill development. Acknowledgement is also given that Southeast Chandler is now well established with low-density residential and is no longer considered as a major growth area.

6. Redevelopment:

As amended by the City Council earlier this year, the Conservation, Rehabilitation and Redevelopment Element no longer incorporates the Redevelopment Area Plan, which was amended and renamed the "Downtown – South Arizona Avenue Corridor Area Plan" (Downtown Area Plan). The draft General Plan reaffirms the status of the Downtown Area Plan as a separate planning document that is utilized to further delineate the policies of the General Plan. The draft also contains updated goals and objectives, together with criteria (rather than a map) for evaluating a redevelopment project located anywhere in the City for consistency with the General Plan. Previously, when the Redevelopment Area Plan was a part of the General Plan, the policies in the Redevelopment Element were limited to the central area of the City.

7. Housing:

The updated Housing Element recognizes the widening gap between household incomes and housing costs, particularly for those households earning below the median. New strategies recommended to improve affordability include incentives to enhance the City's existing supply of affordable homes, greater diversity of housing types in new construction, urban densities in appropriate locations, and affordable dwellings as a component of mixed-use and re-use projects.

8. Neighborhood Planning:

A new element, not currently required by state statutes, is included in the draft General Plan to emphasize preservation and revitalization of older neighborhoods with grassroots citizen involvement and assistance through City resources.

9. Energy:

In 2007, the State passed a new law requiring an Energy Element in the General Plan to identify policies that encourage and provide incentives for efficient use of energy and that provide for greater use of renewable energy.

10. Criteria for determining "major amendment":

State statutes require each City to establish their own criteria for determining what constitutes a major amendment to the General Plan. The current General Plan establishes four criteria for determining major amendments. The draft General Plan changes two of the criteria as follows:

- Any change in a non-residential classification of 40 or more acres (formerly 160 acres) to a residential classification.

- Any modification or elimination of one or more stated goals contained in the Land Use Element that changes any policy regarding the overall densities, intensities or major roadway locations that would have citywide implications (formerly “affecting 640 acres or more”).

Exhibit A, Addenda to the 3-7-2008 Draft General Plan

The changes in the attached addenda have been incorporated into the 6/26/2008 Final Draft. Items in the addenda were received from a variety of interested parties including council members, planning commissioners, citizen oversight committee members, stakeholder groups, zoning attorneys, citizens and Staff from various City departments.

The addenda are attached to identify the changes that have been made to the 3/7/2008 Draft General Plan, which was previously delivered to the Mayor and City Council. While the addenda may seem daunting at first glance, the majority of the proposed changes are correcting spelling, formatting, or grammatical errors. To help identify some of the more substantial changes, Staff is highlighting the items below (numbers correspond to the number on proposed addenda):

29. Consistent with a Mayor and Council goal, Staff is proposing to add a new objective under the goal of planning for sustainable development (Land Use Element) - “Encourage the use of shade and environmentally sensitive design”.

40 – 42. These proposed changes are intended to clarify where the various land use intensities can be considered. The consideration of Revitalization//Infill and Growth Expansion Node Growth Areas and were added to be consistent with other text in the Land Use Element and the policies in the Growth Areas Element.

45, 54 & 56. The draft General Plan strongly emphasizes the importance of resisting pressure to convert non-residential land to residential development. While this is a key message, there are instances where conversions to residential may be in the City’s interest, such as when additional residential is needed to balance existing commercial land uses or when a property’s potential for commercial development is limited by the size, shape, orientation, accessibility or visibility. For this reason, Staff is proposing to add such a statement after each time the case is made to resist conversions. This will ensure that both the rule and the exception are presented equally.

52, 122 & 128. These addenda create a new type of office development; “Large Office Development”, which consists of large corporate offices and multi-story offices with multi-tenants. This new type of office was created to distinguish from “Commercial Office” which consist of the smaller office developments, usually characterized as garden office. The distinction is necessary to direct the larger office developments to downtown, employment areas, growth areas, and regional commercial areas.

53. This item identifies the uses that do not fit in the South Price Road Employment Category. Such a statement is made in the Glossary of the 2001 General Plan.

62. The City's Planned Area Development and Preliminary Development Plan process currently includes a compatibility analysis with developers and neighbors. This item clarifies that such an analysis is currently being done and the General Plan calls for a continuation of the analysis.

67. A new objective is proposed to "Plan an interconnected bicycle system containing continuous east-west and north-south bicycle routes." This objective will complement another objective that is already in the draft to plan for bicycle route connections among adjoining communities.

102 & 105. These addenda update the draft with the latest information regarding Tumbleweed Recreation Center and Veteran's Oasis Park.

116. This addendum adds a list of national accreditations received by various City departments to the Public Services and Facilities Element.

PLANNING COMMISSION VOTE REPORT

Motion to Approve.

In Favor: 6 Opposed: 0

One person spoke and read from a prepared statement at both the May 22nd and June 4th public hearings. The Planning Commission did not have any discussion regarding the person's comments and expressed support of the proposed General Plan. The comments and Staff's response are attached.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Planning Commission and Staff recommend approval of the Final Draft General Plan dated June 26, 2008.

PROPOSED MOTION

Move to approve Resolution No. 4195, adopting the Final Draft General Plan dated June 26, 2008, as recommended by the Planning Commission and Staff.

Attachments

1. Final Draft General Plan dated 6/26/2008
2. Draft Executive Summary (Final version will be twice as large)
3. Resolution No. 4195
4. Public Meetings List
5. Sixty Day Statutory Review Distribution List
6. Comments received during the sixty-day statutory review period:
 - a. Letter from Chamber of Commerce dated April 24, 2008
 - b. Letter from Valley Partnership dated May 16, 2008
 - c. Comments from Maricopa Association of Governments
7. Comments from Krista Collins dated June 4, 2008 and Staff's response
8. Staff Memo to the Citizens Oversight Committee dated December 18, 2007
9. Exhibit A, Addenda to 3/7/2008 Draft General Plan (addenda have been incorporated into Final Draft)

RESOLUTION NO. 4195

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CHANDLER, ARIZONA, REPEALING THE CHANDLER GENERAL PLAN, ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL ON NOVEMBER 1, 2001 AND RATIFIED BY VOTERS ON MARCH 12, 2002, 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 NOVEMBER 4, 2008.

WHEREAS, the Chandler City Council has resolved by previous resolution that it expects to expand, modify, or otherwise update the General Plan as provided for by law or as deemed appropriate in the opinion of the City Council; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Arizona Revised Statutes, the General Plan is required to include sixteen (16) 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 June 2007, prior to beginning the General Plan update; 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 November 1, 2001, and ratified by voters on March 12, 2002 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

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE - PUBLIC MEETINGS, FORUMS AND WORKSHOPS FOR COMMUNITY INPUT

DATE	MEETING	LOCATION
1 August 13, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	Vision Gallery (downtown Chandler)
2 August 21, 2007	General Plan Update Kick-off meeting	Santan Junior High
3 August 27, 2007	General Plan Update Kick-off meeting	City Council Chambers
4 August 29, 2007	General Plan Update Kick-off meeting	Chandler Police Desert Breeze Substation, Community Room,
5 September 10, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	South Atrium Conference Room, Planning & Public Works Depts Building
6 September 11, 2007	Intel Community Advisory Panel	Intel Campus (5000 W. Chandler Boulevard)
7 September 19, 2007	Planning Commission Briefing	City Council Chambers
8 September 28, 2007	Local Initiatives Support Corporation Briefing	Planning Department, Planning Services Conference Room
9 October 2, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	Snedigar Recreation Center
10 October 15, 2007	Stakeholders Forum	City Council Chambers
11 October 17, 2007	Neighborhood Link	Chandler Community Center
12 October 18, 2007	Transportation Commission Briefing	City Council Chambers
13 October 23, 2007	Neighborhood Planning, Preservation & Redevelopment	Galveston Elementary School
14 October 25, 2007	Neighborhood Planning, Preservation & Redevelopment	ICAN
15 October 27, 2007	Congress of Neighborhoods	Chandler Community Center
16 November 6, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	McCullough-Price House
17 November 14, 2007	Airport Commission Briefing	Chandler Municipal Airport
18 November 15, 2007	Energy element and Green Building Public Forum	City Council Chambers
19 December 4, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	Chandler Municipal Airport
20 December 11, 2007	Neighborhood Advisory Committee Briefing	City Manager's Office, 3rd Floor Conference Room
21 December 13, 2007	City Council Briefing	City Council Chambers
22 December 18, 2007	Citizen Oversight Committee	Chandler Community Center
23 January 8, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	Chandler Municipal Airport
24 January 22, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	Chandler Municipal Airport
25 February 5, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	Chandler Municipal Airport
26 February 19, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	South Atrium Conference Room, Planning & Public Works Depts Building
27 February 26, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	Tumbleweed Recreation Center, Cotton Room South
28 March 4, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	Tumbleweed Recreation Center, Cotton Room South
29 March 12, 2008	Airport Commission Briefing	Chandler Municipal Airport
30 March 19, 2008	Planning Commission Briefing	City Council Chambers
31 March 20, 2008	Transportation Commission Briefing	City Council Chambers
32 March 25, 2008	Maricopa Association of Governments, POPTAC	MAG offices, 302 N. 1st Avenue, Phoenix
33 March 27, 2008	City Council Briefing	City Council Chambers
34 April 11, 2008	Chandler Chamber of Commerce	25 S. Arizona Place
35 April 11, 2008	Ocotillo Community Spring Event	Jacobson Elementary School
36 April 15, 2008	Stakeholders Forum	Tumbleweed Recreation Center, Cotton Room South
37 April 24, 2008	Valley Partnership	Coe & Van Loo Offices
38 May 6, 2008	Citizen Oversight Committee	South Atrium Conference Room, Planning & Public Works Depts Building
39 May 22, 2008	Planning Commission - Public Hearing	Chandler Heights Police Substation, Community Room
40 June 4, 2008	Planning Commission - Public Hearing	City Council Chambers
41 June 26, 2008	City Council Public Hearing and Action	City Council Chambers

SIXTY DAY STATUTORY REVIEW DISTRIBUTION LIST

In accordance with Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS §9-461.06), the draft General Plan was transmitted on March 7th, 2008, at least 60-days prior to the notification of the required public hearings, to the following:

- Mayor and Council
- Planning and Zoning Commission
- Maricopa County Planning & Development
- Pinal County Planning Department
- City of Phoenix
- Town of Gilbert
- City of Mesa
- City of Tempe
- Gila River Indian Community
- Maricopa Association of Governments
- Arizona Department of Commerce
- State Land Department
- Arizona Department of Transportation Planning Division
- Regional Public Transportation Authority
- Arizona Department of Transportation, Community Relations
- State Department of Water Resources
- Any person or entity that requests in writing to receive a review copy of the proposal

In addition to recipients required by state statutes listed above, the draft General Plan was also transmitted on March 7th to the following:

- Citizen Oversight Committee
- Salt River Project
- Arizona Public Service
- Cox Communications
- Qwest
- Southwest Gas Corporation
- Chandler Unified School District
- Gilbert School District
- Mesa School District
- Tempe Union / Kyrene School District

April 24, 2008

The Honorable Mayor and Council
Chandler Planning and Zoning Commission
City of Chandler
55 North Arizona Place, Suite 301
Chandler, AZ 85244-4008

Re: Support for City of Chandler's General Plan Update

Dear Mayor and Council:

We were pleased to have Sen. Jay Tibshraeny, Hank Pluster, and David de la Torre present the Chandler General Plan Update to the Chandler Chamber Public Policy Committee members on April 11, 2008. They did a thorough job explaining the importance of the Chandler General Plan and its role in guiding development in the city as well as creating an enduring vision for Chandler for the future.

We recognize that the proposed general plan addresses the approaching city build-out and outlines a strategic plan for Chandler to remain a sustainable city, and that an important component of the strategy is protecting key economic development areas in order for the city to continue to provide services to its residents and citizens.

The plan also represents a shift in direction for the city allowing for more intense urban development along transit corridors and emphasizing neighborhood maintenance and preservation.

The Chandler Chamber of Commerce believes that the strategies in the proposed general plan point the City of Chandler in the right direction towards sustainability with continued business prosperity and a high quality of life for its residents. For this reason, the Chandler Chamber of Commerce supports the proposed general plan and recommends approval.

Sincerely,

CHANDLER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE



Roz Santangelo
Chairman of the Board

RS/sbh

c: Sen. Tibshraeny, Chairman of the Citizen Oversight Committee
David de la Torre, General Plan Coordinator



**VALLEY
PARTNERSHIP**

May 16, 2008

CHAIRMAN
Steve Betts
SunCor Development Company

VICE CHAIRMAN
Mark Winkelman
Arizona State Land Commissioner

SECRETARY
Curt Johnson
Coe & Van Loo Consultants

TREASURER
Sean Walters
Sunbelt Holdings

IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIRMAN
Keith Earnest
RED Development

GENERAL COUNSEL
Michael Phalen
Fennemore Craig

PRESIDENT & CEO
Richard R. Hubbard

DIRECTORS

Maria Baier
City of Phoenix

Cheri Brady
First American Title Company

Art Brooks
Brooks Engineers and Surveyors

Richard Dozer

Carol Grumley
Standard Pacific Homes

Rick Hearn
Vestar

Don Henninger
Phoenix Business Journal

Don Keuth
Phoenix Community Alliance

Mindy Korth
CB Richard Ellis

David Krumwiede
Lincoln Property Company

Willis Martin

Rusty Mitchell
Luke Air Force Base

David Scholl
Scholl Partners

Vicky Smothermon
RED Development

Debra Stark
City of Phoenix

Karrin Taylor
DMB Associates, Inc.

Mr. David de la Torre
Principal Planner and General Plan Coordinator
City of Chandler
215 East Buffalo Street
Chandler, Arizona 85225

Dear Mr. de la Torre:

Valley Partnership appreciates the extensive work Chandler has undertaken to reach out to stakeholders regarding its draft General Plan. In particular, we thank you for your presentation to the Valley Partnership City/County Committee in April, which was very interesting and helped further our understanding of the City's goals.

Valley Partnership respectfully submits the following suggestions for your consideration:

- A. The General Plan sets many laudable goals for planning Chandler's remaining commercial properties. In order to meet those goals, Valley Partnership strongly recommends the City consider the effects of the Development Impact Fee proposal that Council will review next month. The proposed fees create a substantial barrier to any non-residential developer seeking to build in Chandler. We suggest that the City consider competitive cost-of-development policies which will continue to make Chandler an attractive and cost-effective place to develop commercially.
- B. Based on our Members' vast experience in Arizona and other markets, we offer Valley Partnership as a constructive partner as Chandler develops its programs aimed at encouraging specific building practices. Valley Partnership requests the opportunity to participate early in the development of incentives mentioned throughout the General Plan, whether they are for sustainable practices, retail revitalization, redevelopment, or other areas.

Because Valley Partnership is the only organization in Maricopa County representing all segments of the commercial real estate development industry, early inclusion in discussions affecting the industry can be a helpful tool to enhance the general support of the organization's 500-plus member companies, many of whom are already working with Chandler on high value projects.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to participate in the General Plan Update process. We look forward to partnering with you and will do whatever we can to support your efforts.

Sincerely,

Alisa Lyons
Vice President, Governmental Affairs

2817
EAST CAMELBACK ROAD
SUITE 510
PHOENIX ARIZONA
85016

Phone: 602-266-7844
Fax: 602-266-7845
info@valleypartnership.org

DRAFT COMMENTS ON THE CHANDLER GENERAL PLAN FROM MAG

Conservation and Environmental Planning Toward Build-Out

The Conservation and Environmental Planning Toward Build-Out Element of the Chandler General Plan contains a comprehensive set of goals and objectives which address conservation of natural resources and environmental planning. The general plan indicates that safeguarding our natural resources is critical to supporting a sustainable way of life.

For solid waste, this element includes goals to protect residents from environmental hazards and conserve nonrenewable natural resources. The objectives include managing solid waste through environmentally-sound landfills and recycling efforts and promoting recycling and expand recycling opportunities. These goals and objectives are consistent with the goals of the MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

For water quality, this element includes a goal of ensuring clean air and water resources. One of the objectives involves practicing state-of-the-art water reclamation and reuse. The general plan also indicates that Chandler has historically utilized cutting-edge designs and practices in providing services for residents including reclaiming wastewater and distributing it for broad-based municipal use and for groundwater recharge. This element also states that all of Chandler's wastewater is treated and subsequently utilized for irrigation or recharged into the groundwater aquifers. Wastewater reuse and groundwater recharge of reclaimed water are common and beneficial practices within the MAG region and are addressed in the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

Water Resources Element Toward Build-Out

The Water Resources Toward Build-Out Element contains a comprehensive set of goals and objectives which address the water resources for the City of Chandler at build-out. One of the goals is to continue progressive water conservation efforts. An objective is to continue use of reclaimed water for parks, common areas and lakes. The general plan indicates that the City's Water Plan Update provides a strategy to use all future reclaimed water and that the recycled resource is projected to meet the demands of all City parks, golf courses, and large HOA common areas south of the SanTan/Loop 202 Freeway. Wastewater reuse of reclaimed water is a common and beneficial practice within the MAG region and is addressed in the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

This element indicates that the City's wet utilities systems also must deal with expanding existing or constructing new water and wastewater treatment facilities. It is important to ensure that wastewater treatment plants are consistent with the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals.

Public Services and Facilities Toward Build-Out

The Public Services and Facilities Toward Build-Out Element contains a comprehensive set of goals and objectives which address the existing and planned systems/locations with particular emphasis on police, fire and emergency services, drainage, solid waste, wastewater and local utilities. One of the goals is to plan for long-term, safe, and efficient wastewater, stormwater, and solid waste facilities. For solid waste, one of the objectives includes reducing transportation costs and landfill capacity needs through further expansion of recycling programs. This objective is consistent with the goals of the MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan.

For water quality, this element includes objectives to match wastewater system capacity to community needs and ensure wastewater reclamation facilities can meet the requirements for reuse and recharge of reclaimed water. Water quality management planning is aligned with the wastewater treatment goals of the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

This element indicates that the City currently operates three major wastewater treatment facilities: 1) Lone Butte Water Reclamation Facility, 2) Ocotillo Water Reclamation facility, and 3) Airport Water Reclamation Facility. These facilities are identified in the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. The element also indicates that the City has plans to expand its wastewater treatment capacity. It is important to ensure that wastewater treatment plants are consistent with the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan. The MAG 208 Plan is the key guiding document used by Maricopa County and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality in granting permits for wastewater treatment systems in the MAG region. Consistency is necessary for permit approvals.

This element also discusses the recharge facilities operated by the City of Chandler. The recharge of reclaimed water is a common and beneficial practice within the MAG region and is addressed in the MAG 208 Water Quality Management Plan.

For solid waste, this element indicates that trash collected in Chandler is hauled to transfer stations and transported to the Butterfield Landfill. There is also discussion about the City's recycling program. The Butterfield Landfill is identified in the MAG Regional Solid Waste Management Plan and waste reduction through recycling is consistent with the goals of the MAG Solid Waste Plan.

Transportation

Chandler's Transportation Master Plan should be a component of the Chandler General Plan. The current General Plan does not have enough detail in the circulation element about transportation.

**Comments Submitted by Krista Collins to the Planning Commission
on June 4, 2008 and Staff's Response**

Text in quotes has been taken verbatim from Krista Collins' written statement.
Staff's response is in italics.

“For the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 4, 2008 (General Plan Update)

With respect to industrial land uses, this draft General Plan does not reflect public input, which began in August of last year. Residents from various parts of Chandler expressed concern about industrial land uses. Even neighbors of the Westech Industrial Park had concerns about what effects industrial growth will have on their health and safety.”

The goals and policies in the proposed General Plan were developed using comments received at the public meetings. All of the comments are documented and available at www.chandleraz.gov/generalplanupdate. That is to say that there were conflicting comments made at the public meetings and therefore not all of the input received throughout the update process could be incorporated into the draft.

For example, a minority of the comments suggested that the Employment land use category should be compartmentalized. This suggestion is inconsistent with a greater number of comments received in favor of embracing emerging technologies and expanding employment opportunities. While the proposed General Plan is a strategic policy to encourage economic development, this does not mean that in order to do so, the City will compromise the health and safety of its residents and businesses. Health and Safety are and always will be the City's top priority. There are various regulatory agencies in the State, County and in the City that have procedures in place to test and keep track of a development's potential impact with respect to hazardous materials, water pollution and air pollution. Regardless of a development's land use(s), safety is never compromised.

“Consultant and Staff have refused to include definitions of any current industrial land uses. They have also refused to include definitions of known emerging industrial uses such as biotechnology, biomedical, bioscience, life science and nanotechnology.

Consultant and staff have refused to define even the word nanotechnology, even after written request. And I do know that nanotube technology is one of the industries that the economic development department is interested in. Judith Garner and I discovered references to nanotube technology while they were researching the Chandler Life Science and Technology Incubator Feasibility Study and Operating Plan.”

The suggestion to compartmentalize the Employment category into more specific land use categories was made previously to the COC. At that time, Staff responded to the suggestion (see attached memo addressed to the General Plan Citizens Oversight Committee Members dated December 18, 2007). Below are two of the main points made in the memo:

- *Consistent with the hierarchy of the Chandler planning process, the General Plan provides broad policies and strategies, whereas, area plans provide greater levels of specificity. For example, the Chandler Airpark Area Plan identifies more specific types of employment (industrial, light industrial and commercial/office/business park) in areas that are designated by the General Plan as "Employment".*
- *Council policy direction regarding economic development is to encourage emerging technologies such as nanotechnology, biosciences, and sustainable construction. Compartmentalizing "Employment" into more specific categories may, by omission, have the effect of prohibiting other desirable emerging industries.*

The terms biotechnology, biomedical, bioscience, life sciences, and nanotechnology are not unique to the Chandler General Plan and thus are not defined in the General Plan. These terms are used to identify the types of industries (among several others listed that are also not defined in the General Plan) that would be appropriate in Chandler's Employment areas.

"Their refusal to define industrial land uses in ways comparable to the definitions of commercial uses has the end effect of concealing a whole class of land use from voters and residents. This fuzzy zoning policy in the case of emerging types of industrial growth will endanger public health in the future. News reports from May 21 reveal that there are significant risks associated with nanotube technology. According to reports in the Washington Post and the L.A. Times, mice exposed to nanotubes developed cellular changes similar to the precursor changes seen in cases of mesothelioma cancers."

Many cities around the world are competing for the same types of industries listed in the draft General Plan: high technology, nanotechnology, aerospace, renewable energy research and development, and biosciences. The definitions of these industries are available in any dictionary, and the General Plan makes it no secret that these highly sought after industries are the targeted Employment development in Chandler. Again, as stated previously, the health and safety of Chandler's residents and businesses remains the number one priority. There are various regulatory agencies that have procedures in place to ensure that all developments follow strict health and safety standards.

"It is my belief that the Incubator Plan is what is being referred to on pages 23, 30 and 31 of Next Twenty. The guidelines in Next Twenty have been used to lay the groundwork for this General Plan. As a result, the Incubator Plan format is also referred to in the General Plan. Judith Garner and I shared our findings about the Incubator Plan and the corresponding descriptive language about it, which is included in both the Next Twenty and the General Plan with Staff, consultants and the Citizens Oversight Committee. As a result, the term incubator was removed from the Growth Area Element. Key terms included in the Incubator Plan, Next Twenty, and this General Plan which are associated with biotech, nanotech, wet labs, life science etc. are still not defined. That means we run the risk of voters being completely unaware that they are being asked to vote in favor of a

controversial industrial park, the purpose of which is to attract wet lab start up companies close to existing homes.”

Copies of the Next Twenty report were available at the public meetings and on the Web site. From the beginning, it was stated in the written materials, and in the presentations that the General Plan would test the recommendations of the Next Twenty report with the public to determine if and how they should be incorporated into the General Plan. The term “incubator” was replaced with “start-up business” because the point made in the General Plan is to assist small business development and encourage a variety of start-up businesses - not just biosciences as the term “incubator” may incorrectly lead some to believe. Again, the terms bioscience, nanotechnology, wet labs, life sciences, are not unique to Chandler and their definitions are available in dictionaries.

I do not even know what this is about, it would be like to go to the E.D. side. Question?

“If the voters approve the language in this Plan, the City Council can then vote for funding of this partnership with the excuse that they were only acting on the policy adopted by voters through this plan. This is what is being proposed on page 12 of Land Use in an abstract way. It doesn't tell voters how much money will be needed. This doesn't say that a possible city sponsored entity proposed to administer this partnership will be a 501c3 corporation. Anyone who is unaware of the Incubator Plan will not realize that this page 12 language is part of the Incubator Concept. Folks have a right to know what they are voting on.”

Yes to be made

The Incubator Plan refers to a feasibility study that is being conducted by the City's Economic Development Division. The decision whether or not to fund an incubator/accelerator project is a completely separate decision by the Mayor and Council. The proposed General Plan does not enable any incubator projects that aren't already enabled by the current General Plan.

“The same problems exist when discussing the residential density terms in this Plan. On page 6 of Land Use the text fails to reveal that 40 dwelling units per acre is a potential goal in some redevelopment areas. Instead, the reader is referred to the glossary, which is also vague. The Land Use Element and glossary fail to define in terms of building height and mass just exactly what 40 du/acre will look like. On the second page of Land Use, high-rise buildings are mentioned, but no definition is given. I did ask for that on February 26.”

Addendum number 41 in the attached addenda adds language to the Urban Residential Densities description (already incorporated in the Final Draft) stating that ultimate densities will be determined by a number of factors including infrastructure capacity and neighborhood compatibility. The description clearly states that the Urban Residential Densities would be greater than 18 dwelling units per acre. Certainly, the maximum density of 40 du/acre planned in the downtown area is consistent with this category. The General Plan also refers to the Downtown – South Arizona Avenue Corridor Area Plan, which provides examples of what 40 du/acre, may look like and how tall those buildings could be. There may be instances where densities greater than 40 du/acre may be considered – again, the ultimate

density will be determined by a variety of factors. The term "high rise" will be replaced with a reference to the Council- approved Mid-rise Development Policy (see addendum item number 31).

"On December 18, 2007 at the Oversight meeting there was discussion of this new high-density residential use in terms of it being a red flag issue for West Chandler if it were shown on a map. And one member of the consulting team referred to high density as a LULU or "Locally Unwanted Land Use". As a result, it is hard to discern what any of these terms mean. On February 26 I even requested a web link from Land Use page 6 to the High Capacity Transit Corridor map. Last time she checked that was not done. How are folks supposed to know where this new super dense residential use is going to go?"

The comments made on Dec. 18th were in response to a wider High Capacity Transit Corridor area that was graphically illustrated to match the Tempe South Alternatives Analysis study area. Subsequently, the High Capacity Transit Corridor area on the map was narrowed along Rural Road to match the same width as the other two designated High Capacity Transit Corridors, Chandler Blvd. and Arizona Avenue. High Capacity Transit Corridor is also defined in the glossary, which in turn references the Circulation/Bicycling Element, which includes the map.

"According to Oversight Committee meeting notes from November 6 some members expressed concern over the low attendance at the October 23 and 25 meetings for the redevelopment neighborhoods. This is of great concern to me as well. That is because some of these areas serviced by the October meetings had been referred to during the October 2 oversight meeting as areas where "height by right" incentives might be appropriate.

The problem here is that the handouts distributed to announce those meetings failed to mention that future intended super dense residential uses such as "height by right" incentives and high rise development are proposed for those neighborhoods. Voters should not have to play hide and seek to figure out what they are voting on in this document."

The proposed General Plan refers readers to the Mid-Rise Development Policy, which identifies general locations and performance characteristics of projects within the city that might be appropriate for building heights greater than 45-feet in height. The Mid-Rise Policy also identifies basic design considerations to be made when such requests for taller buildings are submitted. Furthermore, the Mid-Rise Policy requires all proposed developments containing buildings over 45-feet in height to rezone the property, thus making all requests for Mid-Rise buildings a public process that includes neighborhood notification, neighborhood meetings and public hearings. There is no such thing as "height by right".

While Staff would have liked a larger attendance at the October meetings, there were about 10 people at each. An extensive multi-media approach was utilized for notification of the meetings including press release and bilingual flyers that were sent home with

school children in the area and distributed at I.C.A.N., the downtown Library, Senior Center, C.S.A., Chandler Christian Community Center and Salvation Army.

“New population projections based on the new density descriptions and proposed incentives will allow Chandler to max out 286 K at build out. That is 36 K more than the current 2001 standards would have allowed. Given that figure voters have an absolute right to know how much, how high and where with respect to all of the new super dense, super intense land uses proposed by this General Plan Draft.”

The projected build-out population for Chandler has been around 286,000 since 2005. The 286,000 build-out projection is based on the current General Plan. Should the proposed General Plan be adopted by Council and ratified by voters, Staff would update the population projections based on the new General Plan. Without having done any in-depth analysis, Staff would expect any population increase over 286,000 to come from higher residential densities in redevelopment projects. Currently, the City's population is estimated to be around 250,000.

December 18, 2007

TO: General Plan Citizens Oversight Committee Members

THRU: Doug Ballard, Planning & Development Director

FROM: Hank Pluster, Interim Long Range Planning Manager

SUBJECT: **STAFF RESPONSE TO "SUGGESTED INDUSTRIAL ZONING DEFINITIONS"**

Staff offers the following in response to the handout prepared and submitted by Krista Collins and Judith Garner as citizens attending the December 4th meeting of the Oversight Committee, entitled "Suggested Industrial Zoning Definitions" (see Exhibit "A", attached).

This response is based upon the following key points:

- Understanding the hierarchy of the Chandler planning program.
- Council policy direction regarding economic development is to grow "Employment", i.e., facilitate nanotechnologies, bioinformatics/information technologies, biosciences, and sustainable construction (green building).
- A general plan does not include zoning definitions.
- The regulation of particular land uses is addressed through zoning and other regulatory approvals, and not through a general plan.

Hierarchy of the Chandler Planning Program

First and foremost, it's essential to understand the Chandler planning program, its hierarchy, and how it goes into effect. As illustrated on page 4 of the current General Plan, the Chandler General Plan is a written statement of broad policies and strategies adopted by the Mayor and Council and subsequently ratified by City voters, that are subsequently detailed and described through land use area plans, various facility plans, and other adopted studies. Ultimately, those plans, studies, and strategies are implemented through the City Zoning Code (particularly through the Planned Area Development application process), the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and the annual City budget as reviewed and adopted by the Mayor and Council. With regard to land use, the area plans that are referenced in the General Plan more appropriately contain greater levels of specificity. One example is the Chandler Airpark Area Plan, which describes additional categories of industrial land use (i.e., light industrial, industrial, commercial/office/business park with and without taxiway access, and aerospace industry). But even in such examples, area plans contain land use planning

descriptions, which should not be confused with Zoning Code definitions and Official Zoning Maps that regulate where certain land uses are and are not permitted.

Council Policy Direction

As evidenced in the “Next Twenty” report prepared by Mary Jo Waits & Associates, the Mayor and Council policy direction is to facilitate growth of the nanotechnologies, bioinformatics/information technologies, biosciences, cognition-based technology, and construction/sustainability “green” building (found on page 32 of the MJW study, identified as “Big Bet #5”). If the City were to “compartmentalize” employment into various categories or definitions as suggested and somehow regulate them through the General Plan, the likelihood increases that the City would prohibit by omission other desirable segments of these evolving “idea technologies”. With respect to its growth and development, much of Chandler’s success has been the result of remaining open and flexible to the needs and requirements of employers, which in turn, ultimately, provide the homebuyers, shoppers, service-users and other key components of the local economy. Job retention/expansion has already been identified as a key strategy in Chandler remaining a sustainable city through build-out and beyond.

Zoning Definitions

Definitions and descriptions of industrial land uses such as those found in the December 4th handout represent a constrained approach that has not previously been a part of the Chandler planning program. As noted earlier, the General Plan is at the top of the planning hierarchy, and as such is not a regulatory document; rather, the General Plan is a statement of development policies as required by State law, to be considered by the Mayor and Council at the time zoning decisions and other matters pertaining to City development are made. The Zoning Code is in fact a regulatory document, in which it is necessary to set forth permitted uses, development standards, definitions and other requirements to insure orderly and compatible development of all land within the City jurisdiction.

Externalities of Particular Land Uses

In Chandler, the regulation of any land use (traffic generation, noise, odor, dust, smoke, parking, access, site development, building mass, orientation, height, setback, other intensities, etc.) are effectively dealt with through the Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning process, as detailed within the City Zoning Code. In practical terms, the PAD process is an individualized public analysis of any particular use or mix of uses of any scale or intensity, with extensive public notice and public involvement that include neighborhood meetings prior to advertised public hearings by Planning Commission and City Council. The PAD process directly facilitates a set of specific conditions that are aimed at any particular externality or land use characteristic that might be identified through the public process, and for that reason is used very extensively in all parts of the City. Again,

much of Chandler's successful development over the past 25 years (since the PAD ordinance has been in place) can be directly attributed to the public involvement, technical scrutiny and stipulated conditions of approval that are enabled through the PAD zoning process.

In addition to the Chandler zoning process, there are other regulatory mechanisms that are triggered when those needs arise, such as public health and safety codes as determined and administered by the City Fire Marshall regarding hazardous materials, City Municipal Utilities Department regarding water use and waste water discharge), and County and State Environmental Protection Agencies (EPAs regarding air emissions).

CONCLUSION

As outlined in the above, the Chandler planning program has been very successful in its a strategic approach, rather than taking the more traditional parcel-specific approach used by some other cities. The Chandler General Plan sets forth the strategies necessary to achieve the Mayor and Council's policy direction, and as such must remain open and flexible to emerging forms of employment within its economic development strategy. Such is not to say that all questions of land use compatibility and impact upon City infrastructure are automatically set aside; rather, such considerations are indeed made and effectively stipulated on a case-by-case basis through the City zoning (PAD) process that includes public notice and neighborhood meetings prior to advertised hearings, and in concert with other municipal, County, and State regulatory processes as necessary.

In reality, the 2001 Chandler General Plan currently in effect only identifies four (4) primary land use categories on the Chandler Land Use Map (page 33 of the current General Plan), i.e., residential, commercial, employment, and public/open space. While the text preceding the Land use Map presents some additional descriptions within some of those land use categories (such as residential and commercial), many of those additional descriptions are not shown on the Land Use Map. The reason for not doing so is best expressed on page 22 of the General Plan:

GOAL: CONTINUE TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE DIFFERENCES OF EACH PART OF THE CITY AND IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES THAT BEST FIT THEIR PLANNING NEEDS.

OBJECTIVE: Recognize the uniqueness of Chandler's neighborhoods and their individual planning needs.

Policy: Using the general policies of the Land Use Element, maintain the City's system of requiring the adoption of more detailed area plans and more specific land use policies, special districts, character areas, and corridor plans prior to development.

Simply put, the “compartmentalized” approach is not endorsed by the General Plan currently in effect, and at the time of this writing, it remains to be seen how general land use categories will be displayed within the forthcoming General Plan update.

Attachments: Exhibit “A”, Suggested Industrial Zoning Definitions”, from Krista Collins and Judith Garner

FOR the General Plan Update Citizens Oversight Committee, Dec. 4 Meeting

SUGGESTED INDUSTRIAL ZONING DEFINITIONS

The following suggestions for defining the existing classes of industrial land uses are similar in format/detail to the current General Plan commercial land use definitions. The parameters for these classifications are a compilation of existing industrial definitions throughout many of Chandler's other land use docs including the Airpark Area Plan, the zoning code. Even though Commercial land uses are similarly defined in these documents- their master definitions are still stated in the current General Plan. And Industrial uses should also be included in the new plan.

{NOTE----If Chandler continues to pursue even more vague zoning language in the new Plan, Chandler's ability to attract good quality industrial growth will be injured. And Chandler's home owners will also be injured by the corresponding lack of information they will be allowed to access in the general plan}

>**LIGHT INDUSTRIAL** is characterized by campus like office/business parks with corporate offices, and commercial services. Light high-tech manufacture, and associated research and development as related to that high-tech manufacture are allowed. These light operations and light mechanical industrial are allowed when they are not offensive, obnoxious or detrimental to neighboring uses thru dust, smoke, vibration, noise, odor or effluents. These uses are appropriate near existing/planned homes, schools, day care-provided that sufficient neighborhood notification has occurred to existing neighbors and that full disclosure of the intended land use is required of the developer of planned homes near the industrial area. Buffering and transitional treatments may be necessary between these dissimilar uses.

>**GENERAL / HEAVY INDUSTRIAL** is characterized by intensive land use, involving those manufacturing and assembly operations that are noisy, dusty, and utilizing frequent or heavy truck traffic or are otherwise obnoxious. They are such uses as heavy manufacturing of stone and metal products, gravel products. Construction and salvage yards, machine shops and plastics manufacturers are other uses. Warehousing, distributing and wholesale operations can also be expected in this classification. These uses are not appropriate near existing/planned homes, schools, daycare. Significant buffering/transitional land uses are required between this use and residential, school, and day care uses.

>**AEROSPACE INDUSTRY**-see the Airpark Area Plan

>**BIOSCIENCE INDUSTRIAL**-is a special class of land use encompassing a mix of varying land uses and intensities. And is expected to be the chief trend in future industrial development in Chandler. The U.S. Office of Technology Assessment defines bioscience as "any modern technology that uses living organisms (or parts of organisms) to produce or modify products, to improve plants or animals, or to develop microorganisms for specific uses." Some varying levels of land use intensities range from least intensive such as computational and bio-infomatic labs, and other dry lab types--thru wet labs up to vivariums. All of these uses are often combined with offices and limited warehouse uses., with more intense uses having commercial spaces as well.

DRY LAB uses such as bio-infomatic labs, and computational labs combined with office uses and some warehouse uses are allowed near planned/existing residential, school and day care uses. Those who require frequent truck traffic are allowed if the traffic is restricted to normal business hours.

A **WET LAB** is where both licensed and non EPA- licensed chemicals, and licensed and non FDA-licensed drugs are analyzed. Low level nuclear materials as well as biological materials also may be analyzed. These uses require water, direct ventilation, and specialized piped utilities. These are classified in varying degrees of biosafety levels (BSL), from 1-4. BSL 4 uses are NOT permitted in Chandler.

Wet labs should not be allowed within 1500 feet of planned or existing residential development, schools or day care. This distance shall be measured in a straight line from the nearest property line of any parcel currently zoned or planned as residential, school or day care to the nearest property line of a parcel where all or part of the use is proposed for wet lab use. In addition-full disclosure of the wet lab use shall be given by the developer or homebuilder of the residential parcel.

VIVARIUMS are labs comprised of enclosed areas for keeping and raising animals for observation or research; animal facilities support research and development labs by using animals in experiments such as efficacy and toxicology testing prior to clinical trials in humans. They also are classed in BSL categories 1-4. BSL 4 vivariums are NOT permitted in Chandler.

The same distance requirements and disclosure requirements spelled out for wet labs are required for vivariums. In addition-any proposed vivarium shall be considered on an individual basis. Further requirements are that neighborhood opposition shall be considered, and compatibility with adjacent land uses shall be considered.

{NOTE-to assist with reducing public resistance to wet labs and vivariums, Chandler should adopt a Hazardous Materials Permit and Disclosure Ordinance. This ordinance will require labs to submit information on the types and

quantities of hazardous materials that the lab uses and prepare emergency response plans . This information shall be available to the public. This has been done in other world-class biotech cities as a way to foster public acceptance by demonstrating a dedication to openness and safety.)

Other bio-tech cities have found that by developing comprehensive zoning controls via citizen advisory task groups two goals are met. The process involved results in certainty for the industry and a very good educational process for the public causing a sense of ownership in the new industry. It allows residents to gain accurate information to judge the economic and environmental impacts of the new industry. Chandler's lack of use categories to encompass all of the various functions of modern bio-science labs will be a deterrent for quality companies to locate here. Other cities have polled bio- science developers and have been told that one main deterrent to locating in a new city is the lack of a clear category definition and open ended planning department discretion. That this lack of definition actually increases their cost of development, especially for smaller innovation companies.

The big guys in the bio-tech race (Boston, San Francisco, Cambridge) all have detailed concise zoning laws brought about by citizen oversight, and advisory groups. We encourage this oversight committee to direct the city planning department and city council to adopt similar policies and institute a Mayor and Council appointed advisory committee for this purpose.

Krista Collins
Ph. 480-895-7662
kic-silk@worldnet.att.net
4960 So. Gilbert Rd. Suite 1, Chandler Az, 85249

Judith Garner
Ph. 480-560-7842
662 W. Nolan Way, Chandler Az. 85248
judithgarner@cox.net

EXHIBIT A

ADDENDA TO 3-7-2008 DRAFT GENERAL PLAN

(New text is underlined and deleted text is struck through)

1. Renumber all pages (including all map and chart pages) in conventional order (e.g., 1,2,3...), and print the appropriate page number on the map/chart pages.
2. Add Web site address on the new cover of the General Plan to direct readers to the General Plan and additional related information available on-line.
3. Add tabs for faster reference to General Plan elements.
4. Intro-2 (Figure #1): ~~Boundaries represented on this map show the incorporated city and town area extents, not necessarily the municipal planning area extents.~~ Source: City and town incorporated boundaries obtained from Arizona State Land Department as of April 2008. City of Chandler boundary represents the City's Municipal Planning Area.
5. Intro-3 (Figure #2): Re-title as "CHANDLER PLANNING AREA AND CITY LIMITS" and correct the spelling of "Chandler".
6. Intro-3 (Figure #2), revisions to Legend: Add "Incorporated City Limits" next to a new light brown rectangle, add text "(Unincorporated Area)" after County Island, and "Chandler Municipal Planning Area Boundary" next to rectangle with boundary but no fill color.
7. Intro-4 (1st ¶): As required by the Arizona Revised Statutes for all municipalities, the General Plan serves as an expression of development guidance policies used to guide development decisions.
8. Intro-4 (2st ¶): ~~Elements are the Plan's fundamental subject area components —most all required by the State; others except for one, the Neighborhood Planning Element, which is added by the City. For example, a new component, Neighborhood Planning, was included by the City to stress a new emphasis on assisting older neighborhoods to maintain their quality of life. the opportunities for public involvement in the planning process.—The Energy Element, recently mandated by the Arizona legislature, introduces goals to encourage energy efficiency and the utilization of renewable resources."~~
9. Intro-4 (5th ¶): "What is Build-Out? Build-Out occurs when most vacant or agricultural land has been developed committed to urban uses. The City will never be one hundred percent built out since there will always be infill development and redevelopment efforts. However, the City of Chandler is running out of space for new development. Figure 3, on the following page, shows the current supply of land committed and planned for residential or Nonnon-Residential residential use. Committed properties in Figure 3 are defined as properties that were either under construction, recently zoned for a particular development, or in the process of requesting zoning as of the date of

- the maps. Uncommitted properties are those that had not submitted any rezoning application to the City, had agricultural zoning or zoning approval for a specific development, but had remained inactive for several years.”
10. Intro-5: update each map with the April 1st data when available.
 11. Intro-6 (1st ¶): ~~“Chandler’s General Plan proceeds directly from community goals set by citizens to the implementation steps necessary to achieve those goals.—The General Plan itself consists of the Introduction and separate sections addressing Plan Elements, which are the City’s basic planning components. An Implementation Strategy guide lists possible follow up activities in a separate, supporting administrative document.”~~
 12. Intro-7 (2nd ¶ in Vision Statement box): “As a major suburban City, Chandler will be home to many world class corporations.”
 13. Intro-7 (4th ¶ in Vision Statement box): “Besides a strong employment base and desirable neighborhoods, what will make Chandler stand out from other suburban cities is its commitment to become a sustainable City and to encourage sustainable development.”
 14. Intro-7 (1st ¶ under Citizen Participation) “Persons of all various ages and interests participated in identifying...”
 15. Intro-8 (5th ¶): Two public hearings were held by the Planning & Zoning Commission (May 20 22, 2008* and June 4, 2008*), after which the Commission recommended approval of the Chandler General Plan. The City Council held a public hearing on June 26, 2008*, at which time the general Plan was approved and adopted for subsequent ratification by Chandler voters on November 4, 2008. (Delete footnote at bottom of page)
 16. Intro-8 (2nd ¶ - last sentence): “Feedback from citizens continued to be gathered throughout the process from persons submitting comments or replying electronically to the questionnaire through the City’s website (<http://www.chandleraz.gov/gpupdate.aspx>).”
 17. Intro-8 (3rd ¶): “Special Area meetings were held with citizens in October 2007 to discuss Neighborhood Planning and Redevelopment.” “Then they were asked to mark on maps noting locations where they thought further development/redevelopment ought to occur neighborhood improvements or redevelopment efforts could be made. Various locations...”
 18. Intro-8 (4rd ¶): “Opportunities to provide additional input were made available throughout the General Plan process. City Staff and consultants presented General Plan overviews and provided public input opportunities at a variety of community meetings: Local Initiatives Support Corporation Briefing;

- Stakeholders Forum; Congress of Neighborhoods; Intel Community Advisory Panel; Link-Neighborhood Link Group; Maricopa Association of Governments; Chandler Chamber of Commerce; Valley Partnership; Ocotillo Spring Event; Airport Commission, Transportation Commission, Neighborhood Advisory Committee, Economic Development Advisory Committee Board, and the Energy and Green Building Forum, in addition to a-Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council Briefings.”
19. Intro-9 (2nd ¶): “Arizona Statutes (ARS §9-462.01) require that all zoning regulations and rezoning actions ~~are be~~ consistent with the General Plan... The Elements taken into consideration with the goals, objectives, build-out policies and implementation strategies recommendations – supply a checklist for... Chandler’s ~~flexible~~ innovative Planned Area Development zoning process allows proposed developments to be analyzed for consistency with the policies within this General Plan and taken through a citizen participation and public hearing process. ~~proponents and neighbors of a proposed project to work with Planning Commission, City Council, and staff to achieve site plans that fit the particular location.”~~
 20. Intro-9 (4th ¶, last sentence): A Glossary and Appendices ~~are~~ is also provided.
 21. Intro-9 (last ¶): It ~~should be noted that the General Plan leads to, but does not incorporate, additional information. Maintaining separate reference sources, such as an Implementation Strategy, allows them to be updated frequently, without requiring a General Plan Amendment.~~
 22. Intro-10 (3rd ¶ and last ¶ with bullet points): “The Planning and Development Department is the lead agency to process the amendment request. More detailed information regarding Major and Minor General Plan amendment procedures including steps, important deadlines, and application forms is available at the Planning and Development Department office and Web site. ~~This Department will provide the necessary forms and information.” Delete the last paragraph beginning with “Steps in the process...” including bullet points.~~
 23. Intro-10 (2nd ¶, #4) “...regarding residential densities, intensities or major roadway locations, ~~–that would have~~ city-wide implications, ~~in one or more locations anywhere within the municipal planning area.”~~
 24. Intro-12 (Figure #4. Hierarchy of the General Plan and other City Adopted Plans). In the left-hand box under “AREA PLANS”, strike the reference to “Santan Freeway”.
 25. Intro-12 (2nd ¶, 3rd sentence): “However, when more detailed, specific plans that were adopted by City Council prior to the effective date of this General Plan are found to be in conflict with the goals, objectives, recommendations...”

26. Intro-13 (2nd ¶): “There are ~~two~~three reasons to recommend planning at this level . . . 3) to establish neighborhood preservation/ maintenance goals and programs.”
27. Intro-13 (Figure 5.) “Downtown-South Arizona Avenue Corridor Area”
28. LU-1 (1st ¶ under LAND USE, 3rd sentence): “Now, greater development intensity ~~—consistent with City codes—~~is sought in appropriate locations and circumstances.”
29. LU-2: Add the following objective under the 1st GOAL: “Objective: Encourage the use of shade and environmentally sensitive design.”
30. LU-2 (2nd Objective under 2nd GOAL): “Encourage residential preservation, maintenance, and revitalization programs.”
31. LU-2 (2nd Objective under 3rd GOAL): “~~Describe criteria and recommend locations for considering mid-rise or high-rise buildings.~~ Encourage building heights greater than forty-five feet at select locations in accordance with the Mid-Rise Development Policy.”
32. LU-2 (3rd Objective under the last GOAL): “Encourage knowledge-intensive industries (such as high-technology, biomedical...”
33. LU-2 (4th Objective under the last GOAL): “Promote the innovation zone concept (See Growth Area Element) where research and industry intersect and benefit . . .”
34. LU-3 (Figure #6): update Land Use Distribution (pie chart) and Land Use Comparison Table with April 1st data when available.
35. LU-4 (2nd ¶, 2nd sentence): “~~The more specific planning layer addresses distinguishing physical or locational characteristics that support targeted land use implementation strategies.~~These Area Plans address unique characteristics and support unique land use planning and implementation strategies for each area.”
36. LU-5 (1st ¶ under Downtown-South Arizona..., 2nd sentence) “The Redevelopment Area Plan contains Chandler’s strategies, policies and actions steps as they pertain to five specific areas.”
37. LU-5 (3rd bullet point under Downtown-South Arizona...): “Create a cultural and commercial entertainment environment linked to the historic downtown square. zone along the west side of Arizona Avenue and north of Frye Road.”

38. LU-5 (Last bullet point under Downtown-South Arizona...): “Create design standards ~~a strong design theme for the downtown corridor area.~~”
39. LU-5 (1st ¶) under Land Use Categories): “...its land use categories are not parcel specific. Area plans may provide more specific land use designations for particular areas in accordance with the land use considerations provided in this section. Further, the zoning process is used to evaluate proposed developments and determine consistency with area plans and ultimately, the land use considerations in this section. The strategic broad category descriptions and land use considerations for each category are as follows:”
40. LU-5 (last ¶): Change paragraph format to bullet points. “*Rural Residential* (link to Glossary) properties (0-2.5 dwelling units per acre) are appropriate in areas adjacent to rural or large lot subdivisions. *Low-density residential* (link to Glossary) 2.5-3.5 du/ac continues to be appropriate in areas that ~~are not located within designated growth areas~~ designated Residential as shown on the Future Land Use Plan (see Figure #8) (link). *Medium density residential* (link to Glossary)...”
41. LU-6 (1st ¶): Change paragraph format to bullet points “High density residential (link to Glossary) (12-18 du/ac) can be considered as a stand alone use in downtown, areas adjacent to arterial roads, and freeways, or as part of a mixed-use development (link to Glossary) in areas adjacent to arterial roads, freeways, commercial areas, Revitalization/Infill Growth Areas, Growth Expansion Nodes, and within designated High Capacity Transit Corridors. *Urban residential densities* (link to Glossary) exceeding eighteen dwelling units per acre can be considered in downtown and other Revitalization/Infill Growth Areas, Growth Expansion Nodes, regional commercial areas, and within designated High Capacity Transit Corridors (maximum allowable densities would be determined at the time of development plan approval by the City, based upon such considerations as existing and planned capacities for water and sewer infrastructure, trip generation vis-à-vis traffic/transit systems, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and other factors). In order to maximize the efficiency of land uses and promote sustainable urban development, developments with high or urban residential densities should be considered as part of mixed-use developments consisting of ground floor retail, office, or live-work opportunities.”
42. LU-6 (2nd ¶): “Mixed-use developments (link to Glossary) containing residential, commercial and office, can be considered at the intersection of major arterials, freeway intersections, interchanges with arterial streets, commercial areas, Revitalization/Infill Growth Areas, Growth Expansion Nodes, and along High Capacity Transit Corridors. Residential densities within mixed-use developments will be determined in accordance with the locational considerations outlined above as well as by infrastructure capacity, neighborhood compatibility, and design quality.”

43. LU-6 (4th ¶): “Chandler’s adopted Area Plans establish target densities intended to blend with the surrounding environment. For example, at 0-2.5 dwellings per acre the Southeast Chandler Area Plan (web link) suggests spacious single-family lot layouts to maintain connection compatibility with nearby rural character. The South Arizona Avenue Corridor Area Plan.....such as those served by public transit (weblink). ~~Chandler’s preferred Planned Area Development (PAD) zoning process provides the ideal mechanism for fitting proposed residential projects in to different community settings in accordance with the General Plan and Area Plan goals and objectives.”~~
44. LU-6 (5th ¶, 2nd sentence): “However, Chandler’s build-out growth emphasis on the more cost-beneficial business and employment components fully recognizes that quality residential excellence development supplies the foundation for municipal financial stability.”
45. LU-6 (6th ¶): “Although the residential category is not marked for expansion on the Future Land Use Plan, it will be relied upon to produce variety in housing choice, affordability and value in absorbing its remaining acreage. Blending higher densities into mixed-use areas and revitalization projects will be instrumental to Chandler’s strategic urbanization. Finally, it is recognized that in certain limited circumstances where a parcel is challenged by its size, shape, orientation, vehicular access and visibility from an arterial street, that residential use may be the only realistic development potential for such a parcel.”
46. LU-7 (2nd ¶, last sentence): “Sites reserved for retail, service, commercial office businesses, and institutional uses ~~likely will~~ transition from no longer follow ~~ence~~ typical strip shopping, neighborhood and community center models to more urban, compact, mixed-use developments.”
47. LU-7 (3rd ¶): Delete 3rd ¶ “A blend of... some housing.”
48. LU-7 (4th ¶): “...a range of commercial intensities, not illustrated on the Future Land Use Plan, may be considered in other select location~~this category~~ as described in the following paragraph.”
49. LU-7 (5th ¶): Change paragraph format to bullet points “...needs of the low-density residential areas. *Community commercial* (link to Glossary) is appropriate along freeways and arterial street intersections at the intersection of major arterial streets, subject to the consideration of strategic criteria identified in the Glossary. *Commercial office* (link to Glossary) complexes such as garden offices are appropriate along arterial roads, and adjacent to or mixed in with neighborhood or community commercial centers. For large office developments (link to Glossary) including multi-tenant office buildings and corporate offices see Employment category. *Urban commercial* (link to Glossary) is appropriate in downtown, other growth areas, or along

transportation corridors where mixed use buildings or compact urban development may be appropriate. *Regional commercial* (link to Glossary) includes major regional commercial uses such as malls, power centers, large single use retail and other major commercial developments. Regional commercial locations are shown on the Future Land Use Plan and are also subject to eligible for consideration for of urban-style mixed-use developments, large office users, and a compatible mix of residential densities. For a statement of the recommended standards for building intensities, see Glossary for the respective commercial type.

50. LU-7 (6th ¶): “**Commercial Nodes.** This category denotes intersections that may be considered for neighborhood or community commercial developments including large single-use retail (link to Glossary), commercial offices (link to Glossary), commercial services (Link to Glossary) and institutional uses (link to Glossary). Other uses such as...”
51. LU-7 (7th ¶): “**Employment.** Chandler’s strong job base ~~relies will continue to rely on~~ attracting a diverse range of high-paying industries. ~~emerging technology companies.~~ This category targets knowledge intensive industries (link to Glossary) and ~~other high-paying industries such as high technology, nanotechnology, aerospace, renewable energy research and development, biosciences,~~ as well as advanced business services (link to Glossary) and information technology.”
52. LU-8 (3rd ¶): “Large office developments (link to Glossary) Corporate offices offer additional employment prospects for the City’s workforce. In many instances, the company’s offices may locate on the same site as their research or manufacturing functions. Corporate offices and large multi-story offices with multi-tenants can also be considered in employment areas as well as downtown, regional commercial areas, growth areas, as a component within an innovation zone and along freeways, and along High Capacity Transit Corridors. In some instances where surrounding land uses are determined to be compatible, corporate offices may locate on the same site as their research or manufacturing functions.”
53. LU-8 (5th ¶): “**South Price Road Employment Corridor.** This area is recognized as the City’s premier employment corridor, which is reserved for single employment users such as high-tech manufacturing, corporate offices, and *knowledge intensive employers* (link to Glossary) in campus-like settings on parcels generally not less than 15 acres. Parcels less than 15 acres may be considered when they are part of a larger innovation zone as described in the Growth Areas Element (link). General industrial parks and subdivisions, warehousing, distributorships, and other uses that fall outside the description of knowledge-intensive employers, large office developments, or advance business services do not fit this category.”

54. LU-10 (3rd ¶, last sentence): “...raise spendable local incomes—(weblink). However, at the same time, the City must strive for a balance of land uses and avoid an unsustainable proliferation of any particular land use. For this reason, land use conversions from commercial to residential may be appropriate in certain areas where additional residential is needed to balance existing commercial land uses or when a property’s potential for commercial development is limited by the size, shape, orientation, accessibility or visibility.”
55. LU-10 (2nd to last ¶): “...which may be passed along to ultimate users. Building heights greater than forty-five (45) feet should be considered in accordance with the Mid-rise Development Policy and any subsequent amendments to the policy adopted by City Council.”
56. LU-11 (2nd bullet point under Build-Out Policies): “Resist attempts to convert acreage reserved for non-residential development into housing use, except when additional residential is needed to support existing commercial uses or when a property’s potential for commercial development is limited by its size, shape, orientation, accessibility, or visibility.”
57. LU-11 (7th bullet point under Build-Out Policies): “Consider permitting limited number of residential dwelling units in mixed-use developments as incentives for providing workforce housing...”
58. LU-11 (9th bullet point under Build-Out Policies): “Support locally owned businesses Promote business retention and expansions within Chandler and avoid sales tax leakage to other municipalities.”
59. LU-12 (5th ¶, 2nd sentence) “For example, metro— transit service advancements...”
60. LU-12 (6th ¶, last sentence): “Efforts could include, infrastructure expansion, spec building construction, recruitment at...”
61. LU-12 (Last ¶, 2nd sentence): “Articulating acceptable types, sizes and intensities of adjacent non-residential uses before developments planning was are proposed would be far more constructive than adversarial contentiousness.”
62. LU-13 (1st recommendation): “Require Continue compatibility analysis from with developers and neighbors of growth area sites, within specified distances from existing or planned residential areas. Statements Considerations should include assessments of costs and benefits to the City, commitments to buffering...”
63. LU-13 (Last recommendation): “Produce regular updates recording land absorption by general land use category and location.”

64. LU-14 (Figure #8 Future Land Use Map):

- Add western canal bicycle path;
- Under Residential category description – “Public facilities, commercial offices, and institutional uses may be located along frontages of arterial streets, and commercial may be located at the corners of arterial street intersections, and mixed-use developments may be located at the intersection of major arterial streets and along High Capacity Transit Corridors.”
- Under Commercial category description – “As described in the text of the General Plan, urban style mixed-use developments, large...”
- Under Employment category description – “A compatible mix of residential densities as an integral component, and innovation zones may be considered as described in the text of the General Plan.”
- Make Large Tract Growth Areas and Growth Expansion Nodes patterns a little more distinct from each other.

65. C/B-1 (3rd ¶, 4th sentence): ~~“Instead, as the~~ The City is applying lessons learned from other mature urban communities: transforms into a mature urban community, high intensity land uses will need to be placed near transit corridors within walking distance of bus rapid transit or light rail transit stations.”

66. C/B-1 (1st objective under the second goal):

~~“Objective: Plan High Capacity Transit Corridors near planned high intensity land uses~~ near High Capacity Transit Corridors.”

67. C/B-2 (Add new objective under 1st Bicycling goal):

“Objective: Plan an interconnected bicycle system containing continuous east-west and north-south bicycle routes.”

68. C/B-3 (Insert 3 new ¶s after the 3rd ¶): “The City of Chandler provides a number of transportation programs and services to help senior citizens and people with disabilities maintain their independence within the community. Dial-A-Ride service is provided in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) through the East Valley Dial-A-Ride (EVDAR). EVDAR provides door-to-door, shared-ride public transportation services for senior citizens and persons with disabilities. Valley Metro operates the EVDAR service under contract for the Cities of Chandler, Mesa, Tempe, Scottsdale and the Town of Gilbert. Proposition 400 funds the cost of service for persons with disabilities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which makes up approximately 80% of the EVDAR service hours. Non-ADA service is funded by the City of Chandler.”

The Maricopa County Human Services Department Special Transportation Services (STS) program supplements dial-a-ride services currently provided through East Valley Dial-A-Ride with assisted, door-to-door transportation for persons with disabilities and the elderly. This is a shared-ride service and advance reservations are required. The City of Chandler also contracts with Maricopa County to provide transportation service to income-qualified veterans.

The City of Chandler initiated a subsidized taxicab coupon program with Valley Metro in 2006. This program, modeled after successful cab subsidy programs in Mesa and Scottsdale, provides subsidized taxicab coupons for Chandler residents that are eligible for dial-a-ride services. The program is intended to provide additional transportation options for senior citizens and persons with disabilities at a lower cost than traditional dial-a-ride service. Under this program, participants purchase coupon booklets at a nominal co-pay of \$2.50 for one book, valued at \$10. The coupons can then be applied toward the fares of participating cab companies.”

69. C/B-3 (5th ¶): “Positive bike system factors include planned roadway widening ~~for~~ to include bike lane installation, pathway connections designed into new developments and incorporation of facility extensions through linear parks and along canal banks.”
70. C/B-3 (Insert new ¶ after 1st ¶ under Challenges/Issues): “Two commuter express bus routes offering weekday, peak hour service between Chandler and downtown Phoenix have been in operation since the mid-1980’s. In 2004, Maricopa County voters approved Proposition 400, which will provide additional funding for construction of freeway high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and park & rides, and expansion of the express bus fleet with new routes offering service between Chandler, Phoenix, Tempe, and Scottsdale. A regional park & ride with 450 parking spaces will be built adjacent to Tumbleweed Park in 2008. As fuel prices continue to rise, demand for commuter express service will likely increase requiring construction of additional park & ride facilities in proximity to the freeways and further expansion of commuter bus service.”
71. C/B-3 (9th ¶): “**Opportunities.** Tax dollars allocated by passage of Proposition 400 are expected to generate one billion dollars for Chandler transportation projects over the life of the sales tax. An example is providing Bus rapid transit (BRT) in the Arizona Avenue Corridor. This improvement, ~~second among six priorities countywide,~~ is scheduled to begin service in July 2010.”
72. C/B-5 (2nd ¶): “Public transit offers excellent prospects to relieve transportation demand on a large scale. ~~Valtrans~~ Valley Metro, the metropolitan transit system, will play an important role in Chandler’s alternative ridership progress. Working with...”

73. C/B-5 (2nd ¶--recommendation box): "Increase mass transit planning and funding communication with Federal, State, and county agencies, and especially with ~~Valtrans~~ Valley Metro and MAG staff. An annual transit..."
74. C/B-5 (8th ¶): "Growth Area development approvals, incentives, or bonuses might require applicants' traffic management plans Transportation Demand Measures (TDMs) to include innovative approaches to reduce transportation system impacts. Employers could..."
75. C/B-6 (1st ¶--recommendation box): "**Recommendation.** Consider transportation improvements as essential prerequisites for approving higher intensity development projects. Site layouts can be designed to reduce walking distances from ~~parking~~ transit. Efficient interior roadway circulation..."
76. C/B-7 (7th ¶): "Traffic management policies ~~need to~~ may address such issues as minimizing the impacts of truck movements during peak hours and discouraging through traffic from penetrating neighborhoods. Public safety departments..."
77. C/B-7 (2nd ¶): "Investments in bicycling will produce long-term benefits. An alternative transportation system can be accomplished at relatively little public expense when compared with the costs associated with public transit or major roadway projects. Most bike lane installations/upgrades would occur in conjunction with ~~Street~~ City Capital Improvement Program projects."
78. C/B-7 (3rd ¶): "Neighborhood Plans ~~could~~ should include bicycle plan components to encourage use by residents and businesses."
79. C/B-7 (4th ¶--in recommendation box): "**Recommendation.** Identify and prioritize existing gaps in the Bike Plan "main line" routes. Update order-of-magnitude cost estimates, including street crossing improvements and other safety enhancements. Develop annualized public funding targets from possible financial resources (e.g., ~~Proposition 400, State funds, City CIP~~ Federal funds and local funds) for implementation."
80. C/B-7 (5th ¶): "**Encourage commuting and shopping by bicycle.** Private sector participation in Bike Plan implementation could be instrumental to accessing specific destinations. Developers' contributions to new collector street bike lanes and/or planned trails are expected in traffic management plans for project ~~construction~~ approval. Added amenities for employee or customer use of bicycle transportation alternatives would be highly encouraged."
81. Circulation Plan (Figure #9):
 - Combine Major and Minor Arterials into one category "Arterial Streets".

- Remove Val Vista Drive and the segment of Lindsay Road from Queen Creek to Ocotillo Roads since the right-of-ways for these street segments are not in the City of Chandler's jurisdiction.
 - Add Frye Road, Ellis Road, and Chandler Village Drive street names to
 - Extend hatch marks to south side of Frye Road
82. NP-1 (Las Objective on page):
"Objective: ~~Relate to~~Respect the character of traditional neighborhoods or county islands by encouraging them to preserve and improve upon the positive qualities that make each area unique.~~on a broader social scope to capture the spirit of neighborhood preservation and improvement."~~
83. NP-1 (2nd Goal, 2nd Objective): "...sidewalks, aging and other infrastructure..."
84. NP-2 (last ¶, line 3): "...such as the South Arizona..."
85. NP-3 (4th ¶): "Maintaining living quality represents a shared concern of residential neighbors whether their homes are new or older. The LEED program, developed by the United States Green Building Council (USGBC) and advocated in Chandler's Energy and Housing Elements, is expanding to bring smart growth for entire neighborhoods: LEED for Neighborhood Development is geared to ~~preservation~~ new construction and infill. LEED-ND could help knit urban residential areas together."
86. NP-4 (7th ¶--in recommendation box): "Publish an expanded "Neighborhood Planning and Redevelopment Primer" (derived from planning process handout materials) and ~~explore LEED-ND programs for use by citizen groups and property owners. Evaluate neighborhood-generated proposals for citizen consideration in formulating Chandler's annual Capital Improvement Program."~~
87. H-4 (4th ¶): "The h~~Housing production slump~~ in Chandler ~~dropped from 2004-07 from annual highs of nearly 4,000 residential permits issued to just over 1,000 permits as the downturn~~ peaks began to leveled off in Fiscal Year 2006-07. The affordability..."
88. H-6 (2nd ¶, lines 1-2): "When opportunities arise, Homeownership Programs are offered to Public Housing and Section 8 residents whom have worked to become self-sufficient and financially stable ~~the opportunity to become homeowners. The Housing and Redevelopment Division...~~"
89. H-7 (4th ¶): "Higher density layouts lower the cost of land per dwelling unit. Permitting greater height in a few, ~~select~~ appropriate locations encourages urban..."

90. GA-3: “Chandler Fashion Mall – expanding retail, entertainment and dining enterprises invite additional employment, such as a variety of urban development opportunities. Consistent with the Land Use Element (link) development opportunities include upscale high end large offices developments (link to Glossary), urban residential (link to Glossary) and mixed-use development (link to Glossary).”
91. GA-3 (Last bullet item on page): “Chandler Regional Hospital vicinity—health-care related uses (link to Glossary), corporate commercial office (link to Glossary), large office development (link to Glossary), a compatible mix of residential, mixed-use developments (link to Glossary) and other support functions may extend from the hospital vicinity on the west east and west sides of Dobson Road south to the SanTan Freeway.”
92. GA-4 (1st ¶ under the first two bullet points): “...Chandler Regional Hospital, to each other. Consistent with the Land Use Element (link) a compatible mix of High to Urban Residential densities can complement commercial and employment uses within this growth area. The combination of major anchors, variety of existing land uses, and proximity to each other with the Frye Road connectivity create an exciting opportunity within the High Capacity Transit Corridor designation to build upon the synergy in these growth areas. Further east of these growth nodes, Frye Road leads to downtown providing another important connection that will add to the dynamic nature of these growth areas. The other Growth Expansion Nodes, at major transportation junctions, represent strategic locations for placing specialized commercial and employment, with additional opportunities for High to Urban Residential densities or mixed-use developments.”
93. GA-7 (2nd Recommendation): “With the participation of stakeholders, develop criteria for evaluation growth area project proposals. Defined performance standards...”
94. CD-4 (3rd ¶): “**Tie Land Use Decisions to Economic Sustainability.** Recognition of the relationship between land use and municipal costs and revenues is essential for Chandler during build-out. While not all remaining land should be developed as non-residential, the City should strive for a balance of land uses that may require additional residential in some areas. One thing is clear, however, that business as usual cannot be acceptable if Chandler wants to achieve community goals of sustainability.”
95. R-4 (1st ¶, line 2): “Employing alternative measures, including voluntary design and improvement guides and standards, poses significant implementation challenges.”

96. R-5 (2nd Recommendation, 2nd ¶, line 1): "An expanded "Neighborhood and Redevelopment Primer" (included in Appendices) should be published for use by property owners, the development community and neighborhood groups."
97. R-6 (3rd Recommendation, 3rd ¶): ~~"Regulatory Involve private sector in creating redevelopment incentives, may encourage new urban housing types and densities as well as supporting services in near downtown neighborhoods. Establish outreach program to obtain suggestions from development industry."~~
98. R-6 (3rd ¶, line 2): "...Programs and policies predominantly particularly aimed at non-residential buildings..."
99. R/OS-1 (3rd Objective under 2nd Goal): "Objective: ~~Integrate more shade into park projects.~~ Integrate additional shade into parks."
100. R/OS-1 (1st Objective under 3rd Goal): "Objective: Renovate existing ~~community parks to ensure all residents have updated facilities.~~"
101. R/OS-2 (2nd ¶, lines 2-3): "...amenities. ~~A comprehensive listing of recreation and open space facilities, their locations and contact information may be found at (weblink). Figure 19 illustrates...~~"
102. R/OS – 2 (4th ¶): "In addition, the Community Services Department operates: the Tumbleweed Recreation Center, a 62,000 square foot multi-generational facility that features a fitness center, indoor jogging track, group exercise studio, gymnasium, game room, art and ceramics studios, racquetball courts, teaching kitchen, room rentals, birthday party packages and more; the Veterans Oasis Environmental Education Center, a 10,000 square foot facility that has four classrooms, exhibit areas, a gift shop, and staff offices; the Chandler Community Center, a 33,000 square foot facility... ..and the 11,300 square foot Snedigar Recreation Center that includes multipurpose rooms and classrooms."
103. R/OS – 3 (2nd ¶ under Assets): ~~"New Park Design and Development. Funding is included in the Capital Program to design and construct an average of one neighborhood park per year for the fiscal years of 2008-09 through 2011-12. The park development process includes many variables, which affect the schedule. In some years two parks may be developed while only one may be developed other years. The development schedule for individual parks will be reviewed and prioritized on an annual basis based upon acquisition schedules, residential development in the park service area, community needs, and ability to fund the maintenance."~~
104. R/OS – 4 (1st bullet point, last sentence): "...open space for recreation. To date, approximately ~~400~~ 120 acres have been developed... The overall

master plan for the park includes a tennis complex, festival area, open space, parks/buildings and facilities –maintenance service center–facility, a multi-generational recreation center, train display area, Playtopia, a large playground area and other community...”

105. R/OS – 4 (Add new bullet point at top of page): “Veterans Oasis Park, located at the northeast corner of Chandler Heights and Lindsay Roads, covers 113 acres and features 4 ½ miles of trails, wildlife viewing areas, ramadas and picnic areas, a butterfly and hummingbird habitat, an outdoor amphitheater, a unique learning-oriented playground, a learning center, and a 5-acre urban fishing lake.”
106. R/OS – 6 (1st ¶ under Implementation Recommendations): “Derived primarily from Community Services planning efforts with the Chandler Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, Goals and Objectives have been refined...”
107. R/OS – 6 (2nd Recommendation, line 1): “Utilize trend analysis and user needs assessments to proactively identify and program necessary need renovation of facilities to meet changing demographics, interests and needs.”
108. R/OS-8 (Figure #19 Parks and Open Space):
 - Add western canal bicycle path to the map.
 - Update Tumbleweed Park’s “Existing” vs. “Future” designations
 - Text edits on map:
 - i. “Blue Heron Park–Site”
 - ii. “~~Snedigar Sports Complex Expansion~~”
 - iii. “~~Old Stone Park Site~~Citrus Vista Park Site”
 - iv. “Mesquite Groves Park Site and Aquatic Center–Site”
 - v. “The Parks and Open Space Map shows Chandler’s open space including parks, recreation facilities, canals, and golf courses, and retention basins. Private parks and retention areas such as those owned by Home Owner Associations are not shown on the map.”
109. E-4 (1st Recommendation): “Establish and maintain a Green Building Program that utilizes ~~recognized criteria and standards,~~is appropriate for the desert environment...”
110. E-4 (3rd ¶, lines 2-3): “As identified by community Goals, Objectives and Policies, the following recommendations are suggested below. Specific Action Steps.”
111. E-4 (1st Recommendation, line 3): “Incorporate incentives to advance improve the program's appeal to all potential users.”
112. E-4 (last ¶): “Although voluntary, the benefits of green building are appealing to an ever expanding market. Strong community energy

conservation policies appeal to companies that the City is striving to attract. The establishment of a Green Building Program..."

113. E-5 (1st ¶ under New Technologies): "The need to continually develop new energy sources and enhancements to existing technology offers a significant opportunity to Chandler."
114. C/E-2 (6th ¶): "...The City has completed a variety of earth-friendly, responsible programs (provide web link-or-appendix). The Veteran's..."
115. C/E-3 (5th ¶, lines 1-2): "Large employers such as Intel provide an ample amount abundance of local jobs for Chandler residents, reducing the need for regional travel to meet employment needs."
116. PSF-3 (2nd ¶ under Assets): "City Departments are responsible for the provision of facilities and programs, including maintenance of acceptable levels of service, and compliance with federal, state and local requirements. Chandler has been recognized by several professional organizations for its excellence in public service. The following City departments have been nationally accredited:
 - **Fire:** The Chandler Fire Department has received "accredited" status from the **Commission on Fire Accreditation International**. Fire was first accredited in 1999. At the time, it was the only the 11th fire agency in the country to receive that designation.
 - **Police:** The Chandler Police Department became the seventh law enforcement agency in Arizona to be awarded accredited status by the **Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies** in November 1996. The agency was re-accredited in 1999, 2002, and 2005. Agencies must be reassessed every three years. The next assessment is scheduled for fall of 2008.
 - **Police Communications:** The Chandler Police Department Communications Section became the sixth communications section in the United States and Canada to be awarded accredited status by the **Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies** in November 2001. Chandler is the first city in North America to have its Police Department, Communications Center and Fire Department accredited.
 - **Public Works and Municipal Utilities:** The Public Works and Municipal Utilities Departments are one of only 45 agencies in the United States and Canada, and the first city in Arizona, to receive national accreditation from the **American Public Works Association**. Accreditation was awarded following a two-year process involving an internal assessment of 530 management and operational policies, practices and procedures. The Departments were re-accredited in 2008.

- **Purchasing:** The Chandler Purchasing Division has received the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing Outstanding Agency Accreditation Achievement Award for excellence in public procurement. The City was first recognized in March 2003 and reaccredited in 2006. It is the highest form of recognition for public purchasing agencies. Of 2,100 Institute members, Chandler is the 55th to receive this award.
117. PSF-4 (Insert new ¶ after 3rd ¶ under Opportunities): “The redevelopment of downtown Chandler will create opportunities to provide and expand upon existing cultural facilities such as museums, art galleries and the performing arts center. Consistent with the Downtown – South Arizona Avenue Corridor Area Plan (web link), cultural facilities such as these will be an important component to creating an arts and entertainment district in downtown Chandler that will offer Chandler residents a variety of downtown activities to choose from.”
 118. PB-2 (1st ¶ under Existing Conditions): “Figure 20...the City. ~~(An extensive listing of City facilities is included in the Appendices.)~~”
 119. PB-2 (Table 21, edit note): “*Enrollment of schools located within Chandler’s city limits. Based on 2007 School District data”
 120. PB-3 (1st ¶): “**Assets.** The City Center Campus Plan, adopted in 2001, has Various City facilities master plans and studies have provided direction on the development of municipal facilities in the Downtown area where the highest concentration of public buildings exists, centered around Dr. A. J. Chandler Park.”
 121. S-2 (insert new ¶ after 1st ¶ under Challenges/Issues): “Developments in county islands follow different standards than developments located within the City’s limits. Infrastructure conditions that facilitate the City’s response to emergencies such as streets and water will need to be considered and addressed upon receiving petitions for annexation of areas that were developed in the County.”
 122. Glossary – 1: “**Commercial Office.** Office buildings and complexes such as garden offices, typically characterized by, but not limited to single-story buildings with multi-tenant spaces. Examples of commercial office users include medical offices, dental offices, insurance offices and real estate offices. Commercial office developments can be considered in residential areas as described in the Land Use Element and are therefore designed to be compatible with surrounding residential areas. For taller and more intense office developments, see Large Office Developments.”
 123. Glossary – 1 (Add new term): “**Commercial Services.** Businesses that cater to the surrounding area and may contain ancillary retail. Examples of

commercial services include barbershops, beauty salons, general printing and copying services, day care, preschool, Laundromats, and dry cleaners.”

124. Glossary – 3 (Add new term): **“Healthcare Related Uses.** Includes health and medical related facilities such as hospitals, medical offices and services, pharmaceutical services, research institutions, therapeutic center, rehab center, birthing center, nursing homes, convalescent homes, and assisted living facilities.”
125. Glossary – 4: **“Industrial Support Uses.** Ancillary commercial uses that are an integral component of a planned mixed-use development that supports the businesses within the employment areas. Examples of industrial support uses include printing services, delis, coffee shops, catering services, restaurants containing meeting space, convenience commercial, and business hotels. Industrial support uses do not include commercial uses that are primarily meant to attract customers from outside employment areas.”
126. Glossary – 4 (Add new term): **“Institutional Uses.** Includes private and public schools, religious sanctuaries or assembly areas, higher educational facilities, civic organizations such as Kiwanis Club, and non-profit organizations.”
127. Glossary – 4 (Add new term): **“Large Single Use Retail.** Any single use building, whether stand alone or within a multi-building development, that occupies an area that is equal to or greater than the square footage specific in the Zoning Code and is primarily utilized for the sale of goods and merchandise for consumption by the general public. See Zoning Code for a more details.”
128. Glossary – 4 (Add new term): **“Large Office Developments.** Multi-story office buildings containing corporate offices or multi-tenants. Large Office Developments are characterized by taller, more intense office buildings and can be considered in Employment and Regional Commercial areas as well as other areas described in the Land Use Element.”
129. Glossary – 5 (Edit title): **“Mixed Use Development”**
130. Glossary – 5 (Add new term): **“Public Facilities.** Government offices and services including police and fire stations, libraries, and general offices.”

Note: Additional edits not listed in these addenda may be made to correct punctuation, spelling and grammatical errors.