Zoning Code Rewrite Task Force and Stakeholder Comments

Source	#	Page/Section	Comment	Suggested Action	Final Action
ZCRTF - Member Manfredi	1	Pg 4	Auto Sales - How many cars have to be sold on the lot to determine if the lot must follow these rules? If a person sells tires and has 5-6 cars for sale on their lot are they going to be required to follow all these rules to see the cars? My main concern of course is it makes it hard to do business in the town	The standards are intended for the principal use of a site, not an accessory use that may involve occasional sales. That said, the objective is still to make Maricopa a community residents can be proud of as well as a good place to do business. Will prepare language to address accessory auto sales uses on commecial properties.	
	2	Pg 7	Daycare facilities - (in the summer the time to play outdoors due to temp is at night, so I think times should be changed to allow for this. Currently the draft shows "Outdoor play is allowed before 7:30 a.m. or after 5:30 p.m.", but it may read better as 7:00 am and 7:00pm	Good idea	
	3	Pg 16	MEDICAL MARIJUANA USE - can we add a requirement that they cannot operate Within 1,000 feet from a lot containing a business that sells alcohol?	Yes	
	4	Pg 18	Abandonment. Current the draft reads "If a medical marijuana use closes for a duration longer than 18 months or if its license is revoked, the use will be considered abandoned and any authorization for the use on the lot shall be null and void.", can this be moved to 12 months?	Will do unless State statutes limit changes in time periods.	
ZCRTF - Member Miller	5	P.10. Eating and Drinking Uses:	B & C repeat each other	OK	
	6	P. 11 Golf Courses A. Dimensional, Parking and Access Requirements	#4 has the phrase actively being used for farming? ; #5 also has the same phrase, what does farming have to do with golf courses?	Error; wll be corrected.	
	7	P. 22 E. #2 Seasonal Sales	should dates be so restrictive?; it seems Christmas tree sales start before Thanksgiving. Although I personally, don't feel this is wrong, some may	We can extend the time period.	
ZCRTF - Member Cheney	8	General	Minor Use and Minor Use Permit – Need more information on this required approval. Are there other cities in the Valley that use this term "Minor Use" and require a permit?	Yes, there are, although some may call it an "Administrative Use Permit".The idea is simply that it's a discretionary permit that does not need to go the Planning & Zoning Commission	
	9		I know many cities have a Design Review based on Performance Standards and/or Design Guidelines, including requiring diversity with incentives. As an example the City of Phoenix in its single family zone categories requires "a 5 foot staggered front building setbacks on 25% of the homes on a block" as one of a list of items that creates diversity/variety in the subdivision and that item combined with other diversity elements then allows the width of the lots to be reduced from the minimum standard. The Design Guidelines Diversity Goal works very well in that it allows a residential developer/homebuilder the flexibility to choose from a list of guidelines for both the subdivision design and the house design. The result is the creation of a smaller lot subdivision that is attractive, diverse and has a distinctive character. Thus getting away from the "cookie cutter" type subdivision. Are we contemplating doing that or something similar in this zoning code?	We agree that this is a good idea and intended to provide for it in the new Code.	
	10		a. See attached City of Phoenix Tab 507A Subdivision Design Guidelines for additional examples and Diversity Incentives Concept. I can also provide additional Guidelines from other municipalities in the Valley.	Will review this informaiton	
	11		b. Many of the top homebuilders have marketing department that study and understand the various types of home buyers. Many of them do what's called "Market Segmentation", which is the process of dividing the homebuyer market into subsets of consumers according to similarities, such as 'first time homebuyer', 'empty nester', 'active adult', etc. Those market segment are further divided according to other similarities such as family income, years of education and number of children; and further by demographics, lifestyles, personal preference, and benefit sought (4 bedrooms, 2 ½ baths, family room, 3 car garage, etc.); and even by the number of vehicles or 'toys' you park in your driveway or back yard. My point here is that the Homebuilders know what the homebuyer wants depending on their specific "Market Segment". Hence, the Zoning Code should stay away from dictating items such as "50% of the homes must have front porches" and should instead provide the homebuilder with a variety of options that would accomplish the diversity that is desired and at the same time provide the homebuilder with flexibility and the freedom of choice.	We intended to facilitate this type of development and marketing.	

	12		c. Can ***the Task Force discuss this Diversity Incentives Concept at the next meeting?***	Good idea	
	13	Pages 2 -21	Are all of the Specific Uses and their subcategories identified in this section supposed to be listed on the Table 5 Use Regulations and vice-versa? Also, shouldn't the name of the specific use be the same on Table 5 and in this section, i.e. Table 5 has Off-Track Establishment, while this section calls it Off-Track Betting Establishments and on Table 5 Adult Entertainment Establishment versus this section Adult Oriented Businesses.	Yes; cross-references will be checked and corrected.	
	14		Should Home Occupation, Reverse Vending Machines, Personal Storage, Golf Courses, Temporary Uses, etc. be listed on Table 5?	No to Home Occupations, Reverse Vending Machines and Temporary Uses because they are not principal permitted uses. Personal Storage and Golf courses would be in Table 5.	
	15		Table 5 Use Regulations under Automobile/Vehicle Sales and Services **Automobile Rentals** is listed but there is nothing in this section on Rentals.	We will clarify and add as necessary. A rental office, with off-site storage would be treated as an office use.	
	16		This section does not identify all of the Public/Semi Public Uses shown on Table 5. Should the other uses, Cemetery, Colleges & Trade School, Cultural Facility, Emergency Shelters, Government Buildings, etc. also be included?	It may be best to treat these as unique uses with case-by-case review, but standards for some can be added (e.g. emergency shelters). Government buildings are similar to office buildings and no special standards are needed.	
	17		Should the Animal Sales Care and Services be included in this section, as well as others?	Yes, these can be added.	
	18	Page 2	Prohibited Uses specific to Rural Districts – what about a farm employee that lives on the premises? It wasn't too long ago that a bunkhouse would house farm employees, sometimes migrant workers. Would those existing bunkhouses (there are some still in the Stanfield area) be considered a non-conforming use and structure?	We will add this option.	
	19	Page 3 B.5.	Why only 500 feet? Why not 1,500 feet?	Task Force option, but idea is to establish a reasonable distance. These are current standards.	
	20	Page 3 F.	Why the ratio by parking spaces? That seems so variable, i.e. a vehicle with one person could park in a parking spot, as well as a van with 15 people. Why not by building maximum occupancy and then by per capita, ex. 1 per 15 people.	We will evalaute this option. It may make more sense to delete this provision and rely on the Police Dept.	
	21	Page 3 & 4 B.1.c.	Need consistency in what these are being called. Page 3 it is called 'Adult Oriented Businesses', on the Table 5 Use Regulations it is referred to as "Adult Entertainment Establishment" and on page 4 under Alcoholic Beverage Sales item B.1.c. it is referred to as "adult uses".	Agree; will be fixed.	
	22		Throughout this section (page 3, 6, 7, 14, 16, etc.) does R stand for Residential Districts and Rural Districts or just Residential? Please clarify or identify what the R stands for at the beginning, so the reader has that knowledge when reading the rest of the document. Be consistent with how everything is being called out i.e. on page 20 item C.1. The full words Residential District is used, should this be R District?	R is just for Residential; references to be estbalished in the 100 Series.	
	23	Page 4 B.1.a.	Automobile/Vehicle Sales and Leasing, Lot Landscaping - Trees (and all other Uses that have additional landscaping/screening requirements) – 1 tree per 5 vehicle spaces and coverage of 50% within 15 years – who determines if 50% coverage is met within 15 years? What is the 50% coverage trying to achieve, visual aesthetics or shade for the parking area? How will this be enforced, if 50% coverage is not achieved within 15 years? If the primary answer is shade, then why not allow some covered or shaded parking in exchange for some of the trees. The added bonus here is there could also be a 'green' element in that solar panels could be incorporated into the parking shade structures. The current Subdivision Regulations do not require 'a percent coverage in so many years' concept for trees – see Article 14-6-5 A.4. Trees and C.3. Commercial and Industrial Developments. Also item B.2. Perimeter Lot Landscaping has requirements that appear to be in conflict with the Arterial and Collector Streets Landscape requirements or at least in my interpretation of the two they are in conflict.	Good idea; shade is the goal. The time period would allow for full canopy trees. We will clarify substitution provisions and remove conflict with Subdivision Regulations. Where a conflict does occur, the more restrictive code shall apply. For instance, the subdivision ordinance does not require a specific minimum quantity or size of materials. Should the new Zoning Code provide min size and quantity for landscaped areas in a manner that requires more plantings, the Zoning Code would prevail in that instance.	

	24		All Landscaping and Screening requirements in this Module 1 Base and Overlay District Regulations should be crossed checked with the Subdivision Regulations for conflicts. It appears that the requirements are intended to beef up, beyond what the Subdivision Regulations require, the landscaping and/or screening for the specific uses. The problem with having the requirements in two different regulations (Zoning and Subdivision) is that it is very cumbersome and confusing ('not user friendly') to have to go back and forth between the two different regulations to find out what the landscape requirements are for the specific use. Wouldn't it be better to include these additional requirements in the Subdivision Regulations, so they are all in one regulation? How difficult would it be to update/amend the Subdivision Regulations simultaneously with the Zoning Code? I'm not talking about a complete overhaul of the Subdivision Regulations, but rather just amending the pertinent sections that correspond to the new zoning code. If that is not possible, at minimum I suggest that this section of the New Zoning Code refer to the Subdivision Regulations, Article 14-6-5, for additional Landscape and Screening requirements, see also comment 24. below.	We will rectify and only propose additional standards where warranted and note that this may warrant explicit considerations. Agree that there should not be two sets of standards and that if a higher standard makes sense it should apply as noted above.	
	25	Page 8 E.2.	Day Care - Screening of Outdoor Play Area, same comment as 14. above.	OK	
	26	Page 10 B. & C.	Eating and Drinking Uses, item C. is an exact repeat of item B.	Will fix.	
	27	Page 11 A.4., 5. & 8. & B.1.	Golf Courses - Need to understand why Maricopa needs to have these specific golf course requirements. Where did these specific requirements come from and do other cities in the Valley have similar requirements? Also, item A.4. and 5. what does "not including structures that are actively being used for farming" mean in Golf Course regulations? Why are we restricting the building coverage to 2% and impervious cover to 7%? This seems unnecessary. Item 8. Please explain what a 'wildlife friendly' fence is and what wildlife this applies to? Same comment as in 14. above regarding the screening requirements.	Will simplify based on best practices in AZ, or eliminate.	
	28	Page 13 C.2.	Hospitals and Clinics - Same comment as in 13. and 14. above.	OK	
	29	Page 14 D.	Live/Work Units - Sale or Rental of Portions of Unit Prohibited - at Verrado (Buckeye), the living areas in the second story are sold separately from the business below (townhome). They call them the Main Street Lofts and Apartments. I think Kierland Commons has some, as well and there are several in down town Phoenix. What is the thought behind prohibiting the sale or rental of the living unit?	We will look at examples cited. Separate sale may make sense for a groundfloor unit, but separate business ownerships on upper floors could create problems with residential uses. Maricopa is not yet as urban as Phoenix. It might make more sense to promote this type of development, but only allow separate sale for ground floor space to be used as commercial. Upper floors to be restriced for residential only for the time being.	
	30	Page 14 & 15 C.1., 9., 12., 13. & C.2.	Manufactured Home Parks - the terms "mobile home park" and "mobile home or trailer park" are used. To be consistent shouldn't this be 'manufactured home park'?	Yes	
	31		a. Item C.9. Internal Streets – private street minimum width 30' is this the tract total width or the pavement width?	Intent was pavement width, as a viable two-way street. Are narrower street viable? Yes, internal two way drive-aisles are minimum 24 - we would need to account for dry utilities outside of roadway as well. The City could also require a Local roadway standard of 50 ROW w/32' of pavement. Will revise	
	32		b. Item C.12. Common Open Space where did the 300 SF per manufactured home criteria come from? Does the 100 SF of outdoor living area, identified on Table 3 count toward the 300 SF common open space? How much of the common open space must be useable?	The individual space would count toward the total outdoor living area. Useable open space vs. on-site retention areas will be defined under Landscape and Open Space criteria in Module 3 or detailed under this section	
	33		c. Item 13. Recreational Hall – Is the required 'laundry facility' really necessary? Most manufactured homes come with washer and dryers.	Could delete; City staff had suggested this as a need, which could be met in a community building with flexibile space. A separate requirement will be deleted.	
	34		d. Item C.2. Indicates maximum density of 16 units/acre, but Table 2 of Development Standards indicates 10 units/acre. Which is it?	16 offers more flexiblity, but density could be capped at 10 if desired. Will also add definition for net vs gross acreage calc.	
	35	Page 19	Personal Storage – There are a number of 'RV garage storage facilities', i.e. garage condo or rental units for recreational vehicles, in the Valley. Would these fit into this category?	Yes, D. provides for open vehicle storage	
			Temporary Uses – Item B. need to include additional requirements for farmers markets.	OK, will add.	

	36	Page 21 B., D.4. & E.	a. Item D. Model Homes, 4. Term of Use – why a term period of only 2 years? Where did this criterion come from?	Will expand term so as not to limit sales.	
			b. Item E. Temporary and Seasonal Outdoor Sales – do the General Requirements also apply to the Seasonal Sales, i.e. "outdoor sales must be located … on the same lot containing the business with which the temporary sale is associated? Often Christmas Trees, Pumpkins and Fireworks outdoor sales are often done on vacant lots or parking lots and those lots are not owned by the vendor. What about the Halloween haunted houses and corn mazes? Should they be allowed in rural areas?	Will clarify how terms apply to Seasonal sales.	
	37	Page 24	In most cases will need the illustration/graphic in order to understand concept (a picture speaks a 1000 words). May have further comments and questions once illustrations are made available for review.	We will add graphics after reviewing Task Force direction.	
	38	Page 24 - 39	Need to make sure there are no conflicts between the Development Standards and the Subdivision Regulations. Example, the Subdivision Ordinance Article 14-3 describes the types of Subdivision Developments that are allowed in Maricopa and provides minimum lot square footage, lot dimensions and open space standards for each type. The Standards identified on Table 2 plus the Additional Standards on pages 27 thru 39 are not consistent with the Standards in the Subdivision Ordinance. A few examples of the inconsistency are High Density Residential (RH) New Zoning Code 6,000 SF min lot area and 55' minimum lot width, while Section 14-3-5 High Density Residential has a minimum lot area of 7,000 SF and minimum lot width of 60'; and the Subdivision Regulations Sections 14-3-6 and Article 14-5 define and identify standards for both a Master Plan Development (MPD) and a Planned Area Development Residential (PAD) neither of these are Zone Districts and neither fit into the New Zoning Code definitions and standards for the Planned Area Development District and proposed Master Plan Overlay District. Also, there are numerous conflicts between Article 14-6 Design Standards of the Subdivision Ordinance and the proposed New Zone Code Development Standards, including transition/buffer areas and landscaping standards.	Agree; we appreciate all of these examples and will make sure that no conflicts occur or will recommend amendments to bring both sets of regulations together with a consistent set of standards.	
	39		a. It does not make sense to adopt a new Zone Code that is immediately in conflict or inconsistent with the City's Subdivision Regulations. Nor does it make sense to have similar Development Standards, such as Landscaping and Pedestrian Access, in the existing Subdivision Regulations and additional similar and sometimes conflicting Landscaping and Pedestrian Access Development Standards in the new Zoning Code. This may result in multiple interpretations of a Standard and is in conflict with the goal of streamlining the development review and approval process. I suggest updating/revising specific sections of the Subdivision Regulations concurrent with the New Zone Code or conforming the New Zone Code to the Subdivision Regulations.	Great idea. We will try to avoid adopting a code in immediate conflict with any other city adopted codes. We will recommend code revisions to other documents to avoid conflict, but in the event of a conflict, the more restrictive code should be applied.	
	40		***b. Would it be possible for the Task Force to have this as a discussion item at our next meeting?***	Based on the above, can you please bring it up for discussion on the "other" items to discuss agenda item if it requires further discussion?	
	41		c. Are existing zoned properties with and without the PAD overlay exempt from the new standards in the proposed Zone Code or is conformance required once the PAD Overlay is converted to a PAD District?	All existing PAD provisions will continue under the Codes which they were approved. Most future changes or modifications to land uses or structures after the new code is adopted are required to conform to the new standards.	
	42	Page 25 Table 2	The **Table 2** and the associated List of **Additional Development Standards** is very confusing and cumbersome. Example: Which Zone Districts require the additional regulation item O. Stormwater Detention, the RM and RH? (As a side, note in Arizona land development is most often required to RETAIN the Stormwater, not DETAIN the Stormwater.) More thought needs to go into the Table 2 and Additional Development Standards List, so it is understandable and user friendly. Suggest relooking at the way the list is organized and lettered and numbered. Perhaps creating more than one table, i.e. a Table for the Rural and Residential Zones, a separate table for the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones and another table for the Industrial and Public Institutional Zones. Please provide a legend on the bottom of the Table that identifies the full name of each District.	Will do, and the table will be broken out and included in each of the proposed Zoning District classes, ie, Residential, Commercial, Industrial, Mixed Use, Etc as suggested - similar to the table of permitted uses. Correction will be made to name and refer to as "Stormwater Retention" and All future site development will similarly restrict the amount of required landscape setback and buffer can be used for retention, similar to peer communities.	
	43		a. I have a number of questions regarding minimum lot area, width, depth and maximum density. I assume for the residential districts these will change with the addition of other smaller lot Residential Districts. I will wait to comment, once those are provided.	Yes revised single family district development regulations will be provided	
	44		b. Should there be a maximum building coverage and/or floor area ratio for the conventional zone districts that do not have a PAD Overlay/District?	Was hoping to address lot coverage by required landscape area, but can add coverage if necessary	
	45		c. Maximum Density for the RM, RH, RMHP, MU-N and MU-G Districts - where did these standards come from? Why not MF at 16 un/ac, RH at 24 un/ac, RMHP at 16 un/ac (see also comment 24. above)?	Will further review	
	46		d. Does the Neighborhood Commercial District NC have a residential (20 un/ac) component?	per list of permitted uses, yes. This would allow livework or stacked flats as well and table of permitted uses will be clarified accordingly	
	47		e. Why are the densities for the MU-N and MU-G higher at 20 & 25 un/ac than the RM & RH Districts at 15 & 20 un/ac? Need to understand logic of higher density allowed in the Mixed Use Districts.	Good point, Will review this information and clarify	

	48		f. **Additional Standards** – I do not agree with requirement for private open space 'outdoor living area' for <u>every</u> single apartment unit (RH) and (RM). Having just looked at a number of apartments with my daughter, all in the City of Phoenix, we found that the units that had balcony or patio areas had a premium associated with them and cost quite a bit more ($150 to $200 more per unit per month). We looked at some complexes where all units had the private open space and we looked at some where the private open space was an option. My daughter ended up choosing an apartment without the private open space, because it came down to what she could afford. Thus, if Maricopa wants to provide multi-family housing that covers a range of incomes, only a percentage of the units should be required to have the private open space. My suggestion is to start at 1/3rd of the units or 33% and on the 33% why not require a minimum outdoor living area square footage per bedroom, i.e. RH - 60 SF/bedroom, such that a one-bedroom would have 60 SF, a 2 bedroom 120 SF and 3 bedroom 180 SF?.	Great points, will review peer communities and can provide detail based on number of bedrooms and more flexibility	
	49		g. Mixed Use Heritage District – Is there a maximum density requirement? Again, the outdoor living area requirement at 100 SF/unit should not apply to every single unit, see 25.f. above.	Will review density, but like to keep the mixed use/urban village concept open to market. Maybe minimum densities	
	50	Page 27-37	**Additional Development Standards**		
	51		a. Do the RS Zones include the Rural (RA and GR) zones?	No	
	52		b. RS Zones – need graphic illustration for A. Ground Floor Setback – In Fill Lots and B. thru E. in order to visualize these proposed standards.	graphics to be discussed with Task Force	
	53		c. RS Zones – where are the Standards for Pedestrian Access or is the intent to utilize the Subdivision Regulations Section 14-6-4 C.?	will review for best practice and consistency with other ordinances	
	54		d. Transitions Adjacent to RS Zones – again does RS include the rural zones?	Task Force option, but idea is to establish a reasonable transition & buffering	
	55	Pg 27 F.1	i. "45 degree daylight plane" – I looked this up in order to understand what it meant. I found the attached definition and illustration for daylight plane and thought it might be helpful to the other Task Force members. If we are going to use this 'daylight plane' as the criteria to measure building height transitions, then I suggest we include similar definitions and illustrations. The other option is to use the method that several Valley cities use, which is "there shall be a 20-foot maximum height within 20 feet of a single-family residential (RS) zone, which height may be increased one foot for each additional one foot of upper story building setback to the maximum permitted height".	Good ideas	
	56	Pg 27 F.3	ii. Why use a 10' wide landscaped planting area along all RS Zone boundaries with a requirement of trees every 15' as the only allowed screening method between the RS Zones and the other Zone Districts? In many circumstances solid CMU walls 6' or 8' tall would suffice. What happens if a new residential development is proposed adjacent to an existing commercial development? Would the 10' landscaped area be required on the new residential development? Does this 10' wide landscaped area apply when there is a street ROW that separates the RS zone from one of the other zones? Who is responsible for maintaining this landscape area? See criteria in Subdivision Regulation Section 14-6-3 B. 1. Section 14-6-5 C.2.c. and C.3.b. and Section 14-6-5 E.2.b., which are inconsistent with this Standard.	Will review and clarify	
	57	Page 27G&H.	e. RM and RH Zones, Item G. & H. - same comments as in 26.b. above, need illustrations to review.	OK	
	58	Pg 28 I.1.a	f. Outdoor Living Area (Private Open Space) – same comment as in 25.f. above - only a percentage of the units should be required to have the private open space. My suggestion is to start at 1/3rd of the units or 33% and on the 33% require a minimum outdoor living area square footage per bedroom.	Will review per response #48	
	59	1.b	g. Common Open Space - minimum horizontal dimension of 20 feet – needs clarification. Does this statement mean if there are open space areas that are less than 20' in width that those areas do not count as open space or does this mean that a common open space area less than 20' in width is prohibited entirely? What about a pedestrian trail within a 15' wide area that connects two larger open space areas? Would that be prohibited?	Minimum areas of 20' diameter can be included to meet the open space calculation. Isolated OS aras less than 20' diameter are not counted toward meeting OS. Connectivity between OS will be required	
	60	Page 29-31 N.	**Table 3** - **Small Lot Single Unit Development** – Does the Small Lot Development fall only under the RM and RH residential zones? What about the RS-2 Medium Density Residential Zone? The definition of the RS-2 Medium Density Residential on page 6 of Module 1 includes clustering/smaller lot developments.	Small lot would be RS-2. Attached more than 2 units will be RM/RH	
	61		a. Table 3 – Would it be possible to see a comparison of the standards and incentive guidelines of other cities in the Valley that have a small lot and/or auto cluster type of residential development?	Yes, staff can provide a peer community small lot/cluster code analysis with the presentation of the Admin Draft in September/October	
	62		b. Examples of typical small lot clustering with illustrations and calculations would be very helpful and would enable the Task Force to visualize and understand the intent of the various Standards.	Will provide with analysis above	
	63		c. Some of the development standards seem unnecessary, as examples - 50% of the homes require front porches (where did this come from?), landscaping required on 35% of site and enclosed personal storage at 80 SF. Does a garage meet the 80 SF of private storage requirement?	Single family development standards will be furtehr reviewed based on comments	
	64		d. Please provide visual illustrations and calculations of existing projects where the .45 FAR and 40% Lot Coverage works for a cluster/auto court development.	Will include in analysis with respons #61	

	65		e. Why only 6 units per cluster and the limit of two stories?	Will include in analysis with respons #61	
	66		f. Number of parking spaces per unit – 3, with one being non-exclusive and off-site – the word 'off-site' implies off of the development property. I believe what you mean is that the third parking space is outside of the cluster and within the project boundary. Some municipalities require that the third non-exclusive parking space be within a reasonable walking distance (150 to 200 feet) from the cluster.	Yes, provision will be provided for distance to guest parking and trash recepticle/storage	
	67		***g. Usable Open Space / Outdoor Living Area*** – 200 SF minimum **private** useable open space and 200 SF minimum **common** useable open space per unit, where did this criteria come from and how does it relate to the open space requirements of the Subdivision Regulations of which 60% is to be useable? See also comment 32.d. Does the total 400 SF of useable open space per unit count toward the 60% useable open space requirement of the Subdivision Regulations? Are there other recreation amenities required under the 60% useable open space? ***Please provide Task Force with illustrative examples and calculations, so we can understand this requirement.***	Yes, private will be considered in meeting the useable open space criteria. Further OS crieteria wil be provided	
	68		h. Please explain where the 35% landscape requirement came from and identify the landscape requirements. If a Small Lot development falls under the 25% open space requirement of Table 1 (at 4 to 5 units/acre) of the Subdivision Regulations Section 14-5-3 E. and this Table 3 requires 35% of the site to be landscaped, please explain how that will be accomplished.	All landscaping requirements will be cross-checked with the Subdivision Regulations and the Parks Master Plan and rerevised, as warranted to achieve consistency and not impose unnecessary costs, whlle still striving for appropriate landscaping in new development."	
	69		i. Will there be discretionary density bonuses based on predetermined performance standards, similar to the height bonuses for Mixed-Use Buildings, Section R. on page 34?	yes	
	70	pg 31.N.1.c	i. Design Criteria - Entries and Porches – Where did the porch requirement on 50% of the homes and at 50% of width and 8' deep and 4' wide requirements come from? Please provide visual examples. The zoning code should not be trying to dictate these types of features on a house. That should be left up to the homebuilders who know what features sell and what do not sell in any given market segment. See comment 2. above for explanation of 'Market Segmentation'.	Can massage, but idea is to require opportunities for front outdoor living areas to create architectural diversity and create opportunities for "eyes on the streets" and to encourage neighor interactions. Minmum dimensions are necessary to ensure the space is usable	
	71	pg 31 N.1.d	ii. Shared or Clustered Driveways – Requirement of "at least 36' of uninterrupted curb between each pair of clustered driveways" – This is on the public street and not the auto court, correct? If not, we need to understand the logic of this requirement and what is to be accomplished, i.e. is this for parking? Is there an alternative to the 36' uninterrupted curb that would accomplish the same goal? See also comment 2. above.	Correct (or private accessway). Will review further with the cluster analysis	
	72	pg 31 N.1.e	iii. Variable Yards – Requirement of 'no more than 50 percent of the homes shall be set back the same distance from the front lot line' – please define the front line on an auto cluster development? Not sure that the variable front yard setback requirement would be applicable to all small lot developments. See also comment 2. above.	Will review further with the cluster analysis	
	73	pg 31 N.1.f	iv. Lighting – Has anyone checked with Electrical District 3 on these lighting standards? Who would be responsible for maintenance and replacement ED3 or HOA?	ED3 is a stakeholder, but will follow up to ensure no conflicts with proposed lighting standards	
	74	pg 31 N.1.h	v. Architectural Diversity – I would rather see a Performance Standards and/or Design Guidelines, including requiring Diversity with Incentives, as discussed in comment 2. above. Otherwise, I suggest revise to "Project with 50 or fewer lots shall have a minimum of 3 unique elevations and Projects with 51 or more lots shall have a minimum of 4 unique elevations. What about other things which create diversity, such as paint and roof colors, pop outs, building accent materials, front entry features and porches, etc.? See attached City of Phoenix Tab 507A Subdivision Design Guidelines for additional examples and Diversity Incentives Concept.	Great idea, will review and advise accordingly	
	75	pg31 O	j. Stormwater 'Detention' – It should be 'Retention'. What is the reasoning behind 'no more than 50% of the minimum required landscaping setbacks may be proposed for joint use as a "retention" basin'? If the retention area is landscaped, why the 50% limitation on joint use? Please provide the logic/reasoning behind this additional restriction. Which zone districts does this additional standard apply?	The reference to detention will be replaced with retention. Unfortunately, not all engineers allow buffer landscaping in retention basins. The idea for limitting the amount of retention in required landscaped sreas is to allow for landscaping out of the retention basins, particularly along street frontages. This is a common practice amongst Peer communites - chandler, gilbert, phoenix, and others	
	76	28. Page 31 P.1.	**Commercial and Mixed Use** Development – "15% of site must be landscaped" – the statement is too vague, please define 'landscaped' or is the Subdivision Regulations definition of landscape applicable? There is a minimum open space requirement of 10% or 15% depending on size for Commercial Development, see Section 14-3-7 of Subdivision Regulations. Included in the open space % is all landscaped areas, but open space also includes retention, buffer areas, common areas, hardscaped plazas, fountains, sitting areas, etc. – see Subdivision Regulations Section 14-1-6 Definitions of Landscape, Open Space, Open Space (Common) Open Space (Public) and Open Space Useable) and Section 14-6-5. Explain how the 15% Landscape requirement relates to the Open Space requirement of the Subdivision Regulations.	All landscaping and OS requirements will be cross-checked with the Subdivision Regulations and the Parks Master Plan and rerevised, as warranted to achieve consistency and not impose unnecessary costs, whlle still striving for appropriate landscaping in new development."	
	77	pg 32 P.2.b & c	a. Please provide copy of the street furniture and street lights lists that are maintained by the City.	OK	

	78	pg 32 P.2.d	b. Street Trees – See Section 14-6-5 Landscape Requirements, B. Arterial and Collector Streets of the Subdivision Regulations. The standards are not the same as what is being proposed in this New Zone Code. As an example, are the 3 shrubs and/or organic groundcover required per tree per the Subdivision Regulations?	Landscape standards will be updated for consistency bewteen ordinances and minimum quasntities will be established by this code	
	79	pg 32 P.3	c. Orientation of Primary Building Entrance – There may be site specific circumstances that require a buildings orientation to be other than the higher classification of street, perhaps more so in the Mixed Use Districts. Perhaps there should be a provision that allows an alternative orientation based on certain criteria. As an example, see Our Lady of Grace PAD where the orientation of the buildings is not toward the higher classification street.	Will add flexibility and allow staffs/PZ discretion	
	80	pg 34 P.11	d. Stormwater "Retention" – same comment 'Why?' as in 27. j. above.	OK	
	81	Page 34 Q.1.-3.	Required Side and Rear Yards for Residential Uses – Are these additional rear and side yard residential setback requirements applicable to only the Commercial and Mixed Use Districts (see Table 2)? The text seems to imply that they are applicable to all of the residential districts, as well. Suggest adding 'within Commercial and Mixed Use Districts' at the end of the title so that it reads 'Required Side and Rear Yards for Residential Uses within Commercial and Mixed Use Districts'.	Yes. Intended for Mixed Use/Commercial, will clarify	
	82	Page 36 T.1.	Industrial Zones – 10% of site must be landscaped, see comment #28 above.	OK	
	83	Page 37 V.4.	Technology and Office Parks – Stomwater "Retention" facilities, no more than 50% of required landscape setbacks can be used for retention basin – "Why?' - same coment as in #27. j. above.	Can consider allowing greater retention encroachment for industrial parks, where not abutting public ROW or residences	
	84	Page 38 & 39	**Standards for Planned Area Development District** – During our last Task Force meeting it was explained that all existing PAD Overlay Districts in Maricopa would become or would be converted to this proposed PAD District. I would like to understand how the process would work, i.e. will an existing PAD Overlay District automatically become a PAD District when the new zoning code is adopted or will the property owner need to apply for the PAD District? Will the PAD District be mandatory for all existing PAD Overlay Districts? Am I correct in assuming that the conversion process from the zoned property with a PAD Overlay to the the PAD District will not require any additional or revised conditions of approval (stipulations) and that the maximum number of units and open space percentage approved with the original zoning will remain the same? What about the land use plan (development plan) that was approved as a part of the original zoning?	Yes; covered in administrative provisions and we will get into more detail in the Draft Code, and confirm with Zoning Map	
	85		a. Will the PAD District have a Development Standards Table similar to Table 2?	Will further review subdivision PAD to determine best method	
	86		b. How will this PAD District relate to the Subdivision Regulations Section 14-3-6 and Article 14-5 on Master Plan Developments and Planned Area Developments?	Will further review subdivision PAD to determine best method	
	87	pg 38 A.1	c. Heritage Mixed Use District – Is this Heritage MU District also a PAD District? Item A.2. Shouldn't this read 'Other PAD Disticts', since this falls under the subtitle for the Planned Area Development District?	OK	
	88	pg 38 B	d. **Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space** – "Open Space shall be shown on the PAD plan, and the total open area in a PAD Plan shall meet or exceed the level of service standards and new park siting criteria established in the City's Parks, Open Space and Trails Master Plan (2008) for the proposed population at buildout and the total area of the planned development. Proposed Parks and their service areas shall be shown on the PAD plan, and the recreational facilites to be developed shall be listed in detail in the PAD application". Please explain what this means for a PAD District and what is intended.	The open space regualtations will be further reviewed and recommendations will be made to achieve consistency across documents.	
	89		i. The City adopted by Ordinance (No. 05-07) on 7-12-2005 an Open Space Requirements and Design Standards Ordinance. That Ordinance amended the City's Subdivision Code by incorporating the Open Space Requirements and Design Standards to the then existing subdivision code (Pinal County Subdivision Regulations).		
	90		ii. On November 30, 2006 the City adopted by Ordinance new Subdivision Regulations, which incorporated the 2005 Open Space Requirements and Design Standards.		
	91		***iii.*** The City's Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan (PTOS Master Plan) was approved in 2008		
	92		***iv.*** Further, page 17 of the PTOS Master Plan states "City of Maricopa Ordinance Number 05-07 specifies detailed standards for Neighborhood level parks." "***Recognizing current development trends, the smaller neighborhood parks will continue to be developed and maintained by private developments. This will enable the City of Maricopa to focus on the larger community parks and special use parks".*** So, although the PTOS Master Plan does discuss level of service standards and new park citing criteria, clearly the intent was for the development community to be responsible for the neighborhood parks (owned and operated by the HOA) and not the larger community and special use parks.		
	93	pg 38 B.	v. If private developments are required to develop and maintain, via HOA's, these smaller neighborhood parks, then wouldn't the PAD Standards for Item B. Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space be the existing Subdivision Regulations? Please explain what additional requirements for Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space for the PAD District does this new Zoning Code propose.		
	94		vi. Further, page 18, Table 3 of the PTOS Master Plan recommends level of service standards for Neighborhood Parks (HOA maintained) at 10 acres per 5000 population or 87 SF per person. Hence, at an average 2.6 persons per household, the 10 acres per 5000 population level of service would equate to 226 SF per dwelling unit or lot.		

	95		vii. Please note this level of service standard from the PTOS Master Plan of 226 SF per dwelling unit is in conflict with the Open Space Requirements and Design Standards of the Subdivision Regulations, which requires residential developments to provide 7 acres of Neighborhood Parks per 325 lots or 938 SF per lot or dwelling unit and is four times higher than the level of service standard in the PTOS Master Plan. Attached are the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) park and acreage (level of Service) standards. The NRPA recommends a 1 to 2 acre neighborhood park per 1000 residents. Using 2 acres per 1000 residents equates to the 87 SF of park per person and at 2.6 persons per household, the 2 acres per 1000 residents equates to 385 dwelling units or lots. Hence, a requirement of a 2 acre neighborhood park per 385 lots would be more in line with the NRPA standards and would correspond with the City's PTOS Master Plan. Please also keep in mind that these neighborhood parks are owned and maintained by the HOAs, which are financed by the homeowners HOA dues.		
	96		viii. I believe Section 14-6-4 A.4. of the Subdivison Regulations should be amended to correspond to the City's Parks, Trails and Open Space Master Plan and the NRPA standards.		
	97		***ix. Can we please have this Item B. Parks, Recreational Facilities and Open Space as an agenda item for the Task Force to discuss?***	Yes, please bring up on the "other issues" agenda item, after the initial review discussion	
	98		x. Finally, per the PTOS Master Plan the City is responsible for the larger Community and Special Use Parks, such as the Copper Sky Recreation Complex. Hence, wouldn't the Community, Village, Grand and Special Use Parks level of service standards as listed on page 18, Table 3, of the PTOS Master Plan be a part of the Public Districts - Open Space/Parks & Recreation (OS-PR) standards?	The Parks,Trails, and Open Space Master Plan was not intended to be a zoning code perse. There are suggestions for "Ordinance Opportunities" in the plan and these will be reviewed and incorporated into the Code rewrite. Further review will be provided	
	99	Page 38 C.	e. **Residential Unit Density** – When will we see the information on the 'density bonus granted under this code'?	Some provisions will be provided in Module 3, others will be provided in the updates to the Small lot/cluster in this section.	
	100		i. "…the total number of dwelling units in a PAD Plan shall not exceed the maximum number permitted by the General Plan density for the total area of the planned development designated for residential use". This may work for properties that are not currently zoned with a PAD Overlay. However, the existing zoned properties with a PAD Overlay have a maximum number of dwelling units approved for the PAD through the zoning process and in several cases the maximum density approved via the zoning case does not match the General Plan Land Use Map or the General Plan Land Uses Densities. This is due in part because many of the properties were zoned with the PAD Overlay before the General Plan was adopted in Jan. 2006 and because the General Plan Land Use Map did not reflect Land Uses that were analogous with the previously approved zoning districts and PAD Overlay.	The approved zoning typically supercedes the GP, unless there is an inherent issue with the land use balance. Staff is preparing the Genreal Plan RSOQ and these questions may best be addressed through the GP update process.	
	101		1. Using the Eagle Shadow PAD (zoning PAD approved May/June 2005 and zoning PAD Amendment approved Sept 2005 by Ordinance 05-13) as an example, the underlying zone districts of the PAD Overlay are CR-3 & CR-2 Residential @ average of 3.4 un/ac, TR Transitional/Mixed Use @ 20 un/ac (if developed as high density residential) and CB-2 Commercial. However, the General Plan Land Use Map depicts part of the Eagle Shadow property as Employment (E) Industrial land use when the approved zoning is CR-3 Residential at 3.5 un/ac. Please note there are no Industrial zoned parcels in the Eagle Shadow PAD. In addition, the GP Land Use Map depicts another part of the Eagle Shadow property (Phase 5) as Low Density Residential (L) @ 1-2 un/ac when in fact that area is zoned CR-3 residential at 3.5 un/ac and all of Phases 4 and 5 should have been given a GP Land Use designation of MPC Master Planned Community, since those Phases are part of the Eagle Shadow PAD Master Planned Community.		
	102		2. Another example is the Eagle Wing PAD where the GP Land Use Map depicts a large portion of the property to be Employment (E) industrial land use when most of that particular area of the Eagle Wing PAD is actually zoned a mix of CR-3 residential, TR transitional/Mixed Use and CB-2 Commercial.		
	103		**3. Appropriately, this Item C. Residential Unit Density of the PAD District Development Standards needs to provide exceptions for the existing zoned PAD properties that have approved maximum dwelling units / maximum residential densities and differing/conflicting land uses approved via the zoning process.**		
	104		ii. When the General Plan is updated next year, is staff proposing to revise the densities assigned to the various residential GP Land Uses? If so, how will that affect this provision in the Zoning Code?		
	105	Page 38 & 39 D.	f. **Other Development Regulations** – Are you proposing to further develop/define the Standards listed in 1 through 15, i.e. provide minimum and maximum standards? If so, please provide so the Task Force can review and provide comments.	We can, but idea is to alow the greatest flexibility for creativity	
	106		i. Item D. 7. What is meant by 'minimum building site'?	Min Lot size	
	107		ii. Item D. 10. 'Minimum yards' – do you mean minimum building setbacks?	Yes	
ZCRTF - Member Batt	108	Pg 7, Community Assembly A.	Shouldn't large Community Assembly facilities be located in close proximity to or fronting Arterials? This would reduce traffic in neighborhoods. Explain rationale as proposed or modify	Good idea; will be done.	
	109	Pg 7, Daycare	Outdoor play areas should not be located adjacent to arterials or intense commercial/industrial uses	Agree	

	110	Pg 7,			
	111	General	Need to provide for RV parks, including minimum design standards	Will do	
	112	General	Where will animal husbandry regulations in residential neighborhoods be discussed. City needs restrictions on number and type of pets on residential properties and animal boarding as home occupations	Will add these to the residential district regulations.	
	113	Pg 36, Industrial Zones U.1	Build to lines may conflict with minimum building setbacks shown in Table 2, page 25	Will eliminate build-to line to avoid a conflict.	
	114	Pg 38, Standards for PAD's	Where are the minimum open space requirements identified for PAD's?	The governing standards would be the City's Parks Master Plan; more detail can be included as necessary but the intent is to allow flexibility in meeting the Plan's standards by showing how the PAD meets or exceeds the base district standards that otherwise would apply. Also, the Parks, Trail OS Master Plan provides ordinance opportunities, specifically pg 9 & 14 that will be considered for the Zoning Code Open Space criteria	
ZCRTF - Members Yocum/Marsh	115	General, Restatements	Please consider removing issues/restrictions that are restatements of content covered by other higher authorities (e.g.: ARS, County code, Federalcode or standards.) Restating this content will cause confusion later if/when the other authorities' details change.	Agree generally, but some in some instances a reference to the enabling authoirty may be helpful.	
	116	P3 Para B, Location	Areas are specified to be 1500 feet from something. Should state "Minimum 1500 feet."	OK	
	117	P3, F., Adult Oriented	1 security person per 10 parking spaces maybe excessive; statement to not "Violate any laws" seems vague, can you insert language to mitigate potential nuisances such as loitering, etc?	Agree with suggestion; would prefer to delete.	
	118	P5 Para 3, Maintenance	Suggest changing "permanently" to "continually" or "continuously" or "perpetually." (How do you permanently maintain something?)	Revise to: Maintain in conformance with approved landscape plans in perpetuity	
	119	P7, Community Assembly	I think we should delete the corner lot requirement. Doesn't make sense for Maricopa.	OK	
	120	P7, Community Assembly	Can this section cover churches, other houses of worship, fraternal organizations, rideshare/park-and-ride lots, social organizations, political organizations?	Rideshare and Parking Lots will be covered as a separate use, however, the definition of includes the other uses - see definition in Module 1 Part 1, page 23	
	121	P9, B.1, Table 1 - Drivethru Stacking	Carwash stacking for automated needs to increase, maybe 4-5 vehicles would be adequate?	Good idea.	
	122	P10, Eating & Drinking Uses	Delete C (duplicate). E and F sound silly. Do we really want to require these?	Will revise.	
	123	P10, Family Daycare	Why a 300 foot separation?	To minimize on-street parking and circulation conflicts with drop-off and pick-up activities. Also to ensure neighborhood character	
	124	P11 Par A1, Golf courses	Why must they be owned by a single entity?	Will eliminate	
	125	P11, A.3, Golf courses	Why w/in a 1,000' diameter? AZ Golf Courses sometimes follow lineal washes	OK; will eliminate	
	126	P11 Para 2, Golf Course buildings	Why no buildings within 400' of lot line?	Will revise. Idea was to keep an open character.	
	127	P11 Para B1, Screening Req's	Six inches in diameter when planted or when at full growth? One tree per 100 sf (10x10') could be excessive. Consider a landscape buffer with two rows of 24" box trees staggered at 30' on center.	Good suggestion	
	128	P11 Para B1A, Fence Req's	Can we generally specify the fence here rather than causing more work for the P&Z Commission?	Yes; good idea.	
	129	P12 Para B6, Inventory	Most small home-based businesses will require some inventory to be stored on premises. This req seems burdensome. This provision conflicts with I. Staorage. We should allow some incidental storage of merchandise	Revised language proposed to clarify that intent is to prohibit on-site sales.	
	130	P12 Para D, License	Is this covered by city ordinance, and thus need not be restated herein?	Will check and delete, if covered elsewhere.	
	131	P12 Para H, Order-taking	I get the point, but the communicatons methods for order-taking are too limiting. What about phone, fax, and other possible future methods? Key is to preclude walk-in customer traffic, so perhaps only restrict onsite sales/ walk-in customers and any on-site display of product	Agree.	

	132	P 14, Live Work Units	How is outdoor storage of materials and merchandise regulated in Live-Work?	Need to specify that some on-site storage and sales are allowed.	
	133	P16-18, Cannabis Sativa	Much of this section is covered by federal and ARS regs and need not be covered here.	The Model Regulation provided by the City Attorney suggests there needs to be local regulations to implement ARS.	
	134	P18, OTB	Is OTB significant enough that we need to cover it in this code?	Local policy option.	
	135	P18, OTB Separation	Why separate them? That just makes it harder to keep an eye on them. Might be better to cluster them all in one district or area so police can monitor the activity easier.	Agree; this is a good alternative. More discussion may be needed.	
	136	P19, Personal Storage	Furniture and files seems limiting. Can we get a clearer, more general definition?	Yes, will generalize.	
	137	P19-20, Recycling	Can we say something about smells, pests, and separation/distance from a residential area?	Yes.	
	138	P21 C1-3, Garage Sales	Two per year is too limiting. Some retireees supplement their incomes with frequent sales, often buying stuff shrewdly and reselling at a profit. Current Code - Article 22 Signs, 2206.J. allows garage sales events allows up to 8 events per year (your proposing 4) - maybe poicy discussion	Some limits may be good: 6 per year could be an upper limit, but the Task Force may have comments. 8 per year seems like a lot.City staff would prefer 4 per yr.	
	139	P27 Para A, Infill lots	What are infill lots?	These will be defined as lots within a subdivion or pre-existing lots with developed lots on two or three sides.	
	140	General, RV	Do we cover parking/storing RVs on residential lots? What about using them as an extension of the house, e.g.: as guest rooms, mother-in-law apartments?	Parking will be addressed in Module 3 and will incude RV storage and related screening.	
	141	General, Table	How about adding a table showing what lot types are allowed to be adjacent?	Good idea.	
	142	P36 Para U1, Build to Line	Really? Buildings built right at the lot line?	We recommend deleting this standard as unnecessary in hindisght. Zero lot line is common for interior side yards between commercial and industrial lots.	
	143	P37 Para U3, Details	Do we really want to specify design and ornamentation at this level of detail?	Could be dropped as over-reaching, but idea was it only applies to a street-facing façade and many industrial areas do show some treatment, with landscaping, signage and identification of an entrance. Setting clear expectations may attract good development.	
	144	General, Park & Ride	Need Park and Ride provisions for public and private properties as a primary and accessory use. Incentivise park and rides for transportation overlay includingshred parking provisions with primary use and owners permission	Good idea; will add in subsequent drafts.	
Stakeholder - Gina D' Abella	145	Recycling Facilities Pages 19, 20	The definition of a "Recycling Collection Facility" as it is used in this section is misleading. Is it a business? An area in the parking lot of a business? An area for the business's own recycling or for public use?	The classification is intended for a secondary use typically located in a shopping center; it would not be a facility for on-site recycling of a business' waste materials. Will be clarified.	
Stakeholder - Chris Webb/Rose Law/PRI	146	General	In instances where the document utilizes very specific numbers, dimensions, etc. for development standards, how do these compare with industry standards and other municipalities? If they are not “competitive”, the specificity could be detrimental to the City.	Our intent is to maintain the City's competitive advantage, so numbers are checked with those of "peer" cities, such as Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, Phoenix and Tempe and with Queen Creek.	
	147	2 - Accessory Uses	The definition provided seem very subjective. Can this be better defined and more specific?	The range of accessory uses is actually quite broad. Additional detail may be appropriate in "Definitions" in the 600 Series.	
	148	2 - Accessory Uses, A.	How are these floor area limitations interpreted? Does this mean more than ¼ or 1/3 of combined area of the principal building and accessory building?	Yes, its combined area, as stated.	
	149	2 - Accessory Uses, B.1.	How does this relate to “cottage industry”? How are we providing for this under the ZO?	"Cottage Industry" could either be a home occupation, an activity in a Live/Work Quarter, "Artist Studio and Production" or "Limited Industrial" depending on the scope and scale.	
	150	2 - Adult Oriented Businesses	Can we limit the SF of adult oriented businesses, much like the ZO does with medical marijuana facilities?	Task Force Policy issue, but generally courts uphold spacing and location criteria, and limitations on signage and exterior displays, more often than outright size limits.	
	151	2 - Alcoholic Beverage Sales, B.1.	Recommend raising the required separation from 500 feet to 1,000 feet. This would theoretically move it off of the same block.	OK; we will be seeking comments from the City Attorney on this as well.	

	152	2 - Drive In & Drive Through, F.	How does the menu board size compare to industry standards? If it's not competitive, it could limit those types of establishments.	We will confirm, but this reflects "best practices" in peer communities.	
	153	2 - Golf Courses	This section contains many specific thresholds, such as minimum acreage, building area coverage, impermeable area coverage, screening requirements, etc. Does the City really want to place those types of specific restrictions on golf courses and their layout? Seems unnecessary and discouraging to golf course development in the City.	Upon reflection, might be best to drop these standards and let the professionals design the courses.	
	154	2 - Home Occupations, D.	Will this be interpreted to require anyone working from home to obtain a business license from the City?	Yes, unless otherwise specifically exempt per the Cities tax/business license code	
	155	2 - Home Occupations, J.	How would the generated trips per day be monitored and enforced? Seems impossible.	This would be evaluated on a complaint basis, and monitored by the person conducting the home occupation with the idea of being a good neighbor. It is not much different than a noise standard or a limit on size of large commercial trucks parked on residential lots.	
	156	2 - Live/Work Units	Language should be incorporated into this section to clarify that live/work units can be all "live" but not all "work".	OK	
	157	2 - Manufactured Home Parks	Is there a way in the ZO to think of this as a "transitional" use? Even though it may be there for 20 years, mobile home parks always eventually go away. Can we somehow provide for and address how this gets transitioned out?	Will review, but we also are seeing interest in allowing for replacement or upgrading of mobile homes to allow for continued use as affordable housing. Potential Policy Issue.	
	158	2 - Medical Marijuana Uses, C.2.	Recommend raising the required separation from 500 feet to 1,000 feet. This would theoretically move it off of the same block.	OK	
	159	2 - Off-Track Betting Establishments, B.	Recommend raising the required separation from 500 feet to 1,000 feet. This would theoretically move it off of the same block.	OK	
	160	2 - Personal Services, C.1.	Recommend raising the required separation for tattoo parlors from 500 feet to 1,000 feet. This would theoretically move it off of the same block.	OK	
	161	2 - Personal Storage	Is there a way in the ZO to think of this as a "transitional" use? Even though it may be there for 20 years, storage facilities often eventually go away. Can we somehow provide for and address how this gets transitioned out?	Will review, but normally a zoning ordinance does not establish rules for long term transitioning. That is better addressed in a General Plan.	
	162	2 - Recycling Facilities	Is there a way in the ZO to think of this as a "transitional" use? Even though it may be there for 20 years, recycling facilities often eventually go away. Can we somehow provide for and address how this gets transitioned out?	(same as above)	
	163	2 - Temporary Uses, B.1.	Why not include residential districts in the allowable locations? What about an HOA that wants to have a community carnival? Also, include property owned by a church or religious institution.	Could be a conditional idea, with a larger site and HOA approval.	
	164	2 - Temporary Uses, C.	Is this limiting garages sales to the RA and GR districts (the "R" districts)? Garage sales should be allowed in the "RS" districts as well.	Agree; will clarify.	
	165	2 - Temporary Uses, C.1. & C.2.	If a permit is not required for a garage sale (which is fine), why even include items 1 and 2? Who is going to police that?	It is preferable to establish some limitations on timing in the ordinance to avoid abuses and provide guidance for permit issuance.	
	166	2 - Temporary Uses, D.1.	Increase this period from 6 months to 12 months.	For model homes this change makes sense.	
	167	2 - Temporary Uses, D.2.	Does this mean a builder can only sell homes in the same community where the model home is located, or is this only referring to a temporary sales trailer? If the former, this items should be deleted altogether (it is very common for builders to sell homes in another subdivision in the community out of their models). If the latter, it should be clarified.	Yes, they can only sell homes within the development/PAD the model home is located. The use of a model home sales trailer for pre-sales should be allowed for a limited period until the model home sales office is complete. Will clarify	
	168	2 - Temporary Uses, D.3.	This should be edited to say "Prior to the close of a sale of any model home…"	OK.	
	169	2 - Temporary Uses, D.4.	Why would we want to put a time limit on how long a builder can have their models open? The market will dictate that. Creates unnecessary additional actions by the builder and Staff.	Good suggestion; changes will be made.	
	170	3 - Development Standards, Table 2	Recommend changing minimum lot size for GR to 43,560 SF.	OK	
	171	3 - Development Standards, Table 2	The minimum lot sizes, widths, depths, and setbacks need to be thought of in terms of the product widths and sizes that are typical in our Arizona market (35' product, 45' product, 55' product, etc.). Some better distinction should be made between the RM and RH districts. The content of this table will be one of the most important elements of the ZO and should be discussed in great detail with the Task Force. It would be useful exercise for everyone to redline the table and then arrive at some consensus standards.	A policy discussion is welcome; our intent is to fit with the Arizona market and refine the standards accordingly, based on Task Force input and City staff comments as well as further review of recent project plans for development in the City.	

	172	3 - Additional Development Standards, RS Zones, A.	Delete this altogether. This essentially changes setbacks and the rules mid-development.	OK	
	173	3 - Additional Development Standards, Transitions Adjacent to RS Zones, F.3.	Wouldn't this effectively prohibit you from back or siding lots against another zoning district boundary? You would have to put a 10' landscape strip outside of your wall that will become a 10' wide alley when the adjacent property develops. Delete this.	Task Force Policy Issue: we believe some transitional space is appropriate adjacent to single family homes and often required in peer communities.	
	174	3 - Additional Development Standards, RM & RH Zones, G.	Delete this altogether. This essentially changes setbacks and the rules mid-development.	OK	
	175	3 - Additional Development Standards, N. Table 3	Not certain what this is intended to apply to? Is this for single-family detached on small lots, or for cluster product, or what? This is very confusing and some of the standards don't seem to make sense (i.e. 0' setback for a garage on an alley). Hard to comment on this when its unclear what it applies to.	Could apply to both a small lot, fee-simple project or to clustered development with an HOA. No setbacks for a garage on an alley often is allowed if the alley width is sufficient for access.	
	176	3 - Additional Development Standards, N.1.b	The intent of these entrances and entry features needs to be clarified.	The intent is the create an attractive neighborhood-oriented welcoming environment, not inward looking development.	
	177	3 - Additional Development Standards, N.1.c	This type of porch standard often has the unintended consequence of creating a very homogeneous street scene.	With variable yards and porches on only half the lots, it would not be homogenous. The idea is similar to the "Housing Diversity" concept supproted by other Task Force members.	
	178	3 - Additional Development Standards, N.1.d	Don't require shared or paired driveways. Sometimes this makes sense, but not always.	Two options are offered: shared or clustered. Some flexibility could be added.	
	179	3 - Additional Development Standards, N.1.h	This should be changed to simply require 3 unique elevations, regardless of the number of lots. This is the industry standard.	OK	
	180	3 - Additional Development Standards, O.	Delete the last sentence. This will become very restrictive for developers. Many retention areas are done in turf and well planted and can function very well as both landscape and retention areas.	Can be revised to limit joint use rule (no more than 50%) to Outdoor Living Area - common and private open space that is intended to be usable year-round. The last sentence is intended to enhance the minimum required setback landscape and buffering. Engineers reluctance to allow plantings in retention drainage areas greatly limits the ability to provide effective landscaping. Peer communities practice this as well.	
	181	3 - Additional Development Standards, Commercial & Mixed Use Development, P.4.b.	Any requirements/allowances/incentives for "liner" buildings? This would help in hiding the parking garage while still providing usable (and taxable) real estate.	Good idea; will add incentives to do such in provisions for parking garages.	
	182	3 - Additional Development Standards, Commercial & Mixed Use Development, P.6.c.	This is getting WAY too specific. It may be wholly incompatible with the architectural style. Delete this.	Idea is not to have exposed concrete on visible frontages. Can provide language to allow flexibility for treatment to achieve the same goal.	

	183	3 - Additional Development Standards, Commercial & Mixed Use Development, P.7.d.	Requiring the use of permeable materials has economic implications. It would be better to incentivize somehow rather than require it.	The permeable materials requirement can be an option to meet voluntary green building program criteria.	
	184	3 - Additional Development Standards, Required Side and Rear Yards for Residential Uses, Q.	This whole section needs to be re-evaluated. Essentially your setbacks change based on your floorplan. Why? That's very difficult for a developer to work with. What is considered a "primary" room?	Good comments; this can be simplified, but the idea of having larger than minimum Building Code requirements for light courts makes sense when the room served is a living room or primary room.	
	185	3 - Additional Development Standards, Commercial & Mixed Use Development, S.1.	Why require plazas in all cases?	Plazas are only required in larger commercial centers and offer a place for community gathering and to enhance the pedestrian experience. This requirment might be limited to "Village Centers" but increasingly many shopping center owners are doing this so it does not seem unreasonable.	
	186	3 - Additional Development Standards, Transportation Corridors	How will this be applied? Does this apply to every driveway or building onto the corridor? Very confusing.	Only applies where major corridors are designated through the "TC" Transportation Corridor Overlay.	
	187	3 - Standards for Planned Area Development District, C.	This method of calculating density is not competitive with other municipalities. You should not have to net out your ROW and open space areas used for drainage and retention. If you have 100 gross acres and a max density of 3 du/acre under the General Plan, you should be allowed 300 units.	Polcy Issue. We agree that more flexibility is provided with a gross density, without deducting land for street, washes and drainage and will revise accordingly.	
ZCRTF - Member VonFleckinger	188	Page 3 Adult businesses:	F. Better definition for Security personnel. Extra employee, actual Uniformed security guard?	Could delete and just rely on the Police Dept.	
	189		G. Why such small signage 10 sq.' is smaller than my desk. It seems the quicker this clientele can identify their destination the better. The content and context can be controlled by code.	Requirement will be made consistent with City's Sign Code.	
	190	Page 4. Automobile Vehicle Sales and Leasing	B. 1. Interior Lot Landscaping: 1 tree per 5 spaces, 50% canopy in 15 years> Where did this ratio come from? I studied a satellite zoom photo of the entire valley. Not one dealership has anything close to this ratio-some have no trees. So I contacted several of those dealerships and their overwhelming response was the initial cost, continued water and care could discourage them locating here and certainly having to deal with mother nature (monsoon winds and bird droppings on their valuable inventory under a 50% canopy is unacceptable.	Will revise based on comments made.	
	191	Page 5 and 6 Auto Mobile Service and Repair/Major	D. Litter Needs have some provision to allow a little more flexibility in this area as I don't see Body Shops or Classic Car Restorers addressed anywhere else. Outdoor storage (temporary) is usually necessary for these business. Can be done ascetically but should be considered.	Will revise based on comments made. Litter collection standard is intended for car washes, for people to put waste they may remove from their car. We can add that temporary outside storage in screened areas could be permitted for certain uses, with an Administrative use permit, but not for old body parts or salvage materials.	
	192	Page 7 Community Assembly:	More definitive example of what is deemed as a community assembly ? A. Location: What is the purpose to require it to be on a corner lot UNLESS it is in excess of 1/2 acre? B. Access; May require discussion after definition of "community assembly"	Good points; see reponse to comment #152.	

	193	Page 7. Day Care Facilities	This section is VERY confusing. The heading says "(Family Day Care and Residential Day (page 10) Are addressed Separately) BUT in B. Noise C. hours of operation : Cites residential circumstances. I can only use the Learning Center as an example. Would it be appropriate in a residential area? Is it considered "Community Assembly" Commercial business, need some clarification please C. Hours of operation. Why is the city getting involved the "Large" day care facilities hours and days of operation. Shouldn't that be a business decision based on customer needs? In the existing code 17-11-31 there operating hours and outdoor activities hours given for "noise abatement" for home day care. Certainly doesn't seem it would apply to the facilities like the "Learning Center "on John Wayne Parkway.	The Noise standard can be deleted, and the hours of operation standard clarified as only applying when a Day Care Facility is located in an RS Single Family District.	
	194	Page 8 Drive in and Drive Thru Facilities	B. Screening: Why is the city wanting to require any NEW business that would come to Maricopa to spend their money on something that not one single fast food restaurant was required to do? i.e. Panda, Taco Belle, Sonic , KFC, Carl's, Arby's	Staff's review of the properties cited generally meet this criteria. We can also limit the screening requirement to locations where an interior lot line abuts a residential use in which case it is appropriate. In that case, I think we would need to increase the buffer between a residential lot line and a drive-thru aisle.	
	195	Page 10 Family Day Care:	Note: If there are time restrictions for outdoor activities it should address specifically in this section for clarification. In the existing code 17-11-31-i The hours are 8:00 to 7:00. I personally think 7:00 a.m to 8:00 p.m. would be more in line with codes governing concrete trucks and heavy equipment moving thru residential areas.	Will revise based on comments made.	
	196		D: The minimum separation between Family day care shall be a minimum of 300 feet (OR an average city block OR the length of a football field) Where did this arbitrary number come from and why? I lived on a small residential side street in Mesa for 10 years where a mother and daughter each operated a day car with in a few houses of each other.....one was my neighbor...There was never an issue of any kind: noise, traffic or otherwise. Drop offs were sporadic because they were preschoolers and working moms have different working hours.	Task Force Policy Issue - We can discuss the separation standard for Family Day Care.	
	197		E: Why were garages included in this list of restrictions. If someone want to only Modify their garage to an extra play area, maybe a little classroom, what is the problem here. It is done all the time i.e. man caves, Rec. rooms sometimes an extra office by other residential homeowners. I do not see the difference.	The idea is that garages should be reserved for covered parking if that is the standard that applies. Allowing conversions is giving "free space" away and not treating property owners equally.	
	198	Page 11 Golf Courses	There is a lot technical knowledge involved in understanding what it takes for a practical, flexible zoning to make a golf course possible. I can only hope that all of these detailed provisions won't preclude a major golf designer coming to Maricopa and putting in a championship course--we have a lot of open land in our city limits. I don't have the time, energy or expertise to the research EXCEPT: A. 1. Minimum acreage 75 acres. This would preclude a 3 par Executive Course (9 holes) Which are desirable and common in retirement "Park Model" type communities. see>http://robertsresorts.com/resorts/gold-canyon/ I am sure a lot of these requirements are not applicable to an Executive course. I would like to see some separate provision for this amenity and just as a side bar what category will "Miniature Golf" come under	As noted above, these standards can be removed so golf course design professionals have freedom to design.	
	199	Page 12 Home Occupations	B. Permitted Uses: 6 This is also confusing the part in parenthesis seems to contradict the first part regarding direct sales.(NO direct sales or exchanges will be permitted) This seems it will make all in home direct sales "parties" a violation: i.e. Avon, Tupperware, Pampered Chef, Mary Kay, Jaffra, Artistry, Nutrilite, Shackley, Herbal Life, Amway and latterly hundreds of others....definitely needs clarification which by the way normally don't require a business license. H. Requires the same attention	Will revise based on comments made. Sales parties probably will be fine as they are informal, and large amounts of "stock in trade" are not kept on-site nor used for walk-in customer sales.	
	200	Page 13 Hospitals and clinics:	C.1. A. Interior Lot Landscaping; Interesting that the requirements here are 1 tree for every 8 spaces with a 35% canopy in 15 years. Seems inconsistent with requiring Automobile lot requirements of 1 tree per 5 spaces with a 15 year 50% canopy. The auto traffic in hospitals and clinics is fluid with constant pedestrian traffic where it seems like more shade would be desirable. NOTE: Wouldn't a provision for any facility that opts to do what Basha's Grocery has done by erecting covered shaded parking eliminate extra time and effort down the road. C.a.i.ii. Banner Health didn't have to meet all of these requirements....more "NEW" business unfriendly code!	Will refine and allow tradeoffs with covered shade structures. Idea is for the new Code to be business-friendly while also establising some basic landscaping requirements appropriate for the City.	
	201	Page14 Live/Work Units	I am not familiar with this....Need clarification (example) Rest of code may need discussion upon clarification	Examples not by other commenters include projects in Downtown Phoenix (Main Street Lofts and Keirland Commons) and a project on Buckeye. Also try 525 Tempe Town Lake: http://www.525townlake.com/images/floorplanLW.pdf	

	202	Page 15 Manufactured Homes:	Is this collectively putting manufactured homes, mobile homes, park models, and RV homes all in the same category for the same provisions? Needs so much more clarification, identification and "separation" for understanding of the implementation: One shoe does not fit all feet. The city needs to be mindful that while Arizona is a very important state that has the most appeal to retirees, for many reasons. But, ultimately the "destination" city is what we care about. Without a doubt Mesa is probably the city that has the most history to figure it out.. Let's at least look at their findings.....We don't need to start over...they have given us a trail map....and all you have to do is check out the parks in East Mesa to see how it has worked for them. By the way some of those parks have been there since we cam to AZ in 1985 and they ARE still an attractive and needed asset to the community	Good points; revisions will separate different types. Mesa is a good model and much can be learned from them.	
	203	Page 18 Off Track Betting	C. Minimum Separation for Other Restricted Uses. To be determined; may ..... When would this take place and what process? Seems very vague.	This can be done at the July meeting.	
	204	Page 18 Personal Services and Restricted Personal Services	B. Minimum Separation for Other Restricted Uses. To be determined; may.....When would this take place and what would be the process? Seems very vague		
	205	Page 19 Personal Storage:	A. Business activity; No retail, repair or commercial use: Both Personal Storage Businesses currently operating in Maricopa also lease moving trucks, trailers etc. Seems a logical business to run out of a storage facility. G. Screening: Always need to be mindful of cost.	The restriction in "A" is intended to prevent dealing, sales, repair,etc. being done in the individual units, not to limit what other businesses the owner-operator might conduct. And, we are mindful of costs, and think these are customary and acceptable to the major operators in this sector.	
	206	Page 19 and 20 Recycling Facilities	I have a lot of questions in this area so I have contacted Gina DiBella as she currently operates one of the 2 recycling centers in Maricopa.	We look forward to hearing how to make these standards work in Maricopa.	
	207	Page 21 Residential Care Facilities (Not Home Based)	D. Parking - My mother resided in (more than) one of these facilities. It is customary for facilities to have the main entrance in the front of the building as other doors are secured, often with a drive under portico and some parking spaces to allow easier access to the facility by older impaired residents and visitors.	Will clarify that visitor parking is fine near the entrance.	
	208	Page 21 Temporary Uses	B. 2. Time Limit (Carnival and Fairs) 8:00 to 9:00 p.m. Needs more flexibility and see https://azstatefair.com/general/hours-and-admission	Good suggestion.	
	209	Page 21 Garage Sales	1. The current code allows for 8 garage sales a year and it hasn't been a problem....why change it and who is going to police this micro-management of 45,000 plus private citizens.	City staff indicates that 4 per year is consistent with current City enforcement practice per the City Code	
	210	Page 22-E Temporary and Seasonal Outdoor Sales	2. a. Season Sales Time limit (Christmas Trees) Why are we limiting sales to begin ON Thanksgiving? There are a lot of people who like to put their tree up before Thanksgiving (including me) as soon as the first lot is open. Which means that we will be driving into the valley to spend our tax dollars and while we are there we might as well do the rest of our shopping.	Will revise based on comments made.	
	211	Page 23. 3. Non Profit Fundraising	Why should there be any limit on non-profit fundraising-three times a year is ludicrous.	Can delete based on comments received. The City has an interesting situation related to this activity. This will require further review.	
	212	Page 23 4 Long Term Special Events and Sales.	b. Two events a year. Why are restricting the right to do business by having sales. There is an upscale ladies Boutique in Ahwatukee at the SE corner of 48th and Ray that has a sidewalk sale every weekend-weather permitting. Retail tire shops have ongoing sales events .	Will revise to allow flexibility with a Temporary use Permit; see response to Comemnts 173 , 174 and 182.	
	213	Page 23 5 Vehicle Sales Prohibited	The current code allows an auto to be sold on a commercial or industrial property with owner/mangers permission. Also the way this could be interpreted: If the owner of Mountains View Plumbing decided to sell one of his service vehicles, he couldn't do it on his own business property.	Policy issue: a clarification that offerring multiple cars for sale may not be acceptable could be included.	
Stakeholder - Bill Mattuchio	214	Adult Oriented Businesses - Section B (Location)	I prefer not to have them located in R zones. It would be best to keep them isolated from homes. Rather than having rules that would allow a pigeon hole effect around the city, perhaps using Commercial or Industrial zones would fit. At the last meeting, the area surrounding AK-Chin airport came up as a not so desirable area for homes, etc. It is possible this area could be designated for Adult Oriented business activity. This would provide one section for this type of activity, rather than spreading it out around the city to fit zoning rules and locations. It would prevent residents from walking past these areas when going to a local store that is located in a MU or R location. It would keep traffic away from these areas and improve safety, especially at night.	We agree; Table 5 would prohibt them in R zones. We will explore possible locations as we develop a Zoning Map.	
ZCRTF - Member Councilwoman	215	pg 2, Accessory Uses B-2 Prohibit	Add "gaming / gambling, wagering" establishments?	Task Force Policy Discussion: Should OTB be prohibited or regulated? To what extent?	

Chapados	216	pg 3, Adult Oriented Businesses B-4 & C	If 1,000 ft. is required between businesses, how can adult business expand within the same building / lot?	Will measure from lot line; “Rules of Measurement” will address this so expansion is allowed on-site.	
	217	pg 3, E Screening	Make requirement consistent with sign code	OK	
	218	pg 3, F Security	Providing personnel requirement vague: on-site, active "patrolling", sedentary post?, more detail	Could delete and just rely on the Police Dept.	
	219	pg 4, Alcoholic Beverage B-1 Stores	Can distance be consistent with above: 1,000 ft.?	Can increase to 1,000 ft from other stores selling packaged alcoholic beverages.	
	220	pg 4, B-2 Litter	Require separate recycling receptacles also	OK	
	221	pg 4, B-3 Phones +	Also prohibited: add ATMs?	OK for external ATMs, but probably should allow internal ones.	
	222	pg 5, Auto Sales & Leas., B-3 Maint.	Include "walls & barriers" to be maintained as well	OK	
	223	pg 5, Auto Service A, Lot Size	Should a minimum size be established regardless?	OK, 10,000 sq.ft. may make sense.	
	224	*General*	*should barrier heights specify "above grade" or other reference point?*	Yes, this will be done in "Rules of Measurement".	
	225	*General*	*does Maricopa have a "landscaping" plant scheme / plan? Anything prohibited?*	City staff will be providing input on this for subsequent modules. Appendix A of the Subdivision Code provides a list of approved plant material. The Zoing Code should identify unwanted plant materials.	
	226	pg7,Community Assemb. , A Location	Why not "mid-block" if less than 20,000 sq. ft.?	Good idea, just wanted to have more corner visibility and easier access to parking, and fewer problems for neighbors on both sides; might make sense to limit mid-block in residential areas only.	
	227	pg 7, Day Care C. Hours	More flexible with time frames to accommodate parents who commute / work late, exten. circmstncs	OK	
	228	pg 8, D P/Up, D/Off	Require that plan does not cause / allow pedestrian traffic to cross or otherwise cut-thru traffic flow	OK	
	229	pg 10, Eating & Drinking, F Clean-up	This forces a safety issue, especially for businesses closing late at night or using primarily female employees. Revise to require maintenance consistent to comply with aesthetics / code	We could say “periodically during day-time hours of operation” or just delete if not really an issue.	
	230	pg 10, Family Day Care B. Employee	Why "no more than 1 F/T" if not family member?	The idea is that these should be small owner-run operations, with maybe two part-time (1 FT-equivalent) outside staff, not a commercial facility, similar to limits on Home Occupations. Not a critical standard though and could be dropped.	
	231	pg 10, C	*Spelling - should be "solid" (not sold)*	OK	
	232	pg 10, D	*Spelling - should be "separation" (not separate)*	OK	
	233	pg 12, Home OccupationsB-6 Uses	Why no storage of merchandise if not obtrusive?	We could see abuses, if sales from the home then start; (I) does allow storage. Could just say “provided that no direct sales or to customers or exchanges with customers occur from the residence”.	
	234	12, C Prohibited	Kennels, storage / care / grooming of animals?	Good addition	
	235	12, E Floor Area	Is 25% a "standard" amount, floor area house only?	This is reasonable; a Live/Work Quarters would allow more.	
	236	12, H Merchnd.	Same concern as with B-6, too restrictive?	Maybe simply just say “no merchandise shall be kept and displayed for the purpose of sale on the premises”	
	237	12, I Storage	Inconsistent with B-6 & H, "storage" of goods, etc.?	Should be resolved with changes above.	
	238	13, J Parking	In a res. area, why would covered parking apply?	Idea is that we want to have garage or carport spaces be available, and not lost because they are taken over for a home occupation. Could have an impact on the character of the neighborhood.	
	239	pg 14, Live / Work Units D	Why not allow owner to lease space to non-resident? Ex. Professional services, provider deceased, spouse in-residence, space usable and useful	Policy Issue: Allowing for “subdivision” and leasing of portions of a Live/Work unit could become problematic on upper floors as its formally introducing a commercial component into a mixed use setting and this might cause conflicts with neighbors. We can allow this for ground floor uses (sale or rental separately).occupations.	

	240	pg 14, Manufactured Home	If covered separately, is this a duplication?	It will only be in one place; just had not been presented in "Part 1" for Task Force review.	
	241	16, Rec. Hall	10% enclosed bldg. ok, but why mandate laundry?	City staff thought this would be helpful to add; not essential.	
	242	pg 16, Medical Marijuana	Can the City prohibit them altogether?	City Attorney call. We do not think that ARS allows this. The state legislation sets up different 'districts' to be assigned a distribution facility. Whether the city falls into one of those districts is determined by the state. There are additional medical marijuana uses other than the main distribution facility where individuals can grow and distribute-those are the areas to regulate. We based this proposal on a model regulation provided by the City Attorney.	
	243	pg 18, Off-Track Betting	Can the City prohibit them altogether?	Off-track betting will be regulated as an accessory use, similar to what is done in the Mesa Code. City business licensing requirements also can be adopted for this use.	
	244	pg 19, Personal Storage B	Storing hazardous materials prohibited, who enforces this, who is cited: owner or lessee or both	The City's Code Enforcement Officer, maybe with support from the Fire Chief. Both could be cited, I would assume.	
	245	pg 20, Recycling Facilities B-1	Why no more than 3 parking spaces?	The idea is to keep the "footprint" small and make it a convenient operation. Usually staffing is at most 2 people, with drop-off and high turnover.	
	246	pg 20, Recycling Facilities B-7	"Director" - 1st reference, who is this referring to?	Director of Development Services	
	247	pg 21, Temporary Uses A Definition	Is there an accepted time-frame for "temporary"?	Local preference. We have set limits for special events (4 times a year), seasonal sales (one month prior to holiday and one week following), garage sales (3-4/year, no more than two consecutive weekends) and grand openings and outdoor sales, with grand opening rules tied to sign regulations. Model Home Sales Offices for 2 years. A Task Force option.	
	248	pg 21, B-2 Time	What about events lasting longer than 9pm or 24 hr	We can say a "unless a longer time period is approved with a Temporary use Permit".	
	249	pg 21, B-4 Parking	Do we need to specify maintaining traffic access, etc. when events are held in parking lots?	This can be added.	
	250	pg 21, C Grge sale	Why reduced by 50% from current code?	Will revise; City staff would prefer a limit of four times a year, three consequetive days per event, which is current enforcement practice and City Code.	
	251	pg 22, D-2 Models	Location - what about sales in more than 1 subdiv?	Typically we keep the sales within the same development/PAD. We will research if the City should allow for sales in other subdivisions.	
	252	pg 22, D-3 Return	**THANK YOU** for including the flagpole requirement!		
	253	pg 22, D-4 Term	2 yrs. commencing from trailer / temp use or home?	Two years was to be from opening of model home, but will further research time limits or increase per Task Force direction.	
	254	pg 22, E Temp/Snl	What about addressing on-site craft sales? *(Basha's)*	OK	
	255	pg 23, E-3 NFP	Fund-raising events - too restrictive	OK, will modify	
	256	pg 23, E-4 Lng Trm	Number of events allowed per site too restrictive	Would 4 be good, or "or as allowed by a Tempory Use Permit"?	
	257	pg 23, E-5 Vehicles	Expand to include ROW, vacant land, etc.	OK	
	258	*General*	*What about addressing arts & craft fairs / sales events? The City has had several discussions in the past about issuing a 1-day license or other permit for these types of events. Given the proposed activities at Copper Sky, Pacana Park, Rotary Park, and in some HOA common areas, we need to discuss options and possible revenue streams as well as setting specific criteria for participation and sales for these types of events.*	Good idea	

	259	*General*	*observation / suggestion - Whenever "signs" are mentioned, reference the Sign Code chapter and/or section (when applicable) to maintain consistency with compliance, design, placement & use.*	Good idea	
	260	pg 25 - Table 2	Enlarge & orient landscape, hard to read & decipher	OK	
	261	pg 27, RS Zones D Garage	"Review Authority" - specify ZAdmin., P&Z, BofA	Will be refined based on feedback on Module 2	
	262	pg 32, Commercial & Mixed Use, 2-D Tree grd	"Tree guards shall be provided". - Clarification?	Can do; idea is to have a root guard forcing growth downward, so the sidewalks are not damaged.	
	263	pg 33, 6-C Wainsc.	Wainscoting required - clarification? Why?	Idea is not to have exposed concrete, at least on visible frontages. Can delete or modify to allow flexibility as long as intent is met.	
	264	pg 34, R-2 & 3	Cites contributions to a "fund" - does this imply / direct the creation of specific / dedicates funds? Can we do that, or would this go to General Fund?	Code can specify that fees if paid, go to a dedicated fund for use for a specific purpose, and that fee be based on a rule of "rough proportionality" so it relates the off-site improvement need to the increased density with the increased height.	
	265	pg 38, PAD Development D	Add - "lighting plan / elements"?	OK	
	266	*General*	*suggestion - Whenever feasible and/or applicable, can we build in a "sunset" to the approval processes so that the span from initial approval and/or amendment to actual construction or installation does not go on for years? Or, as an alternative, can we require that approval means actual implementation (construction, renovation, alterations, etc.) must begin within a specific time frame? Could failure to meet the deadline be considered "abandonment" of the project?*	Some of these ideas are in Module 3.	
	267	*General*	*Is there a way to have a "refresher" step, as opposed to starting the process over, that ensures compliance with the present code as well as any other extenuating circumstances which have changed? For example - a major development project may alter myriad elements affecting the proposed site or surrounding areas. (Ex. SR347 Grade Separation).*	These ideas can be refined as responses to Module 3 are incorporarted into the Administrative Draft.	
Stakeholder - Mike Richie	268	p.2 Accessory Uses B.1. b.	Prohibiting employees in home based businesses is completely onerous to the City's numerous home based entrepreneurs and those that will be here in the future.	Policy issue for Task Force. Many peer communities do this or restrict the number of non-resident employees to one.	
	269	p.3 Adult Oriented Businesses B. 4 & 5	It would seem more logical that these two distances be reversed; that an adult business should be further from a family oriented entertainment business than from another legal adult business.	Good idea. Task Force Policy: Identify distance separations	
	270	p.3 C	It would be better to allow adult businesses to be in the same building and make monitoring and enforcement easier and more efficient.	Good idea, maybe in certain industrial districts this could work.	
	271	p.4 Automobile/vehicle Sale and Leasing B. 1.	the requirement of 1 tree per 5 vehicle spaces is too restrictive and having trees result in a canopy coverage of 50% of the lot's hard scape in 15 years has two problems. First, the auto business is trying to sell cars and those cars have to be seen (and kept clean) in order to sell; secondly who is going to monitor and enforce this requirement? Is this before the trees are trimmed, or after? What happens if the trees don't grow as fast as they are expected to? This is just a bad idea and the landscape element should be dictated by an allowable pallet, planting size and number of trees required.	Will revise based on comments received. A simple landscape palette will be recommended with no special consideration to this use to avoid undue costs.	
	272	p.4 Automobile 2. a. i.	does the 8' deep reference mean 8' in elevation or 8' in width along the ground?	A standards based on width is intended.	
	273	p.5 D. Vehicle Loading and Unloading	What if the site backs up to a residential property? In that case, it would be a good idea to have the trucks in the back of the property.	A clarification will be added to have some buffering or an alternative location where a rear lot abuts an R lot.	
	274	p.6 E. Landscaping and Screening 1. a.	same comment as 4 above; 50% coverage is overkill and it can't be reasonably enforced.	Good point; will be revised.	
	275	p.6.E. 2. a. ii.	This seems to be confusing. Is there a reference diagram available to graphically show the intent of this requirement?	Graphics will be prepared to show Task Force direction on standards.	
	276	p7. H. Noise	Shouldn't the noise be measured at the openings of the car wash, rather than at an exterior wall? Also, is 70 decibel equipment available today? What is the current technological standards for car wash equipment?	Additional research will be done on this question.	
	277	p.7. Day Care A	calls for Dare Care to be in a 'standalone' facility. Why would that be? In many strip centers, the playground of Day Cares takes up the back corner area making effective use of a traditionally non-productive space. In this situation, there is no reason that this use couldn't be attached to another in-line building/user.	As a policy issue, it may not make sense to encourage Day Care in GC or SC zoned strip centers, particularly on major transportation corridors.	

	278	p.7. B. Noise	the reference to noise customary in a residential neighborhood doesn't make sense here since it's not clear that this section speaks of only residential zoning situations.	This will be clarified; it was only intended where the Center is in a RS Single Family Neighborhood.	
	279	p.8 Drive in and Drive Through A. General	The length of a drive through at 20 feet only allows for one car, so doesn't make sense when compared to the Stacking requirements in C. which follows this requirement.	The 20-foot length is a minimum; Table 1 governs. To clarify this, we can add, "or as otherwise required by Table 1."	
	280	p.8 B. Screening 1	the reference of 36" in height here is different than we've previously seen for other uses/screening requirements. Wouldn't it be more effective and easier to administer if all screening walls in commercial districts would be the same height?	Good idea; we will strive for such consistency and revise all low screen walls to 42" in front setbacks and adjacent to driveaisles where there is no outdoor storage or need for full height screening is not necessary.	
	281	p.9 Table 1; in the 11th line	Automobile/Vehicle Washing, Full Service; What does 'full service' mean in this instance, and how is '8 spaces minimum' determined to be relevant?	Full-service is intended to include attendants in contrast to self-service, with coin-operated equipment. 8 spaces in the queue is what Gilbert determined is needed for a faciity during a peak period, to avoid overflow into the street. Could be reduced to 6, with a footnote that the access queue should be wide enough for side-by-side stacking, if needed, to prevent spillover onto the street.	
	282	p.9 E. 2	says that wall along and visible to the street shall be "transparent". It should indicate some % or other criteria for enforcement purposes. "Transparent" isn't good for security or for energy efficiency in our climate.	The term "Transparent" is just intended to mean to allow a view into a building; it could be a double-glazed window with security features.	
	283	p.9 F Menu and Preview Boards	20 sf doesn't seem sufficient to allow the new drive through signage of today.	Will confirm dimensions in relation to the City's Sign Code and "best practices".	
	284	p.10 G. Noise	Given the normal layout of the building facing the street, setting up the drive thru to allow a left turn and then have the speaker on the driver's side of the car, it seems only logical that the speaker is going to be facing the rear of the property; so if there is residential behind the subject property, the speaker is going to be facing it. That makes this requirement unrealistic.	Will revise based on comments received.	
	285	p.10 Eating and Drinking Uses A	Is "quiet" of the establishment and adjacent area appropriate here? Depending on the 'nature' of the establishment, quite might not be what they are going for.	"Quiet" can be deleted as this is addressed in other standards and may vary depending on locaiton.	
	286	p.10 E	This signage requirement is unrealistic and should be stricken from the code.	Agree; will be deleted.	
	287	p.10 F	Requiring employees to do this after dark might be construed as a security hazard and could place unnecessary burdens and responsibilities on the employer, property owner and City.	Agree; will be deleted.	
	288	p.10 Family Day Care B.	(it appears as if this applies only to home based day care, but it isn't indicated) B - It is completely unfair to allow a home based day care business to have an employee when any other type of home based business is prohibited from having outside employees.	The rationale here is that family day care meets a critical community need, and the health and safety of the children may require additional assistance.	
	289	p.10 Family Day Care D	the word "separate", should be "separation".	Yes.	
	290	p.11 Golf Courses, A. 3.	One would think that a golf course design would be submitted all at the same time so that the functions of all facilities work together. Why would the zoning code care what distance a building might be from the golf course. Either the design is going to be approved or not. This is too restrictive.	Good points; details on golf course design will be deleted.	
	290	p.11 A. 4 & 5	The comments excluding structures actively being used for farming makes no sense in the context of a golf course.	Agree; will be deleted.	
	292	p.11 B. Screening Requirements. 1.	This landscape requirement seems too restrictive. People buy homes on a golf course so they can see the golf course.	Agree; will be deleted.	
	293	p.12 Home Occupations. B. 6 -	This restriction of direct sales or exchange from the premises is onerous and should be struck from the code.	Policy issue; we recommend retaining as "best practices".	
	294	p.12 B. 7.	Uses which we see today should be added as well, such as plumbers; electricians; contractors; pool service providers; locksmiths; these and many more are businesses that people operate out of their homes	Under B.2 we can add these additional occupations, and note locksmiths and watch repair as well.	
	295	p.12 G - No On-Site Employees -	This is too restrictive and should be struck from the language of the code. The Maricopa Chamber of Commerce's new Small Office/Home Office (SOHO) Task Force may well take up this zoning rewrite restriction as it's first project. Whether that happens or not, the Chamber will not support this language in order to support/protect its current and future home based members, and to provide the City with the ability to attract future home owners who plan on relocating an existing home based business.	Policy issue; we recommend retaining as "best practices", or allowing only one individual. Having 2 or more employees on-site may not be compatible with promoting a residential environment because of parking issues and related activity that this would create.	
	296	p.12 H. Merchandise	This issue is similar to the employee restriction. This would not allow an Am-Way distributor, for example to operate from their home. These types of restrictions will force people to leave Maricopa, and prevent new home based entrepreneurs from moving here. HOA restrictions already have these issues covered.	Revisions proposed in response to comments received.	

	297	p.13 J Traffic and Parking	Once again, this language should be deleted from the code. The City can't effectively measure, monitor and enforce this type of restriction. Once again, rely on the HOA's.	Policy issue; we recommend retaining as "best practices", but could envision deleting if no more than one employee or independent contractor were permitted on-site.	
	298	p.13 Hospitals and Clinics; B. Minimum Frontage	Less than a 1/4 A doesn't seem adequate to allow curb cuts on the site. The minimum here needs to be reconsidered.	Will be reviewed with City staff.	
	299	p.13 C. 1.	Again, this method of determining landscape requirements seems cumbersome and impossible and unrealistic to monitor and enforce.	Will be reviewed with City staff. A simplified planting requirement may be preferable.	
	300	p.14 Manufactured Home Parks	I think there needs to be a definition of "Manufactured Home" laid out here. Are they mobile homes that get delivered on wheels, or 'prefabricated' homes that get assembled on sight from preassembled modules?	This will be refined based on "best practices" in peer communities. Modular structures can arrive on trailers and be assembled on-site.	
	301	p.15 C. Development Standards. 3	Maximum Allowable Height: 25 ft - is this for a mobile home, or for the club house of a trailer park? Again the language here bounces back and forth between 'manufactured' and 'mobile' home. I don't see them as being the same product.	Will clarify.	
	302	p.17 G. Allowable Amount of Marijuana	This statement is informational in nature and doesn't have anything to do with the zoning code. Therefore, it should be stricken.	Agree; this is an ARS standard and can be enforced accordingly. The zoning ordinance need not be involved.	
	303	p.17 I. Cultivation 2. Amount	Once again, this is informational only. Unless the zoning code is going to include districts where authorized patients can live, this language should be deleted.	Agree; this is an ARS standard and can be enforced accordingly. The zoning ordinance need not be involved.	
	304	p.18 Personal Services B. Minimum Separation	I personally think that they are better off together, rather than scattered out around town, sot the distances shouldn't apply.	Good point; City staff would prefer a separation standard. Potential Task Force policy discussion issue.	
	305	p.20 B Recycling Collection Facilities 1. Size	There should be a clarification here that this restriction doesn't apply if the Collection Facility is part of a Processing Facility. Or at least it could indicate what zoning districts it applies to.	Good point; will be revised.	
	306	p.21 Residential Care (Not home based); D. Parking	Why would parking not be allowed in the front of the building? This is too restrictive from a design standpoint. If the building faces the street, visitors expect the entrance to face the street as well, and they want to park as close to the entrance as possible.	Good point; will be revised. Staff parking can be on the side and rear, as can loading facilities.	
	307	p.21 Temporary Uses; B. 2. Time Limit -	If City events don't end until 10:00 pm, private, approved function should be allowed to go to 10:00 pm as well.	Agree, depending on the conditions, location, and circumstances, the hours of operation can be a discretionary approval.	
	308	p.21 C. Garage Sales. 3	I have some concern about the R-O-W language. While I understand the liability issue, I have to wonder about enforcement, since most homeowners don't know where the ROW is.	Nonetheless, worth retaining we think.	
	309	p.22 E. Temporary and Seasonal Outdoor Sales; 1. C	In the second line, delete "or occupy required parking". This is an issue of the business operator determining how many parking spaces are required, and enforcement by the City.	We disagree. With an online ordinance it will be very easy to determine what is required. Without this limit, whole parking lots could be used for outdoor sales, with spillover parking impacts on adjacent property or city streets, which may be undesireable.	
	310	p.22 E. 2 Seasonal Sales; a	I would request that the permitted date for Christmas Tree sales be November 15, rather than Thanksgiving, to allow for sales to begin as soon as lot set up is complete. This would accommodate anyone who wanted to have the tree up to decorate for Thanksgiving.	OK	
	311	p.23 4. Long Term Special Events and Sales; d	four square feet of sign wouldn't be effective for informing anyone about what was happening at any event. I would suggest 32 square feet.	Will review in context of City's Sign Code.	
	312	p.25 Table 2	the 2nd & 3rd lines should be in linear feet, rather than square feet; 2nd line under NC - the 25' minimum lot width doesn't seem adequate as the minimum area of 5,000 sf would create a 25' x 200' lot, which would be unuseable; 3rd line in NC indicates a Unit/acre, but does that apply to NC zoning?; first line under 'Additional Standards', does Outdoor Living Area apply to NC?; the key for footnotes at the bottom doesn't appear to be complete.	Corrections noted and will be made.	
	313	p.27 RS Zones; A.	I would recommend not using this OPTIONAL standard. The way I understand this, once it is activated, the home builder couldn't build the model which has the smallest setback on that block. This is too restrictive and doesn't allow for good planning.	Will be deleted based on comments received.	
	314	p. 27 RM and RH Zones; G	same comment as 46; do not use the options as it is too restrictive from a design standpoint.	Will be deleted based on comments received.	

	315	p.28 J. Building Entrances. 1. Orientation	This entire paragraph should be eliminated for being too restrictive. If exceptions may be approved, it doesn't make any sense to have the requirement in the first place. Let staff and the designers work out an effective, appealing layout.	Policy issue. Since the City had not had much multi-family housing built, providing design guidance in terms of orientation to the street may be helpful. The language could be softened to suggest orientation to local and collector roads to encourage the idea of street fronting architecure and pedestrian orientation.	
	316	p.28 J. 2. Projection or Recess	Delete "with a minimum depth of at least five feet and a minimum horizontal area of 50 square feet. Alternative". This requirement is too restrictive. The following language indicates the desired standard, a "welcoming entry feature". Again, let staff and the design team work it out.	Agree that J(2) could be deleted, but let's retain (1) and (3).	
	317	p.32 Commercial and Mixed Use Development P. 2. b. Street Furniture	This needs to specify who owns and maintains this furniture. I would submit that the City should own and maintain it, since it is in the right of way.	Agree; may be initially purchased by a developer but then given to the City as are other site improvements.	
	318	p.32 c. Street Lights	"Pedestrian scaled" should be deleted. The City will dictate what street lights are appropriate and depending on the area and zoning, these lights might not be 'pedestrian scaled'.	OK	
	319	p.32 d. Street Trees	It should be indicated that "clustering" should be allowed to encourage design creativity and provide the property with better visibility.	OK	
	320	p.32 4. Building Transparency a. Design of Required Openings	Two comments here: 1. having only transparent glazing is an issue in the desert heat, so some level of film should be allowed, or specific overhangs could be suggested (or required) on west facing walls; it would also be beneficial if some incentives would be given for the use of high efficiency glass, and 2. "work area" should be deleted, as not all work areas should be seen by the public.	All good points and appropriate revisions will be made.	
	321	p.33 6. Exterior Building Materials; c	Wainscoting required? No. This has to be deleted. Let the designers create a quality product, which may, or may not have wainscoting, and if it does, let them scale it to the building.	Will be deleted based on comments received.	
	322	p.34 P. 9. Limitation on Curb Cuts	I don't like the phrase "shall be minimized". Does it mean one curb cut per project? That just doesn't make sense. Listing specific distances between curbs cuts makes more sense, particularly in light of the restrictions issued by ADOT on state highways. The phrase "least likely to impede pedestrian circulation" should be deleted. This is a great idea, but should be applied with reason. Also, I have to wonder if the City really wants "clustered" driveways. Again, it seems like minimum distances would be a lot easier to plan and administer.	All good points and appropriate revisions will be made.	
	323	p.34 10. Truck Docks	The same standards should apply here as on P. 36; T. 5.	Agree.	
	324	p.34 R. 4.	In addition to these provisions for Mixed-Use Buildings, incentives should be offered for all commercial projects to incorporate these design measures, as well as covered parking.	Agree.	
	325	p.34 S. Commercial Centers	Consider changing the area requirement here from 25,000 sf to 50,000 sf. 25,000 sf with 4 retail users could mean 6,000 sf + buildings. This small of a project can't support the listed requirements.	Agree with increasing the minimum threshold to 50,000 sq.ft.	
	326	p.35 1. Entry Plazas	define the area of "anchor tenant". A strip center with the largest tenant being 5,000 sf doesn't fit here. Maybe the number is 25,000 sf. If a particular tenant smaller than that feels as if they need a loading area, they will certainly ask for it.	Agree.	
	327	p.35 2. On-Site Public Plazas; b. Amenities	"Paving materials" should be deleted and replaced with 'differentiated surfaces'. If a designer wants to use pavers, OK, but there are a lot of creative ways to accent besides the use of pavers.	Agree	
	328	p.36 f. Lighting	in the second line, "low" should be deleted, as no one will agree on the definition of 'low', which, in fact, could be different for projects of different scales. Once again, let Staff and the designers work it out.	Agree	
	329	p.36 g. Shade Areas	Enough flexibility needs to be built into this code to allow for the visibility of buildings and signage to be maintained.	Agree	
	330	p.36 Industrial Zones T. 4. Access Location	I believe that there shouldn't be a primary access from an alley, so "alley" should be deleted. The rest of the sentence, which allows for approval by the City Engineer takes care of it.	Agree	
	331	p.36 U. Building Standards; 1.	Build to Line - Why? Remember to allow design creativity. Besides, what about setbacks?	Will be deleted based on comments received.	
	332	p.36. U. 2. Orientation	This says the primary entrance should be parallel to the street, but 3. Parking above on the same page, doesn't allow parking in front of the building. People want to park close to the front door and these requirements prevent that, and should be changed to allow it.	Will revise based on comments received.	
	333	p.37 U. 3. Building Details	This states that the street facade shall include "applied" surface ornamentation or decorative detailing. Does that indicate that steel buildings are allowed? That is a question that should be asked, is steel construction allowed, or only block or tilt? The quality would be higher if steel buildings were prohibited, but I'm not sure that is the right thing to do, as it would restrict some users from building in the City.	Will revise based on comments received. Steel buildings certainly should be allowed.	

	334	p.37 V. Business/Office Parks; 1.	While these types of properties might certainly want to have eating and drinking establishments and personal service providers, I'm troubled by the "shall". Can the language be changed to something like, "should plan for"? What happens if they plan for it but don't get tenants to provide these uses? Are they in violation? Can the project be shut down at some point? Requiring these uses is too restrictive.	Agree; more flexibility is appropriate.	
	335	p.38 C. Residential Unit Density	In the first line, the phrase "is granting this Code" doesn't seem to make sense. Perhaps I'm not understanding something here, but this should be reviewed.	Language should have stated "Except where a density bonus is granted under this Code…" and an explicit cross refence will be included to the "Affordable Housing Density Bonus Provisions" that will be presented in Module 3.	