1st Draft Northwest Tempe SAP (6/13/02) Public Comments Report

Document:

Category

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Purpose: Include, "To enhance liveability and sustainability (economic, social, environmental)" [Reinvestment and economic viability aren't the only purposes]
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 29	A8.1	2nd bullet- What incentives?
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 29	A8.2	"Bird Conservation overlay", how does this work? What does this constrain? How does this work with xeriscape ideas?
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 30		Add category, sensitivity towards archeological and sacred sites. Work with Indian tribes before these sites area developed.
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 30	A8.4	1st bullet- Preserve lush landscape vs. water conservation 2nd bullet- "Street tree program", through wat instrament?
Housing	Page		The increased development on Roosevelt change to the highest type of residential development. The increased density development is a taking to those who come to live in this single-story residential area because it eliminates our enjoyment of the views, horizon and adds to congestion. Further, this creates a density level that equates to "apartment" building structures which will no more than increase long-term residential development, affordability of housing and diversity in the neighborhood.
Housing	Page 23		pg. 23 - Add an action item. Increase buyer-driven homeownership opportunities by supporting NewTowN's Individual Development Account (IDA) program - (participants earn matching funds on their savings for a home purchase).

Housing	Page 23		Housing - Statement: paragraph 3 Disclose Tempe Plannings history of accommodation for owner alterations toward a stable community.
Housing	Page 23		Affordable Housing, encourage in Tempe to encourage economic diversity and housing for Tempe workers.
Housing	Page 23		Housing Statement: change to say, "Although it's a University community, home ownership has its benefits."
Housing	Page 23	A6.2	pg. 23, 6.2 - Provide homebuyer education and counseling through partnerships with local nonprofit organizations. Offer classes in Tempe.
Housing	Page 23	Statement	"Studies show..", but not in this area.
Housing	Page 24	A6.3	2nd bullet- "exterior code violation", what is this specifically?
Housing	Page 25		RE: Rentals/Controls Send in the cops.
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	3rd bullet- How do you determine who gets permits? Does this include Granny Flats? 4th bullet- Does this not happen already.
Housing	Page 25	A6.6	1st bullet- Statement unclear. 2nd bullet- "an abatement or reduction of annual licensing fees", statement unclear.
Housing	Page 25	A6.7	3rd bullet- "Crime Free Multi-Housing Program" What is this?
Housing	Page 26	A6.11	Keep section (Action) 6.11 because the standards are attainable.
Housing	Page 26	A6.11	Affordable Housing for new development: Multi-Family and Single-Family? Disincentive to rehabilitation or new construction in this area.
Housing	Page 26	A6.11	DELETE: Action 6.11 "Require new housing developments to provide 10% affordable housing . . ." and 1st bullet "Design the affordable units evenly . . ."
Housing	Page 26	A6.12	Stronlgy oppose any secon story mult-family walk-ups two townhomes in and along Mill Ave frontage to ASU

Housing	Page 26	A6.12	Disagree with more cluster homes and vertical walk-ups and townhomes. No more, leave it single-family homes.
Housing	Page 26	A6.12	Oppose "cluster homes" and multi-story housing. Prefer single-story lower density
Housing	Page 26	A6.12	It is true, one-size does not fit all. However, I believe it is inappropriate to reengineer an existing neighborhood to meet these different needs when there is a high demand for the need the neighborhood was built to meet.
Housing	Page 26	A6.9	How do these get permits?
Land Use	Page	M-5	The 2020 general plan shows mixed use from University to 11th Street. The NW Tempe SAP extends mixed used to 13th Street. My understanding is that the SAP is supposed to conform with the land use plan of the 2020 plan. Don’t change the land use for Maple-Ash from a majority of single family to all multi-family.
Land Use	Page 8		Potential use of a site should be reference for adjacent site
Land Use	Page 11		Agree with statement, "When a development contains housing units orient to existing residential, facing the neighborhood".
Land Use	Page 11		When do we see this? "new Land Use and Development Ordinance, anticipated, October, 2002"
Land Use	Page 11		Paragraph 1 Land Use: Sentence dealing with land use should be modified to address "some areas" not a global objective.
Land Use	Page 13		(Amently) oversee on site for majority of fiscal year, exception for those owners whos ownership predates the plan, as longs as they maintain control over premises to ensure tenants use does not constitute a noise, or nuisance to neighborhood.
Land Use	Page 13	1st bullet	The use permit for a change of use. Is this a council process? Can we have preapproved uses?
Land Use	Page 14		I don't have a problem with this designation. The (boundary) can be changed if different designation is desired.

Land Use	Page 15		Paragraph two: Heritage Area Statement: Disclosure of existing non-conforming zoning has value in understanding conditions today.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.1	Reference R1-PAD process in this area, when a property is requesting rezoning.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	"Allow change in density or intensity of use", only with permission of neighborhoods.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	Recognition of relocation is good! City doesn't usually support relocation.
Land Use	Page 16	A1.3	Add to p.16 Action 1.3: "and contribute to long-term residential development and the quality of life for its existing residents."
Land Use	Page 16	A1.3	Action 1.3 Delete: 1st bullet "Evaluate.. " Entire sentence, because who is qualified to do so!
Land Use	Page 18		Assess property owners and developers along University Drive for improvements to University Drive, according to value that will be received by property owners.
Land Use	Page 18	A1.8	MU-2 is excessive. Increasing height, density on Mill and University to RR tracks and 11th Street would impact neighborhood. Disagree that it's appropriate.
Land Use	Page 19	A1.14	Action 1.14, I like infill for sidewalks and bike lanes on Broadway.
Open Space & Recreation	Page	A9.3	Action 9.3: Revise bullet to read: Modify comprehensive Multi-Modal Transportation Plan and Zoning Ordinance to accomplish goals of Specific Area Plan. 2nd Bullet: Identify in this plan.
Open Space & Recreation	Page 30		Save "A" Mountain into perpetuity.
Open Space & Recreation	Page 30	A9.1	4th bullet- Who and How. (potential use for Mitchell Park)
Open Space & Recreation	Page 31	9.2	2nd bullet: Light Rail to serve performing arts center and Town Lake. Instead of signal at Rio Salado, build pedestrian bridge at end of Farmer.
Open Space & Recreation	Page 31	A9.2	1st bullet: Add " Provide access or (to the existing text).."

Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.2	2nd bullet- "Provide a small business "incubator". School site?
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.4	Delete 3rd bullet; requiring documentation of surrounding area.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.4	Specify size of model; allow graphics
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.4	Action 7.4 + Statement on page 27: Policy and Project Development should identify historic properties and Districts the community resources of value to be present in conjunction with urban infill and pedestrian-oriented design.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.4	3rd bullet- "Submittal documentation of conditions within 500 feet", this is large for urban sites. To what detail?
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.6	1st bullet- "consult the com. Tranporation Plan when developing on University", what does this suggest? 3rd bullet- Specifically for this neighborhood!
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29	A7.7	1st bullet- statement unclear.
Public Art	Page 23		Why can't individuals initiate public art.. Not just neighborhood groups.
Public Art	Page 23		Add: Action 5.4: Implement public art maintenance program Action 5.5: Integrate public art in parks
Public Buildings	Page 20		New Action Item: Continue the public use of the Tempe Woman's Club in its Historic Building.
Public Buildings	Page 20	A3.1	I don't want to see any commercial use for Mitchell School, or any other use that would encourage driving?
Public Buildings	Page 20	A3.1	2nd bullet- "Discourage uses that create a "closed" facility, such as storage or OFFICE SPACE". In conflict with live-work suggestions previously stated and lot depth difficulties.
Public Buildings	Page 20	A3.1	Rehabilitate Mitchell School: Establish community suited use. Consider developing a branch library there.
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.2	Clark Park pool: Expand operation of pool and lengthen swimming season.

Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.2	Clark Pool, expand operation - lengthen swimming season - modify parks masterplan.
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.3	1st bullet- Statement unclear.
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.4	Eliminate wireless communication structures from ever being built at Jaycee park. Take out bullet #3 under action 3.4
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.4	Action 3.4: Eliminate communication towers from Jaycee Park. Put them along Rio Salado.
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.4	Action 3.4: Expand renovation of Jaycee Park. Don't agree with locating wireless communication in this location. Would create eye-sore and would not improve park or area.
Public Services	Page		Create enhancement program to identify neighborhood 'betterment' projects.
Public Services	Page 31		Establish criteria to ensure negative impacts of noise, light, climate, visual blight on (residential).
Public Services	Page 31		Public Services- Who pays for this section? How realistic? What timeline? Who can demand these services?
Public Services	Page 31	A10.1	I heartly agree, stronger code enforcement is needed!
Public Services	Page 31	A9.2	Keep Mitchell Park as a park and not a grocery store.
Public Services	Page 32	A10.3	Add bullet: Monitor energy use and miles driven and set goals for reductions.
Public Services	Page 32	A10.3	.."Develop incentives.. " Delet whole sentence. Too subjective, who would be qualifiedto judge.
Public Services	Page 32	A10.5	Add; renters should have a way to receive information, like what is provided in the water bill.
Safety	Page 33	A11.1	Safety- How implemented, very vague. "Infill Design Guidelines", where are these?

Transportation	Page		Transportation: Bring light rail to the NWT neighborhoods, Pedestrian Overlay District is here for this purpose. -vertical curbs throughout. -street narrowing. -street trees -traffic calming -assess developers and property owners on University Drive for transportation comprehensive plan improvements
Transportation	Page		With respect to street quieting, I would like street redesign to force reduced speeds (not speed bumps) like that on 5th Street.
Transportation	Page		Recognition of rights-of-way vs. personal property: Maintenance, construction, plantings, landscape, pedestrian access, parking.
Transportation	Page 19		Non-automotive transport is to be the preferred and funded mode.
Transportation	Page 19		(Transport) children from local schools to provide art, k-12 etc.
Transportation	Page 19		"The comprehensive multi-modal transportation plan will be modified to meet the criteria for the Northwest Area planning documents." Revise las full sentence at bottom of page 19 as stated above.
Transportation	Page 19		Transportation Section: Would like to see mention of bicycle accessible, bike loops, etc.
Transportation	Page 20		Enhance other uses for streets, besides auto uses.
Transportation	Page 20		New Action 2.3: Establish a parking and traffic management program which limits or prohibits downtown and special events intrusion into neighborhoods.
Transportation	Page 20	A2.1	Add Bullet: Bring Light Rail to the neighborhood- Land use is here to support it (Pedestrian Overlay District)
Transportation	Page 20	A2.2	5th bullet- Nature or intent of this statement unclear.
Transportation	Page 32	A10.4	Add Bullet: Extend Flash (free bus service) to Mitchell Park and reduce on street parking @ Mitchell Park with street treatments (i.e. trees in street like Michael Freedman)

Urban Design	Page 21	A4.1	"Design Guidelines", how are these interpreted / inforced?
Urban Design	Page 22	A4.2	Develop a plan.. In a specific area for stacked housing and ensure that future housing is regulated in such a way that to promote long-term residential development and promote quality of life in Tempe.
Urban Design	Page 22	A4.2	ASU to Residential #4- This statement encourages students to park in the neighborhood.
Water	Page 34	A12.2	2nd bullet- Using what criteria?

Category **Accessory Dwelling**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		i will be a new resident-owner at xxx W 10th street this month. I have not reviewed the guidelines yet. But have spoken to Tempe Planning Staff (Sean) regarding R1-6 stipulations for 1/2 addresses in that zone. I would like to build a small detached art studio, approx 500 sf, with small bath, kitchen, in my backyard, respecting the yard setbacks and heights. But would like to use it as a studio apartment rental for a couple years to finance improvements on the rest of the house, before reverting to personal art studio use only. I do not want to attach the studio, to keep the smell and art materials away from the main residence. there is an existing alley for additional parking off the alley. the adjacnet hosue across the alley has a detached garage with concrete slab with autos parking existing. This 'mother-in-law' or 'one-half address' apartment is not currently allowed. But many houses in the same zone are commonly owned as rental property, the adjacent house to mine for that mater. And most certainly all the residents in that house are not of the 'same family'. This type of infill provides additional income to aging residents in neighborhoods and is strongly promoted and legislated in cities similar to Tempe and Phx with suburban sprawl issues. In fact second story apartments above garages is the most common buidling configuration. This is also a method to reclaim wasted space from the front yard setbacks, which are essentially useless areas in the neighborhood.
	Page 3		Don't need accessory dwelling overlay zoning district.

	Page 13		Clarify Accessory Dwelling Unit owners residing on site.
Land Use	Page 13	D	DELETE: Last sentence in next to last paragraph: "It can be occupied only if owner. . ."
Land Use	Page 16		"Allow accessory dwellings", only as approved by neighborhood.

Category: Appendix

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Archeologically sensitive areas: What is criteria? Include here?
	Page	C	Appendix C: Encourage a larger scale multi-family, adjacent to downtown and Lake. Especially as it relates to height. Appendix D: Dwelling units density not required, rather suggested

Category: Building

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Design buildings so we don't have a heat sink.
Land Use	Page		Cottage Homes- eliminate size requirement for homes
Urban Design	Page		Discourage: Garage dominated facades (I.e. neighborhood east of Rosita's) Encourage: Pedestrian orientation
Urban Design	Page		Promote development like the homes east of Rositas on University Drive. Using details like the fountain in the middle of the road.

Category: Building Setbacks

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Lot coverage: What is number for max. lot coverage - reference appendix.. Include in text.

Category: Character Areas

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	I am very concerned that my properties at xxx S. Roosevelt and xxx W. 3rd. Street are shown to be surrounded by the "Urban Neighborhood Area" according to the map on M-3. I want to see the Roosevelt and Fifth Street areas removed from the Urban Neighborhood and see them conform to the projected land use map on page M-5. My neighbors are alarmed at the thought of living in a "vibrant, lively, twenty-four hour activity zone." Please protect us from such encroachment into our reasonably quiet residential neighborhood! I have similar concerns about Maple-Ash. This neighborhood is a treasure and a unique link to Tempe's history. It deserves stronger protection than it gets in the plan.
	Page	We assume that the descriptions given under "Character of the Land Use Area," pp. 14 - 19 describe the current, existing conditions. The description of "D. Urban Neighborhood Area" (pp. 16-17) is erroneous and incorrectly applied to Roosevelt Street, Brown, and Fifth Street east of Roosevelt. It grossly missleads an individual that is not familiar with the neighborhood. Additionally, our property is incorrectly described your Current Land Use map as a rental or small scale multi family. We have owned this property as a single family since 1990. This, again, makes us question your source of information. THe neighborhood plan adopted by the City Councile suggested that Riverside be considered a "Heritage Area"; we would like to see that maintained. thank you.
	Page	Should be called something other than Classic Suburban. I think it should be ecletic. Suburban area name, I am not too comfortable with.
	Page	Continue to consider Mill Avenue as a residential area, part of the residential core.
	Page	How did the Heritage Area move away from the now "Urban Area"?
Land Use	Page 14	Include "Eclectic" or change "Classic Suburban" to "Eclectic".
Land Use	Page 15	Heritage Area: "A sensitive transition that insulates the core residential properties is required between Mill and Maple". We like our neighborhood Maple houses. We don't want a transition.

Land Use	Page 15		Keep Heritage Section- important for preserving neighborhood.
Land Use	Page 15		B. Heritage Area.. Delete: Entire "Heritage" Section and area proposed for its existance.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	Define "Core and Heart of the Heritage Area". Unclear.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	Establish transition of building use and massing between Mill and Maple. Is it appropriate to enhance or add to existing property rights in a heritage area?
Land Use	Page 16		Page 16 Last sentence of paragraph: Statement Delete: "without care, new development.. (whole sentence). This is a "spin" sentence.
Land Use	Page 16		The Urban Neighborhood element "residents will be able to access services without setting into the car."
Land Use	Page 16	A1.4	"Calm activity in area", how?
Land Use	Page 16	D	The description of 'Urban Area' is not a positive reflection on the neighborhood and not appropriate. A 24 hour activity area is not desirable.
Land Use	Page 17		Rio Salado Area -Proposal to have First St. new structures and buildings to be pedestrian in scale and character. Maintain bicycle corridors on Rio Salado and First St.
Land Use	Page 18	A1.8	+ p.18 Action 1.8 No incentives for Neighborhood Services such as grocery store or drug store. Develop incentives or bonuses.
other	Page		Urban Neighborhood designation was not implemented through the homeowners in area and ignores previous planning communication to neighborhood. Please provide Urban designation to be east of Wilson Street.

Category **Comments**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page		I'm interested in reading all comments submitted via this website/tool. Will you please post them for all to read? Thank you
	Page		Would you please let me know if you plan to post all comments turned in via this method?
	Page		Re-structure web site so that dialogue can be had on the web. If this can't be done on www.tempe.gov, such a site exists for the SAP @ www.newtown.org
	Page		It is important for others to be able to read the comments written here. Otherwise, your process has a disturbing air of secrecy. Why not make these comments instantly accessible to other readers of this page?

Category **Commercial**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 4		"Encourage" essential services
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.2	DELETE last bullet in Action 7.2 (Form a NWT Business Association)
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.6	Action 7.6A: Market NWT neighborhoods to basic goods and services provides to move to University Drive- coordinate with Economic Development Department.

Category **Density**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Don't increase density.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	Action 1.2: Change to- "no change in existing density or intensity."
Land Use	Page 18	A1.8	"Increased height, density.. " should be minimal.
Public Services	Page 32	A10.3	Sustainable Development incentives like increased density, may be opening a can of worms.

Category **Download**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Why wont the plan download. I have acrobat

Category **General**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	Easements, the fire department didn't ask for permition to place a fire hydrant. Sometimes we may lose parking for the property. Fire hydrants on a small lot may prevent any on-street parking for the property.
	Page	I like the incentives that mentioned in the plan to achieve desired goals.
	Page	I have a general comment about the Northwest SAP. After attending the latest discussion meeting between city officials and citizens at the Priest and Rio Salado complex on Monday Sept. 22 (as well as the one previous to it in June at the Tempe Women's Club), it is becoming evident to me that the city is acting in bad faith in regard to its claim to be listening to the individual homeowners in the Maple-Ash neighborhood. Many SAP details simply don't reflect this, even after more than a decade of effort by the neighborhoods to make their voices heard. I realize that developers also own property in my neighborhood, where I have lived for over 25 years and in the last five or six years have invested around $100,000 to improve my property. But the city cannot play favorites in the SAP. It is unfair to weight the document so heavily toward development, and it is bad faith on the part of city planners to pretend that it listens to individual homeowners' concerns when there is little evidence of it in the SAP. And it is also bad faith to try to blame unfriendly-to-homeowners aspects of the Northwest SAP on the necessity of its being "consistent" with the city-wide SAPs. That only proves that the city is not interested in what homeowners are saying. Anyway, "necessity is the tyrant's plea," as the poet Milton says. We are not talking about a slum area either that cries out for redevelopment. Maple-Ash is a "gem" of the city, as it was referred to in the recent discussion meeting. The thought of having to contend with the future possibility of 3 to 5 storey business or apartment buildings in my neighborhood after having spent so much money on my property is especially sickening. They would destroy the neighborhood.
	Page	Where is the grocery store to be?

	Page	I am writing to lend my support to the "draft" Northwest Tempe Specific Area Plan and the "draft" Northwest Tempe Design Guidelines. As a resident of the subject area, I have taken the time to read both documents in their entirety, and I concur with the recommendations contained in each. If you require more specificity, I would be happy to provide it.
	Page	It's important for the city to have some changes in the community and progress where it is acceptable. Some people feel threatened by the plan, that it's geared towards developers and not enough for protecting the neighborhood.

Page	The following are my comments concerning the draft of the Specific Area Plan for Northwest Tempe. With a great deal of disappointment, I strongly recommend that the Specific Area Plan in its current draft form be scrapped. And, that the City and neighborhoods revert to the Neighborhood Strategic Plans as the planning tools for the area. In general, the Specific Area Plan as it exists is a poorly written document characterized by poor organization, incompleteness and inconsistencies. The process by which it was produced also fell far short of expectations. In particular, the draft plan does not reflect the wishes of a majority of the property owners in my neighborhood, Maple Ash. For many years the vast majority of property owners has said over and over and over: "protect and enhance the historic and residential character of our neighborhood." We recognize that a small minority of property owners do not agree with that view. And, that developers who neither own property in the neighborhood nor live here have lobbied the City with a different view. What has been produced by the City largely disregards the voice of the vast majority of property owners for the views of a few. I respectfully request that the City quit "visioning" with my property. It is property owners like myself that chose to live next to a vibrant downtown and major university and to invest lots of money in the restoration and enhancement of our properties. We were drawn by the character of the neighborhood, a character that the plan would lay the groundwork for destroying. The rules are being slanted towards scrape and redevelop at the expense of the property rights of owners like

myself.

I'm disappointed because it was property owners like myself that lobbied for a Specific Area Plan and a Zoning Rewrite in order to achieve the types of development we support: preservation of existing owner-occupied houses with infill via "back cottage" houses, complemented by affordable basic goods and services.

An example of the former is the Scheuch's at 1117 S. Maple Avenue. They preserved and restored their existing historic home and, thus, the streetscape, while simultaneously adding a wonderful "mother-in-law" house in the back. The hoops they had to jump through were daunting, including a few thousand dollars for variances. We recognized new tools needed to be in place to support these types of projects. There are many other examples of such quality development that have preserved and enhanced the historic and residential character of the area and that have built what many are striving for in America: a "back to the roots" neighborhood.

Our other desire is affordable basic goods and services. It is clear that the redevelopment of downtown Tempe has not resulted in affordable basic goods and services. The costs of development require City subsidies AND high leases that only bars, restaurants and national chains can pay. We currently have a variety of affordable basic goods and services south on Mill and west on University. The plan could result in their elimination.

The twisted logic of the current draft of the plan calls for more development so that basic goods and services will "pencil." The logic is that developers need more square footage, mostly achieved through height, in order to subsidize such services. As a result the

plan contains guidelines
that allow for buildings 3 to 5 stories in height along Mill and University.
Those heights ARE TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE to the vast, vast majority of PROPERTY OWNERS in Maple Ash.

The result of such development is that Maple Ash will lose BOTH key portions
of its streetscape, as well as existing basic goods and services, so that a
project will "pencil" in order to give us back the basic goods and services
we just lost. If condemnation is employed, as is enabled by the
Redevelopment District designation, we will be forced into such development
against our will. If the City subsidizes such development as it has
historically done, we will pay for it with our tax dollars. Side note: NOT
a free market, but one heavily subsidized and directed by the City.

That is what the could result from the current drafts of the Specific Area
Plan, Zoning Ordinance rewrite, Pedestrian Overlay District and
Redevelopment district designation: development that the VAST majority of
PROPERTY OWNERS do not want - done against their will - with their tax
dollars. I would call that a gross violation of personal property rights.

The well-written Neighborhood Strategic Plans that were created for
Northwest Tempe resulted from a very professional, open, public process and
hard compromise. A few didn't like it and found a way to change the process
and product to their benefit.

I respectfully ask that the City throw out the current draft of the plan and
revert to the Neighborhood Strategic Plans.

	Page	Dear City of Tempe, The City of Tempe is currently in the process of formulating its Northwest Tempe Specific Area Plan and related documents. As part of this process the City has solicited comments from interested residents on the first draft of the SAP. Under the current process comments are due to the City by October 1, 2003. I attended the 6:30 p.m. meeting on September 23, 2002 and provided several comments, but felt that I needed to follow up with written comments to more fully explain my concerns with the proposed document. The proposed SAP has many good aspects to it and obviously is the result of a great deal of effort. Certainly there are a variety of interests that can and should be considered in drafting any visionary document for the City of Tempe and its neighborhoods. However, great deference should be shown to the residents of areas which would be substantially impacted by the vision put forth in the SAP and related documents. There are certain aspects of the proposed SAP that I find quite troubling and not necessarily reflective of what would be good public policy for the City of Tempe as a whole or for individual neighborhoods. The focus of my concerns is the treatment of the Maple-Ash neighborhood and particularly the vision put forth in the proposed SAP for properties along the west side of Mill Avenue between University and 13th Street. As a homeowner and resident of a property along this stretch of Mill Avenue, I am directly and significantly impacted by the variety of changes to the area contained in the proposed SAP.
	Page	As a former executive director of a rehab program (Neighborhood Housing Services of Phoenix), I see where this program is going. As an owner of a small family business, we are concern on how the program will assist business-owners in this re-development program. I need to review your packet before we (business-owners) can validly support or oppose your project. But on the surface, I'll try to be objective to this preservation project.
	Page	Check Specific Area Plan with 2 Strategic Plans.
	Page	Have developer go to ask neighborhood association prior to going to city.

	Page		After reviewing the NW Tempe SAP, we are encouraged by several developments. Specifically: 1) the recognition of the importance of the intersection of Mill Avenue and University Drive and the area surrounding it and its potential for redevelopment: 2) the desirability of mixed-use development in urban areas; and 3) the recognition that so-called preservation of neighborhoods must "accommodate the demand for new forms of urban housing."
	Page		I want to congratulate you on producing such a comprehensive document. There's a lot of good ideas in it. Time permitting, I would comment on the positive aspects. However, time is not permitting, so I will comment on some of the aspects that concern me. Because I live in the Maple-Ash neighborhood, all my comments will be in relationship to that neighborhood and/or Mill Avenue South of University.
	Page		In many cases there are links to the Strategic Plan. Its important that the Strategic Plans are recognized and reiterated with the SAP. The intent was that the Strategic plan would guide the development of the Specific Area Plan.
	Page		Confirm understanding between neighborhood and city re-strategic plans.
	Page		Ensure that development in the opinion of the organized neighborhood, is consistent and in harmony with the long term resedential development and enhancing quality of life in residential.
	Page		Specific Area Plan needs to be checked against Strategic Plans. Assure that Specific Area Plan supports Strategic Plans.
	Page		What will this cost? Alleys.. Overall improvements? Like Mill? More taxes? Pedestrian Overlay.
	Page		I would discourage entry markers for the NWT.

Category **Height**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		No matter the "zoning" the idea is simple: I don't want my home facing a 3-5 story building!

	Page		3) Large developments on Mill Ave will not enhance the neighborhood if they are large scale and/or above 3 stories. The bottom line is this: no one here wants to look out their window and see tall buildings next door, or have greater traffic coursing through the streets adjacent to the yards where our children play.
Land Use	Page 18	A1.8	Don't limit structures to 2-Story where height is 30 feet or higher. (existing rights)
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 28	A7.4	Don't limit new development to existing buildings - especially when they are slated for redevelopment.

Category **Heritage Area**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Amen to: -No height increase at University and Mill -Keep Heritage section in document -Fund improvements that encourage pedestrian and bike transportation -Action 1.2 2nd bullet & 5th bullet: ADD with neighborhood agreement
	Page 15	A1.2	NO: Live-work provisions to Heritage Area
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	Explain "Sensitive transition", of building use and massing between Maple and Mill Ave. How would core residential properties be protected? 1. Develop incentives or bonuses for preservation of historic properties. 2. Only allow change in density and intensity when core residential properties are protected.
Land Use	Page 15	A1.2	With respect to Action 1.2 on page 15 regarding the protection of "the core residential properties at the heart of the Heritage Area," "core" is not defined or specified on any map that we could find. How are these properties to be proteceted?

Land Use	Page 15	B.	In a number of places in the proposed SAP (particularly pages 15-16 of the SAP and p. 10 of the proposed Northwest Tempe Design Guidelines), representations are made that the existing conditions along Mill Avenue and future needs of the area which I believe are at least to some extent inaccurate. For example, the SAP states on p. 15 that in this area owner occupied residential uses have been discouraged, while retail and office uses find the area appealing. Further, the document talks of a "sensitive transition" to insulate the residential area on Maple Street from Mill Avenue. Obviously that struck me as an odd statement, as I'm a resident homeowner on Mill Avenue that is apparently going to be insulated from the residential portion of the neighborhood under the vision contained in the SAP.
Land Use	Page 16		Specifically maintain the existing alley in the Maple-Ash Neighborhood between Mill and Maple to provide a buffer from Mill Ave and in effect limit density and redevelopment.

Category **Historic**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		We are adamantly opposed to the establishment of any historic overlay district on our property.
Land Use	Page 27	A7.3	Treat historic structures as Land Use to level the field in development planning. Historic Preservation zoning - per existing ordinance should be encouraged.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.1	Preserve and enhance character of neighborhood an economic vitality. Develop tax and disincentives to develop in historic neighborhoods.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.3	Treat "historic" as at least 50 years old. Do not require listing on register.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.3	Yes, creat a map of all historic resources, homes etc. of Heritage Area and place under historic preservation status

Category **Info**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page		I got your name off a Fact Sheet which a friend was given at a recent meeting. We own property on Maple St. and would like to know more about what is going on in that neigborhood. Last year I called someone at the City of Tempe to ask to be put on the mailing list for Maple-Ash Neighborhood Association, but we have never received anything. We would be particularly interested in the Maple-Ash Redevelopment/Preservation Plan. I am reading the Northwest Tempe draft plan. How can we get more specific information in the future and find out about meetings before they happen?
	Page		Request copies of proposed plans that are currently underway and existing ordinances.
	Page		What is appropriate manner for me to receive information about the Redevelopment Process/Plan for the neighborhood north of Fifth Street, south of First Street bounded by Farmer and Roosevelt? I have not followed this process because I am disabled and never thought it applied to me. My landlord is willing to sell me the property now, but I do not have the resources to repair it. I have lived here two years, this is a very nice house and I and would very much like to stay here. My neighbors say the city would help me and I could always live here. I would like to know what is true. I have been told I am eligible for new windows and attic insulation because the airplanes now fly over my house. Is this true?

Category **Intro**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Pg. 5 - B. NewTowN should be mentioned as one of the organizations that helped to complete the Strategic Plan for NTN.
	Page 1		Include: Livibility, stable, quality of life.
other	Page		Add regulatory overlays in preface.
other	Page 1		Bring text from page 5, regarding strategic plans to "relationship to other documents" on page 1.

other	Page 4		Page 4: Next to last paragraph, change last word in sentence from "reinvestment" to "liveability"
other	Page 5	B	Pg. 5 - B. NewTowN should be mentioned as one of the organizations that helped to complete the Strategic Plan for NTN.
other	Page 7		"Divergent views were expressed, discussed and documented." Then what?

Category: Irrigation

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 30	A8.4	I support Action 8.4 - keep flood irrigation where possible.

Category: Landscape

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Concur with maintaining flood irrigation.
Envrnmt., Conserv. & Mn	Page 30	A8.4	I strongly approve of the section ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING, CONSERVATION, AND MANAGEMENT. Action 8.4 which describes strategies to preserve the character of the neighborhoods, stresses the importance of flood irrigation to preserve lush landscaping. The development of a street tree program to protect existing trees and replace aging trees is an excellent idea.
Public Services	Page 31	A10.1 bul	Maintain landscape on site rather than removal of plants. An irrigation system is necessary for landscape maintenance.

Category: Live-Work

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
Land Use	Page 13		Paragraph 2 Designations: Definitions provided for Home Occupation and Work-Live but no definition for Live-Work.

Category: Lot Assemblage

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	Statement: Much of character of historic areas is individuality created by development on separate lots. Question: Can zoning regulations in historic areas disallow combination of lots. Result: Redevelopment can continue - evolving but retaining individuality.
	Page	2) I advocate adding a provision to the plan that will prevent land owners from combining smaller parcels into larger pieces for development.
	Page	Recognize street rythms created by existing lot sizes and create design guidelines that recognize and maintain this street rhythm.
	Page	I propose two policy changes which could safeguard the neighborhood and still retain the concept of Redevelopment and Conservation of character. 1. Developers should not be permitted to amalgamate lots. The individuality of each lot gives the area its character, and this cannot be replicated by design (however architecturally imaginative).

	Page		The plan should recognize and maintain the property rights of the community and property owners near a site that might be subject to development (or redevelopment). Existing open space (setbacks and yards) and mass/void rhythms on streets in existing neighborhoods and commercial districts should be identified as desirable characteristics and maintained. The plan should establish standards that describe these desirable patterns, especially where they already exist. Maintaining such things as existing property widths is a powerful tool for preserving the scale and character of endangered neighborhoods and districts. Further, it is not a taking to require that the size of a property be maintained, as the property owner has not been required to give up any of the property rights that were purchased with the site. This effort should be coordinated with the Zoning Ordinance rewrite. The new ordinance should include a mechanism that requires public hearings for replats of properties in sensitive areas, redevelopment areas or overlay districts. According to the City Attorney, this is legal and would not be considered a taking. A similar public hearing requirement for replats is already in effect in Maricopa County.
Land Use	Page 17	A1.5	As a neighborhood association we oppose "any" assemblage of single-family residences or incursion of any type into Mitchell Park to accommodate future commercial development on the south side of west University Drive. Ref.# page 17, action 1.5 #2
Land Use	Page 17	A1.5	3rd Bullet: Clarification on intent, assemblage?
Land Use	Page 17	A1.5	2nd Bullet: Good!
Land Use	Page 17	A1.5	Riverside/West University PAC: Inform residents when Project Area Committee or city recommends (lot) assemblage (change).
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page		Against land assembly in redevelopment areas.

Category **Map**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page		Along first street, difficult to tell if mixeduse emphasis residential or retail. Define better. Portion of MU residential reduced to a smaller portion along First Street.
	Page		Need to change boundary of "Urban Neighborhood Area", map. Maybe Urban Neighborhood should be Eclectic?

Category **Maple-Ash**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		There isn't anything on Maple other than residential. So don't understand respecting the core of the residential from the commercial. There is only residential from Mill to Maple.

	Page	Any discussion of the Maple-Ash area should include some facts that are very important: 1. All of the residential properties in this area with the exception of one, are currently zoned some type of multifamily zoning classification under the City of Tempe zoning ordinance and zoning map. 2. Any additions to or substantial modifications to any residential property in this area are subject to all the criteria of the city of tempe design review ordinance. 3. Any additions to or substantial modifications to any residential property that exceed the criteria of its specific zoning classification, are subject to the criteria of city of tempe board of adjustment. 4. This area exhibits an unusual array of assorted 'architectural styles' and associated design details that are not historically date specific, other than that they exist in the housing stock presently in the area. 5. This area has the full run of housing sizes from two-three room, detached, single-family, single story to multi-story, attached multi-family dwellings. 6. Since the time that the current zoning classifications for the residential properties were imposed, only one property has been re-zoned, and that happened less than two years ago, remaining the only one to date. 7. This area IS NOT a 'historical district' despite numerous attempts to make it so. As a registered architect, who live in and works out of the residence/studio that I designed and built in this area in 1978, I cannot support another set of arbitrary 'guidelines' that will attempt to tell a property owner what they can or cannot do with their property. More standards only impede design creativity. When the city of tempe established a new zoning classification for residential 'infill', they saw fit to not impose any of the typical criteria existent in all other zoning categories. The purpose of your 'design session' specifically is aimed at this 'infill' or redevelopment of properties, the same 'target'. Ido not believe that more imposed criterion for improvement of properties is necessary. This area needs diverse, high quality design solutions to individual property owner programs, that will create well-crafted improvements to the area. Rather than generate more 'common themes' for this area, a

			more diverse approach should be taken where project quality is paramount in all aspects.

Category: Maps

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Don't want Mitchell Park in redevelopment area.
	Page		Don't want mixed use creeping inot Maple-Ash neighborhood along Mill/Maple or University/9th.
	Page		Redevelopment Area Map: Please remove Mithcell Park from the Redevelopment area. In Strategic Planning process we were told by city that this designation would make the park eligible for funding mechanisms. This has not happened. Instead, park is threatened by development.

Category: Mixed Use

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		MU-1 5 acres is too huge. It should address arterial vs. collector locations.
	Page		Define business type "in any residence". Define residency requirements for owner -- accessory dwellings
Land Use	Page 11		Residential Facing Development: Interior courtyards should address neighborhood streets also.
Land Use	Page 11		Mixed-Use Develoment Delete: "A development must contain, . . ." Whole sentence.
Land Use	Page 12		Mixed Use Districts require new zoning, MU-1 and MU-2. 1. Currenlty the new zoning increases density of dwellings. 2. There are zoning bonuses for tearing down historic residences and businesses. Questions: 1. Can't the mixed use district utilize existing zoning? 2. Can't bonuses be developed to keep historic structures in place?
Land Use	Page 12		"Home Business", coordinate definition with zoning rewrite.

Category: PACs

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page 8		PAC development should not just be done by staff.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29		Mid-page, DELETE: "Continue the formation of a PAC for the Maple-Ash study area." and DELETE any PAC for Maple-Ash area.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29	A7.7	Action 7.7: Redevelopment/Preservation areas are unnecessary. Oppose PACs.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29	A7.7	On page 29, the creation of two study areas is proposed -- one being in Maple-Ash. The reason for creating these study areas and associated PACs is supposedly because these areas need greater detail with regard to design guidelines and conceptual development plans. Please. Enough is enough. We are opposed to the creation of a Maple-Ash PAC. On page 35 these two areas are identified as "the obvious areas where increase in density and intensity" will occur and it CAN occur without a PAC where a few neighborhood zealots attempt to force everything and everyone into going along with their limited vision/self serving agenda. Let's NOT waste any more money -- there are other more pressing needs.

Category **Participation**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		If a member of the Northwest Tempe Neighborhoods community is notified of this planning process and chooses not to participate, then one would expect that this person's views could not be represented as a polar extreme in the "Issue Mapping" process. Is this indeed the case?
	Page 8		Staff to choose PAC membership, public needs to have a voice too.
	Page 28	A7.4	Have best practices reference book translated in spanish. Also, include in neighborhood info.
other	Page 8		Provide additional input from residents on choosing Project Area Committees.

Category **Preservation**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	I'm writing to promote the preservation of the Maple-Ash neighborhood. This neighborhood exemplifies an alive, vibrant community whose vitality would be surely threatened by altering its' makeup. It not only preserves and honors Tempe history, but also the important notion of community as a positive entity that unifies people meaningfully. The Maple-Ash neighborhood is a living model of many basic American values. To compromise this, undermines the very spirit of community.
	Page	What I've heard goes against the preservation grain I feel in my heart. It looks like you intend to destroy, through redevelopment/multi-use designation, one of the best "neighborhoods" in the Valley...Maple/Ash. Not so short sighted I suppose...if you a developer! Shame on you. Keep Maple/Ash a neighborhood.

Page	I am troubled by the thought of the oldest neighborhood in Tempe potentially in the hands of developers and profiteers. The Maple/Ash neighborhood, besides being of historical significanceto the community, harkens back to a time when America was not so GREED DRIVEN and city officials truly cared for and respected neighborhoods and families. One visit to downtown dramatically illustrates the lack of need for any further development as the area has been historicaly plagued with cronic commercial vacancy. Even the newest of the "new and improved" downtown redevelopment projects, The Brickyard, is in bankruptcy due to lack of tenants. Dont get me wrong, I am all for progress in the community but not at the expense of irreplaceable historical community gems such as the Maple/Ash area. I am a firefighter for the city of Phoenix and choose to live in Tempe (15 years now) because of this precious neighborhood and it's neighbors. I work in the WILLO historical district in downtown Phoenix. What a travesty it would be to destroy(read redevelop)any portion of Willo for the purpose of another chain franchise or commercial business. Tempe has demonstrated its leadership and commitment to areas of historical and communal importance in the past when city leaders stepped in to save "A" mountain from being improved upon by "developers". I submit to you that the Maple/Ash neighborhood falls within this same context of historical and communal importance and once destroyed can never be replaced by anything of near or equal value to the community. Dont be fooled by the arguement of this entire issue being one of "property owners rights". These profiteers(a vocal and politically connected minority) bought in the Maple/Ash area solely for the pupose of lining their pockets by driving the area toward redevelopment without regard for the existing community of neighbors and home owners. Its time for Tempe to stand up to its declaration of purpose, that being a city which cares about its neighborhoods and citizens. THANK YOU VERY MUCH

	Page	I'm writing to promote the preservation of the Maple-Ash neighborhood. This neighborhood exemplifies an alive, vibrant community whose vitality would be surely threatened by altering its' makeup. It not only preserves and honors Tempe history, but also the important notion of community as a positive entity that unifies people meaningfully. The Maple-Ash neighborhood is a living model of many basic American values. To compromise this, undermines the very spirit of community.
	Page	I've put a lot of money into renovating my house (over $250K) and I'm not alone. Lately many owners have seen this neighborhood for the positives it provides and have been investing in their homes. This is one of the few remaining areas where large irrigated lots establish a family friendly place, close to ASU and downtown, yet it still retains the small-town feel of a historic neighborhood. If the city plans to change this by increasing density and making it easier for developers to "redevelop" the area into a more urban-like core, my neighbors and I will lose both the investment we've made in our homes (sweat, tears and money), we'll also lose the place we've fought so hard to make better. And the city will loose a unique environment. I believe the city should support those of us who have invested in the neighborhood by helping us preserve its character. What incentive is there for any home owner to continue to improve our homes if we feel that in several years developers will be piling up multi-unit dwellings on our lots? I will oppose with all my resources any attempt to advance development at the price of preservation. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
	Page	Character Preservation Issue: (as a Maple-Ash homeowner) -Redevelopment and Preservation Contridiction -SAP does not support the interests of homeowner's in Maple-Ash. -Support keeping individual lots separate to disallow development of larger structures.

Housing	Page 24	A6.4	1) change "older" to historic 2) change "methods" to materials and methods 3) reference Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
Land Use	Page 11		Paragraph two: Statement, Last sentence overlooks effect of defacto existing conservation. Identify increasing scarcity of historic eligible housing choice.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page		Propose "Historic Preservation Area" with clear set of criteria. Allow redevelopment/change on individual lots, not on combination of lots.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page		Preservation and Rehabilitation: The plan is full of well meaning phrases describing a vibrant urban atmosphere- like Georgetown, Washington. How do you actually adhere? How do you ensure development actually improves an area? Question: Why should Maple/Ash be a redevelopment area - but not a Historic Preservation Area.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	A7.3	Neighborhood Preservation: Suggestion we made to designate a year a point in time at which buildings become historic - such as when they become 50 years old. I confer this idea; however specific plans would need to be made to deal with the fact that new neighborhoods would come into historic designation every year. Redevelopment should take this into consideration, possibly by making new buildings a renovation to old buildings remain in the style of that neighborhood and in keeping with the ambience.

Category **Process**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Current Situation: The Specific Area Plan is being driven by the General Plan, and the Zoning, Transportation, and Parks plan. Proposed: The Specific Area Plan must be driven by the General Plan, but it must, in turn drive the zoning, transportation, and parks plans. In development of the SAP, liaisons should be present to adapt zoning, transportation, and park plans to reflect the SAP. The SAP should NOT be adapted to fit these plans.

Category **Public Process**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	Very well facilitated. The postcards do not motivate participation. I like room organization, non-confrontational. Kept the meeting moving. Didn't know I should have read the book. Too much emphasis on Maple-Ash Notice of meeting was timely (good).
	Page	In the spirit good and open public process, I suggest that the comments submitted here be published on this web site.
	Page	No page number! This meeting and input is excellent, however the zoning rewrite will end up null and voiding the peoples desires and wishes. Rewrite supercedes the SAP! And General Plan.
	Page	Establish and maintain goals of General Plan, which (neganne?) parties seeking changes within a defined neighborhood must seek and obtain neighborhood approval for changes before applying to city.
	Page	There was very poor notification for the Community Review Meetings. Also, it was poor public involvement planning to have the events on back-to-back days with no weekend opportunities. This is how the city gets a bad reputation for creating these plans with out the neighborhoods and why the neighbors become suspicious of the City's actions. Unpleasantly surprised, and disappointed again.

Category **Redevelopment/Mix**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	It is my understanding that all comment are requested in writing concerning the Northwest Specific Area Plan. I OPPOSE THE REDEVELOPMENT AND THE MIXED USE PLAN FOR THE EAST SIDE OF MAPLE AVE. I attended many hours of planning sessions and do not agree with the city development office that the city needs redevelopment on the east side of Maple Ave. To preserve the vintage neighborhood, the specific plan must set down guidelines so the boards, commissions and city council WILL NOT approve abandoning the alley or granting height variances. While the plan can not change zoning, it can set the tone for size and scale. To replace the streetscape and the 50 year old trees would remove an important piece of Tempe heritage.
	Page	Save Maple Ash - ALL OF IT! NO Redevelopment NO Mixed Use
	Page	I OPPOSE THE MIXED USE PLAN and REDEVELOPMENT FOR THE EAST SIDE OF MAPLE AVE. Please preserve this lovely historical neighborhood. Tempe has so few historical homes, it is a shame not to encourage their preservation. The plan as proposed would destroy this diverse area with modern development. I am especially alarmed by the prospect of high rise buildings (more than two stories high) being erected in this area.

	Page	It is my understanding that all comments concerning the Northwest Specific Area Plan are to be submitted in writing. I OPPOSE THE REDEVELOPMENT AND THE MIXED USE PLAN FOR THE EAST SIDE OF MAPLE AVE. I find it hard to believe that after many planning sessions, during which the vast majority of the residents and property owners told city staff that they did not agree that redevelopment is needed on the east side of Maple Ave, that the city development office is recommending a move in that direction. The specific plan must specify guidelines so that boards, commissions and City Council WILL NOT approve abandoning the alley between Mill and Maple, or grant height variances. While the plan can not change zoning, it can set the tone for size and scale. Replacing the streetscape and 50 year old trees would remove an important piece of Tempe heritage.
	Page	I have lived in Tempe since 1972. In 2000, I bought a home at xxx S. Maple. I have rennovated the house completely with a lot of hard work and expense. I am very attached to this neighborhood and do not want to see the value of it disturbed by higher density zoning. I am against the mixed use and redevelopment proposed in the Specific Area Plan. This is a rare neighborhood for Tempe and should be preserved.Too many other historical neighborhoods have already been lost in this town.
	Page	I am a resident residing just west of Maple Ash neighborhood. The proposal to make a chunk of that neighborhood mixed use is reprehensible! There are a few treasures that Tempe should not touch, and one of them is the "historic" Maple Ash neighborhood. Other cities around the country have done well to preserve these areas. It is a travesty if downtown moves into the historical residential areas west of downtown.

	Page	I am a long time resident in the neighborhood bordered by University on the north, 13th Street on the South, Mill Ave. on the east, and the railroad tracks on the west. Or as it is recognized more affectionately as Maple Ash. As a long time resident, I would like to voice my opinion that I am opposed to any redevelopment or mixed use of that or the neighboring areas. Thanks for your time, Robert Malarz
	Page	I live at xxx S.Ash and am opposed to any changes made in the zoning of this area. "'Mixed use" does not sound promising for an established neighborhood.
	Page	It is my understanding that all comments are requested in writing concerning the Northwest Specific Area Plan. I OPPOSE THE REDEVELOPMENT AND THE MIXED USE PLAN FOR THE EAST SIDE OF MAPLE AVE. Please preserve the entire neighborhood in this lovely historical area. Tempe has so few historical homes. I'm incredulous at the fact the city would even consider destroying such a diverse area with modern development. I am especially alarmed by the prospect of high rise buildings (more than two stories high) being erected in this area.

Page	I understand the nature of planning is to anticipate future needs. However, I believe we are over-anticipating. Newly developed buildings in downtown Tempe are not occupied and, given the state of the economy, I doubt that the additional properties scheduled to be developed will be fully occupied in the next few years. Downtown Tempe could become the next Scottsdale Galleria. Changing zoning today in anticipation of development that may never occur will damage the neighborhood. You have the opportunity to change zoning at any time in the future. Build out North Mill Avenue and leave Mill Avenue South of University and Maple-Ash alone until you run out of space. I don't believe five blocks of mixed-use retail emphasis buildings along Mill Avenue is consistent with neighborhood preservation. If these are zoned MU-1, then (according to the definition on page 12) their intent is to serve the residential area. We don't have five blocks of unused needs; even if you include all of Northwest Tempe. If you allow these buildings to be built as described, parking will be troublesome. What the neighborhood will experience are parking garages and parking lots. Rather than creating a buffer between Mill Avenue and Maple-Ash you will create a neighborhood blight.

	Page	As a homeowner in the Maple Ash Neighborhood, I am shocked that the City is contemplating part of the Maple Ash Neighborhood as a re-development area and part of Maple Ave as "mixed use", and I object to these designations. I am writing to state that I want the Land Use Map from the Strategic Plan used for the Specific Area Plan. The Maple Ash Neighborhood is unique within the Phoenix metropolitan area, and I do not wish to lose our historic and extraordinary neighborhood to commercial development, condos and red-tile-roof apartment complexes. Current zoning has allowed renovation of existing homes, while maintaining the character and integrity of the neighborhood, and has led to skyrocketing property values in the last twenty years. These factors have, of course, benefited homeowners in the area – I do not desire a change which could destroy our beautiful neighborhood and adversely impact my property values. I strongly object to both designation of a re-development area and of mixed use zoning in the Maple Ash Neighborhood. The current draft of the Specific Area Plan does not reflect my vision for my beautiful community.
	Page	Preservation and redevelopment are oxymorons.

	Page	I've just learned that there is a possible plan in place to re-zone the maple ash neighborhood for multi-use. As a past resident of this area, I'm horrified at the thought of the last remaining significant historical neighborhood in Tempe being gutted to create blocks of mass housing and coffee shops! The only theory I can come up with on why this is even being considered, is that there are a few people buying up votes to force through a plan the majority of people in the are don't want! Send me the Land Use Map from the Strategic Plan ASAP, as i am a current homeowner in the Northwest Neighborhood, i'd like to find out if you're trying to destroy my neighborhood also and if there's any way this travesty can be stopped before it's too late. This unique area that is the Maple-Ash neighborhood should be getting support and funding from the city to complete the renovation of it's last few un-restored houses, not getting a green light from the city to tear them down for a quick profit and minor increase in the taxable businesses in the area.
	Page	MU-1 and MU-2: Should not be identified by acreage (5)+

Page

Page

As an Arizona native and a 20-year resident of the Maple-Ash neighborhood in Tempe, I recognize the UNIQUENESS and the VALUE of the Maple-Ash NEIGHBORHOOD as a neighborhood. I am extremely concerned with the level of redevelopment and the changes in mixed-use designations that do NOT reflect the opinions and visions of the approximately 350+ households in Maple-Ash - but instead support the visions of a few main developers who stand to make large sums of money by redeveloping my neighborhood. I welcome this mediation process as an opportunity for the COMMUNITY voice to be recognized.
Thank you,

	Page	1) The plan shows my block (xxx S. Ash) changing from < 8 du/ac to 11-15 du/ac. I oppose this increase. If anything, I would like to see the number lowered, NOT increased 4) I'm not interested in "redevelopment" of my neighborhood if it means increased density and a change from its present character. I'm more interested in preserving the historical feel of the place. I want to encourage owners to fix their houses not abandon them for profit.
	Page	I am concerned about the land Use map for re-development in the Maple Ash area. I want the land use map from the Stratigic plan in the SAP. It was a compromise with all parties participating.
	Page	As a homeowner and resident of the Maple/Ash neighborhood, I question the use of labeling the area as a redevelopment/historic district study area. It appears that the two terms are contradictory. Can you explain to me how the two terms fit together? In addition, I am opposed to the desired influx of mixed uses into the neighborhood. As one of Tempe's oldest neighborhoods, Tempe should be embracing the historic character of the homes in the area. Why does it appear that the City is placing greater value on redevelopment rather than boosting the neighborhood's historic nature? I believe there is an economic value to history. There have been numerous occasions where people from outside Tempe walk by my home and express how much they like the character of the neighborhood. They love the homes, the tall trees, and the fact that people know one another and don't live behind walls like some of the newer developments. Many of these people express that their neighborhoods don't even have sidewalks. I urge you to consider the historic value of the neighborhood as much as you consider the redevelopment aspects.

Land Use	Page	We tentatively support the projected land use designation of the quarter-block that we own at the northwest corner of Ninth Street and Maple Avenue of "mixed-use: emphasis residential," although we preferred the consultant's original recommendation that the whole block be designated mixed use without the qualifiers "emphasis retail or residential." The support is tentative only if no specific percentages are adopted that would prevent the sensible future redevelopment of the entire block to include other such uses as office, restaurant and entertainment. We think this designation in conjunction with the designation of "mixed-use: emphasis retail" for that part of the block north of the east-west alley along University Drive will prevent strip mall development and allow for redevelopment of the entire block while providing for appropriate transition with the block to the south of Ninth Street.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page	As an urban designer, I originally supported the proposal that the MANA area could be a Redevelopment/Historic Preservation area. This was because I believe in change and evolution, rather than preservation for its own sake, as established in the British concept of "Conservation Area" . But this assumes that the planning system supports the principle of using development to improve an area for the benefit of the community, not for the benefit of individuals. From the discussions that I have taken part in, it is clear to me that the planning system is far too weak in standing up to private interests. The whole character and value of MANA (and similar areas) is threatened not only by being designated 'redevelopment' but also by the proposed zoning and density changes.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page	Take away redevelopment designation.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page	The designation of "Redevelopment Study Area", "Redevelopment Area" and/ or any reference to redevelopment of Mitchell Park or the Mitchell school building should be removed from the plan and maps contained in the plan.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 27	Restrict redevelopment in neighborhoods where residents do not desire it.
Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29	We don't need redevelopment/preservation plan in Maple-Ash

Preserv., Rehab. & Redev.	Page 29	A7.7	I would like the redevelopment-preservation designation for Maple-Ash removed. The redevelopment designation is damaging. In my mind, the preservation component is meaningless.

Category Rental Registration

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		As property owner that owns several lots in the Northwest Tempe area, I support a rental registration. When you have this much rental property, there should be a revenue for property rentals for the city.
Housing	Page		I want a rental registration. For (?) and quality of life issurance.
Housing	Page		Student Rentals: Maintain only three unrelated persons allowed in a single family house. Another concern is the number of automobiles associated with students.
Housing	Page 23		Ownership is 51%, please correct to whatever it is!
Housing	Page 25		Actions 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 Rental management sounds "preachy" - eliminate these.
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	Yes, please develop to monitor compliance rental properties compliance with cities rental housing code.
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	Action items 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7 on page 25 regarding rental housing should be eliminated from the SAP. Even if a rental property registry was developed, who would ensure "proper neighborhood balance" and how would this balance (whatever it is) be enforced? What are "forgivable loans"? If it is a give-away of taxpayer dollars to promote MANA's agenda -- we are opposed to it. An most certainly, we do not want to be "educated" by MANA on their so-called neighborhood standards. These and a lot of other nonsense proposals in the SAP need to be eliminated or you risk the loss of document credibility. Other examples: identify irrigation boxes with opportunities for public art; bird conservation overlay districts in areas utilizing flood irrigation; and all references to preserving lush landscaping. Again, we live in a desert.
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	I support possible moratoriums on issuance of rental property licenses.

Housing	Page 25	A6.5	Action 6.5, 6.6, 6.7: I support these ideas.
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	Action 6.5 to last bullet add: "and add enhanced landscaping regulations.'
Housing	Page 25	A6.5	Action 6.5, ADD to sentence, ". . .to track inventory AND OWNERS (including . . ."
Housing	Page 25	A6.6	The idea of rewarding a landlord that is unable or unwilling to maintain a property is disturbing. Fine them for failing to maintain their property. Don't pay them. They don't deserve to be in the rental business. The goal shouldn't be to provide affordable rental properties, it should be to provide affordable home ownership properties. If the city was more aggressive about enforcing regulations maybe rental property ownership would not be so popular and more properties would be available for purchase.

Category **Retention**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
Urban Design	Page 19		ADD A4.3- Encourage unique water retention methodology through-out Northwest Tempe.

Water	Page	A12.2	we have one comment regarding on-site stormwater retention and it is summarized below via a previous e-mail sent to Planning. We could expand the on-site retention concepts to include underground retention may be considered on a case-by-case basis for new individual infill development sites in the planning area. This strategy is intended to help ease the "tight" development site implications regarding stormwater retention to facilitate the City's intended long-term preferred development for this planning area. I did a quick scan of the document and offer the following comment concerning section 12, Water. The first Action 12.2 bullet point states "Complete the PW study . . ." That study is complete and the wrap we did with Development Services concluded the overall sewer system and basin-wide retention concept would be too expensive to fund (over $10M) with regard to CIP revenue potential and/or property assessments. The strategy that was agreed upon by the PW/DS was to consider sub-regional stormwater facilities on a case by case basis coinciding with major redevelopment efforts.
Water	Page 34		Action 12: The city should provide storm water retention facilities.

Category **Transportation**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 17	A1.6	Discourage cut-through traffic in alleys in residential areas.
Public Buildings	Page 21	A3.1	3rd bullet- "..discourage developing destination uses that require automobiles." Statement unclear.

Category **Work-Live**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
Housing	Page 27	A6.13	(Work-Live Units) Prohibit home-based businesses which emit sound, light or odor beyond property line; or which generate any alley traffic.

Category **Zoning**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page		Want community control of zoning. (ex: Tucson neighborhood plans)
Land Use	Page		Land Use is NOT Zoning! This plan will not change our existing zoning rights.

Document: Design Guidelines

Category

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 1		Page 1, Allow flexibility. . ." Delete General Plan. Insert Zoning Regulations. Page 3, Delete, ALL "overlay districts" Page 5, Second "Guideline: Delete, "in the Northwest Area Appendix," Insert: "AS defined by zoning"
	Page 4		First Guideline: add at end of first sentence "when appropriate."
	Page 11		Shared Driveways (b.) "No fence," Fire land gates?
	Page 13		On-Site Circulation: 1st bullet- or entire parking space as pedestrian dominated. 4th bullet- "delineated and marked drop-off" disencentive to good design. "Separated pickup zones from traffic", not generally possible on small sites. 6th bullet- Avoid such large parking lots in Tempe. 10th bullet- "Fully illuminate" not always good - subtle desert design.
	Page 28		Relate size and proportion to what can be built on adjacent property.
	Page 30		Strategy: DELETE, entire paragraph.
	Page 34		DELETE: "Gated developments . . ." subjective statement.

Category Building

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

Page 26		Diagram: Not realistic in current market. Show dimensions as landscape buffer 6 feet min., pedestrian area 6-10 feet, sheltered pedestrian use 10 feet. First floor retail 15 feet height, second and third office/residential 10-12 feet, and roof 5 feet. Guideline: "..oriented to the corner.." Difficult for merchants (see Baja Fresh and Bagels on Mill + University)
Page 27		3rd Guideline: "..positioned to the back.." No back in urban setting. 2nd Diagram: Backyard pool and lawn is now driveway - maybe basketball. This doubles neighborhood infrastructure (for esthetic benefit only)
Page 28		1st Diagram: More affordable - multiple of 2 x cost. 2nd Diagram: Multiple of 4 in construction costs for esthetics. 3rd Guideline: "computer images" Not real useful without a lot of money.
Page 29		Building Materials: provide tax incentives for utilizing materials an design for structure to last 100 years or more.
Page 29		Street Elevation- Human dimensions (not like Alphagraphics)
Page 29	A5c	Encourage alternative, long-term building material proven in other geographical areas. (i.e. coarse stone, straw bale, adobe)
Page 30		1st Guideline: include, ",appropriate indoor light levels" 4th Guideline: Glare and light color go hand-in-hand. Use other deep desert colors and soft textures to reduce glare. 7th Guideline: "..active solar systems for heating water." Expensive and often ugly for urban setting.

	Page 33		2nd Guideline: "corner stores and small offices" Difficult tennants to sustain. 3rd Guideline: "..public.." Or private for safety. Often dangerous, scale public spaces without a large amount of activity.

Category **Building Setbacks**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 6	b	page 6. Under front yard setbacks item b. Eliminate all words after "5 feet" on line 3. "Reduce mass and reflect character of property in close proximity" has nothing to do with setbacks.
	Page 7		Rear Yard Setbacks, "minimum setback should be 15 feet." Why, with 5 feet front yard setbacks? As measured from alley center?

Category **Character Areas**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 16		Urban Neighborhood Area: delete statement. I believe my street falls into (Eclectic Area) this category (Roosevelt between 5th and 2nd Streets.) This would be a drastic change to the residential character of this street. The description of this area sounds unrealistic. I don't believe it should be imposed on current residential areas.
	Page 40		Boundary of Broadway Area is undefined. Need specific boundaries.
	Page 41		Heritage Summary: It's multi-family use in multi-family zoning not single-family use.
	Page 43		Urban Neighborhood: Note: single family uses on Roosevelt/Farmer, move west boundary to the East.

Category **Commercial**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 16		Issue: What new uses? How to limit competition? Supported by existing / planned market? 3rd Guideline: Money often comes with second phase (Centerpoint) 4th Guideline: (c.) 10% required by SAP?

Category: Density

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 14		Guideline: Density Bonus, to what extent? "may be granted", by whom?
	Page 14		Density transfer, page 14. I am concerned about the density transfer concept. You may tangibly punish someone else for an intangible value to the city. I don't believe this is appropriate. Either a historic property is worth preserving or it isn't. Would the historic property be permanently rezoned so it could not be torn down or redeveloped?

Category: General

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Recommend to change the section title for NW Tempe Design Guidelines to NW Tempe Design Recommendations. "Guidelines" typically restrict or define rules to follow, i.e. character, color, plant types, etc. The document is to vague to offer a developer guidelines. Maybe remove graphics that imply what "character" is intended for the buildings.
	Page 40		No commercial development along University that would encroach on Mitchell Park!

Category: Height

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 8		"The wider the street, the taller the buildings should be to define the street." University? 7 Stories?
	Page 8		Page 8. Under building height transition: "New buildings that are across the street from an existing residential zoning district should step down to a height that matches that district." This is very unclear and can be interpreted in different ways. The height allowed by the zoning is what is called for and not what may currently exist.
	Page 9		Height along Rio Salado Prky; appropriate to support increased height as buildings approach Downtown Tempe.
	Page 10		From 10th Street to 13th Street no buildings over one story, along Mill Ave. No redevelopment of single family homes currently existing along Mill

	Page 10	Maximum of 2 stories in residential neighborhood (example 10th and Ash)
	Page 10	Disagree that maximum height for Mill and University should be 5 stories. This is too much. What is the definition of a story? 10 feet?
	Page 10	Please no 5 story or 3 story buildings on University between Mill and Farmer.
	Page 16	Disagree with statement, "The development scale of the neighborhood commercial area and the building height standards of applicable zone. . . Should support an intensification of use."
	Page 42	6th Guideline: Further comments relating to the last item in the last paragraph is warranted. The SAP designates MU-1 and MU-2 districts or areas, but we could find no map which shows which designation applies in what specific area. If we assume our property is MU-2 (on a block along east University Drive) then we must take exception to the third bullet under "Action 1.8" on page 18 which provides for "transition structures to two-story residential development where mixed-use fronts on an existing residential street." This is inconsistent with the existing R-3 zoning which allows for three-story buildings. It would not make sense to force us down to two-story, only to have the property to the south of Ninth Street redeveloped to three-story the next year. In addition, any statements regarding "scale" must take into account what is allowed with existing zoning and NOT just what currently exists.

Category **Heritage Area**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

Page 10	In a number of places in the proposed SAP (particularly pages 15-16 of the SAP and p. 10 of the proposed Northwest Tempe Design Guidelines), representations are made that the existing conditions along Mill Avenue and future needs of the area which I believe are at least to some extent inaccurate. While the level of traffic is certainly one consideration in looking at the area, I have been quite pleased to live along Mill Avenue and have made a significant investment of time, effort, and money to upgrade both my home and my landscaping. My home was built in 1939 and has a great deal of historical character. If it and others like it are torn down to implement the vision contained in the SAP, it will be a loss for the City of Tempe and will send a message that the Tempe's historical character takes a backseat to commercial development interests. Further, I don't feel that my view of living along Mill Avenue is at all unusual, but rather is more of the norm. Often when people come to visit my house or people even just walk by my house they comment on how much they like it, in what a great location it is, and how they wish they lived in such a location. Additionally, I have spoken to quite a number of other people who have lived along Mill Avenue in this area who think that it is a great residential location. Also, the current movement to limit traffic through the downtown section of Mill Avenue appears likely to at least somewhat reduce the heavy traffic concerns expressed for the section of Mill Avenue between University and 13th Street. Further, the Northwest Tempe Projected Land Use map attached to the SAP shows my property and all others along Mill Avenue as being designated "Mixed Use: emphasis Retail". And on page 10 of the design guidelines large scale development is contemplated along Mill Avenue, with building heights ranging from five stories at University to two stories at 13th Street. It appears that residential use of properties along Mill Avenue, including my home, are being phased out in favor of commercial development interests. Further, while there is some relatively small scale business development on the north end of this section of Mill Avenue, the southern portion of this section of Mill is totally residential at this point, with the

exception of the historic Tempe Women's Club. The SAP and design guidelines present a very different view of Mill Avenue than that which exists today and such a view does not appear to take into consideration the value of residential land use along Mill Avenue. Further, the level of development contemplated along Mill Avenue would impact the Maple Ash neighborhood far beyond just those homes located along Mill Avenue. Adoption of the SAP and related documents in their current form would likely discourage neighborhood residents from investing time or effort into their properties, knowing that the City's vision of the neighborhood is for commercial development in and around the neighborhood.

As the City of Tempe notes on its website's Tempe Neighborhood History, "The Maple Ash neighborhood is the only remaining pre-1940 neighborhood in Tempe; the others have been displaced by expansion of the downtown commercial district and Arizona State University." Neighborhood residents overwhelmingly oppose the type of development contemplated in the SAP and related documents. The Maple Ash neighborhood is not a blighted section of town which needs to be leveled and redeveloped. Rather, it is a desirable residential location with unique characteristics which should be protected. Residents of this neighborhood appreciate its historical character and these residents' efforts to maintain the historical character of this neighborhood should be aided, rather than hindered by any actions on the part of the City of Tempe. Given my home's location on Mill Avenue, I am fundamentally impacted by the vision of the Maple Ash neighborhood put forth in the SAP and related documents. I respectfully request that the City of Tempe revise the SAP and related documents to reflect the desires of the vast majority of the residents of the Maple Ash neighborhood association, including myself. Thank you for your consideration.

	Page 42		After years of acrimonious fighting in the Maple-Ash area, it appears that some semblance of reality may be taking hold. Most importantly, the first draft of the SAP does NOT adopt the land uses developed in the Northwest Neighborhood Strategic Plan that would have down-zoned Maple-Ash and limited our property rights and our ability to redevelop our property. And yet, the NW Tempe Design Guidelines and the first draft SAP continues to perpetuate the myth that the Maple-Ash area is "single-family use with multi-family zoning" (see page 41 -- Heritage Area). Our family has owned property in this area for over fifty years, and we know this has never been so. Maple-Ash has always been multi-family -- in zoning and USE. XXX's own property consists of a house and two or three apartments behind--which makes it multi-family. XXX property consists of a duplex, a triplex, a fourplex, and one three bedroom house. Page 42 in the Design Guidelines is very unhelpful with all its talk about historic designation when no such designation exists, about lush greenery when we live in a desert and should be promoting water conservation, and about providing two-story residential units facing an existing residential neighborhood when in fact our zoning is R-3 which allows three-stories.

Category **Historic**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 36		Page D 36 - Section 7(c) Strategy captures the essence of Historic Preservation in Tempe.
	Page 37		4th Guideline: Expensive, discourage maintenance.
	Page 39		Special use guidelines: Don't limit criteria to "economic" hardship to encourage relocation of historic buildings.
	Page 39		Historic homes unduelly burdend to provide and maintain neighborhood character. Sketch: What forms of preservation? Replace vs. repaired?
	Page 42		Keep Maple-Ash a Historic Area

Category: Intro

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Purpose and intent: ADD bullet: "promote environmental sustainability and enhance liveability of the neighborhoods."
	Page 1		"SAP and DG will not reduce property rights." This is an opinion or over riding regulatory statement.

Category: Landscape

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 20		City should mandate xeriscape on all new residential and commercial development, since we live in (the) desert with rapid population growth.
	Page 20		Issue: ".. Plants that are difficult to maintain." Example Oregano's. 1st Guideline: "..where appropriate," Hard with fire requirements.
	Page 20		Element 2 (b): Difficult to accomplish with water weight Consider pots on balcony / roofs. Pots on/in rails. Allow to be covered by photo element.
	Page 21		1st Guideline: Urban Landscape measure by mature tree canopy. 3rd Guideline: "..for year-long color.." Expensive maintenance in desert, $800 per acre for monthly maintenance.
	Page 22		2nd Guideline: "..low-maintenance specimens" Not usefull in urban setting. Generally used for water retention basins and non-public landscape. 4th Guideline: "Slope parking surface to drain into landscape areas." Hard on "colorful urban landscapes".

Category: Lot Assemblage

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 42		Add as a guideline on page 42; land parcels will not be combined.

Category Maple-Ash

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 3		Keep residential character on Mill Ave.all the way south to 13th St.
	Page 42		8(b) Heritage Area: keep the developers and bulldozers out of Maple-Ash.

Category Mixed Use

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 4		Page 4. In the SAP, there is no lot size in acres or square feet associated with the MU-1 or MU-2 designations. On page 4 of the Guidelines, MU-1 areas are said to be on parcels smaller than five acres--implying that MU-2 districts area for developments greater than five acres. Five acres in Tempe, especially downtown, is humongous. Collector or arterial street designation is more appropriate. Take out reference to parcel size.
	Page 8		Mixed Use: Buildings that abut street must have pedestrian entrances and windows on street side.
	Page 16		Keep picture (sketch) on p.16 for reference and ideas. Possibly exist on Hardy and University or Broadway somewhere.

Category open space

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 19		Eliminate all credits for open space re: small developments.
	Page 19		Use PAD process to balance new open space with existing open space

Category Overlay

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Preface: Discuss multiple overlay coordination and administration (case study examples?)
	Page 36		"Accessory Dwelling Overlay District", how is this done?

Category Parking

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page	I support shared parking between office use and special night/weekend use to supplement public parking and to alleviate problems at large events in Rio Salado Area.
	Page 23	Diagram: Unrealistic. General commercial uses require 1.5 to 2 times as much area for parking as the building size. 3rd Guideline: (Parking Maximum Ratio) Difficult to do with long driveways of small infill areas.
	Page 24	2nd Issue: More than a perception for convenient parking. It sounds like you don't believe issue. 2nd Strategy: "parking garages" worse. "Signage to easily identify parking structures" good.
	Page 25	1st Guideline: "Municipal Parking lots", mega destination lots required like Centerpoint. "..on-site parking.." at surface parking price? 6th Guideline: Very expensive incorporation due to building code, who pays?
	Page 26	1st Guideline: Strikeout "90-degree curb", replace with VERTICAL CURB. 4" curb preferred to 6", works with drainage raised curb as alternate on public spaces. 2nd Guideline: ADA circulation issues at corners. Especially in tight urban fabric. 10'-15' radius at corner preferred.

Category **Pedestrian**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 31		Diagram: Show pedestrian level lighting. Diagram text: "Minimize curb-to-curb distance at crosswalks" Expensive to maintain. "Develop interesting views into shops" and interesting shops? 2nd Strategy: "..rather than hurry to their destination." Often confused with congestion.

	Page 32		Bullet Points: For what size site? 2nd bullet: Can be nuissance, with no loitering signs. 5th bullet: "Transit amenity" at transit stops. Lower Diagram: Where is the property line? Last guideline "..creative, quality projects." According to whom.

Category Preservation

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		Condemnation of non-blighted/non-slum properties for redevelopment does not help preserve heritage properties.

Category Public Process

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page		2. The design guide critera should be given teeth, insisting that developers bring sketch ideas for discussion with planners and community before they become committed to a detailed design in Redevelopment/Conservation areas . Together, developer and planners could then produce a design brief for the individual site which meets the requirements of the Design Guide.
	Page 33		Insist that developers submit sketch designs to design review before they are committed, so that staff/citizen input can be introduced before the developer is committed. If cannot insist then encourage with pressure.

Category Rio Salado Area

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 45		Page No. 45 of Design Guidelines 2nd Guideline. Insert the word "residential" before the word buildings. 3rd Guideline. Insert after the work neighborhood "unless ingress and egress is approved by the neighborhood."

Category Safety

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment

	Page 34		Top Diagram text: (1st bullet) Fire issues, (2nd bullet) not always in urban setting. Territoriality: low hedges change from 36 inches to 42 inches. Add bullet, Grade separation. Layered landscape. Bottom Diagram text: instead, divide into small panes of glass for security. Access Control: 2nd bullet; Not so - think of area by Fat Burger - better or worse with private gates.

Category **Work-Live**

SAPElement	Page	Section	Comment
	Page 3		Residential Zones: "Establish a work-live overlay zoning district." I oppose this guideline. Would create busy neighborhoods, crime, traffic, etc.